



TRINITY JOURNAL

VOLUME 2 NS, NO. 2 FALL 1981

M. M. B. TURNER
The Significance of Receiving the Spirit in Luke-Acts:
A Summary of Modern Scholarship. 131-158

STUART S. COOK
Behavioral Objectives in Christian Education:
A Need for Integration. 159-168

PHILIP B. PAYNE
Libertarian Women in Ephesus: A Reponse to Douglas J.
Moore's Article, "1 Timothy 2:11-15: Meaning and
Significance" 169-197

DOUGLAS J. MOO
The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15: A Rejoinder 198-222

EXEGETICAL NOTES
Luke 24:13-35 (Walter L. Liefeld) 223-229

BOOK REVIEWS 230-252

BOOKS RECEIVED 253-256

LIBERTARIAN WOMEN IN EPHEBUS:
A RESPONSE TO DOUGLAS J. MOO'S ARTICLE,
"1 TIMOTHY 2:11-15: MEANING AND SIGNIFICANCE"

PHILIP B. PAYNE
KYOTO, JAPAN

Douglas J. Moo's article in *Trinity Journal* 1 (1980) contends that "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" (p. 82).

Our response will consider, first, exegetical weaknesses, and second, logical weaknesses in Moo's evaluation of the meaning and significance of 1 Tim 2:11-15. Third, we will examine more closely the situation in the Ephesian church which 1 Timothy addressed. Finally, we will examine whether Paul intended 1 Tim 2:12 as a universal prohibition of women teaching or having authority over men.

I. EXEGETICAL WEAKNESSES IN MOO'S ARTICLE

ἡσυχία in 1 Tim 2:11, 12

Moo on p. 64 interprets *ἡσυχία* as meaning "silence" rather than "quiet." In support of this he adduces Acts 22:2. Although translations are not always a faithful guide, practically all of the major English versions translate *ἡσυχία* in Acts 22:2 as "quiet."¹

All of the main Greek lexica including LSJ, BAG, Moulton-Milligan, and Thayer give "quiet" as the primary meaning for *ἡσυχία*. In 1 Tim 2:11-12 *ἡσυχία* is translated "quiet" by the majority of English translations. The same is true of every other occurrence of *ἡσυχία* or *ἡσυχῶν* in the NT, contrary to the impression given by Moo in n.15, p. 64.

When Paul wished to specify "silence" he commonly used *συνήκω* (1 Cor 14:28, 30, 34). A strong case can be made that every time Paul used *ἡσυχία* or *ἡσυχῶν* he intended to convey the idea of quietness. All major English versions agree that it is this idea and not "silence" that Paul intended in 2 Thess 3:12, commanding lazy people "to work in a quiet fashion (*μετὰ ἡσυχίας*) and eat

¹NIV, NASB, RSV, NEB, NAB, ASV, RV, Berkeley, Goodspeed, Moffatt, Williams, Beck, TEV, Basic, Weymouth, Amplified, Confraternity, Concordant, Centenary, Emphasized, 20th Century, Riverside, and An American Translation.

their own bread." All the other pauline occurrences of *ἡσυχία* and *ἡσυχῶν* are in 1 Timothy 2. Verse 2 is a prayer on behalf of rulers "in order that we may lead a tranquil and quiet (*ἡσυχῶν*²) life." Again, all the major English versions agree that "quiet," not "silence" is the meaning.

In 1 Tim 2:11-12 the context further supports the usual translation of *ἡσυχία* as "quiet." "Quietness" forms a natural pair with "submission," which Paul links to it in the parallel phrases of 2:11: *ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μαθητεύω ἐν πᾶσι ὑποταγῇ*. Likewise, the "authority" or "lording it over" indicated by *ἄλλοις ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ*. Furthermore, "quietness" is appropriate to a context of teaching and learning. A quiet spirit, the attitude of receptivity, is more significant to learning than is silence. Silence may even be detrimental to learning and does not necessarily indicate submission.

We conclude, contrary to Moo, that *ἡσυχία* in 1 Tim 2:11-12 means "quiet" since: 1) the usual NT meaning of *ἡσυχία* is "quiet"; 2) elsewhere in Paul's letters *ἡσυχία* denotes "quiet" and another term, *σγῶω*, is used to denote "silence"; 3) the context of 1 Tim 2:11-12 supports the translation "quiet" since "quiet" forms a natural pair with "submission" in 2:11 and a natural contrast to *ἄλλοις ἐν* in 2:12. Unfortunately, all of this crucial data is omitted completely from Moo's discussion.

ἐπιτρέπω in 1 Tim 2:12

On p. 65 Moo makes a series of false or misleading assertions about the verb *ἐπιτρέπω* in 1 Tim 2:12, all of which camouflage the fact that *ἐπιτρέπω*, particularly in the first person singular present active indicative usually does not refer to a continuing state and can only be determined to have continuing effect where there are clear indicators to that effect in the context.

Moo begins by stating, "Paul's counsel is introduced with the verb *ἐπιτρέπω*, 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" (p. 65). Simply because a verb is used with God as its subject in one occurrence is hardly a reasonable foundation for asserting what it can or cannot indicate in a passage in a different book! In fact, the verb in 1 Cor 16:7 which Moo cites is not in the first person present indicative as is 1 Tim 2:12, but is in the third person first aorist subjunctive, *ἐὰν ὁ κύριος ἐπιτρέψῃ* ("if the Lord permits"), making it inappropriate even as a parallel verbal form. Furthermore, both 1 Cor 16:7 and the only other occurrence of *ἐπιτρέπω* with God as subject, Heb 6:3, refer to specific situations and not to a continuing state and so, if anything, are evidence against Moo's contention that *ἐπιτρέπω* in 1 Tim 2:12 should be interpreted as applying to the church in every age and place.

Paul more than any other NT writer distinguished his personal advice for a particular situation from permanently valid instruction from the Lord by specifying some sayings to be the Lord's commandment (cf. 1 Cor 7:6, 10, 12, 25,

40). When Paul was giving his own personal advice he typically used first person singular present active indicative verb forms, as in 1 Cor 7:6, 7, 8, 12, 17, 25, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35, 40, exactly the verb form of *ἐπιτρέπω* in 1 Tim 2:12.

Similarly, when Paul wished to specify that a given command was to be observed in all the churches he did not hesitate to do so, as in 1 Cor 11:16; 14:33, 34, 36. Since in 1 Tim 2:12 Paul uses his typical verbal form for giving his own personal position (first person singular present active indicative) and since he neither claims that his position is from the Lord nor that the same restrictions on women should apply in all the churches, it would seem to be the most natural reading to understand *ἐπιτρέπω* in 1 Tim 2:12 as referring to the particular situation in Ephesus to which Paul was speaking without necessarily being applicable in all times and places.

Concerning *ἐπιτρέπω* in 1 Tim 2:12, Moo's n. 17, p. 65, suggests, "It may be that a rabbinic formula of prohibition is reproduced with this word. . . . Cf. 1 Cor 14:34." If a rabbinic formula of prohibition were being reproduced, however, it would most naturally be in the third person passive, "it is not permitted" (as in 1 Cor 14:34, which Moo cites) rather than in the first person active (as in 1 Tim 2:12). Yet even "it is permitted" can refer simply to a particular situation, as it does in Acts 26:1, where Agrippa told Paul, literally, "It is permitted for you to speak for yourself." Practically all of the English versions of Acts 26:1 translate *ἐπιτρέψεται* as though it were in the second person, "You have permission to speak" since in English, unlike Greek, "it is permitted" almost invariably implies a continuing state.

Moo continues by alleging, "The first person singular formulation renders the present tense necessary and can have almost a gnomic timeless force (cf. also on 2:1 and 2:8)" (p. 65). The first person singular formulation, however, does *not* render the present tense necessary as is evident from *ἐπέτρεψα* in 1 Macc 15:6. Rather than use the present in 1 Tim 2:12 Paul could have written, "I will never permit. . . ." using the future tense, as is done in Matt 26:33, "I will never be offended"; or he could have used the aorist subjunctive, as occurs twice in Heb 13:5, "I will never leave you nor forsake you." A formulation like either of these would have indicated a continuing prohibition, but Paul gave no such indication that 1 Tim 2:12 should be understood as a continuing prohibition.

When Paul does use the present tense with a specifically timeless force he usually indicates this with phrases such as *ὅτι ἐπὶ πάντων* in 1 Tim 2:1 and *ἐν παντί ὅτι* in 1 Tim 2:8. These examples, cited by Moo, in fact suggest the opposite of his conclusion, namely, that where Paul intended to convey a gnomic timeless force with the present tense we can expect an indication to that effect in the context.

Moo concludes his discussion of *ἐπιτρέπω* saying, "... any limitation [to Paul's day or to peculiar circumstances in a given period] will have to be inferred from the context and not on the basis of tense alone." It is not just in the case of *limitation* of meaning, however, that such should be defended from the context; clear evidence would seem to be *even more necessary if one extends* the meaning of a present tense, particularly in the first person, to make it universally applicable. This requirement, which places the major burden of proof on those who, like Moo, desire to universalize Paul's restriction on

²*ἡσυχῶν* is the adjective from which *ἡσυχία* is derived according to G. B. Winer (*Grammar of the Idiom of the New Testament* [Andover, 1883] 95) and Joseph Henry Thayer (*A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* [NY: Harper & Brothers, 1889] 281).

women, is reinforced by an examination of the occurrences of *ἐπιτρέπω* in the LXX and the NT.

Every occurrence of *ἐπιτρέπω* in the LXX refers to permission for a specific situation, never for a universally applicable permission: Gen 39:6; Esth 9:4; Job 32:14; Wis 19:2; 1 Macc 15:6; 4 Macc 4:17, 18; 5:26. Similarly, the vast majority of the NT occurrences of *ἐπιτρέπω* clearly refer to a specific time or to a short or limited time duration only: Matt 8:21; Mark 5:13; Luke 8:32; 9:59, 61; John 19:38; Acts 21:39, 40; 27:3; 28:16; 1 Cor 16:7; Heb 6:3. There are only two cases in which *ἐπιτρέπω* seems clearly to refer to a permission with continuing effect: 1 Cor 14:34 and Mark 10:4 with its parallel in Matt 19:8. "Moses permitted you to divorce your wives," a permission which Jesus said was "because of your hardness of heart . . . but from the beginning it has not been this way." Neither case is parallel in verbal form to 1 Tim 2:12. 1 Cor 14:34 has the third person passive, unlike the first person active of 1 Tim 2:12; and *ἐπιτρέβω* in Mark 10:4 and Matt 19:9 is third person first aorist referring to the past event. "Moses permitted . . ." unlike the first person present of 1 Tim 2:12.

The most crucial data concerning *ἐπιτρέπω* in 1 Tim 2:12 may now be summarized:

- 1) The first person present active indicative form of *ἐπιτρέπω* which occurs in 1 Tim 2:12 is Paul's typical way of expressing his own personal position.
 - 2) *Ἐπιτρέπω* in the NT only rarely occurs with reference to a continuing state and never elsewhere does so in the first person. When Paul desired to express a permanent restriction using *ἐπιτρέπω* he used the more natural third person passive, "it is not permitted" (1 Cor 14:34). Even when *ἐπιτρέπω* occurs with "God" or "Lord" as its subject, it never in the NT refers to a continuing state.
 - 3) Paul in 1 Tim 2:12 does not claim that this restriction on women is from the Lord or to be observed in all the churches; nor does he include any universalizing qualifier. Yet Paul more than any other NT writer distinguished his personal advice for a particular situation from permanently valid instruction from the Lord by specifying certain sayings to be the Lord's command; frequently Paul specified what was to be observed in all the churches; and when occasionally he did express a continuing state using the first person he typically included some universalizing qualifier.
- Unfortunately, none of this data is included in Moo's discussion. We conclude, therefore, contrary to Moo, that *ἐπιτρέπω* in 1 Tim 2:12 refers to the particular situation in Ephesus to which Paul was writing without necessarily being applicable in other places or in other times. It could be determined to have a continuing effect only if there were clear indicators to that effect in the context.

Also unfortunate is the usual English translation of *ἐπιτρέπω* in 1 Tim 2:12, "I do not permit." It is misleading since this English translation implies a continuing state where *the Greek does not*. A translation which avoids this misleading implication is "I am not permitting" since it preserves the nuance of the Greek, favoring the normal present reference without excluding the possibility of a continuing state. The Jerusalem Bible's translation captures this nuance: "I am not giving permission for a woman to teach or to tell a man what to do" as does the Concordat Version, "Now I am not permitting a

woman to be teaching, neither to be domineering over a man, but to be quiet." The same verbal form (first person singular present active indicative) in 1 Tim 3:14 is translated in practically all English versions, "I *am* writing. . . ."

διδάσκω in 1 Tim 2:12

Speaking of the meaning of "teaching" according to Paul, Moo on p. 65 detects in the Greek verb "the authority inherent in the teaching, and thus in the teacher." Although Paul at times used various forms of the word *διδάσκω* to express authoritative Christian teaching, he also used the word to refer to believers in general teaching one another (1 Cor 14:26; Col 3:16; Titus 2:3-5), Jewish teachers (Rom 2:20-21), merely human teaching (1 Cor 2:13; Gal 1:12; Col 2:22), the teaching of nature (1 Cor 11:14), false or impure teaching (Eph 4:14; 1 Tim 6:1; 2 Tim 4:3; Titus 1:11; 2:7), and even teaching of demons (1 Tim 4:1). The very fact that Paul specifies that some teaching is sound (1 Tim 1:10; 4:6; 2 Tim 4:3; Titus 1:9; 2:1), pure (1 Tim 2:7), or godly (1 Tim 6:3), and urges Timothy, "Pay close attention to your teaching" (1 Tim 4:16), makes it obvious that Paul did *not* consider authority to be inherent in the teaching in the church, much less in human teachers, even if they be teachers like Barnabas or the apostle Peter (Gal 2:1-14).

Moo alleges on p. 65 "the fact that the teaching ministry was restricted to particular individuals (the elder-overseer in the Pastorals)." Yet although not everyone has the special gift of teaching (1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11), there are several instances in Paul's writing where he affirms a teaching ministry in which all segments of the church should take part, both in assembled worship (Col 3:16 "Let the word of Christ richly dwell within you, with all wisdom teaching [*διδάσκοντες*] and admonishing one another with psalms and hymns and spiritual songs, singing with thankfulness in your hearts to God"; 1 Cor 14:26 "When you assemble, each one has a psalm, has a teaching [*διδάχνη*], has a revelation, has a tongue, has an interpretation") and in more private instruction (2 Tim 2:2 "The things you have heard me say in the presence of many witnesses entrust to reliable people who will also be qualified to teach [*διδάσκειν*] others"; Titus 2:3 "Likewise teach the older women . . . to teach what is good [*καλοδιδάσκουσας*]").

According to Paul's vision of the church, all members are to be involved in ministering, building up the body of Christ (Eph 4:12). To this end God has gifted all members of the church for profitable participation. It is true that overseers should be able to teach (1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:9), but Paul did not specify that they must have the special gift of teaching. These special gifts are given to whomever the Spirit desires (1 Cor 12:8-12). Nowhere does Paul say that the gift of teaching is restricted to people with a particular office such as overseer. The special preaching class of professional "priests" and "ministers" as we know them today developed later in church history as did the idea that the teaching ministry should be performed only by ordained ministers. Therefore, at the time 1 Timothy was written "teaching cannot be presupposed as a special function of the bishop."³

³Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972) 55; cf. H. von Campenhausen, *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power* (trans. J. A. Baker; London: Adam and Charles Black, 1969) 109-110.

The teaching role of Priscilla in the history of the church in Ephesus, the church about which Paul writes in 1 Timothy, shows how unlikely it is that Paul in 1 Tim 2:12 had in mind a teaching ministry which should always be restricted to males in the position of elder-overseer. When Paul departed from Ephesus after his initial proclamation of the gospel, he left Priscilla and Aquila, apparently to oversee the work there. That this is indeed what they did is evident from several statements about them: 1) They had already received the necessary training for such oversight since Paul had just lived and worked with them for at least one and a half years in Corinth (Acts 18:1-3, 11, 18) before traveling with them to Ephesus (Acts 18:18). 2) Priscilla and Aquila are explicitly said to have invited the eloquent and powerful visiting preacher Apollos to their home where they "explained to him the way of God more accurately" (Acts 18:26). 3) Even before Apollos left Ephesus, there was already a group of Christian brothers there sufficiently well organized to give him a letter of endorsement to the Corinthian church in Achaia (Acts 18:12, 27; 19:1). Since Priscilla and Aquila had just come from Corinth, their endorsement would have provided the needed link of trust; so they must already have been respected highly enough for their endorsement to have carried weight. 4) Their leadership in the Ephesian church is further evidenced by the mention of the church that met in their home (1 Cor 16:19). 5) There was clearly not a passive role in the church for Paul speaks of them as his "fellow-workers" who "risked their lives for me. Not only I but all the churches of the Gentiles are grateful to them" (Rom 16:3-4).

The prominence of Priscilla is evidenced by her name being listed first in the four passages which are particularly concerned with their active ministry.⁴ She was a companion, close friend, and fellow-worker with Paul and is described during the foundation of the Ephesian church as directly involved in teaching Apollos, one of the most powerful preachers in the early church—the very sort of teaching that Moo describes as excluded from women (p. 66): "careful transmission of the tradition concerning Jesus Christ and his significance."

Moo stresses this precise definition of the meaning of "teaching" in 1 Tim 2:12. This passage, however, gives no definition of what Paul meant by *διδάσκω*. *Διδάσκω* in the NT is a general term which can apply to all sorts and levels of teaching. If the women in Ephesus who were promoting false teaching stopped teaching in the assembly and merely wrote and passed out pamphlets which advanced their views, would Paul have been content that they had not "taught"? Of course not!

Moo avoids mentioning the vast practical implications of his position even with his narrowed definition of "teaching." If women are not to teach men, is it consistent to let them write theological books, articles, or hymns? or teach in our seminaries? Yet to deny women in every age and place all of these avenues for what may be their God-given gifts would result in untold spiritual im-

⁴Cf. D. E. Hiebert, "Aquila and Priscilla," *The Zondervan Pictorial Encyclopedia of the Bible* (5 vols., Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), 1:232; M. J. Shroyer, "Aquila and Priscilla," *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (4 vols., NY: Abingdon, 1962), 4:176. Even C. Kyrle (*The Place of Women in the Church* [Chicago: Moody, 1968], 55), who in general opposes having women in the role of pastor-teacher, admits "She could hardly be excluded from the ranks of a teacher."

poverishment. Think of the hymns by Fanny Jane Crosby, Frances Ridley Havergal, and Charlotte Elliott—hymns that instruct and inspire.

The apparent assumption of Moo that Paul prohibited women from teaching *men* (p. 82) is a reflection of some English translations, "to teach or have authority over men," rather than the Greek which reads, literally, "To teach, however, on the part of a woman I am not permitting, nor to lord it over a man." "Man" in this sentence is the object of "lord it over" and is too far removed from "to teach" to be understood naturally as qualifying the meaning of that verb as well. To limit the meaning of *διδάσκω* in 2:12 to teaching only in public assemblies where men are present is more rationalization than exegesis, rationalization to make Paul's purportedly universal prohibition more practically feasible for church life today.

αἰθερέω in 1 Tim 2:12

Moo on p. 67 comes to "the fairly certain conclusion that *αἰθερέω* 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." Moo admits, however, in n. 33 that he has not been able to check either of these pre-Christian occurrences. This and the fact that although Paul frequently speaks about authority (1 Tim 2:2 etc.) he nowhere else used this word to express it should lead to a more cautious estimate.

The meaning "dominate," which Moo documents in n. 34 for his only second century example, or "lord it over" seems to be a more natural pair with "be in submission," *ὑποταγῆ*, in 1 Tim 2:11⁵ and contrasts more sharply with the "quietness," *ἡσυχία*, which Paul commands at the start and close of this sentence (2:11, 12). In fact, most of the major commentaries follow a rendering of *αἰθερέω* as "domineer" or "lord it over."⁶

In no other verse of Scripture is it stated that women are not to be in "authority" over men. It is precarious indeed to deny that women should ever be in a position of authority over men based on the disputed meaning of the only occurrence of this word anywhere in the Bible.

γάβ in 1 Tim 2:13-14

Moo interprets 1 Tim 2:13-14 as teaching that Eve's deception was "causative of the nature of women in general and that this susceptibility to deception bars them from engaging in public teaching . . . [and] that there are some activities for which women are by nature not suited" (p. 70). Moo's sweeping generalizations, however, about the nature of women in general to be susceptible to deception and barring women from engaging in public teaching are cer-

⁵So also Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles* 47.

⁶Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles* 47; J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1963) 68; Walter Lock, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (NY: Scribner's, 1924) 32; C. K. Barrett, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963) 55; E. K. Simpson, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 1954) 47; Donald Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Erdmans, 1957) 76-7; Patrick Fairbairn, *Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1956) 127-8. So, too, several of the English versions: Williams, An American Translation, Concordat, Living Bible, F. Fenton.

tainly not explicit in this or any other Scripture passage, and whether they are implicit is open to serious question. The many examples of godly women in positions of leadership in both the OT and NT should caution us against such generalizations.

Moo's position depends on two questionable assumptions he makes about the function of *γάπο* in 2:13. First, he assumes without discussion (p. 68) that this *γάπο* is illative, giving the reason for Paul's prohibiting women from teaching in 2:12. Second, he assumes that the kind of reason Paul intends to give is an *anthropological norm* describing the nature of women as determined by God in creation.

First, an examination of Paul's usage shows *γάπο* to be an extremely common conjunction, even more than *ἀλλά* ("but").⁷ *Τάπο* is common in a variety of senses. Often it is better left untranslated in English. In Rom 8:18-24 Paul begins every sentence with *γάπο*, but only two are given a translation ("for") in the NIV. As well as having an illative use *γάπο* is frequently explanatory ("for example," "For instance," "Now") or emphatic.⁸ A. T. Robertson writes, "It is best in fact, to note the explanatory use first. Thayer wrongly calls the illative use the primary one."⁹ Grammarians agree that the NT use of *γάπο* conforms to classical use, and the explanatory use of *γάπο* is common both in Homer and the NT.¹⁰

It makes good sense to take *γάπο* in 1 Tim 2:13-14 as explanatory since the example of Eve's deception leading to the fall of mankind is a powerful illustration of how serious the consequences can be when a woman deceived by false teaching conveys it to others. Moo, in fact, supports this position, writing on p. 70, "it is difficult to avoid the conclusion that Paul cites Eve's failure as exemplary." If *γάπο* in 1 Tim 2:12 is explanatory, not illative, the actual reason Paul was prohibiting women in Ephesus from teaching is not that Eve was formed after Adam or that she was deceived by Satan, but that some women in Ephesus were (or were on the verge of becoming) *engaged in false teaching*. That this was indeed the case is evidenced in that some of the Ephesian women had already "turned away to follow after Satan" and were saying things they ought not to" (1 Tim 5:13-15), and by Paul's contrast of sound doctrine to "worldly fables fit only for old women" (1 Tim 4:7).

Moo's second assumption is that the kind of reason introduced by *γάπο* is an anthropological norm, yet even in purely illative uses of *γάπο* "the force of the ground or reason naturally varies greatly.... The precise relation between clauses or sentences is not set forth by *γάπο*. That must be gathered from the context if possible."¹¹ If Paul intended 2:13-14 as a reason at all, it would

⁷Nigel Turner, *Syntax*, vol. 3 of the Moulton-Howard-Turner Grammar, p. 331.

⁸A. T. Robertson, *Grammar of NT Greek* 1189-91, 433; Blass-Debrunner-Funk, *Greek Grammar* §452; H. E. Dana and Julius R. Manney, *A Manual of the Greek Testament* (NY: Macmillan, 1927) 242-3; William Douglas Chamberlain, *An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek NT* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1941) 154; A. T. Robertson and W. Hesse Davis, *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament* (NY: Harper, 1931) §425; Boyce W. Blackwelder, *Light from the Greek NT* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1958) 108-9.

⁹Robertson, *Grammar* 1190.

¹⁰Robertson, *Grammar* 1190; Blass-Debrunner-Funk, *Grammar* §452.

¹¹Robertson, *Grammar* 1191.

seem to be more naturally understood as something like, "For consider what happened when Eve was deceived" than as an anthropological norm since nothing in 1 Tim 2:12-15 extrapolates from Eve's deception to the nature of women in general. Furthermore, the only other reference to Eve's deception in the NT, 2 Cor 11:3, a close parallel to 1 Tim 2:14, is not used by Paul to draw any generalizations about women, but only as an example: "But I am afraid that just as Eve was deceived by the serpent's cunning, your minds may somehow be led astray from your sincere and pure devotion to Christ." Similarly, in 1 Tim 2:14 Paul points to the example of Eve's deception which led to the fall as a warning to the church in Ephesus lest deception of women there, too, lead to their fall. But this does not necessarily imply that women in general are so susceptible to deception that they should always be barred from public teaching. If their susceptibility to deception was that severe we would have expected Paul to bar them from being taught as was apparently the common practice in synagogues at that time. Paul, however, commands, "let the women learn" in 1 Tim 2:11. And in chapter one he has said that the problem with teachers of the law in Ephesus is that they do not know what they are talking about (1:7). The implication is not that such persons could never teach, but that first of all they need to be taught properly.

Moo claims for his view (p. 70), "It is arguable that only this interpretation adequately accounts for... 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 teachings in vv 11-12." Moo has not mentioned, however, the much more simple interpretation which takes Eve as an historical example of what can happen when women are deceived and warning lest deception of women in the Ephesian church lead to their fall. This view does justice to the stress on Eve's deception and the seriousness of its lasting effects (certainly the fall is a serious enough lasting effect without postulating that it made women particularly susceptible to deception and made them by nature unsuited to some activities such as engaging in public teaching!). This view also supports the restrictions Paul has laid on women in the Ephesian church in 1 Tim 2:11-12, but it avoids the dangerous extrapolation from historical example to anthropological norms which are not explicit in Scripture.

οὐκ ὀφείλου δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας in 1 Tim 2:25

A major if not the major interpretation throughout Christian history of *οὐκ ὀφείλου δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας* is the straightforward translation, "she shall be saved by means of the child-bearing" (similarly, the RV, Berkeley, Amplified, Emphasized, Young's, Montgomery's, Godbey's, and the margins of the RSV, NEB, ASV, Knox, and Weymouth).

This thought of salvation through Mary's child-bearing is found in many of the early church fathers. Ignatius' *Eph.* 19 speaks of "Mary and her child-bearing." Irenaeus' *Haer.* iii.22 reads, "Eve having become disobedient, was made the cause of death, both to herself and to the entire human race; so Mary... became the cause of salvation... both to herself and to the entire human race..." (and similarly *Haer.* v.19 and *Prædic. Apostolica* 33).

Justin's *Dial.* 100 deals at length with this concept: "He became man by the Virgin, in order that the disobedience which proceeded from the serpent might receive its destruction in the same manner in which it received its origin."

Similarly, Tertullian, *de Carne* xvii reads:

For it was while Eve was yet a virgin that the ensnaring word had crept into her ear which was to build the edifice of death. Into a virgin's soul, in like manner, must be introduced that Word of God which was to raise the fabric of life, so that what had been reduced to ruin by this sex, might by the selfsame sex be recovered to salvation.¹²

This sort of interpretation of 1 Tim 2:14 is found in Theophylact, in Cramer, *Carena* vii.22, and is advocated by such recent scholars as Elllicott, von Soden, Wohlenberg, Hammond, Liddon, Rowland, Faibum, and Lock.

Moo, too, almost adopts this view in light of "the context of Genesis 3, clearly in Paul's mind in v 14, the natural meaning given *αἰῶς* and *διὰ* and the article with *τεκνογυνία*" (p. 71). There are clear lexical, theological, contextual, and grammatical indications that this is indeed what Paul meant.

Lexically, Moo is correct that in the vast majority of its pauline occurrences "*αἰῶς* consistently indicates salvation from sin" (p. 71).¹³ "By means of Christ" could have correctly been added to Moo's comment, indicating the natural referent of *τῆς τεκνογυνίας* as Christ. Paul had just affirmed this truth in 1 Tim 2:5-6. Moo's comment that "While *τεκνογυνία* could possibly denote the birth of Christ, it is certainly not the most natural explanation" (p. 71) ignores Paul's obvious concern to *highlight the role of woman* both in the fall (2:14) and in salvation (2:15). If Paul had said simply, "Woman will be saved through Christ," he would not have affirmed her role in salvation, balancing her role in the fall.

To support his alternative interpretation Moo alleges that *τεκνογυνία* "may indicate child-rearing as well as child-bearing" (p. 72) and adduces in support of this position that "Paul uses the verbal form of this word in 1 Tim 5:14 to mean the rearing of children" (p. 71). The word that Paul used for rearing children, however, is *τεκνοποιέω* (1 Tim 5:10) and none of the major lexica suggests the meaning Moo alleges. *Τεκνογυνία* means simply "childbirth"¹⁴ and is so translated in all the major versions both in 1 Tim 2:15 and 5:14.¹⁵ Although Moo's interpretation of *τεκνογυνία* does not even occur in the major lexica, he is forced to adopt it since as he admits on p. 72, to say "that women experience ultimate salvation only insofar as they beget children . . . is incompatible with clear pauline teaching."

Theologically, Moo's position, even as adjusted by means of lexical innovation, seems to be incompatible with the heart of Paul's teaching. Moo's position is that "women will be saved . . . through faithfulness to their proper

¹²A beautiful poetic description of this is given in the *Five Books in Reply to Marcion*, author unknown, in 180-210: cf. *The Anti-Nicene Fathers*, ed. Roberts and Donaldson (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1956), 4:148-9.

¹³Cf. Dibelius and Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles* 47-8; Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles* 69-70; Lock, *Pastoral Epistles* 31; J. L. Houlihan, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Pelican: Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin, 1976) 72.

¹⁴LSJ 1768, BAG 808, Moultou-Milligan 628; Thayer 617.

¹⁵This is expressed either as "bear children": AV, RV, ASV, RSV, NASB, Berkeley, Phillips, Moffatt, Goodspeed, Weymouth, Amplified, Concordat, Emphasized, Century, 20th Century, New World, Riverside, and Greber, or as "have children": NEB, NIV, NAB, Williams, Beck, Basic, TEV, Living Bible, and An American Translation.

role, exemplified in motherhood" (p. 71) and that in order to "experience salvation . . . deliverance from sin and its condemning power . . . women must . . . maintain" this role (pp. 72-3) and that "*τεκνογυνία* is one of those 'good works' (v 10) through which the woman preserves her place in the salvific scheme" (p. 72) and "insure[s] her participation in the eschatological salvation" (p. 73). It is difficult to see how Moo's interpretation is consistent with Paul's basic position that salvation is through grace by faith alone. It is hard to imagine Paul saying that *τεκνογυνία* or any other "good works" are the "efficient cause . . . of deliverance from sin and its condemning power" (p. 72). "Salvation by means of" anyone or anything other than Christ would be awkward and unexpected in Paul's writing.

Furthermore, Moo's position appears to contradict Gal 3:28: "There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus." Even if one tries to limit the meaning of this verse to salvation and say that "the full rights of sons" (Gal 4:6) implies nothing about the possibility that leadership in the Christian community may be granted by God to Greeks, slaves, and females as well as Jewish free men: even at a bare minimum Gal 3:28 means that all people without differentiation, women as well as men, experience salvation alike "through faith in Jesus Christ" (Gal 3:22, 23, 24, 25, 26). Moo's position, however, is that women face a special requirement: in order to be saved they must maintain "their proper role, exemplified in motherhood" (p. 71).

Even if Moo could somehow explain his view so as to make it compatible with Paul's theology, his view would face a further theological problem since it introduces a doctrine of ministry with widespread practical implications (excluding all women from teaching and authority positions) which is not clearly taught anywhere else in Scripture. Yet no doctrine, particularly one with such broad implications, should rest on a debatable interpretation of one passage.

Contextually, the whole section from 1 Tim 2:9-15 shows a careful balance of criticism and affirmation of women in the Ephesian church. The criticisms are stated softly and as much as possible are implied clearly without a direct rebuke. By contrast, the affirmations are direct statements:

CRITICISM OF WOMEN

2:9 I want women to dress modestly, with decency and propriety, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or expensive clothes

AFFIRMATION OF WOMEN

2:10 but with good deeds
2:11 Let women learn

2:11b in quietness and full submission
2:12 I am not permitting a woman to teach or to lord it over a man, but to be quiet.

2:13 Eve was formed by God, too.

2:14 The woman (Eve) was deceived and became a transgressor

2:15 But she (woman) will be saved by means of the child-birth

2:15b if women continue in faith, love and holiness with propriety.

The *δέ* of contrast in 2:15 following the reference to the fall which came through the woman's deception, naturally introduces a corresponding affirmation, and nothing corresponds as well as the woman's role in giving birth to Christ. Several factors in the immediate and wider context reinforce understanding *τῆς τεκνογονίας* as a reference to Christ's birth.

The parallels between 1 Tim 2:14-15 and Gen 3:13-15 are substantial. 1 Tim 2:14 in describing Eve's deception (*ἡ γυνὴ ἐξαπατηθεῖσα* . . .) uses the terminology of Gen 3:13 (LXX: *ἡ γυνὴ . . . ἠπάτησεν* . . .). Similarly 1 Tim 2:15, "the woman shall be saved by means of the child-birth," closely reflects the ideas and terminology of Gen 3:15, where the Lord curses the serpent saying, "the seed of the woman [LXX: *τῆς γυναικὸς* . . . *τοῦ σπέρματος αἰῆτος*] will crush your head." In the Genesis passage the promise of the seed that will overcome the serpent is sandwiched between the reference to the woman's deception (3:13) and the curse of the fall on woman (3:16). Since Paul cites both the deception and fall and contrasts to these "she will be saved *δὲ τῆς τεκνογονίας*" it is only natural that "the child-birth" refer to Christ, as does the promised seed in the Genesis passage Paul is citing. Both Gen 3:15 and 1 Tim 2:15 are so worded as to specify that salvation comes through the woman, not man, affirming her in a way that balances the criticism of her deception and fall.

Reinforcing this natural interpretation is the fact that Paul uses terminology similar to this elsewhere to refer to Christ. He refers to Christ as the promised seed, also singular with the definite article, twice in Gal 3:16 (*τῷ σπέρματι*) and again in Gal 3:19 (*τὸ σπέρμα*). Here, as in 1 Tim 2:14-15 the promised seed is linked to the fall: "the whole world is a prisoner of sin, so that what was promised, being given through faith in Jesus Christ, might be given to those who believe" (Gal 3:22). This passage goes on to affirm the oneness of male and female in Christ (3:28) and that Christ was "born of a woman," *γενόμενον ἐκ γυναικὸς* (4:4).

Grammatically, *δὲ* with the genitive in the vast majority of its occurrences refers to space, time, or agency, conveying the meaning "through" or "by means of."¹⁶ In this passage, since space and time cannot apply, "through" or "by means of" indicating agency is the expected reading. Since Christ is the agent by means of whom God has wrought salvation, and since there is no other such agent, *σωθήσεται δὲ δὲ τῆς τεκνογονίας* would naturally be understood as referring to Christ. This understanding is supported by the fact that in Paul's writings "*δὲ* is often used with Christ in regard to our relation to God"¹⁷ as in Rom 5:9 *σωθόμεθα δὲ αὐτοῦ* (Christ), 1 Thess 5:9 *σωτηρίας αὐτοῦ* *ἡμῶν*, *Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*, and Titus 3:6 *δὲ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν*. *Δὲ* followed by a reference to Christ in the genitive case occurs repeatedly in Paul's letters: Rom 1:5, 8; 2:16; 5:1, 2, 9, 11, 17, 21; 7:4, 25; 8:37; 16:27; 1 Cor 1:10; 8:6; 15:21, 57; 2 Cor 1:5, 20; 3:4; 5:18; 10:1; Gal 1:1, 12; 2:16; 3:26; 6:14; Eph 1:5; 2:18; 3:12; Phil 1:11; Col 1:16, 20; 3:17; 1 Thess 4:2; 5:9; 2 Tim 1:10; Titus 3:6; Phlm 7.

Moo's proposal that *δὲ* in 1 Tim 2:15 indicates "efficient cause" is such a

rare use of *δὲ* that it is not even mentioned by Blass-DeBrunner-Funk, A. T. Robertson, N. Turner, C. F. D. Moule, or Dana and Manley. The closest thing to it, that *δὲ* may indicate "because of," is listed by all of them as occurring with the accusative case,¹⁸ not with the genitive as in 1 Tim 2:15. A. T. Robertson says that "the accusative . . . helps . . . to distinguish this idiom from the others."¹⁹ There would seem to be some question, then, whether *δὲ* with the genitive even has the grammatical possibility of the meaning Moo supposes, "efficient cause."

Both Moo's suggestion and the suggestion that *δὲ* may indicate an attendant circumstance seem improbable in this passage since, if that were Paul's intention, it would have been natural for him to have included this item along with the other conditions which follow, viz. "if they continue in faith, love, and holiness with propriety" (1 Tim 2:15). Paul here, however, states directly, "she will be saved by means of the child-birth" and proceeds to list separately the conditions which necessarily accompany and give evidence of salvation.

Likewise, the article *τῆς* before *τεκνογονίας* is most naturally taken as specifying "the child-birth." The use of the article as specifying is exceptionally frequent in the pastoral epistles: for example, *τὸ μυστήριον*, *ἡ δόξα καὶ δόξα, ὁ λόγος, ἡ ἀλήθεια, ἡ πίστις, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον, ἡ παρρησία*.²⁰ Moo's statement that "the article need not be specifying, but may be generic" (p. 71), although a theoretical possibility, because it is such an unusual way of expressing the generic idea it would need to be defended with parallel examples in Paul's writing. There are, however, no other occurrences of *τεκνογονία* or related words such as *τεκνοποιεῖν* with a definite article conveying the generic sense anywhere else in the NT or LXX.

We conclude, then that each of these lexical, theological, contextual, and grammatical considerations supports the literal translation of *σωθήσεται δὲ δὲ τῆς τεκνογονίας*, "But she shall be saved by means of the child-bearing."

Exegetically, then, it has been seen that in supporting his position Moo has adopted doubtful interpretations of *ἡσυχία* as "silence" in 1 Tim 2:11, 12, of *ἐπιτρέπω* in 2:12 as a continuing and universal prohibition, unwarranted allegations regarding the restriction of the teaching ministry to overseers and of "the authority inherent in the teaching and thus in the teacher," the overconfident assertion that *αἰθερεῖν* in 2:12 "must mean 'have authority,'" the undefended presumption that *γὰρ* in 2:13 is illative and that 2:13-14 gives an anthropological norm describing the nature of women in general, and a dubious interpretation of *δὲ* *τῆς τεκνογονίας* in 2:15.

II. LOGICAL WEAKNESSES IN MOO'S ARTICLE

The logical weaknesses scattered throughout Moo's article for the most part seem to be related to his exaggerated claims and his being forced by his position to interpret every passage where women appear to be teaching or having authority over men as though this were not actually the case.

¹⁸Blass-DeBrunner-Funk §222; Robertson, *Grammar* 583; Robertson and Davis, *Short Grammar* 359; Turner, *Syntax* 268; C. F. D. Moule, *Idiom Book of the New Testament* (Cambridge: University) 54, 58; Dana, *Grammar* 101.

¹⁹Robertson, *Grammar* 583.

²⁰For more examples see Lock, *Pastoral Epistles* xvi-xvii.

¹⁶Blass-DeBrunner-Funk §223; Robertson, *Grammar* 581-3; Turner, *Syntax* 267; Dana, *Grammar* 101-2.

¹⁷Robertson, *Grammar* 583.

Exaggerated Claims

Moo on p. 77 alleges that "a view remarkably similar [to his interpretation] . . . has been everywhere found." There are only two other passages in the entire Scriptures, however, which have been thought by a significant number of scholars to present a view similar to that which Moo proposes for 1 Tim 2:11-15. These are 1 Cor 11:2-16 and 1 Cor 14:33b-36. Yet neither of these passages explicitly states either that women should not teach men or that women should not be in authority over men. In fact, the evidence is such that Moo feels compelled to devote the section of his article preceding this comment to giving alternative interpretations of several passages that many scholars have felt to be in conflict with his interpretation.

Moo alleges on p. 80 "his [Adam's] right to predict determinately her [the woman's] character" and on p. 79 the "subordination . . . [of] female-male at every point." The Scriptures, however, nowhere say that the woman is to be subordinate to the man *at every point*, and the inference that Adam's naming Eve implies "his right to predict determinately her character" is speculative indeed.

On p. 81 Moo argues, "Were the sensibilities of Jewish brethren at issue, it is inconceivable that Paul would have allowed the one [learning] and forbidden the other [teaching]." Contrast, however, Paul's part in the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15) and conveying its command (15:30-31; 16:4), which even included: "You are to abstain from food sacrificed to idols, from blood, from the meat of strangled animals" (15:29 and 21:25). Paul's willingness to compromise on non-essentials for the greater good is also evident in his having circumcised Timothy "because of the Jews" (Acts 16:3), the very person to whom 1 Timothy is addressed. Paul was willing to compromise where the sensibilities of Jewish brethren were at issue, and there is substantial evidence, considered in the third part of this article, that the sensibilities of Jewish brethren were an issue in the church at Ephesus. In order to achieve reconciliation between a Judaizing group and a libertarian group in Ephesus, Paul called for concessions from both sides. Is it really inconceivable that to Judaizers, whose background typically prohibited women from learning (so rightly Moo on p. 81), Paul would command "Let them learn" (1 Tim 1:11); but because of libertarian women who were dressing immodestly, indecently, without propriety, and ostentatiously (2:9) Paul would say, "I am not permitting women to teach" (2:12)? Indecent dress alone would be sufficient reason for this restriction.

Moo's implication in the next sentence that "the scruples of Jewish brethren cannot be the reason for Paul's advice" (p. 81) is therefore illfounded.

Moo also alleges on p. 81 that "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." It should be obvious, however, that the prominence of temple prostitutes in the Artemis worship of Ephesus would be an invitation to scandal if women in the church officiated in ways similar to those priestesses. Repeatedly in the OT we read that God's people were not to follow customs that might confuse their worship with that of the pagans. In the OT situation, which was not unlike that in Ephesus, to have had priestesses would have suggested that Yahweh condoned the prostitution of the neighboring temple priestesses. This was probably the key reason why the OT priesthood was restricted to men. The NT

priesthood, however, is a universal priesthood of all believers; and the role of the NT teachers, preachers, evangelists, and ministers much more closely approximates the role of the OT prophet than the OT priest.

Moo asserts that "even if women were particularly prone to the views of the heretics, nothing suggests that they were *teaching* it" (p. 82, italics his). Nothing? The letters of Paul, such as 1 Timothy, were written to meet particular needs in particular situations. It can be assumed that when Paul prohibited something there was a need for that prohibition in the situation to which he wrote. In other words, he prohibited the bad activities which were occurring or were likely to occur in the situation to which he wrote. Hence, when we read, "I am not permitting a woman to teach" it is only natural to assume that women had been teaching or were likely to teach in the church in Ephesus. Moo himself admits that 1 Tim 5:14-15 and 2 Tim 3:6 are "two texts which mention women in this connection [false teaching]" (p. 82).

The exaggerated claims throughout Moo's paper are emphasized in his conclusion on p. 82 (italics added):

There is *absolutely nothing* in the passage which would suggest that Paul issued his instructions because of a local situation or 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.

Part III of this article will reconsider the evidence that Paul in 1 Tim 2:12 was speaking to the needs of a particular situation.

Forced Interpretations

Moo's position forces him to interpret every seeming exception, where women appear to be teaching or in an authority role, in such a way as to avoid this conclusion. The only way he can be so confident that "none of the texts clearly portrays a woman in the role of a leader or teacher of the church" (p. 76) is to accept such unlikely hypotheses as the one that the reference to the apostle Junia "is a shortened form of Judianus" (p. 76). This is equivalent to suggesting that June is a shortened form of Judas. Junia was a common name for the Roman lady. To postulate that by adding an "s" to it which is not in any manuscript (though the alternative Junia does occur in some, another common woman's name) we might derive an uncommon name for a man is speculation based on the assumption that a woman could not have held the position of an apostle.²¹

This same sort of bias is reflected in Moo's comment on the description of Phoebe in Rom 16:2: "It is difficult to give *προορτας* the sense of 'presiding' here because Paul himself is one of the objects of this activity" (n. 86, p. 76).²²

Because of the prominence of women as prophets in the NT Moo is forced

²¹See the discussion on Rom 16:7 in C. E. B. Cranfield, *The Epistle to the Romans* (2 vols., Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1975, 1979) 2:788-90.

²²Is it so strange that Paul who commanded all Christians to "be subject to one another" (Eph 5:21) should himself be subject to others? Cf. further on Phoebe below, pp. 192, 195.

to describe the position of "prophet" as of less authority than that of "teacher." Yet the role of the prophet was of such significant authority that Paul said the church is "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets" (Eph 2:20). This refers to NT prophets, as is clear from the comment in the very next sentence "... which in other generations was not made known to the sons of men, as it has now been revealed to His holy apostles and prophets in the Spirit" (Eph 3:5) and in the statement, "He gave some as apostles, and some as prophets, and some as evangelists, and some as pastors and teachers" in Eph 4:11.

The order "first apostles, second prophets, third teachers" in 1 Cor 12:28, 29 is one of several instances in which Paul gave special prominence to the gift of prophecy (as in 1 Cor 14:1, 4-5, 39). Acts 13:1 speaks of the "prophets and teachers" in Antioch. The NT descriptions of the prophet's work include prediction (Acts 11:28; 21:10-11), preaching with exhortation (Acts 15:32), edification, and consolation (1 Cor 14:24-25), and evangelization. The response of unbelievers to their ministry (1 Cor 14:24-25) shows that they were preachers of the whole message of sin and salvation by God's grace. Hence any scheme which eliminates the obvious teaching and authority aspects of the prophets, whether OT or NT prophets, is artificial.

Moo cites Gerhard Friedrich with apparent approval that the prophets "were not bound by Scripture" (p. 75), but this hardly seems to be an acceptable position in the evangelical church.

To limit "the authoritative proclamation of God's will" (p. 75) to the teacher (for Moo does not mention this role for the prophet) would be odd indeed. And yet it would seem to be precisely this, the authoritative proclamation of God's will, which even more than the careful transmission of the Christian tradition would have the effect of making the position of the prophet one of authority. In other words, the role of the prophet would seem to have, if anything, an even greater authority in terms of proclaiming God's word for a particular situation than would that of the teacher. Therefore, the references in the NT to women prophesying (Anna in Luke 2:26-38; Acts 2:17 as in Joel 2:28-29; Philip's four daughters in Acts 21:9; and Paul's taking for granted that women may prophesy in mixed gatherings of the church in 1 Cor 11:5) contradict both the view that women should not be in positions of authority over men and the view that women should not teach men.²³

Moo claims that women in every age and place are not suited to teach or have authority over men and bases this in their very creation by God in the beginning. Therefore, to be consistent, Moo would also have to explain how women in positions of authority over men in the OT like the judge Deborah were in some sense not really in authority over men. But not only was Deborah in the highest position of authority in Israel, but she was gifted for her administrative and prophetic role by God and was richly blessed in that position. Moo's absolute assertion that women in all ages are not suited to teach or have

²³ Nor should it be assumed that women praying in the church (1 Cor 11:5) would involve no teaching function. The prayers throughout the Scriptures have a teaching function. In particular, Paul's written prayers serve a key teaching function in summarizing his major theses. Cf. G. P. Wiles, *Paul's Intercessory Prayers* (Cambridge: University Press, 1977) 156-7, 212-23.

authority simply contradicts the evidence of Scripture, as we will see in more detail in the fourth part of this essay. Similarly, as we look at the continued work of the Holy Spirit over the centuries in giving teaching and administrative gifts to women, we are forced to conclude that it is simply not true that women are by nature unsuited to teach or have authority over men.

III. THE SITUATION IN THE EPHESIAN CHURCH WHICH 1 TIMOTHY ADDRESSES

Moo raises on p. 82 an excellent question, one which, unfortunately, he does not pursue at any length: "Could Paul have prohibited women from teaching because of their involvement in the heresy at Ephesus?" Moo, along with many who have considered the problems in the Ephesian church, seems to make the assumption that there was just one heresy ("the heresy") or one heretical group ("the heretics") which Paul spoke against in 1 Timothy.

The entire book of 1 Timothy seems to have been written, however, with six key problems in mind, each of which is referred to in the first eight verses and is elaborated throughout the epistle: false teaching, controversies, people leaving the faith, meaningless talk, antinomianism, and Judaizers. The prominence of these six is such that practically every verse in the epistle relates to at least one of them.

These six problems seem to have centered on two opposing factions in the Ephesian church: a Judaizing faction and a libertarian faction. Thus, rather than dealing with a single heresy, Paul's remarks are directed at two extremist poles in the church. The sort of balance Paul desires to promote is already evident in 1 Tim 1:8: to the antinomian libertarians Paul affirms, "We know that the law is good," and to Judaizers he cautions, "if it is used properly." Throughout the letter Paul urges both extremes to mellow and become reconciled.

In light of the libertarian trend Paul denounces unlawful acts (1:8-11), women's indecent dress (2:9-10), the licentiousness, and idleness, and gossip of widows (5:6-15). He encourages women to good works (2:10; 5:10), godliness and holiness (2:9-12, 15; 5:7); he calls everyone to godly purity (4:7, 8, 12), contentment and generosity (6:6-10); and he stresses that church leaders must be above reproach (3:1-13). It is evident from the prominence in these references to women that they were in the forefront of the libertarian trend (2:9-15; 4:7; 5:6-15).

Paul indicates that women were involved in each of the first five problems he is addressing: false teaching (2:12, 14; 4:7; 5:13-15; cf. *της "whosoever"* in 1:3, 6, 8 and 6:3 and the parallels between 5:13-15 and both 4:1 and 6:20-21), controversies (2:11-12; 3:11; 5:13-15), leaving the faith (2:14-15; 5:15; cf. the parallels between 5:13-15 and both 4:1 and 6:20-21), meaningless talk (2:11-14; 3:11; 5:13), and libertarian-antinomianism (2:9-15; 3:11; 5:13-15).

Standing opposed to the antinomian trend were Judaizers who were devoted to genealogies, who promoted controversies (1:4), imposed the law excessively (1:9), desired that women be kept from the teaching assembly (2:11), were proud of their supposed male superiority (2:13-14), and abstained from certain foods (4:3). Paul appeals to their veneration of the Scriptures (1:8; 2:13-15; 4:5; 5:18) and of angels (3:16; 5:4), but reasserts that it is the church, not Jewish traditions, which is "the pillar and foundation of the truth" (3:15) and that "God wants *all* people to be saved" (2:4-6) including the Gentiles (2:7;

3:16; 4:10) without requiring abstinence from certain foods (4:4-6).

It is no surprise that we find these two extremes at Ephesus. Libertarian and Judaizing problems seemed to have plagued Paul in many places, and the history we are given of the church of Ephesus described in the Acts of the Apostles sets the stage for it. Paul began at Ephesus reasoning with Jews in the synagogue (Acts 18:19-21). Apollos also taught about Jesus in the synagogue (18:24-26). The nucleus for the church was established in 19:1-7 when about a dozen men (males) were baptized into the name of the Lord Jesus. The Holy Spirit came on them, and they spoke in tongues and prophesied (19:6). These founding fathers of the church were almost certainly Jewish or at least proselytes strongly influenced by Judaism since they were apparently approached with the gospel in the synagogue and had received the baptism of John. This first stage in the growth of the church characterized with leadership trained in the Jewish ways of the synagogue shifts to a wider Gentile ministry with the split from the synagogue (Acts 19:8-10).

The second stage of the growth of the church in Ephesus, centered on Paul's two years of discussions in the lecture hall of Tyrannus, was so dynamic that we read "all the Jews and Greeks who lived in the province of Asia heard the word of the Lord" (19:10, 17). The kinds of people who believed is suggested by the comment "they openly confessed their evil deeds" (19:18). Sorcerers too! Enough to burn 50,000 days' wages worth of scrolls! Here was a group of new believers, mostly Gentiles, with a wild past to say the least! This mixed Jewish-Gentile group apparently continued since in Paul's address to the Ephesian elders on his way to Jerusalem he says, "I have declared to both Jews and Greeks . . ." (Acts 20:21). Even then Paul sensed that false teaching and controversies would soon develop there. He said, "I know that after I leave, savage wolves will come in among you and will not spare the flock. Even from your own number men will arise and distort the truth in order to draw away disciples after them" (20:30).

After the stage of the Jewish founding fathers and the stage of the influx of new Gentile believers, many with sinful pasts and probably reckless temperaments, the third stage in the development of the Ephesian church is evident in Paul's letter to the Ephesians. Now Paul appears to be addressing a primarily Gentile audience, as in Eph 2:11-13, 19:3:1; 4:17-24 ("You Gentiles"). Doubtless the Jewish pillars are still there, but they are less prominent, owing to the large influx of Gentiles. Already many of the six problems addressed in 1 Timothy have begun to develop:

false teaching	Eph 3:14; 4:14; 5:6-7
controversies	2:14-15; 4:2-6, 13-16, 25, 29-32; 5:6-7, 21
meaningless talk	4:14, 29-31; 5:4, 6
Judaizers	2:14-15
antinomianism	2:1-3; 4:17; 5:3-7, 21

Problems have not yet developed to the point we see in 1 Timothy where people are leaving the faith and the church is endangered with slander and a possible split. But they have begun to center on the Judaizer/antinomian poles. One's attitude to the law is central to the argument of Paul. He urges the Gentiles not to become libertarian, living contrary to the law: 4:17-19 "no longer live as the Gentiles do . . . darkened . . . sensuality . . . impurity, with a continual lust for more"; 5:8-12 "You were once darkness . . . have nothing to do

PAYNE: 1 TIMOTHY 2:11-15: A RESPONSE

187

with . . . darkness." But to those who might be tempted by the presence of sinners in their midst to go back to the strict purity of the Judaism they had known, Paul asserts that Christ has "abolished in his flesh the law with its commandments and regulations" (2:15).

By the time Paul writes 1 Timothy the situation is not hard to imagine. In the face of Gentiles who had picked up Paul's teaching about freedom and carried it too far, it was only natural for the Jewish elements of the church, which still included the powerful founding fathers, to be tempted to return to the tried and true Jewish ways which prohibited the kind of rowdiness which had developed. In the face of women dressing immodestly, even indecently (1 Tim 2:9), and apparently engaging in false teaching (hence Paul's command not to let women teach in 2:12) it would be the most natural thing in the world for them to think, "Things have gotten out of hand! We never should have let women into the teaching assembly. The old Jewish ways of excluding women from assemblies in which the law was taught were right after all!"

According to Jewish custom, the part of the synagogue given to the scribes' teaching was open only to males, as its name suggests: *ἡ δὸς τοῦ γραμματέως* (*Ant.* 16.164). Although there are some references to Jewish women knowing the law such as *b.Erub.* 53b-54d, *b.Kenub.* 23a, *y.Sabb.* 6, 1 and *y.Sota* 3:4; the more common attitude is reflected in the words of Rabbi Eliezer (c. AD 90), "If a man gives his daughter a knowledge of the law it is as though he taught her extravagance" (*m.Sota* 3:4, cf. *b.Sota* 21b) and in *y.Sota* 8 and 10a, "May the words of the Torah be burned rather than be handed over to women." Women were forbidden to teach (*m.Qidd.* 4:13) and were not required to perform the religious rituals for the annual feasts.²⁴ Their position in society is reflected in the common formula, "women, slaves, and children" (*m.Ber.* 3:3; *m.Sukk.* 2:8; *m.Ros.Has.* 1:8; *m.B.Mes.* 1:5). In the home, too, the wife was not even to pronounce the benediction after a meal (*m.Ber.* 7:2).

To counteract such thinking Paul wrote, "Let women learn" (1 Tim 2:11). In fact, all of 1 Timothy 2 is a series of comments aimed at keeping both the libertarian and Judaizing factions from erring in the extreme. Some comments apply particularly to the libertarian faction, some to the Judaizing faction, and some to both:

to the libertarian faction	to both	to the Judaizing faction
2:2 live peaceful and quiet lives in all godliness and holiness.	2:1-3 pray for peace	2:4-6 (opposing Judaizing elitism!) God wants all people saved. Jesus is the ransom for all people. (Remember, Jews, part of the true faith is Gentile inclusion.)

²⁴Cf. *m.Hag.* 1:1; *m.Sukk.* 2:8; *t.Qidd.* 1, 10, 33-35; *t.Ros.Has.* 4, 1, 212; *t.Meg.* 2, 7, 22-24; *m.Ber.* 3:3; *t.Sota* 2, 8, 295.

2:7 I was appointed a teacher of the true faith to the Gentiles.

(Remember, Gentiles, that I speak to you with authority.)

2:8 be without anger or disputing (to restrain controversy).

2:9 Women, dress modestly, with decency and propriety, not ostentatiously.

2:10 Do good deeds.

2:11b in all quietness.

2:12 I am not permitting women to teach, nor to lord it over men, but to be quiet. (This restriction, aimed at bringing more order into the Ephesian church, would encourage Judaizers.)

2:13b Then Eve was formed (implying no inferiority).

2:14b But the woman being thoroughly deceived became a transgressor (beware of the same error!).

2:15b if they abide in faith and love and holiness with propriety (warning: an unholy life belies the claim of salvation, cf. 1:5-6).

The Judaizers may well have used the saying, "Adam was formed first" (2:13) to indicate male superiority. Their basis for this would be that the OT specifically states that God formed (LXX: *παλάστω*) Adam (Gen 2:7, 8, 15; Job 38:14),²⁵ but this is never said of Eve nor is any woman specifically

2:13 Adam was formed first (possibly a saying used to indicate male superiority).

2:14 And Adam was not deceived (possibly a saying used to indicate male superiority).

2:15 However, she will be saved through the childbirth. (Remember, through woman our Savior came.)

²⁵Cf. also Philo, *Op. M.* 137; Jos. *Ant.* 1.32; *Sib. Or.* 3.24; *1 Clem.* 33.4.

referred to as being "formed" (LXX: *παλάστω*) by God: Job (Job 10:8, 9), David (Ps 138:5, 16), Jacob or Israel (Isa 43:1, 7; 44:2, 21, 24), Isaiah (Isa 49:5), the Servant (Isa 53:11), the writer of Ps 118:73, Habakkuk (Hab 1:12), and an idol maker (Wis 15:11). So, too, is mankind in general: Deut 32:6; Job 34:15; Ps 32:15; 93:9(?); Prov 24:12; Isa 27:11; 29:16; 45:9; Zech 12:1; 2 Macc 7:23. By adding *ἐντα ἔδω* to the saying, "Adam was formed first," Paul affirms the essential equality of men and women, both being formed by God.

Similarly, "Adam was not deceived" may have been a saying used by Judaizers to indicate male superiority. The idea was prominent within Judaism that "the beginning of sin was by the woman and through her we all die" (Sir 25:24). Paul, however, clearly refers to Adam's sin in the fall (Rom 5:12-19). If anything Paul viewed Adam's sin as the greater and more culpable, since his sin was not the result of being deceived in the way that Eve's transgression was. As in Rom 5:12-19, so also in 1 Tim 2:14-15: Paul contrasts the fall with the salvation in Christ (*σωθῆσθαι δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας*) but does so in terminology that specifies the role of women, affirming her in a way that counterbalances her role in the fall and counteracts the notion of male superiority.

Our consideration of the background of the development of the church in Ephesus and the tensions that naturally developed in the gradual shift from Jewish to Gentile prominence should sensitize us to the fact that when we read 1 Timothy we are not reading random theological notes of Paul, compiled post-humously. Sadly, due to our isolating verses here and there and only rarely reading the letter straight through, we tend to lose the unity of the letter as a whole and forget that Paul was writing to specific practical problems in the church in Ephesus.

Our brief overview of 1 Timothy 2 shows how thoroughly Paul's comments are aimed at the specific situation that Timothy faced in the Ephesian church. Although theological principles may be derived from Paul's handling of their situation, we need to be careful lest we mistake God's directions through Paul to the church at Ephesus in their practical historical situation as though he would give identical directions to every church in every age and culture.

We face the same problem in reading the book of Acts. How much of God's dealing with the early church is normative for today? Are Peter's words to Ananias and Sapphira (Acts 5:3-11) normative for pastors today? Is community of property, "having all things in common" (Acts 2:44-45; 4:32-37) normative for all Christians today?

Several comments in 1 Timothy 2 should caution us not to assume that everything here is to be normative for all ages. In 1 Tim 2:8 Paul writes, "I want men everywhere to lift up holy hands in prayer." The form of the verb is identical to "I am not permitting" in 2:12, first person singular present active indicative. Yet even though Paul adds the seemingly universalizing "wherever," by no means all Christians today consider the posture of lifting up hands in prayer to be normative. Likewise, Paul adds in 2:9 that he does not want women to adorn themselves with "braided hair or gold or pearls or expensive clothes." Yet very few Christians consider all of this as God's normative will for today. It is inconsistent simply to assume on the one hand that it is normative for women never to teach or be in authority over men, but on the other hand to dismiss as not normative Paul's comments about braids, gold, pearls, expensive clothes, and raised hands in prayer.

Since we know that Paul wrote these words to a particular situation in which women were involved in five of the six key problems in the church in Ephesus we should have convincing reasons before we conclude that the discipline or restrictions Paul placed on the women in Ephesus are restrictions that God desires to place on all women of all times.

IV. DID PAUL INTEND 1 TIM 2:12 AS A UNIVERSAL PROHIBITION OF WOMEN FROM TEACHING OR HAVING AUTHORITY OVER MEN?

The foregoing discussion has pointed out serious weaknesses exegetically, logically, and historically in the position that 1 Tim 2:12 was intended by Paul as a universal prohibition of women from teaching or having authority over men. In fact, quite to the contrary our investigation has given solid evidence that 1 Tim 2:12 was directed to the specific situation in the church in Ephesus where women were in the forefront of the libertarian trend: involved in false teaching, controversies, leaving the faith, meaningless talk, and antinomianism. We will summarize below the key evidence that Paul did *not* intend 1 Tim 2:12 as restricting women from teaching or from holding positions entailing authority over men.

The verbal form of Paul's statement in 1 Tim 2:12 is the first person singular ("I") present active indicative ("am not permitting"), the form typically used by Paul to indicate his own personal advice or position. Every occurrence of this verb (*ἐπιτρέπω*) in the LXX refers to permission for a specific situation, never for a universally applicable permission; and in the NT it very rarely occurs with reference to a continuing state and never elsewhere does so in the first person. Nor is this restriction universalized by any of the standard ways typical of Paul's writing. He does not claim that this position is from the Lord or that the same restrictions on women should apply in all the churches. When Paul does use the present tense with a specifically timeless force he usually indicates this with some kind of universalizing phrase; but there is no such phrase in 1 Tim 2:12.

Furthermore, other restrictions in the immediate context are not generally considered to be universally normative: e.g. restrictions against braided hair, gold, pearls, and expensive clothing (2:9); and Paul's desire that hands be lifted up in prayer (2:8).

Careful exegesis indicates several factors in the situation in the Ephesian church which called for this restriction from Paul. Most prominent was probably the involvement of women in false teaching since this is the focus of the historical example of Eve's deception and the fall mentioned in 2:13-14. Women in Ephesus were being deceived by false teaching and were passing on their mistaken views to others, and the issues were serious enough that they were bringing into serious question the validity of their faith and their very salvation. The situation was so bad that Paul wrote: "Some younger widows have in fact already turned away to follow Satan" (1 Tim 5:15). They were "saying things they ought not to" (5:13). Women may have been the originators of some of the false teaching as is suggested by Paul's warning against "old wives tales" in 4:7.

Paul repeatedly coupled the false teaching with the other problems in the church, indicating that the same people were involved in several problem areas (1 Tim 1:2-7; 4:1-3; 5:11-15; 6:20-21). At least some of the women in the

Ephesian church are stated to be involved in each of the problems listed in 1:2-7; some were abandoning the faith and following deceiving spirits and things taught by demons (4:1, compare 5:15); 5:11-15 is exclusively about women; and women were involved in godless chatter, controversies, and wandering from the faith (6:20-21, compare 5:13-15). Thus, women were not simply being *deceived* by false teachers, their overall description parallels closely the descriptions of those *engaged* in false teaching.

A probable contributing factor to Paul's restriction on women in the church in Ephesus was indecent dress on the part of at least some of them, a concern that he mentions in 2:9 just before the restriction. For such indecently clad women to teach in the church would bring the gospel into contempt.

Another likely contributing factor was that women in Ephesus from either a Jewish or Gentile background would have had little knowledge of the Scriptures or of the Christian message. Jewish women were typically excluded from the synagogue teaching assembly, as we have seen. Gentile women would have had even less contact with the Scriptures. Paul's description of those who taught false doctrines concludes by saying, "They want to be teachers of the law, but they do not know what they are talking about or what they so confidently affirm" (1 Tim 1:7). This description fits well the religiously uneducated women in the Ephesian church who got involved in false teaching. Particularly significant in this statement by Paul is the implication that their error was not in desiring to be teachers of the law but rather their teaching in ignorance of true doctrine. What they should do, at least for the present, is not to make further attempts at teaching, but to learn. This is precisely what Paul says to women in 2:11-12, "Let women learn in quietness and full submission. I am not permitting a woman to teach."

Other probable contributing factors in Paul's restrictions on women in the Ephesian church arise from their cultural situation. The presence of hundreds of temple prostitutes in the worship of Artemis in Ephesus probably was related to Paul's prohibition of braids, and use of gold, pearls, and expensive clothing (2:8-9). In their situation in Ephesus, to have had women officiating in the church services (2:12), particularly with that sort of suggestive dress, would be an invitation to slander. Paul, in fact, specifies in 5:14 that women's activities were giving "the enemy an opportunity for slander." This, combined with the ingrained Jewish tradition of not allowing women to teach or to be in authority in the synagogues, would have led to deep concerns on the part of the Jewish pillars of the Ephesian church and a fighting spirit on the part of the Judaizers. In Paul's desire to bring peace the compromise evident in 1 Tim 2:11-12 is a most practical solution: let them learn (2:11) but not teach (2:12).

If it were Paul's intention that women were forever to be excluded from teaching and from positions of authority in the church, there is no more natural place for him to have said so than in the immediately following passage, which lists requirements for overseers and deacons, 1 Tim 3:1-13. Yet to the contrary, Paul affirms, "*Whoever* (*τις*) desires the office of overseer desires a good work" (3:1, 5; Titus 1:6). Many English versions add a misleading "man" or "men" in 1 Tim 3:1, 5, and 8, but *there is no equivalent for "man" or "men" in the Greek or any of these verses*. Nowhere in the listing of qualifications for leadership, here or in Titus 1:5-9, does Paul limit either the office of overseer or deacon to men or exclude them from women.

In fact, after listing the qualifications of deacons Paul specifically adds, "Women similarly (*γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως*)" (3:11) and proceeds to list their qualifications, which parallel those listed for deacon in 3:8, even in the same order:

3:8 *Διακόνους ὡσαύτως σεμνοὺς* 3:11 *γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως σεμνάς*
μὴ δαδόντας *μὴ διαβόλους*
μὴ αὐτοὺς πολλὰ προσέχοντας *ἡρώδους*
μὴ αὐτοχρεοῦντες *πύρας ἐν πᾶσι*
 The wording *γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως* (3:11) parallels *διακόνους ὡσαύτως* (3:8) and so, as in the former case, is most naturally read, "Similarly, the qualifications for women deacons are . . ." ²⁶

The reading of some versions of 1 Tim 2:11, "Similarly their wives" is doubtful since to make that idea clear Paul would have had to have added the genitive pronoun *αὐτῶν* "their" after *γυναῖκας*, the definite article before *γυναῖκας*, or some other expression indicating "their wives." Furthermore, if *γυναῖκας* refers to wives, it is hard to explain why there is no similar qualification for the wives of overseers since their position was more influential and had stricter requirements. It would seem strange as well, if *γυναῖκας* were not being considered for the office of deacon, that they would be required to meet practically identical qualifications, listed in the same order, as the qualifications of deacons listed in 3:8. It would also seem contradictory if Paul did not envisage women as deacons since he refers to Phoebe as a "deacon (*διάκονον*)—there is no feminine form 'deaconess' in NT Greek of the church in Cenchrea" (Rom 16:1). Here both the specification "of the church in Cenchrea" and her following description indicate that she was in a position of leadership (see further, *infra*). Likewise, comments in the early church fathers specify many of the duties of women deacons. ²⁷

Several times in the preceding context Paul has included statements which affirm the role of women: 2:10 δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν, 2:11 μαθησέτω, 2:13 εἴτα Εἰδᾶ, and 2:15 αὐθόρτα δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας. Once again here in 3:11, possibly as an afterthought to insure that his restrictions on women not be misunderstood to exclude them from church offices, Paul affirms women, specifically including them as eligible to hold the office of deacon in the church.

If women are to be included among the deacons, as appears to be the case, the immediately following phrase *διάκονοι ἔστωσαν μίᾱς γυναῖκός ἀνδρός* (3:12) must not be intended to exclude women and unmarried men, but simply to exclude men who are not faithful to their wives. Similarly 3:12b does not exclude from the office of deacon people without children or with only one child, but simply requires that *if* the person has children they must be managed well. Likewise, the similar phrases describing the overseer in 3:2, 4-5 must not be interpreted as requiring that the overseer be male, married, and have children, for then Paul would have been excluded as well as the entire clergy of the Roman Catholic Church! Common sense tells us that these phrases are intended *only* to exclude those who are not faithful to their wife or managing their children badly; they are not a *requirement*, only an *exclusion* of

the unworthy. Hence, it is inappropriate to interpret *μίᾱς γυναῖκός ἀνδρός* as an indication that only males are eligible.

The NT descriptions of the activities of deacons includes teaching (Acts 6:8-10), preaching (Acts 7:1-53), and baptizing (Acts 8:26-40), so presumably these activities could be part of the role of women deacons.

The description of the office of overseer is a listing of qualifications which would apply to women as well as to men. In fact, parallels to each of these requirements are mentioned in 1 Timothy specifically regarding women, over half using identical terminology:

overseer description	parallel description of women in 1 Timothy
3:1 καλοῦ ἔργου	2:10 ἔργων ἀγαθῶν
3:2 ἀπειθήντων	5:7 ἀπειθήντοισι
μίᾱς γυναῖκός ἀνδρός	5:9 ἐπὸς ἀνδρὸς κυρίῃ
ἡρώδους	3:11 ἡρώδους
αὐθόρτα	2:9, 15 αὐθόρουνης
κόσμιον	2:9 κοσμίῳ
φιλῶν	5:10 ἐξενδοχίονεν θλιβόμενος ἐτηρκεσεν
διδασκαλὸν	2:11 μαθησέτω cf. 1:7 (τῆς) νομοῦ διδασκαλοῦ
3:3 μὴ πάρουσιν	3:11 ἡρώδους cf. Titus 2:3 μὴ αὐτοῦ
μὴ πῆλκην	πολλὰ δέ δεδολκεμένης
ἀλλὰ ἐντεκῇ	2:15 ἀγᾱτῃ . . . ἀγαπᾶται αὐφροσύνης
ἄμαχον	3:11 μὴ διαβόλους cf. Titus 3:2 (for all) ἀμάχους
3:3 ἀφιδάργυρον	2:9 μὴ . . . χρυσίου ἢ μαργαρίτας ἢ ἡματιμᾶς
3:4, 5 τοῦ ἰδίου ὅκου	3:11 πιστὰς ἐν πᾶσι
καλῶς ποιοῦσιν	6:6-10 (for all) [μὴ] φιλὰργυρία
τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν ὑποταγῇ	5:14 οὐκ οὐδοσπορεῖ cf. Eph 6:1-2
σεμνοῦς	5:14 τεκνογονεῖν οὐκ οὐδοσπορεῖν
3:6 μὴ νεφύριον	3:11 σεμνάς
μὴ πυφωθεῖς	5:11 [μὴ] πεσέρας cf. 2:15; 5:5, 9
ἐς κρῖμα ἐμπέσῃ τοῦ	2:9 ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδούς . . . μὴ
διαβόλου	ἡματιμᾶς ποδὺν τελεῖ 2:11 ἐν πάσι ὑποταγῇ
3:7 μαρτυρίαν καλὴν	5:10 πῶδας ἐνέβη
ἔχειν ἀπὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν	5:12 κρῖμα 5:15 ἐξ ἐπαρτίας ὅπως τοῦ σατανᾶ
μὴ εἰς ὀνειδιζομένων	3:11 σεμνάς
ἐμπέσῃ	5:14-15 [μὴ] διδοῦναι τῷ ἀντικειμένῳ λοδορίας
καὶ παρῖδα τοῦ	χάρι . . . ἐξ ἐπαρτίας ὅπως τοῦ σατανᾶ
διαβόλου	

These parallels prove that in the thinking of Paul even at the very time he

²⁶Cf. Kelly, *Pastoral Epistles* 83.

²⁷Cf. Nic. Canon 19; Apost. Const. 2:26; 3:15; Lock, *Pastoral Epistles* 41.

wrote 1 Timothy each of these overseer descriptions not only could but in fact did apply to women.

It is virtually impossible that so many of these infrequently used expressions describing overseers just happen to occur in nearly identical terminology in the verses of 1 Timothy dealing exclusively with women. The table below shows that the mathematical odds of this happening by pure chance are approximately one in 300 quintillion (3 x 10²⁰ or 300,000,000,000,000,000,000) without even taking into account any of the other parallels using different terminology.

nearly identical terminology	NT occurrences ^a	odds ^b
καλὸν ἔργον	5:10 ἔργους καλοῖς	16c 16/500
ἀντιλήπτου	5:7 ἀντιλήπτοι	3 3/500
μὴς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα	5:9 ἐπὶς ἀνδρὸς γυνή	4 4/500
ἡφάλαον	3:11 ἡφάλαους	3 3/500
σώφρονα	2:9, 15 σωφροσύνης	16d 16/500
κόσμον	2:9 κοσμίῳ	2 2/500
οἰκὸν καλῶς προϊοῦμενον	5:14 οἰκοδοποῦν	20e 20/500
τέκνα ἔχοντα ἐν υἱοταγῇ	5:14 τεκνογονεῖν, οἰκοδοποῦν	11f 11/500
σεμνότητος	3:11 σεμνῶς	7 7/500
μὴ νεώθυτον	5:11 νεωτέρας . . . παρὰ τοῦ	2 2/500
κρίμα	5:12 κρίμα	28 28/500

a) Cf. Moulton and Geden's *Concordance to the Greek Testament*.

b) These odds are calculated as follows: There are 36 lines of Greek text in the Nestle-Aland 26th edition specifically regarding women in 1 Timothy (2:9-15; 3:11; 5:2-7, 9-16) out of a total of approximately 18,000 lines of Greek in the entire NT. Therefore these verses about women in 1 Timothy comprise almost exactly 1/500 of the NT text. Thus, the total number of comparable occurrences of any of these expressions divided by 500 gives the odds that in a random distribution throughout the whole NT this expression would just happen to occur in the 36 lines of 1 Timothy exclusively about women.

c) Matt 5:16; Mark 14:6; John 10:32, 33; 1 Tim 3:1; 5:10, 25; 6:18; Titus 2:7, 14; 3:8, 14; Heb 10:24; Jas 3:13; 1 Pet 2:12.

d) All occurrences of the *σώφρων* group including: *σώφρονέω*, *σώφρονίζω*, *σώφρονας*, *σώφρονος*, *σώφροσύνη*, and *σώφρων*.

e) All 13 occurrences of *οικοδοποῦν*/έω plus John 4:53; Acts 16:31-34; 18:8; 1 Cor 16:15; 1 Tim 3:4, 12; 5:14.

f) Luke 1:17; Eph 6:1-4; Phil 2:22; Col 3:20-21; 1 Thess 2:11-12; 1 Tim 3:4, 12; 5:4, 14; Titus 1:6; 1 Pet 1:14.

We conclude, then, that the Holy Spirit so inspired 1 Timothy as to make it undeniable that women could meet the qualifications for overseer.

In the NT, apart from one reference to Christ as "the Overseer of your souls" (1 Pet 2:25), the term *ἐπισκοπος* is always used of overseers in general (Acts 20:28; Phil 1:1; 1 Tim 3:2; Titus 1:7), never with the name of any man or woman. This is a further indication of the *lack* of any clear evidence that only a man could be an overseer.

Unfortunately, practically all English translations of 1 Tim 3:1-13 and Titus 1:5-9 have a generous assortment of the masculine pronouns "he" and "him"

PAYNE: 1 TIMOTHY 2:11-15: A RESPONSE

195

and the possessive "his." *The Greek, however, has not even one masculine pronoun or possessive, nor any other grammatical specification that Paul had men and not women in mind.*

A weighty factor against the interpretation that Paul in 1 Tim 2:12 excluded all women from teaching or any position of authority over men is the substantial number of women Paul cites as involved in ministry with him.²⁸ Just to cite the women mentioned in Romans 16 makes an impressive list.

In Rom 16:1 Paul addresses Phoebe as "deacon (*διάκονον*) of the church in Cenchrea." The burden of proof lies on those who would translate *διάκονος* here "servant" while translating it "minister" or "deacon" in every other NT passage in which it occurs. The leadership role of Phoebe is evident in Paul's following remarks, "receive her in the Lord as befits the saints, and help her in whatever she may require from you, for she has been a ruler or protector (*προοτρίας*) of many and of myself as well" (Rom 16:2). Translations such as the RSV which repeat the word "help her . . . for she has been a *helper*" hide the fact that the Greek word for "help her" (*παρὰσπῆτε* from *παρίστημι* "help," LSJ 1340) is a different word than the description of Phoebe as a "ruler" (*προοτρίας* "leader," "chief," "ruler," "administrator," "protector," LSJ 1526-7). Even C. Ryrie, who in general is opposed to women being in authority in the church, acknowledges, "In the NT *proistēmi* includes the idea of governing in the church (1 Tim 5:17; Rom 12:8; 1 Thess 5:12). . . . All the NT references include to a greater or lesser extent the idea of having authority or presiding . . . *proistēs* does imply official ruling."²⁹ Extra-biblical references confirm this meaning. LSJ 1527 specifies ἡ *προοτρασία* as the title of a priestess at Messene (IG5 [1].1447.13 from iii/ii B.C.). Moulton-Milligan 551 note that "the title [*προοτρίας*] is applied to the office-bearer in a heathen religious association." Josephus speaks of King David as "protector (*προοτάρης*) and guardian of the Hebrew race" (*Ant.* 7.380). Within Judaism the title *προοτάρης* was sometimes given to the President of the Council. In metropolitan cities this was exercised by the chief Jew of the province, that is by the little patriarch; elsewhere it was the chief religious person, the "archsynagogs."³⁰ Emil Schürer notes that in the age of the procurators (AD 44-66) the high priest who held the presidency of the Sanhedrin was called *προοτάρης* *τοῦ ἔθνους* and had governmental functions.³¹ Based on such parallels it can be said that although at the time Paul wrote Romans there do not seem to have been clear-cut descriptions of leadership roles in the churches, at least it can be said that "Phoebe was some sort of minister in the church at Cenchrea."³²

In Romans 16:3-5 Paul called Priscilla "my fellow worker in Christ Jesus" and affirmed that in the furtherance of the gospel she and her husband had "risked their necks to save my life; not only I but all the churches of the Gen-

²⁸If Paul were really as opposed to the ministry of women as many people assume, it would be hard to explain the existence of *The Acts of Paul and Thecla*, an early account that centers on the activities of Thecla, a woman missionary whom Paul commissioned to preach, teach, and baptize.

²⁹Ryrie, *The Place of Women* 87-8.

³⁰Jan Juster, *Les Juifs dan l'empire Romain* (Paris: Paul Geuthner, 1914) 1.442-3.

³¹A *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1890) Div. I, vol. 2, 72.

³²C. K. Barrett, *Reading Through Romans* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977) 83.

titles are grateful to them. Greet the church that meets in their house." As well as teaching the preacher Apollos "the way of God more accurately" (Acts 18:26) Priscilla played a key role in the churches in Corinth, Ephesus, and Rome.

Rom 16:6 praises "Mary, who worked very hard among you."

Rom 16:7 speaks of Junia, which as we have seen is the natural reading of her name, whom Paul calls "my relative who had been in prison with me," indicating both their closeness as friends and mutual missionary struggles. Paul refers to her as "outstanding among the apostles" and as one who "was in Christ before I was."

Rom 16:12 reads, "Greet Tryphena and Tryphosa, those women who work hard in the Lord. Greet my dear friend Persis, another woman who has worked very hard in the Lord."

In Rom 16:13 Paul affirms the mother of Rufus as "a mother to me, also," Rom 16:15 mentions the saints Julia and the sister of Nereus.

In this one chapter Paul affirms 10 women, two of whom were so involved in the missionary proclamation that they were thrown in prison with Paul; one is called a deacon and a *προοδρα*; another was Paul's fellow worker and taught Apollos; four others are said to have "worked hard in the Lord"; and one is even referred to as "outstanding among the apostles." To these could be added among others: Lydia, the first recorded European believer, a seller of purple fabrics from Thyatira in whose home Paul and Barnabas stayed (Acts 16:14-15); the prominent women of Thessalonica and Berea among the founding pillars of those churches (Acts 17:4, 12); and Euodia and Syntyche, who were praised by Paul as "women who have contended at my side in the cause of the gospel" (Phil 4:2-3). Churches are said to have met in the homes of Mary, the mother of John Mark (Acts 12:12), Nymphas (Col 4:15), and Apphia (Philemon's wife, Phlm 2) as well as in the homes of Priscilla.

The NT terms describing the activities of these women are terms normally associated with leadership positions: "explaining the way of God more accurately" (Acts 18:26), "deacon" (Rom 16:1), "ruler" (Rom 16:2), "my fellow worker in Christ Jesus" (Rom 16:3; Phil 4:3), "apostle" (Rom 16:7), "worked hard in the Lord" (Rom 16:6, 12), and "contended at my side in the cause of the gospel" (Phil 4:3). "If women are represented in the NT as fulfilling functions known to be associated with leadership positions, it is reasonable to assume that they were in fact appointed to the offices associated with such activities."³³

In order for Moo to make his interpretation convincing he needs not simply to offer explanations which can handle each of these instances as an isolated case; he needs to demonstrate that it is improbable that *any* of these women were involved in teaching or had positions of authority over men. But the nature of the evidence is overwhelmingly against such a position. To hold it Moo must accept forced and narrow interpretations of passage after passage.

Furthermore, Paul nowhere indicates that leadership gifts such as teaching, preaching, prophecy, and administration are restricted to men. Rather, he stressed that the Spirit gives gifts to everyone just as he determines (1 Cor

12:7, 11) and that the recipient of a gift has the responsibility to *use it* for the *common good* (1 Cor 12:7). If a woman, then, has leadership gifts and does not use them to build up the church she is being unfaithful to her God-given responsibility.

Moo does not even mention the OT examples of women in leadership positions. The prophetess Miriam was sent by God to lead Israel (Mic 6:4; Exod 15:20-21). Deborah was a prophetess (Judg 4:4, 6, 9) and a warrior who delivered Israel from Canaanite rule (Judg 4:10, 14, 24 and chap. 5) as well as the judge who decided the disputes of Israel (Judg 4:5) and the highest leader in all Israel (Judg 4:4).

The prophetess Huldah was consulted rather than Jeremiah when the lost book of the law was found. Her word was accepted by all as divinely revealed (2 Kgs 22:14-20; 2 Chr 34:22-28) and led to a revival (2 Kgs 23:1-25; 2 Chr 34:29-35:19).

We may also note the foreign queens recognized in the Scriptures: the Queen of Sheba (1 Kgs 10:1-13; 2 Chr 9:1-12; Matt 12:42; Luke 11:31); Candace, Queen of Ethiopia (Acts 8:27); the Queen of Chaldea (Dan 5:10-12); the Queen of Persia (Neh 2:6); Queen Vashti of Persia (Esth 1:9-2:17); and Tahpenes, the Queen of Egypt (1 Kgs 11:19). There were the influential consorts, wives of reigning monarchs: Bathsheba (1 Kgs 1:11-21, 28-31), Jezebel (1 Kgs 21:7-15), and Esther, who had sufficient authority to bring about the destruction of the house of Haman along with 75,000 of the enemies of the Jews (Esth 7:9; 9:7-10, 16). Generally holding even greater authority were the queen mothers (2 Kgs 10:13). In the history of Judah the queen mothers are always named. They include Bathsheba (1 Kgs 2:17-20), Maacah (with both her son Abijah and her grandson Asa [1 Kgs 15:2, 10, 13; 2 Chr 15:16]), and Nehushta (2 Kgs 24:8; Jer 13:18; 29:2) who was enthroned and crowned. Examples such as these OT women leaders vitiate the allegation that women by their created nature are not suited to teach or have authority.

Another crucial objection to Moo's thesis that women are not to teach men is that God has chosen to use women as the vehicle for communicating several key portions of inspired Scripture such as the song of the prophetess Miriam (Exod 15:21), the song of the judge Deborah (Judg 5:2-31), the prayer of Hannah (1 Sam 2:1-10), the prophecies of the prophetess Huldah (2 Kgs 22:15-20; 2 Chr 34:24-28) which led to a revival, and Mary's song, the Magnificat (Luke 2:46-55).

We conclude, then, not only that Moo's position has exegetical and logical weaknesses which undermine his allegation that women are not suited to teach or have authority over men, but that to the contrary, throughout history God has given gifts of teaching and administration to women as well as to men and that he has approved the use of these gifts. The situation in Ephesus was one in which women were involved in false teaching which would have given the enemy opportunity for slander had Paul not restricted the teaching and authoritative activity of women. Paul does not, however, extrapolate to say that women should never teach or have authority over men, nor does he exclude women in any of his listings of the requirements for overseer, elder, or deacon. 1 Tim 2:11-15, then, does not provide a solid basis for excluding women from positions of teaching or authority in the church.

³³E. Margaret Howe, "The Positive Case for the Ordination of Women," *Perspectives in Evangelical Theology*, ed. K. Kantzer and S. Gundry (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1979) 276.