Οὐδέ in 1 Timothy 2.12:

A Response to Philip B. Payne, '1 Tim 2.12 and the Use of οὐδέ to Combine Two Elements to Express a Single Idea', *New Testament Studies*, 54 (2008) 235–253

ABSTRACT

Philip B. Payne has argued in this journal for a combinatorial power for οὐδέ, previously unknown to generations of scholars. His case is examined and found to be unpersuasive. Οὐδέ is not a correlative, as claimed, but a negative connective, additive in nature, and generally introducing new material with distinction in meaning. In every text presented by Payne as evidence, a normal function for the conjunction yields a good sense. In 1 Tim 2.12, contra Payne, Origen does not see one prohibition, but two. In that verse, οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός adds a second prohibition to the first.

Οὐδέ in 1 Tim 2.12: Response to Philip B. Payne

Introduction

Philip B. Payne has proposed in this journal a previously unknown power for the conjunction οὐδέ.[1] He argues that the apostle Paul uses it to combine two negatives into what Payne calls 'a single idea', in some cases leaving one or both of the constituent parts largely free from the influence of the negative. Thus in Gal 1.16 he contends that previous translators and commentators have been mistaken in reading Paul as saying that he did not consult with flesh and blood, since actually he did consult with Ananias. In Rom 9.16, Payne submits that the mercy of God is not set against the will or desire of man, but only against the combination of man's desire and effort; in 2 Thess 3.8 that Paul and his companions did not deny that they ate bread without paying for it; and in 1 Tim 2.12 that the apostle left women free to teach, so long as they did not assume for themselves the authority to do so.[2]

It is demonstrated here in response that all grammars and lexicons are in agreement that οὐδέ, in its coordinating role, is a simple connective which adds one negative to a previous, normally introducing new and distinct semantic content. If to one prohibition another is added, the result is an increase in the extent of the prohibition, not a limitation of it.

A.   The meaning and force of οὐδέ

The word οὐδέ almost certainly derives from οὐ + δέ, and although the compound form has had its own development, the power of the constituent particles remains evident in the whole. Thus BDAG describes οὐδέ as a combination of οὐ and δέ, and the entry in LSJ likewise begins simply with 'οὐ

---

[1]   P. B. Payne, '1 Tim 2.12 and the Use of οὐδέ to Combine Two Elements to Express a Single Idea', *NTS* 54 (2008) 235–253.

[2]   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 253.

δέ' in a parenthesis.[3] Smyth says that οὐδέ is to be 'broken up into the negative οὐ . . . and δέ', and Robertson that it is 'merely οὐ δέ'.[4] Louw and Nida view οὐδέ as a negation (οὐ) combined with a clitic (δέ), and state that 'structurally the two parts are independent.'[5]

Οὐ is the negative particle used, broadly speaking, with verbs in the indicative. Δέ is a postpositive conjunction which 'serves to mark that something is different from what precedes, but only to offset it, not to exclude or contradict it'.[6] It introduces 'something new', and 'calling attention to the second of two things, may mean (1) *in the next place*, (2) *on the other hand*.'[7] According to Levinsohn, the 'basic function of δέ' is to 'mark new developments, in the sense that the information it introduces builds on what has gone before and makes a distinct contribution to the argument'.[8] The new material may stand in contrast to what went before, or be a continuation of it. Thus, Denniston states that δέ 'denotes either pure connexion, "and", or contrast, "but", with all that lies between.'[9]

Being originally οὐ δέ, and since δέ is postpositive and most often occurs second, οὐδέ naturally begins the clause it joins, and indeed Denniston confirms that 'connective οὐδέ is invariably first

3   BDAG, s.v. οὐδέ; LSJ, s.v. οὐδέ.

4   H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1984) §2930; A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914) 1185.

5   J. P. Louw & E. A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (2 Vols.; New York: United Bible Societies, 1989²) §69.C, n. 5, I.665.

6   Smyth, *Grammar*, §2834.

7   Robertson, *Grammar*, 1184, citing E. A. Abbott, *Johannine Grammar* (London: Black, 1906) 104.

8   S. H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of the Greek New Testament* (Dallas: SIL International, 2000²) 112.

9   J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1978²) 162.

word in sentence, clause, or word group.'[10] Possibly because of this difference in position, οὐδέ is more suited to joining single words in a continuative way than is δέ, and frequently does so in negative sentences. As a compound negative, when it follows a negative with the same verb, it merely confirms the first negative.[11] In this respect Greek differs from English, which exhibits the resolution of two negatives into a positive.

By classical times, in Attic prose, οὐδέ was 'used only to join a negative clause to another clause itself negative'.[12] A negative clause was connected to a previous positive one by καὶ οὐ, ἀλλ᾽ οὐ, or οὐ . . . δέ (or δέ . . . οὐ). This pattern of use was maintained in the New Testament. Thus BDF states at §445 that 'the connective after a negative clause is οὐδέ (μηδέ), after a positive καὶ οὐ (καὶ μή). All of this remains the same as in classical'. Οὐδέ is additive in this connective role. Jelf says that οὐ . . . οὐδέ is used when the second clause 'comes in as an addition to the first'.[13] Likewise, Winer writes that οὐδέ and μηδέ 'add negation to negation', and that οὐ . . . οὐδέ or μή . . . μηδέ are employed 'when to one negation another is annexed, and negation strung upon negation'.[14] Levinsohn describes οὐδέ simply as a 'negative additive'.[15]

Typically, in its role as a negative connective, οὐδέ has a 'continuative sense, carrying on the negative with no idea of contrast'.[16] Cooper states simply that 'οὐδέ is used commonly after a

---

10   Denniston, *Particles*, 199.

11   Smyth, *Grammar*, §2761.

12   Smyth, *Grammar*, §2933.

13   W. E. Jelf, *A Grammar of the Greek Language* (2 Vols.; Oxford: Parker, 1866[4]) §776.I.b, II.480.

14   G. B. Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1882[9]) 612.

15   S. H. Levinsohn, *Some Notes on the Information Structure and Discourse Features of 1 Corinthians 1–4* (Dallas: SIL International, 2009) 20; *Some Notes on the Information Structure and Discourse Features of 1 Timothy* (Dallas: SIL International, 2011) 12.

16   Robertson, *Grammar*, 1185.

preceding negative as a connective meaning *and not*'.[17] This is not to say that it cannot carry a lightly adversative tone, or an element of contrast, and Ellicott suggests the translation 'not . . . nor yet' for 'οὐ . . . οὐδέ' where 'there is less accordance' between the terms, and 'where the latter clause has somewhat of a climactic character'.[18] Liddell and Scott observe that when connecting two whole negative clauses, 'the δέ in οὐδέ gives it rather a distinctive force'.[19] Moses Stuart states that 'each negative clause denotes a distinct and independent idea', giving as an example:

Matt 6.26 (part) οὐ σπείρουσιν οὐδὲ θερίζουσιν οὐδὲ συνάγουσιν εἰς ἀποθήκας, 'they do not sow, nor reap nor gather into barns'.[20]

Stuart comments that 'each clause denotes an entire action by itself'.[21] Winer, to illustrate his observation, above cited, that οὐδέ and μηδέ 'add negation to negation', cites the same verse along with:

Matt 7.6a Μὴ δῶτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσὶν μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων, 'Do not give what is holy to dogs, and do not throw your pearls before swine,'

---

17   G. L. Cooper, *Attic Greek Prose Syntax* (4 Vols.; Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998) §69.50.1, II.1397.

18   C. J. Ellicott, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians* (Cambridge: University Press, 1866³) 143.

19   LSJ, s.v. οὐδέ A.II.

20   All English translations of Scripture from the NASB unless otherwise noted.

21   M. Stuart, *A Grammar of the New Testament Dialect* (Andover: Allen & Morrill, 1841) §183.1, 280.

4

He observes that 'two different actions [are] equally negatived, i.e., forbidden'.[22] With regard to usage in the Septuagint, Muraoka states that when οὐδέ follows οὐ, it 'introduces an independent clause'.[23]

Comparison is sometimes made between οὐ . . . οὐδέ and the correlative conjunctions οὔτε . . . οὔτε ('neither . . . nor'), which latter bring two words or clauses into mutual correspondence. Winer writes that 'οὔτε and μήτε regularly point to another οὔτε or μήτε . . . whereas οὐδέ and μηδέ attach themselves to a preceding οὐ or μή, – as indeed δέ always looks to something which has gone before. It may therefore be truly said, – it follows indeed from the meaning of τε and δέ, – that a closer connexion is expressed by the sequence οὔτε . . . οὔτε than by οὐ . . . οὐδέ'.[24] Thayer, following Winer, agrees, stating that 'the connection of clauses made negative by οὔτε is close and internal, so that they are mutually complementary and combine into a unity, whereas clauses negatived by οὐδέ follow one another much more loosely, often almost by accident as it were'.[25] In similar vein, Jelf states that 'Οὐδέ marks that the clauses formally answer to each other, but not any necessary connexion between them'.[26]

Οὐδέ may also be used adverbially, in one of two main ways, which correspond very closely with the second and third sections of its entry in BDAG. First, οὐδέ may add a negative idea, usually to another 'negative idea either expressed or implied', with the meaning 'not . . . either', or 'also not'.[27] The terms joined are not of the same structural kind. Second, οὐδέ may be used with a sense of climax, that is 'ascensively', with the meaning 'not even'. Denniston and Levinsohn allow for

---

22   Winer, *Grammar*, 612.

23   T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain: Peeters, 2009) s.v. οὐδέ.

24   Winer, *Grammar*, 613.

25   J. H. Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1889) s.v. οὐδέ.

26   Jelf, *Syntax*, §776.2, 491.

27   Denniston, *Particles*, 194.

οὐδέ to bear on occasion an ascensive sense even when, from a structural point of view, it has a coordinating role, with meaning 'nor even'.[28]

In summary, as a coordinating conjunction, οὐδέ connects one negative to a previous negative in an additive way. It may be translated into English as 'and not' or 'nor'. In general, like δέ in a positive sentence, it adds something new and distinct to what has preceded.

B. Payne's argument examined

B.1 BDF §445

Payne gives no lexical definitions of οὐδέ, and refers to only one section of one grammar, namely BDF §445, asserting that it 'calls οὐδέ a "correlative" and a "connective" indicating "correlation" of members and contrasts its use with "independent continuation".'[29] It may be granted that οὐδέ is a connective, but in all other respects Payne is mistaken, as will be seen from an examination of the relevant section. Payne appears to take the section heading 'Negative correlatives', with its colon, to include οὐδέ. That this was not Funk's intention can be seen from a comparison with an earlier edition of Blass's grammar:

BDF §445 (1961): Negative correlatives: οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . (μήτε . . . μήτε . . .); the connective after a negative clause is οὐδέ (μηδέ), after a positive καὶ οὐ (καὶ μή). All of this remains the same as in classical.[30]

Blass §77.10 (1905): The use of **correlative negative clauses** with **οὔτε . . . οὔτε** or **μήτε . . . μήτε** respectively, and of **οὐδέ** or **μηδέ** respectively as a **connecting particle** after **negative** sentences (and of **καὶ οὐ, καὶ μή** after **positive** sentences) remains the same as in classical Greek.[31]

---

28   Denniston, *Particles*, 193; Levinsohn, *1 Timothy*, 12.

29   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 236.

30   BDF §445, 230.

31   F. Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (London/New York: Macmillan, 1905²) 265.

No grammar classes οὐ . . . οὐδέ as a correlative pair. The construction does not bring two words or clauses into the reciprocal relationship that is characteristic of correlation. Accordingly, neither does it indicate '"correlation" of members', as Payne asserts. This, with his later claim on page 251 that 'BDF §445 states that the use of οὐδέ in the "correlation of positive and negative members, is of course, admissible"', can be traced to BDF §445.3, which reads: 'The correlation of negative and positive members is, of course, admissible, though it is not common in the NT. E.g. Jn 4:11 οὔτε ἄντλημα ἔχεις, καὶ φρέαρ ἐστὶν βαθύ (οὐδέ D syˢ, which seems to be better Greek).' Funk, following Blass, is referring to the infrequent occurrence of οὔτε . . . καί as a correlative pair, not to correlation with οὐδέ.[32] The Western text, οὐδὲ ἄντλημα ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶν βαθύ, would not be an instance of οὐδέ . . . καί as a correlative pair, since οὐδέ would be in its ascensive adverbial position, and the meaning would be 'you do not even have a bucket, and the well is deep'.

Finally, Payne is mistaken in supposing that BDF contrasts the use of οὐδέ with independent continuation. He finds this in §445.4, which begins: 'Καὶ οὐ after negative clauses does not indicate correlation but an independent continuation'. The contrast, however, is not with οὐδέ at all, but with οὔτε . . . καί in the previous sub-section, as again may be confirmed from Blass's earlier text.[33] The point being made is that whereas καί may introduce a second clause in correlation with a previous negative clause, καὶ οὐ does not do so. Matt 15.32 is given as illustration in both the earlier and later versions of the grammar:

> **Matt 15.32 (part)** Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσίν μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν· καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτοὺς νήστεις οὐ θέλω, 'I feel compassion for the people, because they have remained with Me now three days and have nothing to eat; and I do not want to send them away hungry,'

---

32   Blass, *Grammar*, 265.

33   Blass, *Grammar*, 266.

καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν is followed by καὶ ἀπολῦσαι . . . οὐ θέλω in a subsequent clause. BDF is saying that καὶ οὐκ and καὶ . . . οὐ are not in a correlative relation with each other, but are independent since οὐ θέλω is coordinate with Σπλαγχνίζομαι, while οὐκ ἔχουσιν is subordinate to it.

BDF §445 does not designate οὐδέ as a correlative. Rather, in accordance with other grammars, it terms it a connective, employed after negative clauses. It offers no support for the meaning 'and [in combination with]', which Payne is contending for.[34]

B.2   Hendiadys

Payne implies in a footnote that where, in Paul's use of οὐδέ, 'adding the second expression specifies the meaning', there 'hendiadys specifies meaning'.[35] In an earlier article in *NTS,* he makes reference to 'Paul's typical use of οὐδέ for hendiadys'.[36] The literature on Greek hendiadys, however, offers no support for its formation with οὐδέ. According to Sansone, the fullest treatment is that of Lobeck who, in his commentary on Sophocles' Ajax at line 145, gives sixty or seventy examples.[37] Of these only one, οὔτ᾽ ἔθιγεν οὔθ᾽ ἥψαθ᾽ ('neither touched nor handled'), is formed with negative conjunctions, and this not with οὐδέ, but with the correlatives οὔτε . . . οὔτε.[38] No reference to the formation of hendiadys with negative conjuctions has been found in other

---

34   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 235.

35   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 240; n. 11.

36   P. B. Payne, 'Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1 Cor 14.34–5." *NTS* 41 (1995) 240–62, at 248.

37   D. Sansone, 'On Hendiadys in Greek', *Glotta* 62 (1984) 16–25, at 16; C. A. Lobeck, *Sophoclis Aiax* (Berolini: Weidmann, 1866) 112-15.

38   Lobeck, *Aiax*, 113.

treatments of the figure.[39] Where it occurs, it is formed with καί or τέ, and the terms are normally adjacent, not widely separated as they are in 1 Tim 2.12.[40]

B.3   A proposed English parallel

Payne asserts in a footnote that 'Paul's use of οὐδέ parallels in many respects the English oral idiom 'n, as in "hit 'n run", "eat 'n run", "night 'n day", and "black 'n white". Both typically convey a single idea.'[41] In his book, *Man and Woman, One in Christ*, Payne explains what sort of parallel he sees: '"Don't eat 'n run!" prohibits leaving immediately after eating. It does not prohibit either eating or running by itself. "Don't hit 'n run" prohibits the *combination* of hitting someone with a vehicle, then fleeing the scene of the accident. Similarly, 1 Tim 2.12a viewed as a single idea does not prohibit teaching in itself'.[42]

Both 'eat and run' and 'hit and run' have been employed so frequently with a particular meaning, that they have passed into the English language as terms in their own right. As such, they retain their form in a negative sentence. The same is true in Greek of σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα ('flesh and blood'), which BDAG refers to as a 'unit'.[43] Thus we have, in Gal 1.16, οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι ('I did not consult with flesh and blood'), rather than σαρκὶ οὐδὲ αἵματι. In his consideration of the

---

39   G. B. Winer, *De hypallage et hendiadyi in N.T. libris* (Erlangae: Junge,1824); F. A. Fritzsche, 'Excursus IV: De figurae ἕν διὰ δυοῖν natura et rationibus.' *Evangelium Matthaei* (Leipzig: Fleischer, 1826) 853-8; C. G. Wilke, *Die Neutestamentliche Rhetorik* (Dresden: Arnoldische, 1843) §38.d, 148-9; Smyth, *Grammar*, §3025; N. Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963) 335–6; Denniston, *Particles*, 62–3; M. Zerwick, *Biblical Greek* (Rome: s.n., 1963) §460; BDF §442.16, 228-9; BDAG, s.v. καί 1.a.δ,ε.

40   W. D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (Nashville: Nelson, 2000) 128.

41   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 241, n. 13.

42   P. B. Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009) 344–5.

43   BDAG, s.v. σάρξ, §3a.

grammatical function of καί, Jelf writes that it 'marks the intimate connection of the two clauses or terms, the two are as one'.[44] No grammar describes such a function for οὐδέ.

B.4   'A single idea'

Payne asserts that 'Paul typically uses οὐδέ to join together expressions that reinforce or make more specific a single idea', and attempts to demonstrate this from an examination of Paul's use of the conjunction. He then seems to argue that since it is therefore to be expected that the elements joined by οὐδέ in 1 Tim 2.12 will convey a single idea, and since his proposal for its meaning is itself a single idea, then this is indeed the true meaning.[45] It will be seen at once that if there exists more than one way in which elements can combine to form a single idea, then the argument is fallacious, the fallacy being that of the undistributed middle which, in its simplest form, runs 'Cats are mammals; this is a mammal; therefore this is a cat'.

A distinction may be drawn between three types of ways in which two elements can join together to form a single idea. The second element may combine with the first to form a more specific and limited single idea; it may extend the meaning of the first to convey a broader or over-arching single idea; or it may be epexegetical, adding explanatory material while neither extending nor limiting the referent. Only cases of the first type should count as evidence in support of Payne's thesis.

B.5   Non-Pauline examples

Payne gives a list of ten 'non-Pauline examples of οὐδέ joining two infinitives in order to convey a single idea'.[46] Upon examination, in every case, the second term is similar to the first, so that even

---

44   Jelf, *Syntax*, §759.1, 460.

45   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 236.

46   Payne, οὐδέ, 236 n. 5.

where they do, at least arguably, combine to convey a single idea, it is not an idea more limited than the first, but of at least equal extent. A single example may suffice:

> **Josephus,** *Antiquities* **7.127** Τοῦτο τὸ πταῖσμα τοὺς Ἀμμανίτας οὐκ ἔπεισεν ἠρεμεῖν οὐδὲ μαθόντας τοὺς κρείττονας ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν, 'This defeat did not persuade the Ammanites to remain quiet or to keep the peace in the knowledge that their enemy was superior.'[47]

Payne submits that '"To keep the peace in the knowledge that their enemy was superior" reiterates "to remain quiet". It is not a separate idea.'; rather, it is 'a single idea'.[48] He does not contend that the two terms combine to form a more specific, limited idea, so that the Ammanites might actually have become quiet, only not in a way that involved keeping the peace. Thus, even with his own interpretation, the text does not support his argument that the second clause limits the extent of the first in 1 Tim 2.12.

The phrase ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν carries the meaning 'keep quiet, be at peace or at rest'.[49] Ἠρεμέω has a very similar lexical range, but can also mean to 'acquiesce in a verdict'. The participial phrase μαθόντας τοὺς κρείττονας ('having learnt [that their enemies were] stronger') suggests a progression. First, the Ammanites were not subdued and quieted by their defeat; second, despite being inferior in strength, they did not make a strategic decision to keep the peace. William Whiston's translation keeps the participial phrase in its position between the two infinitives, and thus gives more of a sense of such a progression: 'This defeat did not still induce the Ammonites to

---

47   Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* (LCL V; London: Heinemann, 1950) 428–9.

48   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 245.

49   LSJ, s.v. ἡσυχία.

be quiet, nor to own those that were superior to them to be so, and be still'.[50] The clause added by οὐδέ reinforces the first, but also adds something new and distinct.

In only one non-Pauline text, Plutarch's *Roman Questions*, does Payne claim that the second term limits the meaning of the first in the way that he is contending for in 1 Tim 2.12.

> **Plutarch, *Roman Questions* 269 D** οὐ δεῖ δὲ τῶν ἡμερῶν τὸν ἀκριβέστατον ἀριθμὸν διώκειν οὐδὲ τὸ παρ᾽ ὀλίγον συκοφαντεῖν, ὅπου καὶ νῦν ἐπίδοσιν τοσαύτην ἀστρολογίας ἐχούσης περιγίνεται τῆς ἐμπειρίας τῶν μαθηματικῶν ἡ τῆς κινήσεως ἀνωμαλία διαφεύγουσα τὸν λόγον. 'But we must not follow out the most exact calculation of the number of days nor cast aspersions on approximate reckoning; since even now, when astronomy has made so much progress, the irregularity of the moon's movements is still beyond the skill of mathematicians, and continues to elude their calculations.' [Babbitt][51]

Plutarch is addressing a question about the unequal interval between the three fixed dates of the Roman month: the Kalends, the Nones, and the Ides. He points out that despite the progress in the science of astronomy, there is still a limit to the degree of accuracy that can be attained in predicting the movements of the moon. Given the irregularity of the moon's movements, there was no advantage in pursuing exactness beyond the level of understanding that had so far been attained.

Payne understands this passage in a radically different way. He claims that 'Plutarch's explanation praising the progress of astronomy shows that he regards the pursuit of exact calculations positively. He opposes exact calculation here only because it is in combination with casting

---

50   Josephus, *The Works*, trans. W. Whiston (London: Ward, 1878) 188.

51   Plutarch, *The Roman Questions*, in: F. C. Babbitt (trans.), *Moralia* (LCL IV; London: Heinemann, 1957) 40–41.

aspersions on approximate reckoning.'[52] Payne supposes that Plutarch is opposed to the most exact calculation of the number of days only if this exact calculation is combined with casting aspersion on approximate reckoning.

Thus he turns a negative into a positive. Instead of Plutarch opposing over-exactness in calculation, Payne has him in favour of the pursuit of the highest degree of accuracy. Babbitt's translation, which Payne offers, does not support him in this interpretation, and neither do previous renderings by Rose and Holland.[53] Payne seems to miss the distinction between theoretical progress, and the pursuit of precision. Greater accuracy has to wait upon advances in understanding. There is no difficulty here which calls for a new function for οὐδέ.

C   Paul's use of οὐδέ

Payne divides his treatment of Paul's use of οὐδέ between what he calls his accepted letters, and three disputed letters, namely 1 and 2 Timothy, and 2 Thessalonians. He formulates his categories of usage with the accepted letters, which contain thirty-one occurrences of οὐδέ, before examining the four occurrences in the disputed letters, of which three are in 1 Timothy. Since the text under scrutiny is in this same letter, there seems little advantage in this arrangement. If it is not written by Paul, then Pauline usage is of limited relevance. If it is, then it can be considered along with the accepted letters. In this reply to Payne, all thirty-five occurrences will be considered together.

---

52   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 252.

53   Plutarch, *The Roman Questions*, trans. H. J. Rose (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924) 129; Plutarch, *Romane Questions*, trans. P. Holland (London: Nutt, 1892) 37.

C.1   Exclusion of adverbial use

Payne limits his analysis to Paul's use of οὐδέ as a coordinating conjunction. He correctly identifies eight texts as not exhibiting a coordinate structure, but fails to find a further eight, which should also be excluded from consideration.

Sentences or clauses are connected with ἀλλ' οὐδέ in three texts. In this combination, ἀλλά is a coordinating conjunction or sentence connector, and οὐδέ is adverbial, meaning 'neither'. Payne correctly excludes Gal 2.3, but fails to exclude 1 Cor 3.2 and 4.3. In two cases, Rom 8.7 and Gal 1.12, a sentence or clause is connected with οὐδὲ γάρ. In his analysis of Luke's use of οὐδέ, Payne excludes from consideration all three occurrences of οὐδὲ γάρ, but he fails to exclude the two occurrences in Paul's letters. Οὐδὲ γάρ normally means 'for neither', 'for . . . not', with γάρ as the coordinating conjunction and οὐδέ adverbial, and both texts are so listed in BDAG.[54] Alternatively, οὐδὲ γάρ may mean 'nor indeed', with roles reversed, and some translators have understood the two particles in this way in Rom 8.7. Payne presents one of these translations, the NRSV, but mistakenly italicises 'indeed', which stands for γάρ, rather than the 'not' (in 'cannot'), which stands for οὐδέ. Like BDAG, BDF sees οὐδέ as adverbial in this verse, rendering οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται as 'for it can not either'.[55] With regard to Gal 1.12, Winer, Blass, Ellicott, Meyer, Burton and Eadie all take οὐδέ as adverbial, with the last of these authorities stating explicitly that 'γάρ supplies the ground'.[56] Finally, οὐδέ is adverbial in Rom 11.21, where it is employed in the apodosis of a conditional sentence, in 1 Tim 6.7 where it modifies a dependent clause, and in 1 Cor 5.1 and Rom 3.10, where it is ascensive.

---

54   BDAG, s.v. οὐδέ §1.

55   BDF §452.3b.

56   Winer, *Grammar*, 617; Blass, *Grammar*, 265 n. 2; commentaries at the verse.

Robertson distinguishes between three uses of οὐδέ: the continuative, the adverbial additive 'not also', and the ascensive 'not even'.[57] BDAG categorises οὐδέ in the same way: first, where it 'joins neg[ative] sentences to others of the same kind', with meaning 'and not, nor'; second, the adverbial 'also not, not either'; and third, the ascensive adverbial use, 'not even'. All instances of coordinating use fall within the first category, by definition. Where Payne has four sub-categories of coordinating use, these authorities have only one category, with a single grammatical function.

C.2   Sixteen texts

Aside from 1 Tim 2.12, on behalf of which a pattern of usage is to be established, there remain sixteen texts in which Paul uses οὐδέ as a coordinating conjunction, with eighteen occurrences of the word. These texts will be examined in turn to ascertain the relation of the word or clause introduced by οὐδέ to that which precedes. A more detailed treatment is afforded to the three texts in which Payne claims a limiting function for οὐδέ. In only two of these, Rom 9.16 and Gal 1.17, does Payne claim that the second term limits the first in the way that he is contending for in 1 Tim 2.12. In 2 Thess 3.8, he thinks that the first term limits the second. Some use is made of an earlier generation of commentaries on the Greek text, particularly where these carry a more detailed treatment of syntactical structure and the grammatical force of οὐδέ.

> **Rom 2.28-29a**: οὐ γὰρ ὁ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ Ἰουδαῖός ἐστιν οὐδὲ ἡ ἐν τῷ φανερῷ ἐν σαρκὶ
> περιτομή, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ Ἰουδαῖος, καὶ περιτομὴ καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι οὐ γράμματι,
> 'For he is not a Jew who is one outwardly, nor is circumcision that which is outward in the
> flesh. But he is a Jew who is one inwardly; and circumcision is that which is of the heart, by
> the Spirit, not by the letter;'

---

57   Robertson, *Grammar*, 1185.

Οὐδέ adds one negation to another. While outward Jewishness is closely connected to outward circumcision, the referents of Ἰουδαῖός and περιτομή, as explicated in the following verse, are actually to the inward Jew, and to spiritual circumcision, with an advance in meaning from one to the next.

Rom 9.6b-7: οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ· οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσὶν σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ πάντες τέκνα,   'For they are not all Israel who are descended from Israel; nor are they all children because they are Abraham's descendants,'

First, some are excluded from Israel because of their spiritual condition, and second, some are seed yet not children of Abraham, being of the line of Isaac or Esau. Godet comments that the second element 'has almost the same meaning' as the first, 'but with a different shade intimated by the particle *οὐδέ, neither further*.'[58]

1 Cor 2.6: Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις, σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου οὐδὲ τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου τῶν καταργουμένων·   'Yet we do speak wisdom among those who are mature; a wisdom, however, not of this age nor of the rulers of this age, who are passing away;'

Payne renders οὐδέ here with 'and specifically not'. In similar vein, Meyer suggests '*also* (in particular) not', the parenthesis perhaps indicating that the sense of focus comes from the context rather than the conjunction itself.[59] Surprisingly, Payne makes reference to the Jerusalem Bible, which translates οὐδέ ascensively with 'still less', and which in a footnote identifies the *archontes* as being probably evil powers or demons, thus distinguishing more definitely between two types of

58   F. L. Godet, *Romans* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883) 347.

59   H. A. W. Meyer, *The Epistles to the Corinthians* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884) 48.

wisdom.[60] The type of specification which Payne argues for in this verse, even if granted as a viable exegetical possibility, adds a focus but does not serve to limit the first negation. It is not as if Paul might actually be speaking a wisdom of this age, only not that of its rulers specifically.

> **1 Cor 11.16**: Εἰ δέ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνεικος εἶναι, ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν οὐδὲ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ θεοῦ. 'But if anyone is disposed to be contentious—we have no such custom, nor do the churches of God.' [NRSV]

Payne cites the Philips version of the text: 'We and the churches of God have no such custom', and argues that 'we and the churches' should be considered to constitute a single subject. Such a grouping would not limit the negation, since it still extends to include both 'we' and 'the churches'. It is not as if those referred to as 'we' might have such a practice, apart from when they were combined in some way with the churches. It seems more straightforward, with Edwards, to take ἡμεῖς to refer to 'himself and fellow-Apostles, as distinguished from the Churches'.[61] If οὐδέ serves its normal function, then Paul says that they have no such practice, and adds that the same is true of the churches.

> **1 Cor 15.50b**: σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομῆσαι οὐ δύναται οὐδὲ ἡ φθορὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ. 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable.'

To a statement of fact that our mortal bodies cannot inherit the kingdom of God, is added a statement of principle, that corruption does not inherit incorruption, the second clause deepening and providing grounds for the first.

---

60   A. Jones, *The Jerusalem Bible* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1966) 293.

61   T. C. Edwards, T*he First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1885²) 282.

2 Cor 7.12 (part): οὐχ ἕνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος οὐδὲ ἕνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος 'it was not for the sake of the offender nor for the sake of the one offended,'

Payne accepts this text as an example of οὐδέ connecting two 'clearly-distinguishable ideas'. To say that it does not parallel 1 Tim 2.12 because the terms 'form a natural pair' seems arbitrary, unless some reason is given why such a formation should affect the grammatical function of οὐδέ.[62]

Gal 1.1a: Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου 'Paul, an apostle (not sent from men nor through the agency of man,'

Eadie explains the distinction between the terms, indicated by the change of preposition and number: 'an apostle, not from men ἀπό, referring to remote or primary source; nor by man, δία, referring to medium or nearer instrumental cause.'[63] As Bruce puts it: 'Paul's apostolic commission was not derived "from men" (οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων). It was not even derived through a human intermediary (οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου)'.[64]

Gal 3.28 οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλλην, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδὲ ἐλεύθερος, 'There is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free,' [NRSV]

Payne finds difficulty with a statement like 'there is no Jew in Christ', finding it to be 'obviously false', but there does not seem to be any obstacle to an intuitive meaning such as that, for those clothed with Christ, 'all other distinctions, whether of nation . . . condition, or even sex, . . . [are]

---

62   Payne, οὐδέ, 241.

63   J. Eadie, *Galatians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1869) 3.

64   F. F. Bruce, *Galatians* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1982) 72.

wholly lost sight of and forgotten'.[65] In his commentary on the verse, Chrysostom speaks of 'He that was a Greek, or Jew, or a bond-man yesterday' (Ὁ Ἕλλην καὶ ὁ Ἰουδαῖος καὶ ὁ δοῦλος πρώην), demonstrating that he understood Paul to be saying that they were no longer such.[66] A combining, limiting function for οὐδέ would presumably generate the meaning 'there is no Greek Jew, and no free slave'. In Romans 10.12, which Payne refers to, Paul uses διαστολή ('difference, distinction') to convey the meaning Payne prefers for this text, namely that 'there is no Jew-Greek dichotomy in Christ'.[67]

Gal 4.14a καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε, 'and that which was a trial to you in my bodily condition you did not despise or loathe,'

ἐξουθενέω derives from οὐδέν ('nothing'), and means to despise or disdain. ἐκπτύω meant literally to spit out, and metaphorically to feel disgust for or reject. Lightfoot maintains a distinction, rendering the sense as 'ye did not treat with contemptous indifference or with active loathing' and, likewise, Meyer suggests that with the second term, Paul is 'adding the idea of detestation'.[68]

Phil 2.16b οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον οὐδὲ εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασα. 'I did not run in vain or labor in vain.' [NRSV]

---

65   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 238; C. J. Ellicott, *Galatians* (Andover: Draper, 1860) 89.

66   Chrysostom, *Galatians*, in: P. Schaff (ed.), *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. XIII (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1889) 30; MPG 61.656.57-8.

67   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 238.

68   J. B. Lightfoot, *Galatians* (London: Macmillan, 1866[2]) 173; H. Meyer, *Galatians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1873) 245–6.

While κοπιάω may mean either 'to grow tired, weary', or 'to work hard, toil', it has the latter sense in all its thirteen other occurrences in Paul's letters.[69] There may be said to be two metaphors in view, one from the race-track, and one from the workshop.[70] The first verb may suggest 'violent exertion, the putting forth of utmost power in direction of the goal', while 'the second verb has in it the broader notion of continuous and earnest effort'.[71]

1 Thess 2.3 ἡ γὰρ παράκλησις ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδὲ ἐν δόλῳ, 'For our exhortation does not come from error or impurity or by way of deceit;'

Although 'deceit' is included in BDAG among the translation glosses of both δόλος and πλάνη, to which fact Payne refers, the word is qualified in the latter case by 'to which one is subject'.[72] BDAG's reference to the frequent use of πλάνη in the papyri in the sense of 'deceit' seems to be in error, since upon inspection Horsley emphasises not the frequency of such use but its rarity.[73] Fee distinguishes between a 'source in "error" or mere "delusion" . . . Second, . . . "impure motives." . . . . Third, . . . a concealed attempt to "trick you" into believing.'[74]

1 Thess 5.5 πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας. Οὐκ ἐσμὲν νυκτὸς οὐδὲ σκότους· 'for you are all sons of light and sons of day. We are not of night nor of darkness;'

Payne's epexegetical interpretation, 'night viewed as darkness', must fail because of the chiastic structure, which would require 'day' to be explanatory of 'light', rather than the other way around.

---

69 BDAG, s.v. κοπίαω §2.

70 P. T. O'Brien, *Philippians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) 300.

71 J. Eadie, *Philippians* (New York: Carter, 1859) 145.

72 BDAG, s.v. δόλος; πλάνη.

73 G. H. R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (Liverpool: University Press, 1982) II.94.

74 G. D. Fee, *First and Second Thessalonians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) 59–60.

Frame finds 'a slight advance of meaning' from 'sons of light' to 'sons of day', the references to the 'day of the Lord' and 'the day' in verses two and four giving the second term an eschatological aspect. He suggests a possible distinction, that 'Day and night are the periods; light and darkness the characteristics of the periods'.[75]

> **1 Tim 6.16 (part)** ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται· 'whom no man has seen or can see'

The first clause states a fact about the past, while the second adds a principle behind and explanation for that fact, and at the same time extends the invisibility of God to man into the future. Payne states that the second clause is necessary to 'specify God's invisibility', but this is only to say that the second clause adds this matter of principle to the previous empirical assertion.[76] The second clause conveys God's invisibility in its own right, and does not need to combine with the first clause to do so. The second clause does not limit the first, as if it were only the combination of seeing and being able to see God that were negated. With regard to Payne's italicisation of the word 'and' as representing οὐδέ in the second clause in the Jerusalem Bible translation, it would be more accurate to include the negative particle also.

> **Rom 9.16** ἄρα οὖν οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεῶντος θεοῦ. 'So then it does not depend on the man who wills or the man who runs, but on God who has mercy.'

Payne finds a contradiction between Rom 9.16, as normally translated, and Rom 9.32, where Paul implies that Israel would have attained to a law of righteousness if they had pursued it by faith rather than by works. Payne takes τοῦ θέλοντος ('the one who wills, desires') to stand for 'desire',

---

75   J. E. Frame, *Thessalonians* (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1912) 184-5.

76   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 243.

and then argues that Paul cannot have been saying that mercy does not depend on desire, since in 9.31–2 he affirms the pursuit of righteousness by faith. Therefore it can only be 'the combination of desire and effort' that Paul objects to mercy being dependent upon.[77] But in fact, Paul is saying in verse 16 that election and salvation are not determined by the will or effort of an individual, but by the mercy of God. In verse 32, he says that it is only through faith in this same God, who has mercy on whom he chooses, that a law of righteousness may be obtained. Once the participial substantives, each with their own article, are translated as referring to individuals, rather than to abstracts, any perceived difficulty evaporates. Οὐδέ simply adds the idea that God's election does not depend on human effort ('running') to the previous thought that it is not of human will.

> **Gal 1.16b-17a** εὐθέως οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι οὐδὲ ἀνῆλθον εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα πρὸς τοὺς πρὸ ἐμοῦ ἀποστόλους, ἀλλ' ἀπῆλθον εἰς Ἀραβίαν 'I did not immediately consult with flesh and blood, nor did I go up to Jerusalem to those who were apostles before me; but I went away to Arabia,'

Payne contends here that the second term limits the extent of the first so that, contrary to all existing English translations, Paul did indeed consult with flesh and blood, only not with the apostles in Jerusalem. According to Payne, Paul consulted in particular with Ananias, when the latter visited him, and subsequently when, according to Acts 9.19, 'for several days he was with the disciples'.

In fact, προσανατίθημι was used with the dative of a person to mean 'consulting with someone', for example with a soothsayer or interpreter of dreams.[78] Ananias came to Paul, not the other way around, and not to consult but to impart. Moreover, in the words that he spoke to Paul, Ananias hardly touched on the content of the gospel, but rather pointed to Jesus as the one from whose

---

77 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 239.

78 BDAG, s.v. προσανατίθημι, §2; E. D. W. Burton, *Galatians* (New York: Scribner's, 1920) 54.

mouth he would receive instruction.[79] From Gal 1.13 onwards, Paul is supporting, with material

introduced by γάρ in that verse, the assertion of verses 11-12 that his gospel was not from man but

was by revelation from Jesus Christ.[80] His statement of verse 16 that he did not consult with flesh

and blood makes perfect sense in this context, and does not need to be qualified.

If εὐθέως is taken with the first term only, then the meaning is that Paul did not immediately

consult with anyone in Damascus, nor did he go up to Jerusalem to consult with the apostles. The

NEB, which Payne cites, seems to take εὐθεως primarily with ἀπῆλθον ('I went off at once'), so

that the sense may be that Paul did not consult with anyone at all, and that in particular he did not

go up to Jerusalem to consult there. Fung renders the text with this same version, and then

comments that 'vv. 16B–17 emphasize the fact that immediately after his conversion Paul did not

consult anyone, least of all the apostles in Jerusalem'.[81] Both types of reading employ οὐδέ in the

normal additive way, and neither allows for any human consultation.

> **2 Thess 3.7b–8b** οὐκ ἠτακτήσαμεν ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδὲ δωρεὰν ἄρτον ἐφάγομεν παρά τινος, 'we
>
> did not act in an undisciplined manner among you, nor did we eat anyone's bread without
>
> paying for it,'

Whereas elsewhere Payne has claimed that the term introduced by οὐδέ specifies and limits the

previous term, here he proposes that the first term limits the second. It is not, in Payne's view, that

Paul did walk disorderly except in the matter of eating free food, but that he did eat free food, only

not in a disorderly way. In his italicisation of the NRSV translation, Payne mistakenly gives 'and'

---

79   Acts 22.14.

80   Burton, *Galatians*, 44.

81   R. Y. K. Fung, *Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 68–9.

as standing for οὐδέ, whereas in fact with 'and . . . not', the two clauses are clearly separated, and one is added to the other in the usual manner.[82]

 Payne argues that because Paul would have received and accepted invitations to meals, he cannot have meant that he did not eat bread freely. But BDAG gives the meaning of ἄρτον φαγεῖν παρά τινος as to 'receive support from someone', and explains that the use of παρά with the genitive of a person 'indicates that someth[ing] proceeds fr[om] this person'.[83] Frame likewise notes the significance of the use of the dative rather than the genitive case in Tobit 8.20 ℵ, where ἔσθων καὶ πίνων παρ' ἐμοὶ does mean 'eating and drinking with me'.[84] An even more decisive refutation of Payne's argument comes from Paul's statement in verse 9 (οὐχ ὅτι οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν) that it was not that they did not have the right to do what he had just said that they were not doing. He cannot have meant that they did in fact have the right to be idle and take free meals, but must have been referring to the second clause only, and have been affirming that they did indeed have the right to receive support. Only if οὐδέ maintains a distinction between the clauses in verses 7b-8a, can sense be made of verse 9a.

In conclusion, it has been seen that in every case Paul uses οὐδέ normally, to connect one negative to a previous one in an additive way, and generally introducing something new and distinct. There is no peculiarity in Paul's employment of the conjunction.

---

82   Payne, *οὐδέ*, 242.

83   BDAG, s.v. παρά §A, A.3.β.

84   Frame, *Thessalonians*, 301.

D.   Origen on 1 Tim 2.12

Payne claims that Origen, in a reference to 1 Tim 2.12, explains it as a single prohibition. The relevant passage occurs in Origen's commentary on 1 Corinthians, at 14.34–5, where women are exhorted to be silent in the church. Origen takes issue with the Montanist practice of allowing women to prophesy in the assembly, examines in turn the prophetic ministry of Philip's daughters, Deborah, Huldah, Anna, and Miriam, and argues that in no case is that ministry exercised in the congregation of God's people. He then repeats the second half of verse 35 and joins it by means of καί to the first part of 1 Tim 2.12, but with the addition, presumably as his own comment, of the words ἁπλῶς ἀλλά between οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω and οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν. Gryson's French translation is given here, as it reflects the meaning of both the added words:[85]

> αἰσχρὸν γὰρ γυναικὶ λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω ἁπλῶς ἀλλ' οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός.[86] 'Car: "Il est inconvenant pour une femme de parler dans une assemblé", et: "Je ne permets pas à la femme d'enseigneur" tout simplement, encore moins de "gouverner l'homme".' [Gryson][87]

Ἁπλῶς means first of all 'simply', and can serve to give emphasis to a statement, or to signify that it is without qualification.[88] Here, it signifies that the prohibition on women teaching is without qualification ('tout simplement'). The particle ἀλλά derives from ἄλλα (the neuter plural of ἄλλος),

---

85   Compare J. K. Coyle, 'The Fathers on Women and Women's Ordination', *Women in Early Christianity* (ed. D. M Scholer; New York: Garland, 1993) 139; J. L. Kovacs, '1 Corinthians: Interpreted by Early Christian Commentators' (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 240.

86   C. Jenkins, 'Documents: Origen on 1 Corinthians. IV', *JTS* 10 (1909) 29–51, at 42.

87   R. Gryson, *Le Ministère des femmes dans l'Église ancienne* (Gembloux: Duculot, 1972) 57.

88   G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1961) s.v. ἁπλῶς.

meaning 'otherwise'. It therefore 'expresses difference, division, separation'.[89] Robertson gives its fundamental meaning as 'this other matter'.[90] Gryson connects it with οὐδέ and resumes the quotation at αὐθεντεῖν, giving the meaning 'still less' ('encore moins'), to exercise authority over a man. Thus, with this reading, Origen distinguishes one prohibition from the other, giving an ascensive emphasis to the second. If, instead, the quotation is continued from οὐδέ then ἀλλά still serves to separate the prohibitions, and perhaps indicates that Origen feels some sense of contrast between them. The text continues:

> Καὶ ἄλλοθεν δὲ τοῦτο παραστήσω, εἰ καὶ ἐκεῖνο ἀσφαλέστερον εἴρηται περὶ τοῦ μὴ τὴν γυναῖκα ἡγεμόνα γίνεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ἀνδρός· 'Et je prouverai encore ceci à partir d'un autre texte, bien que ce qui précèdent disent plus catégoriquement que la femme ne doit pas se faire par la parole le guide de l'homme.'

When the two demonstrative pronouns are used together, 'ἐκεῖνος prop[erly] belongs to *the more remote,* in time, place, or thought, οὗτος to the nearer'.[91] There can be no certainty about what τοῦτο ('this', nearer) and ἐκεῖνο ('that', more remote) refer to respectively in this text, but it seems probable that the latter relates primarily to the preceding ('ce qui précèdent') discussion about women being silent in the assembly, which is, after all, the subject that Origen is addressing here. It is this that Origen says is περὶ τοῦ μὴ τὴν γυναῖκα ἡγεμόνα γίνεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ἀνδρός ('concerning the woman not becoming leader of the man in speech'). Payne maintains that this clause 'describes' 1 Tim 2.12, but it seems almost certain that it relates rather to the preceding material.

---

89   Jelf, *Syntax*, §773.1.

90   Robertson, *Grammar*, 1185.

91   LSJ, s.v. ἐκεῖνος §A.1.

Conclusion

Payne is not succesful in establishing either a theoretical or an evidential basis for a combinatorial power for οὐδέ. The grammars and lexicons are in agreement that in its coordinating role, οὐδέ is a negative connective with additive function, normally introducing new and distinct semantic content. It has been shown that the word has precisely this function in sixteen texts where Paul employs it as a coordinating conjunction. The one other instance of such a coordinating use is 1 Tim 2.12:

διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ᾽ εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ.

If οὐδέ has its normal function, then to a prohibition on a woman teaching, Paul adds one on her exercising authority over a man. Payne wrote in 1981 that the Greek text 'reads, literally: "To teach, however, on the part of a woman I am not permitting, nor to lord it over a man."'[92] With this, at least with regard to syntactical structure, there is agreement. Οὐδέ simply adds one prohibition to the other. While the precise relationship between them remains to be determined semantically and exegetically, they each retain a force of their own. Payne's 2008 thesis that οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός limits the extent of the prohibition of a woman teaching has no basis either in Greek grammar or in Pauline usage.

---

92   P. B. Payne, 'Libertarian Women in Ephesus: A Response to Douglas J. Moo's Article, "1 Timothy 2:11–15: Meaning and Significance"', *Trinity Journal* 2 NS (1981) 175.