1 TIMOTHY 2:12: AN ANALYSIS OF RESTRICTIVE INTERPRETATION

Perhaps the most significant verse in the "feminist" controversy is 1 Tim 2:12. This verse apparently teaches that a woman is not to teach nor have authority over a man. There can be little question that there is a concerted effort to interpret 1 Tim 2:12 in agreement with the present culture. Although this verse is not complicated, the syntax is simple, and the argument of the passage is clear, almost every detail has been questioned. Most of the modern interpretation has been to restrict either the interpretation of each detail in the verse or the application of the verse. This includes restricting the meaning of "teach nor exercise authority" to "teach domineeringly," restricting the principle Paul states to a specific situation in Ephesus, and often, by those not in "feminist" circles, a restriction of application to the assembly. These interpretations consistently depend on restricting the meaning of each word or concept in some way so that Paul's statement is not applicable in any general sense today. The result is a meaning which is in agreement with the present culture, but which is the opposite of the "traditional" meaning.

The Significance of *Oude* in 1 Tim 2:12

A common interpretation which restricts the meaning of 1 Tim 2:12 is based on the allegation that the construction which involves *oude*, in this verse, is equivalent either to "teach in an authoritative way,"[1] or to "teach in a domineering manner."[2] The verse would then mean, "I do not permit a woman to domineeringly teach, or authoritatively teach" a man. The verb *authentein*, "to exercise authority" is eliminated as a separate item and is used only to modify and thus to narrowly restrict the verb *didaskein* to only one kind of teaching. This is clear from the interpretation itself. It is also explicitly stated by interpreters such as Payne, who interpret the construction so that it eliminates the idea of a prohibition against authority and reduces the

prohibition against teaching to only one manner of teaching,[3] "domineering teaching." It needs to be kept in mind that such an interpretation as "domineering teaching," or "authoritative teaching" is not just relating two verbs to one overall concept. It is eliminating one entirely (*authentein*) and using it to modify, restrict, or narrow the scope of the other. Such a construction where two concepts relate in such a way that one merely functions as an adjective modifying the other is a hendiadys.[4] In 1 Tim 2:12, according to this view, the prohibition against exercising authority over a man is entirely eliminated and the prohibition against teaching is so restricted to one specific manner of teaching (domineering, or authoritative, etc.) that it also is virtually eliminated. A verse which appears to *prohibit* a woman from every kind of authority over a man and from teaching a man is interpreted by this device to *permit* every kind of authority and almost every kind of teaching. This is not merely an insignificant minor adjustment or a more precise understanding of the verse but actually contradicts the apparent and traditional meaning of the verse. Such a usage for *oude* (hendiadys) is not borne out by a study of *oude*.

New Testament usage of *oude*

The basic issue is whether or not the *oude* construction implies that the verb *authenteō*, "have authority," has no real significance except to adjectivally restrict or modify *didaskō*, "to teach." There are 144 instances in the New Testament where *oude* is used. It will be helpful to study all of these uses so that some sense of the normal nuance may be established before studying Pauline uses specifically.[5] There are enough occurrences in the New Testament that this will be sufficient unless other sources provide some rare insight into the term. Due to the number of occurrences, some grouping of the occurrences will be helpful. In a small percentage of cases *oude* functions primarily as a negative rather than a correlation between two concepts; therefore, in these cases there is no possibility of a hendiadys. These show that *oude* is not merely a negative but has the intensive nuance "not even."[6] For example, see Matt. 27:14 which does not mean that Jesus refused to give only one word (He gave more), but that He did not answer at all, "not even one

word." Matt 6:29 (Luke 12:27) does not mean that only Solomon was not dressed thus (others may be), but that "not even Solomon with all his riches and glory was dressed thus." Matt 8:10 (Luke 7:9) is stressing that "not even in Israel (God's elect) have I found . . . ." The same force may be seen in Mark 5:3 where the nuance is not that the demoniac could not be bound with a chain but could be with other bindings; rather, it means he could not be bound "even with a chain." The *oude* tends to reinforce or intensify the basic concept. In Mark 6:31 the concept is not merely that they could not find time to eat but could find opportunity for relaxation; rather, they were so busy they could not even find an opportunity to eat. The same nuance holds true in Mark 14:59; 16:13; Luke 6:3; 12:26; 18:13; 23:40; John 1:3 ("not even one thing came to pass"); 5:22; 7:5; 8:42; 21:25; ("not even the world"); Acts 4:12, 32, 34; 19:2; and Rev. 9:20.

Cases where longer elements, such as clauses or conditional sentences are correlated by *oude*, neither of which occurs in 1 Tim 2:12, will be considered later. There are numerous cases similar to 1 Tim 2:12 where the nuance is clear. In these clear occurrences the relationship is not adjectival (hendiadys) but reinforcement or intensification of a concept to which both elements relate. For example, the statement in Matt 25:13, "you do not know the day nor the hour," does not mean "you do not know the hourly day," or "the hour type of day;" rather, it means "you do not know the day nor even the hour," and specifically means the hearers do not at all know the time including minutes, seconds, and probably the week, month, etc. The unifying concept relates to time. Specifically it refers to their lack of knowledge of the time. The second concept is not eliminated as a separate concept (so that they may know the hour and the time except for a specific type of day),[7] but reinforces and intensifies the overall thought. To interpret this as a hendiadys nullifies and even contradicts the obvious meaning of the verse. In Matt 6:26 (Luke 12:27) the birds are not sowing in some way adjectivally defined by "reaping" or "gathering," so that they could be gathering, reaping and sowing in other ways; rather, they are doing nothing to provide their food. The single idea of not working to provide food is reinforced by the individual

specifics correlated by *oude*. All of the individual aspects, "sowing," "reaping," and "gathering" are necessary to convey the overall inclusive idea that they do nothing at all. To treat this as a hendiadys (as many do 1 Tim 2:12) would imply that the birds possibly did work and thus teach the opposite of the clear meaning of the verse. In Matt 12:4 Jesus does not mean that only a certain type of David was not permitted to eat of the showbread; rather, the construction with *oude* intensifies the fact that none of them, including David and all with him, were permitted to eat. In each of these cases it is impossible to construe the *oude* construction as a hendiadys. To treat it as a hendiadys in the same way many do 1 Tim 2:12 is not merely inaccurate but twists the certain meaning of the verses so that they are interpreted to mean almost the opposite of what they in fact say. The same holds true in the remaining verses in this category.[8]

There are a number of occurrences (approximately twenty-three),[9] involving longer segments, which are extremely difficult to state, even theoretically, as a hendiadys. The construction reinforces or intensifies a basic concept common to both elements without eliminating or restricting either individual element. There are also a few occurrences where the intensive nuance is less obvious (Matt 25:45; Mark 12:10; Luke 7:7; John 15:4; Heb 8:4). However, none of these instances functions as a hendiadys with an adjectival or restrictive nuance.

Of the 109 non-Pauline uses of *oude* there are only fourteen which apparently could be forced into a hendiadys. The intensive use, however, seems to capture more accurately the meaning of theses verses. The fourteen are Matt. 6:20, 28; 13:13; 16:9; Mark 4:22; 8:17; Luke 8:17; John 14:17; Acts 8:21; 16:21; 24:18; Heb 10:8; 13:5; and 2 Pet 1:8. In most of these cases the concepts which are related by *oude* are synonymous, or approximately so. The use of several synonyms or repetition of similar ideas is a customary practice to intensify or reinforce a common idea. Regardless of the presence of *oude*, synonymous concepts or terms are often used in this way. Matt 6:20, "where thieves neither break in nor steal," can hardly mean "where thieves do not make a stealing type of break in" and only refer to a specific type of entry while excluding the

reference to stealing. This would be similar to the hendiadys view of 1 Tim 2:12. It much better captures the nuance to realize that the verse refers to a place which is not at all subject to thieves. This is emphasized by including the two activities common to the thief's operations. In Matt 6:28 the fact that the lilies neither labor nor spin does not mean that they do not do "a spinning type of labor but may do some other kind of labor," nor does it mean that they do not laboriously spin but may spin otherwise, nor that they do not labor; that is, spin, but may otherwise work. Rather, it means that they do not work to earn nor do they spin to make their own clothing; i.e., they do nothing at all yet God provides for them. They do nothing to acquire their clothing. This is the basic concept. In Matt 13:13, "and although they hear they do not hear nor understand," the basic concept seems to be that they are not listening and they lack any real understanding; that is, they are not at all responding in the proper way. It does not restrict their lack of hearing to only one type and at the same time allow for them to understand. Both their lack of listening and their failure to understand are in view. The context rules out any possibility that they could be understanding. Therefore, it is much more likely that Matthew reinforces the concept by this construction than that it is merely a hendiadys opening the door to the implication that they may, in fact, understand. The other verses give the same evidence.[10]

There is not one instance in the 109 non-Pauline uses of *oude* that supports the concept that *oude* is used in a construction where one part is used only as a modifier restricting the other part, or supporting any interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12 to mean "I do not permit a woman to domineeringly (or authoritatively) teach a man, but she may teach a man in some other way."

Pauline usage of *oude*

The study of the usage of *oude* in non-Pauline passages was necessary in order to demonstrate a preponderance of usage. A study of Pauline usage of this word reveals that Paul uses *oude* in the same way as the other New Testament authors. It does not occur in a hendiadys or adjectival relationship. When more than one item is joined, it reinforces or intensifies the

overall concept. There are thirty-five occurrences of *oude* in the Pauline epistles. This is a sufficient number to gain a definite idea of the flavor of *oude* in Paul's letters. A grouping of the occurrences will help. Certain occurrences are relatively obvious and also relatively brief. In Rom 3:10, "there is none righteous, not one," the two concepts joined by *oude* are synonymous. The construction not only reflects Hebrew usage rather than Greek, but is different than the construction in 1 Tim 2:12, since the word *dikaios* in the first concept must also be understood as the basic part of the second concept. This is merely a more emphatic repetition of the same statement; the anarthrous *dikaios* is repeated more specifically by *heis dikaios*. *Oude* functions as a negative in its own clause rather than as a connective. The construction is emphatic (intensive) rather than restrictive. The second concept does not cease to function and allow the possibility that there may be *heis dikaios*. Rom 8:7, "it is not in subjection to the law of God, for neither is it able," cannot accurately be rendered as "he is not in an ability type subjection," or some equivalent. The total construction involving *oude* emphasizes the lack of subjection. To eliminate the idea that the unbeliever lacks the capacity to be in subjection and use this concept rather to narrow the extent of his failure to be in subjection, would destroy the intent of the verse.

Rom 9:16, "Therefore it is not of the one who desires nor the one who runs," is regarded by Payne as equivalent to a hendiadys, "desire expressed by effort."[11] However, would Paul argue, as this implies, that God shows mercy completely on His own initiative and terms, and then in this same discussion conclude "therefore it is not of desire expressed by effort (not of one specific type of desire, but it could be of other types) but of God who shows mercy"? Does Paul seem to be narrowing the statement down to one very narrow type of desire and allowing for other types of desire and for effort? Does such a narrow focus on one specific type of desire really correlate with the all inclusive clause which follows, "but of God who shows mercy," so that this would only mean that it is not of an effort type of desire (but may be of other types and could be of effort) but of God who shows mercy? Such a view is improbable but is equivalent in approach to the

hendiadys or adjectival view of 1 Tim 2:12. It is contrary to the inclusive nature of Paul's argument in the context of Rom 9:16 to interpret this as restricted to desire only. It is even worse to restrict it to only one specific type of desire, and claim (as the hendiadys proponents of 1 Tim 2:12 claim for that verse) that there is an unlimited range of other possibilities which are allowed. The accurate nuance is emphatic, joining two concepts, "desire" and "effort," to emphasize that neither human desire (of any sort, not just one type) nor human effort; that is, no form of human wishing or endeavor, is involved. Rom 11:21 can hardly be interpreted as a hendiadys, but is intensive. The same is true of 1 Cor 2:6, "this age nor the rulers of this age." It is improbable that "the rulers of this age" is not an actual group, but merely a modifier restricting "this age," since in the same context (v 8) Paul specifically refers to the "rulers of this age" as not knowing the wisdom he speaks. In addition, it is contrary to the entire context to think that Paul refers only to one type of "this age." The inclusion of "the rulers" is not to merely restrict the meaning of "this age," but to emphasize that no one of this age, including the rulers, knows this wisdom. The hendiadys view consistently weakens the force of the *oude* construction, since it narrowly restricts the meaning rather than grasps the emphatic, intensive, and inclusive thrust of the construction. 1 Cor 3:2 and 4:3 seem to be intensive rather than functioning as hendiadys. It is hardly possible that 1 Cor 11:14 means that nature does not teach them, but other things may; rather, it means "does not even nature in particular (as well as other things) teach you?" 1 Cor 11:16 seems likewise to be intensive, "neither we (Paul) nor any of the churches," rather than restricting it to a "church type we" and leaving out the churches in general as the hendiadys view would require.[12] 1 Cor 14:21; 15:13, 16; 2 Cor 7:12 (Due to the following clause this must be an intensive total concept rather than a restrictive concept required by a hendiadys); Gal 1:1, 12, 17;[13] 2:3, 5; 3:28; Phil 2:16; 1 Thess 2:3; and 2 Thess 3:8 are all definitely intensive to reinforce a basic mutual concept; none fit as a hendiadys. Payne comments that 2 Thess 3:8 is not a "denial of two separate issues, idleness and taking free meals . . . ;" rather, it is "the combination of idleness and taking free meals from

others.[14] This somewhat nebulous statement is not demonstrating anything equivalent to the hendiadys interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12. There is little possibility that the verse means Paul was concerned with only one form of idleness, only with respect to "free meals." Is it at all reasonable to take this as a hendiadys meaning that Paul did not freeload only as far as meals were concerned but may have in other ways?[15] It seems certain that Paul was not lazy in any respect. The specific of free meals intensifies the overall meaning rather than restricting it. In addition, if the second aspect, "free meals," is eliminated as a specific entity (cf. hendiadys view of 1 Time 2:12), what possible meaning is there in a "free meal type of freeloading?" A few verses in which the precise nuance may not be as obvious should be discussed prior to analysis of the three occurrences in 1 Timothy.

Rom 2:28 contains a longer construction connected by *oude*. This verse is a challenge to anyone who attempts to state it as a hendiadys[16] The two clauses joined by *oude*, in Rom 2:28, are repeating the same basic idea, but one refers to the person specifically, the other to a physical act. This repetition is clearly for emphasis and not restrictive as required by a hendiadys. The following verse (Rom 2:29), which functions together with Rom 2:28 in a negated antonym equivalence,[17] has two repetitive clauses joined by "and," indicating that both clauses are included for emphasis. This also supports the fact that the repetition of the two clauses in Rom 2:28 is for emphasis rather than a construction where one clause modifies or restricts the meaning of the other.

Rom 4:15, "where there is no law, neither (*oude*) is there violation," definitely does not function as a hendiadys and thus mean "where there is no violation type of Law." A basic point of Romans is that the Law actually produces and is characterized by violation. This is specifically stated in Rom 4:15. The intensive idea may not be as apparent, but when considered with the previous two verses in the context, the idea does seem to reinforce the basic concept. In any case it is not a hendiadys. Rom 9:7 combines two longer elements by *oude*. Each of the elements

states the same basic principle and the repetition of the concepts serves to emphasize or intensify the principle common to both. It is impossible to construe this as a hendiadys. Gal 4:14 states that the Galatians did not despise nor loathe Paul's appearance. The second part of the construction cannot merely mean that they did not loathingly despise Paul (but may have despised non-loathingly), since the next clause states that they received Paul as a messenger of God (did not despise him). Obviously the two similar terms joined by *oude* ("despise," and "loathe") are not to restrict the scope of the despising to only one particular (a hendiadys) but are to intensify the overall aspect that they did not at all look down on Paul. Gal 6:13, if considered in its context, is definitely emphatic, meaning "for not even the circumcised, themselves, keep the Law." It can hardly be a hendiadys.

There are three occurrences of *oude* in the Pastoral Epistles, all of which are in 1 Timothy. 1 Tim 6:7 states, "for we have brought nothing into the world, nor are we able to take anything out."[18] No matter which variant is included as the connective, it is virtually impossible to construe this as a hendiadys. The two clauses joined by *oude* cannot relate adjectivally. Together, each giving part of the total concept, they intensify or reinforce the idea that material possessions have no place in eternity. To virtually eliminate the second concept as a valid entity and then to regard it as merely restricting what one is unable to bring in to the world, would destroy the meaning of the verse. 1 Tim 6:16 does not mean that no man has seen God with an "able to see" type of seeing (but possibly has some other way); rather, the basic concept, the transcendence of God, is reinforced by the statement that no one has seen God, nor in fact is able to see Him. Payne's statement that in 1 Tim 6:16 *oude* "joins two elements to convey a single coherent idea,"[19] is true. However, it is an inclusive idea which contains both elements rather than restricting or eliminating either one. It does not function as a hendiadys as his view of 1 Tim 2:12 requires. It is intensive as is every other use of *oude*.

Conclusion regarding *oude*

The evidence is amazingly one sided. There is not one instance of the 143 occurrences (excluding 1 Tim 2:12), which functions as a hendiadys. In many of the cases another Greek word, such as *kai*, "and," or *gar*, "for," could be substituted and the expression would still make sense; however, it would not convey the same basic nuance. The evidence overwhelmingly supports the fact that *oude* is intensive or reinforcing of some basic concept. When more than one item is joined by *oude* the two reinforce a basic concept which relates to both of them. To treat the construction as a hendiadys actually destroys the real meaning of the verse, by forcing it to teach the opposite of that which it really means. The view that 1 Tim 2:12 means "I do not permit a woman to teach domineeringly (or authoritatively) . . ." requires that the one concept functions adjectivally so that it merely qualifies the other concept in some way so as to restrict it. It also requires the elimination of the second concept as a separate entity. This is not merely a view apart from any evidence of any kind but is contrary to the evidence. Such an interpretation which regards the construction as restricting or narrowing the scope of one of the aspects and eliminating the other aspect by turning it into a mere modifier, is actually the opposite of the true sense. The true sense intensifies and even broadens the scope of the individual parts without excluding either. There is no justification either theologically, contextually, syntactically, or lexically to interpret 1 Tim 2:12 in the sense of a hendiadys. Rather than the actual meaning of 1 Tim 2:12, that a woman is to exercise no authority of any kind over a man, the hendiadys approach makes it indicate the exact opposite so that she can exercise authority in every way but one. The construction containing *oude* in 1 Tim 2:12 indicates that the woman is prohibited from engaging in two specific actions described by the verbs *didaskō*, "teach," and *authenteō*, "exercise authority." These two verbs, however, do not limit the specifics from which she is prohibited. They intensify and convey the more inclusive principle of which each is a part. This principle covers the more inclusive range of specifics from which she is prohibited. The context obviously concerns the

relationship of authority and subjection between men and women. The verb "teach" concerns a position commonly connected with authority, and the verb *authenteō* is commonly recognized as related to authority. The inclusive principle from which the woman is prohibited, is any kind of authority over a man. The common interpretation, "I do not permit a woman to teach nor to exercise authority over a man," fits all of these criteria, makes good sense and fits in the argumentative flow of the passage.

The restrictive (usually "feminist") interpretations depend upon the incorrect and unsupported "hendiadys view" of this verse, or upon a restricted view of *authenteō*, or in most cases on a combination of both. Therefore, the meaning of *authenteō* must be considered.

The Meaning of *Authenteō*

The standard lexicons agree that *authenteō* means "to have authority," "exercise authority," or some similar concept. They also allow for instances where *authenteō* has a negative connotation, such as "domineer,"[20] or even "tyranny."[21] Another common meaning for *authenteō*, "to murder," can hardly be meant in 1 Tim 2:12. That the word may be neutral and yet in some contexts have a negative connotation is normal and does not seem to merit any special discussion by these lexical authorities. However, despite this, several have attempted to demonstrate a basically negative connotation for *authenteō*. 1 Tim 2:12 would, then, according to these interpreters, only prohibit a woman from some wrongful exercise of authority, such as to exercise authority in a domineering manner. Such an interpretation depends solely on the alleged negative meaning for *authenteō* since there is no implication in the passage to regard the verb as negative. It is not unusual or contradictory for *authenteō*, when it refers to authority, to be basically neutral and yet in some contexts to have a negative connotation. This is common in Greek, as it is in English. For example, the word *zēlos*, "zeal," in certain contexts means "zeal" in the negative sense of "jealousy." However, *zēlos* does not, in itself, have a negative connotation. This comes only from the context. The context is determinative of the precise nuance of a word. The difference in the proposed

meanings for *authenteō* is not one concerning two entirely different concepts, but of a more precise nuance of approximately the same meaning. It is entirely natural for a word which means "to exercise authority," to occur in some contexts referring to a negative use of authority such as "to domineer."

Since the context of 1 Tim 2:12 gives no implication of a negative meaning for *authenteō*, the "negative" interpretation must demonstrate that the verb is, in itself, negative; that is, that it always has a negative meaning. The general opinion, however, supported by the standard lexicons, is that when *authenteō* refers to authority it is basically neutral, although, depending on the context, it may in some cases have a negative connotation.[22] A study of *authenteō* and of the literature arguing the various views reveals that this "standard" view is correct. Any negative connotation for *authenteō* can only come from the context.

The context is against a negative meaning

Any negative meaning for the practices prohibited in 1 Tim 2:12 is highly improbable in the context. The passage concerns the relationship between men and women, not some practice wrong in itself. Only women are prohibited from the practice, which implies that it is acceptable for men; therefore, it is not some practice such as domineering teaching which is wrong for both men and women. In addition, women are only prohibited from this action with respect to one group, men. They obviously are allowed to engage in this action with respect to others, women or children. Paul would hardly prohibit only women from wrongful teaching. Nor, would he allow them to wrongfully teach women and children. When these two aspects are combined the conclusion is even more forceful. Not only does the prohibition apply only to *women*, but only to *women* with respect to men. The prohibited action is wrong only because a woman practices it with respect to men. She is not prohibited due to inability, lack of education, or some other negative trait. She is prohibited solely because she is a woman. This concept is, of course, anathema to the present sociological thinking. This , however, is the perspective of the entire passage which

concerns male-female hierarchial relationships, rather than sinful practices such as domineering or teaching false doctrine. To object that the prohibition of the woman does not imply the practice is allowable for men, is contradictory to the entire sense of the passage which concerns the actions of women in contrast to men, contradictory to the specific statement that the prohibition concerns only action with respect to men, and is contradictory to any normal perspective of communication. If a guard says "women are not allowed in this area" the very fact that he specified "women" implies that men are allowed, and would be accurately interpreted that way. Language is meaningless if this verse does not indicate that men as a generic group may teach anyone, and that women may teach other women and children. In other passages there are certain restrictions which limit the specific men who may be allowed to teach and exercise authority. None of these are mentioned in this passage, which further implies that the prohibition is due to gender rather than any deficiencies.

Etymological arguments are invalid

The proposed meanings for *authenteō* concern a precise difference in nuance, a neutral (or positive) versus a negative exercise of authority. Although the paucity of occurrences of the verb *authenteō* may imply that it is reasonable to study other words from the same root to determine its meaning, it is impossible to determine precise distinctions in the nuance of a word by studying other words even from the same root. The verb *aphistēmi* means "to depart," but the noun *apostasia* has the negative connotation "rebel" or "defect." The verb *huphistēmi* means to "resist, face, endure," but the noun *hupostasis* means "substantial nature, essence, situation, realization."[23] These are not slight distinctions. The noun and verb from the same root have entirely different meanings. The noun does not necessarily carry the same meaning as the verb. Words from the same root as *authenteō* carry a variety of meanings such as "have authority, murder, take in hand, commit suicide, authentic, principal."[24] Obviously the etymology of this word, which has such a variety of meanings, cannot indicate precise nuances. It is a basic linguistic and semantic principle

that the meaning of a word cannot be determined from its etymology,[25] nor can the precise nuance of a word (verb) be determined by studying other words (nouns, adjectives) from the same root.

Knight, whose study of *authenteō* concludes that the verb, when referring to authority, is basically positive or neutral, properly uses only the verb for his analysis.[26] In contrast, much of the modern discussion of *authenteō* falls prey to the "etymological fallacy" of using other words from the same root rather than the verb itself. For example, the use of the nouns and adjectives is a fundamental flaw in Kroeger's argument for a negative connotation,[27] which claims to discuss the verb but hardly mentions it apart from the instance in 1 Tim 2:12. Payne also labors under this "etymological fallacy" and improperly criticizes Knight for examining only the occurrences of the verb, itself.[28] Wilshire's helpful article on *authenteō* faults Knight's statement that there is a "paucity of occurrences of the term."[29] However, Knight, since he is referring to instances of the *verb*, is correct. There are, in fact, few extant occurrences of the *verb* prior to the time of 1 Timothy. Neither the TLG printout[30] nor Wilshire's article adds any new occurrences of the verb *authenteō* prior to the time of 1 Timothy. The 314 occurrences mentioned by Wilshire refer to the verb *and its cognates*,[31] and, in fact, almost entirely to the cognates. The extant instances of the verb prior to Paul's time are those discussed by Knight.[32]

Although only the verb is the proper subject of this study, the nouns and adjectives from the same root, *when referring to authority*, give no evidence for a basically negative meaning. Wilshire argues for the basic meaning "to murder," but he gives no instances of the *verb* with this meaning prior to pastristic times, other than the one instance discussed by Knight. He also states that in the patristic evidence the predominant meaning for *authenteō* and its cognates is "authority,"[33] and that there is evidence "before, during, and after the time of Paul where some sort of meaning connected with 'authority' is found for the word *authenteō*."[34] His discussion of the verb and cognates, when referring to authority, seems contrary to the view that they are inherently negative. Therefore, even if the nouns, adjectives, and later occurrences are considered, a study

of the standard lexicons, the instances mentioned in various studies, and the occurrences listed in the TLG computer printout indicates that the basic conclusions are the same. When referring to authority the meaning is basically neutral.

Authenteō is neutral (positive)

Kroeger is one of many who argue for a negative connotation for *authenteō*. Among her many interpretations of this verb is an argument for a sexual connotation. She refers to statements from two early grammarians[35] that the verb is "coarse," apparently failing to realize that they are referring to "common" ("coarse") Greek in contrast to the more literary Attic Greek.[36] Her other examples, only two of which concern the verb, are based on imprecise interpretation. One case is where the verb means "murder" and is stated to be "by a sword." She concludes that the sword was a phallic symbol,[37] therefore *authenteō*, a different word than "sword," has sexual connotations. There is not the slightest intimation that the word "sword" has any sexual connotation in this statement. Her arguments are equivalent to arguing that the statement, "the horse was transported by ship," proves that the word "horse" has nautical connotations since it occurs together with "ship." In another instance she must look eight chapters earlier for a sexual reference to support an almost impossible interpretation for *Wis* 12:6, in order to derive a sexual connotation. Her article has been thoroughly refuted by both Osburn[38] and Panning.[39] In a later writing she states that *authenteō* represents a "ritual act or doctrinal tenet propounded by heretical teachers."[40] In the same article she also states that it could mean to claim sovereignty, or authorship,[41] and finally states that it means "to represent herself as the originator or source of man."[42] In this article of about twenty pages she devotes three to *authenteō*, and the rest to be a supposed Gnostic error at Ephesus which apart from any evidence she connects with *authenteō*. As Liefeld points out, her final interpretation does not fit any of her proposed meanings for *authenteō*, which she gave earlier in the article, and it is grammatically impossible in this verse.[43] In another article she states that *authenteō* refers to women "who claimed a feminine spirituality and power of creation superior to

that of males."[44] None of these are grammatically possible interpretations.[45] One may well ask which one of these various interpretations is Kroeger really proposing? Does she really have any specific, relatively consistent idea of Paul's meaning in 1 Tim 2:12, or is she only avoiding the traditional and obvious meaning of the verse?

There are few extant examples before or during the time of 1 Timothy of the verb *authenteō*. Kroeger refers to one instance by Philodemus which is apparently from his *Volumina Rhetorica*.[46] Her "sexual" interpretation of this instance is adequately refuted by Osburn.[47] Knight concludes that this instance refers to those who rule in a "positive and commendable sense.[48] Payne objects that due to missing letters this text has been reconstructed and thus may be a noun rather than the verb.[49] Therefore, he concludes that this cannot be used as evidence for the verb *authenteō*. This seems inconsistent, since he previously argued that both the *noun* and adjective, as well as the verb, are *necessary* to determine the meaning of the verb, and criticized Knight for using only the verb.[50] In addition, his statement that this could well be a noun is highly improbable. Although several constructions of the verb will fit easily in this reconstructed text, it is doubtful that any noun forms can be made to fit.[51] Since the verb seems to fit the context, and the normal forms of the noun will not fit, it seems beyond reasonable doubt that this is an instance of the verb. Concerning the basic issue, the form *authent.*, whether verb or noun, in this context is positive or neutral rather than negative since the tone of the passage implies that it is wrong to be against those described by *authent.* Therefore, the author of the statement definitely regards *authent.* as positive and not negative.

Knight also refers to an instance where the verb clearly means "to murder,"[52] and to another early occurrence in a papyrus dated 27/26 BC. (*BGU* 1208). He feels that this[53] is "perhaps the most important document," and prefers the interpretation of *authenteō* as "exercise authority."[54] Payne, using several untenable arguments, claims that the context of this papyrus refers to a contentious relationship and therefore the verb is used to describe pushy or contentious authority;

i.e., it is used negatively. He argues that the document describes a "hostile relationship; his action is called 'insolence' in the text."[55] Admittedly, *BGU* 1208 is difficult to translate. However, the insolence (*hubrin*) referred to in *BGU* 1208 apparently has nothing to do with the verb *authenteō*, since it seems to refer to a different person than the subject of *authenteō* and to a different incident than that described by this verb. This seems clear in the context, and is expressly stated by the author of the document when he says that the insolence (hubrin) "followed after these things (*meta tauta exēkolouthēkuian*)."[56] Payne's arguments to prove the negative, "contentious" nuance of *authenteō* do not stand up under examination.[57]

There are at least two factors, however, which imply that *authenteō* does not carry a negative connotation in *BGU* 1208. The individual who is the subject of *authenteō* is attempting to do that which is just and right by obtaining a payment which is properly due to a third party. The entire context and the actions of this individual are regarded as positive in nature. The second factor is related to the first but is somewhat psychological in nature. The author of *BGU* 1208 is describing his own actions by *authenteō*. Therefore, although it is not impossible, it is improbable that in such a context he would describe his own actions by a verb which is negative in tone. There is definite reason to regard the verb in this document as having a neutral or positive tone. The evidence of the extant uses of *authenteō* prior to and during the time of Paul consistently supports a neutral (or positive) connotation. The other extant uses of the verb are later than 1 Tim 2:12.[58]

Later occurrences of the verb may in some cases be influenced by 1 Tim 2:12, and, in any case, cannot be conclusive evidence for meanings prior in time. However, they do support the neutral or positive connotation. The second century occurrence in Ptolemy *Tetrabiblos* 3:13, translated "Saturn dominated Mercury and the moon,"[59] can hardly refer to a negative action, since it is by an inanimate object (Saturn). Can a planet improperly exercise authority over other planets, or "domineer?"[60] The statement by Johannes Philoponus (5th/6th century AD), translated as "ignorance dominates,"[61] is much more likely to mean that Philoponus is concerned because

ignorance abounds, rather than that it is arrogant, bullying or domineering. Chrysostom (4th century) apparently uses the verb in the statement "do not tyrannize your wife," however, he more often, also uses the verb in a positive or neutral sense to describe the actions of God and of Christ. Therefore, the negative implication in the one case must come from the context, rather than the verb itself. In his homily on Genesis, Chrysostom states, referring to I Tim 2:12, that the woman is not permitted to teach "because she taught Adam once badly nor to exercise authority (*authentein*) over a man . . . because she exercised authority (*ēuthentēsen*) once badly."[62] Not only does he parallel the tone of *authenteō* with *didaskō,* "teach," but he could hardly say that Eve exercised authority *once* "badly" or "wrongly" if the word, in itself, had a negative connotation. Lampe and others give instances where *authenteō* means to "be primarily responsible for . . . act on one's own authority," and instances where the noun form has a "bad sense."[63] Since each of these authorities lists many more positive or neutral uses for *authenteō*, they cannot be claiming that the verb itself has a negative connotation. On the contrary they imply, as one might expect, that a verb meaning "to rule, exercise authority, exercise influence," etc. could easily have negative connotations in a given context just as any of the neutral English words, "rule, exercise authority." Wilshire's study shows that these later occurrences of *authenteō* and cognates not only support the meaning "to have authority," but he gives no evidence from any period for an inherent negative connotation for *authenteō* when it refers to authority. The very few extant instances before or during the time of 1 Tim 2:12 all support a positive or neutral connotation.

Authenteō is not inceptive.

One of Kroeger's views is based on interpreting *authenteō* in the sense of "to originate or create." Since this results in the impossible meaning for 1 Tim 2:12, "I do not permit a woman to teach nor to create a man," she somehow twists the meaning "originate, create," into "represent herself as creator,"[64] an entirely different and equally unwarranted meaning. Liefeld also argues for an "inceptive" meaning for *authenteō* in the time of the New Testament.[65] He asserts that

"usage close to the time of the New Testament suggests two meanings in particular 'to take charge' and 'to originate'." He deduces from this that *authenteō* rather than meaning "exercise of authority" indicates "the way authority is gained -- that is, by arrogating to oneself, not just by receiving it."[66] This assertion and deduction are replete with problems. There is no evidence that *authenteō* means "originate," evidence for the meaning "take charge" is late (after Paul's day) and scarce, neither "take charge" nor "originate" means "self-arrogation," nor does either indicate the "way" any action is taken, "arrogate to oneself" is not really inceptive, and finally, as will be seen, neither "take charge," "originate" ("create"), nor "arrogate to oneself" will fit in 1 Tim 2:12. Liefeld provides no evidence for his assertion that *authenteō* is basically inceptive.

The standard lexicons BAG, LSJ and *LPGL* give no such meaning as "originate" for *authenteō*.[67] An analysis of *authenteō* reveals that an inceptive idea such as "originate" is not inherent in the verb and it is improbable as a meaning for any of the extant occurrences, particularly in Paul's day. Although LSJ gives "original" as a meaning for the adjective *authentikos*, this proves nothing regarding the verb, and with respect to the adjective means "original" in the sense of primary, or authoritative (common nuances of the root *authent.*), not in an inceptive sense. Although Kroeger depends on an inceptive meaning for *authenteō* such as "create, originate" for several of her interpretations, she gives no evidence from the verb but refers only to a few uses of the noun, none of which is definitely inceptive.[68] Finally, her interpretation of *Wis.* 12:6, referred to earlier, is impossible in its context and supported by few (if any) interpreters. She also refers to Josephus, Diodorus of Sicily, Eusebius and Polybius. Since she gives no references it is difficult to know which statements of Josephus or Eusebius are meant. The other two references seem to be Plb. 22.14.2, and D.S. 16.16, neither of which appears to use the noun *authentēs* as "originator."[69] There is no evidence for an inceptive nuance for *authenteō*, nor is there clear evidence for such a use of the noun or adjective. At the most, such use, even for the noun, is rare and furnishes no support for a basically inceptive nuance for *authenteō*. To say that *authenteō* has

an inceptive nuance is contrary to the evidence. To say that it is a primary use in New Testament times is entirely without foundation.

Liefeld's alleged primary meaning, "originate", implies nothing regarding authority. It means "to initiate" or to "create" and has no other implication. However, the idea of "original," or "author" in words of the *authent.* root comes not from any inherent inceptive idea but from the idea of "original" or "author" as primary or *authoritative.* Liefeld's other alleged primary meaning of *authenteō*, "to take charge," even in English refers primarily to the exercise of authority, and although it may stress the initiation of the act of authority it does not exclude the continuance. There are few occurrences of *authenteō* which are offered as evidence for the meaning "take charge." One occurrence is listed by LSJ and two additional occurrences are given by Knight, all of which are 6th century A.D. and therefore much later than New Testament times.[70] The first, *BGU* 103.3, does not imply "take charge," or "assume authority" in the sense of gaining an authority not previously possessed, nor does it refer to an improper gaining of authority, particularly to "self-arrogated" authority, since the person is requested by another to exercise authority he already possesses. Any idea of "initiating" the exercise of authority (inceptive) comes not from the verb *authenteō* but from the context and the Greek construction. In the other occurrences any inceptive idea lies in the context and the aorist tense rather than in the verb *authenteō*. There is no justification for the idea that *authenteō* is basically inceptive, or that the two primary meanings in New Testament times were "take charge" or "originate."

The deduction that from the two ideas "take charge" and "originate" the conclusion may be drawn that *authenteō* describes the "way authority is gained" and that is by self-arrogation,[71] suffers first from the fact that "take charge" is at best a rare use of *authenteō*, and "originate" is not the meaning in any case. This deduction suffers also from a logical problem. Neither "originate" nor "take charge" implies anything regarding the *way* the action took place, much less that it is self-arrogation. In addition, Liefeld's deduction must also be based on some unusual combination of

the two ideas "originate" and "take charge," since "originate" denotes nothing regarding authority and therefore can have no nuance of self-arrogation of authority, and "take charge" gives no indication of whether the authority is authorized or self-arrogated. Since neither one of these two meanings "take charge" or "originate" can in itself mean "self-arrogation of authority," then Liefeld must be deriving the authority aspect from "take charge" and the "self" aspect from "originate." Not only is this based on improbable meanings for *authenteō*, but it is a linguistically impossible procedure. Even if Liefeld's alleged meanings for *authenteō* were reliable the verb would mean either "originate" or "take charge," it cannot mean a selective combination of the two. The verb *authenteō* definitely means "to murder" in some contexts, and in others it means "to exercise authority." However, from this it cannot be deduced that *authenteō* has the meaning to "assassinate authorities." The word *pneuma* means "wind" and it also means "spirit." However, this does not result in the conclusion that it means "windy spirit" or "stormy spirit." Neither "take charge" or "originate" is a basic use of *authenteō*, nor does either meaning lead to the conclusion that *authenteō* means "self-arrogation of authority."

The crux of the matter of course is 1 Tim 2:12. Is it at all probable that Paul meant, "I do not permit a woman to teach nor take charge of a man," where "take charge" is inceptive and merely deals with the initiation of the relationship but is not primarily concerned with the exercise of authority? Is it at all probable that Paul meant, "I do not permit a woman to teach nor originate (create) a man"? Kroeger, who attempts to build her unusual translation, "I do not permit a woman to teach nor to represent herself as the originator or source of man," upon the alleged meaning, "originate," realizes it is not plausible. In order to have a sensible translation she does not translate *authenteō* by "originate," but by "represent herself as the originator." The meaning "to represent oneself as originator" is not the same as "to originate" nor is it to be found anywhere as a meaning for *authenteō*, but is imported into the context, since "originate" obviously does not make sense.[72] Neither of Liefeld's proposed "primary meanings" for *authenteō* in New

Testament times is valid, nor does "take charge" (in an inceptive sense) or "originate" fit 1 Tim 2:12, nor is Kroeger's view possible.

LPGL lists a few later occurrences of *authenteō* under the category "assume authority, act on one's own authority."[73] However, these are not necessarily unwarranted authority and are rare. Since there are numerous other meanings for *authenteō,* this category can only be derived from the context, not from the verb itself. The context of 1 Tim 2:12 is against such a meaning. It is unreasonable to think that Paul would prohibit only women from a self-arrogation, or unwarranted claim of authority, and it is even more unreasonable to suppose that an unwarranted claim of authority by a woman is only prohibited if it is over men.

Conclusion

All of the evidence supports a neutral meaning, "to exercise authority," as the basic meaning for *authenteō* in New Testament times and later. Any negative connotation comes from the context and not from the verb itself. None of the arguments for a basically negative connotation hold up under scrutiny. A study of the uses of *authenteō* provided by the LTG computer furnishes no evidence to contradict this conclusion.[74]

Although certain neutral ideas such as "originate," "create," and "take charge" have been claimed as meanings for *authenteō*, and then used in 1 Tim 2:12 in a negative way, such as "self arrogation of authority," these claims are not borne out by the evidence nor do they fit in 1 Tim 2:12. Some have tried to incorporate these meanings with the incorrect opinion that the construction in 1 Tim 2:12 is a hendiadys. This is not only incorrect but will not fit the context of 1 Tim 2:12, which concerns only the prohibition of a woman's actions with regard to men.

The Prohibition is Universal

Other attempts to restrict the meaning of this verse center in a denial that it is a universal principle to be observed today, or in an attempt to restrict its application only to the church

assembly. The restriction to the assembly will be discussed separately. There is an overall logical inconsistency in several "feminist" interpretations which argue that this is some sinful activity such as "to teach false doctrine," or "to teach domineeringly," or to teach in some other incorrect manner, and at the same time argue that the prohibition of such a sinful practice is not universal. Payne, in various statements, for example, argues that the prohibition refers to teaching domineeringly, that it refers to teaching false doctrine in Ephesus, and that the action is prohibited because it would offend the local culture. Other "biblical" feminists also hold one or more of these views. However, this results in a prohibition where only women (not men) are prohibited from teaching false doctrine (and that only if they teach domineeringly) only to men (it is apparently permissible to domineeringly teach false doctrine to women and children), only in Ephesus, and that only because it is offensive to the current Ephesian culture, not because it is universally wrong. Obviously there is a logical fallacy in such an approach, which is the result of an attempt to nullify the force of the verse piecemeal without consideration of the result. Even to regard the verse as only a prohibition of domineering teaching can hardly be considered as applicable only in Ephesus.

A universal principle may apply to a specific situation

Another logical fallacy is the feminist attempt to relate this verse to an alleged false teaching by the women in Ephesus,[75] and then assume that this proves the prohibition is local rather than universal. Not only is it fallacious to argue that the prohibition of any sinful activity such as teaching false doctrine, self-arrogation of authority, or domineering teaching would not be a universally true prohibition, not only is it fallacious to assume that this would apply only to women with respect to men, but the entire argument is fallacious. The fact that a principle or prohibition may be directed to a local situation does not, in itself, deny universal applicability. Most of the universal prohibitions in the Bible are given not as theoretical pronouncements but in relation to specific situations. They apply to the specific because they are universally true, just as a student may be prohibited from cheating in a specific class by reference to an overall prohibition against

dishonesty. The only way to determine the universality or non-universality of a prohibition is by the prohibition itself (for example: are any specific restrictions stated) and the reasons, if any, given for the prohibition. No restrictions are stated in 1 Tim 2:12 or its context. The nature of the statement is universal. The verse deals with men and women in a generic sense rather than with reference only to a specific incident. The reasons for the prohibition are from the Genesis account of the Fall, an action with universal ramifications. The prohibition in 1 Tim 2:12 certainly applies to the specific church addressed, but this in no way limits its universal applicability. Most of the proposed feminist interpretations hope to narrow 1 Tim 2:12 only to a prohibition of some activity in itself sinful, thereby, opening the door for a woman to engage in any ministry. A concept popular to feminists is the allegation that the women in Ephesus were involved in false teaching and that 1 Tim 2:12 prohibits only this. Apart from the fact that there is not the slightest implication of this in the verse, passage, context, or in the epistle itself, this view is both logically and exegetically fallacious. Fee states this as a fact without giving any evidence for it. Kroeger, Payne, and Scholer all present this position.[76] It is one of the keystones in their overall argument. Despite numerous pages of discussion, their "facts" are irrelevant and show no logical correlation between 1 Tim 2:12 and their allegation that this verse applies to women involved in false teaching in Ephesus. None of their evidence supports the fact that the women were involved in attempts to teach false doctrine, nor do their statements show any connection of this concept with 1 Tim 2:12. Scholer, for example, argues that v 15 is crucial to the meaning of 1 Tim 2:12, and concludes that it refers to a "domestic" issue. He then somehow argues that since it is domestic it concerns false teaching by the women.[77] However, v 15 is merely a mollifying counterbalance to the statements in vv 11-14, and its interpretation will not affect v 12. To regard v 15 as "domestic" is hardly a rare insight and is true of several of the proposed views for v 15. There certainly is no logical reason why the fact that v 15 is "domestic" in any way connects it with false teaching. There is no logical correlation between "domestic" issues and false teaching. In addition

to the fact that there is no intimation in the verse or passage of the idea that v 12 refers to women involved in false teaching at Ephesus, the verse itself precludes this view. The women are not prohibited from false teaching, but from teaching and having authority over men. Not only are women alone prohibited, which would not be true if false teaching were involved (men would be also prohibited) but they are only prohibited from teaching men. They certainly would not be allowed to teach false doctrine to women and children. Only women are prohibited and that only with regard to men. False teaching will not fit. The only issue is that women are prohibited with respect to men. If this verse refers to any false teaching or heresy in Ephesus it is only heretical or false due to the fact that women are allowed to teach or have authority over men. This is what the verse prohibits. Even if it refers to a specific sinful activity allowing women to teach or have authority over men in Ephesus, this in no way implies that the prohibition is local rather than universal. Not only is it exegetically fallacious to invent such a situation apart from evidence, but is also exegetically fallacious to use an alleged "historical context" to nullify the literary context of the verse in its own passage.

The context is universal in nature.

The paragraph in which this verse occurs discusses some basic differences or relationships between men and women in the body of Christ. The verse beginning the paragraph (v 8) differentiates the role of men who are to pray everywhere and women who are to adorn themselves properly with good works and to learn in silence (vv 9-11).[78] This differentiation in roles continues and becomes more specific in v 11 where the woman is "to learn in silence in all subjection." In v 12 she is not "to teach nor exercise authority over a man but to be silent." This is supported by reference to the prior creation of Adam and to the deception of Eve. Paul adds an additional statement (v 15), that despite Eve's actions, which have affected woman universally, the woman will be saved in child-bearing. This last verse is not part of the argument itself but an additional mollifying statement. 1 Tim 2:12 occurs in and is part of a reasoned and logical discussion of the

relationship of men and women, particularly in the area of authority and subjection. There is no intimation of any specific situation. The context deals with the hierarchial relationship between men and women generically rather than specifically. To insert a discussion relating only to some sinful practice does not fit the argument of the passage, since it would have no correlation with the relationship of men in general with respect to women in general. Are men to pray with holy hands, only in Ephesus? Are women only to dress properly in Ephesus? Are believers to pray for all men, particulary those in authority, only in Ephesus? The context and subject of discussion require a universal principle.

The verse is universal in nature

Paul's statement "I do not permit (*epitrepō*) . . ." reveals Paul as the subject of the main verb "permit." He states this as his own practice which he obviously expects the addressees to also observe. The use of the present tense with Paul as the subject indicates that this is a principle which Paul follows wherever he is. Therefore, this prohibition is not restricted to a specific situation in a specific church (the addressees). If Paul only referred to a specific situation in Ephesus, he would command "you (in Ephesus) do not permit (such a practice)." The importance of this expression *epitrepō* is shown by the attempts to interpret it contrary to its normal meaning. Fee states that this should be "I am not allowing" and feels that this implies "specific instructions to this situation.[79] Payne makes similar observations.[80] However, this expression not only does not in any way *imply* "specific instructions to this situation," within the bounds of any normal approach to Greek grammar, it implies exactly the opposite. It is not a realistic approach to interpret Paul's statement made in the present tense, which is commonly durative, commonly describes present action, and in this context must describe Paul's attitude at the time of writing, as not referring to Paul's practice, but as a command only for a specific situation in a group in another geographical location. Payne's statement that *epitrepō* "particularly in the first person singular present indicative active usually does not refer to a continuing state . . ."[81] is less

impressive when one finds out that 1 Tim 2:12 is the *only* occurrence of this form in biblical Greek (NT, LXX). Further, he apparently means "continuing" in the sense of permanent, an aspect which no tense, mood, voice, or person implies. Therefore, most of his discussion is irrelevant, some, in fact, is potentially dangerous. He implies that Paul's statements in 1 Cor 7:6, 10, 12, 25, 40 are only Paul's advice, to be differentiated with regard to validity and permanence from the Lord's commandments. This is a serious misunderstanding of the passage. He also argues that Paul was only giving his own personal advice when he used the first person singular present indicative in 1 Cor 7:6, 7, 8, 12, 17, 25, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35, 40.[82] His attempt to use this to prove that 1 Tim 2:12 is only for Ephesus and not universal since it also uses the same tense, voice, etc., logically requires that these verses from Corinthians are only for Corinth and not permanently valid or universal, which he definitely implies. Are we to seriously believe that all these verses on marriage and divorce apply only to a specific situation at that particular time in Corinth? These verses, in fact, disprove Payne's argument, since they do use the present indicative active first person singular and although they are written to a specific situation, they are universally true. Payne has completely missed the point, however. The issue is not that the term *epitrepō*, in itself, implies permanence, but that it implies Paul's general practice at the time regardless of any specific situation. Since it was a general principle at the time concerning the relationship of men and women, regardless of specific circumstances, it must be a universally true principle for the church.

Is it plausible to think, along with Fee and Payne, that when Paul, who is not involved in the specific situation, says "I do not permit" he actually means "you in another city, only in this specific instance, are not to permit" and does not refer to his own general approach to the relationship of men and women? There are numerous instances where Paul makes statements (even in response to specific problems) where the principle applies to all Christians. In this same passage to the same church, in 1 Tim 2:1, 8, the first word in each verse is a present tense verb with Paul as the subject. Are the principles revealed in these verses only for those in Ephesus in

a specific situation and are not principles followed by Paul or not expected to apply to other churches? What Payne fails to show and is really necessary for his argument is that although Paul states "I do not . . .," he states something that is not related to his own practice or to the expected practice of other churches.

Not only is the prohibition introduced as a universal principle, which Paul follows, but the statement itself is given without any restrictions or limitations or specifications. The only specifics are that it pertains to men in relationship to women, and that the issue is authority. Therefore, the principle is true whenever and wherever there are both men and women, and whenever teaching or exercising authority are in view. It has already been shown that the passage cannot refer to wrongful teaching or wrongful authority, since the prohibition only applies to women with respect to men. Therefore, it must apply whenever any woman attempts to do any teaching or exercise any authority over any man.

The reasons are universal

That 1 Tim 2:12 refers to a general principle rather than a specific local instance is also revealed by the fact that rather than local circumstances, the example of Adam and Eve is given as the reason for the prohibition in v 12. This rather obvious argument has been disputed in several ways. Scholer argues that 1 Tim 2:12 is not timeless or universal since Paul is selective in the material he uses from Genesis.[83] What would be the purpose of reproducing the entire Genesis account? Paul has selected these specifics from the Genesis account of the Fall which support his statement. There would be no reason to mention other details which do not relate to the issue. The fact of selection, in itself, has no logical bearing on whether or not the issue is universal or specific. The details selected, and the context reveal how the principle is to be taken. 1 Tim 2:13, 14 gives as the first support of the prohibition in v 12 the fact that Adam was created first. This is a timeless, universal truth that does not depend on any specific incident or erroneous action in the church at Ephesus, nor any other church. The entire context and argument of 1 Tim

2:11-14 relates to the authoritative or hierarchical relationship between men and women. In such a context the statement that Adam was "formed first" can only relate to the issue of priority or authority. It does not have any bearing on a restriction of some otherwise sinful activity.

The rest of Paul's "selected" argument relates to the woman's conduct in the Fall. The account in Genesis describes how Satan deceived Eve and she in turn involved Adam in her sin. This is specifically referred to in 1 Tim 2:14. As a result of Eve's actions, God tells her (Gen 3:16) that she will bear children in pain, that her desire will be to her husband, and that he will rule (have authority) over her. The two sentences God pronounces on the woman deal with subjection and with child bearing, the same issues referred to in 1 Tim 2:13-15. Just as the sentences passed on the serpent and on the man are universal principles which are still in effect, so is the pronouncement to the woman. Does the fact that man must "eat by the sweat of his brow" and that women bear children in pain relate only to those involved in false teaching in Ephesus? The result of Eve's disobedience is the universal principle that man has authority over the woman. Paul uses as argument for the prohibition two universally true arguments, the order of creation, and Eve's actions, which resulted in her subordination to man. A local or temporary situation is not appropriate to the context. The woman's conduct in the Fall, referred to in 1 Tim 2:13, 14, is, according to Genesis, a primary reason for her universal, timeless subordinate relationship. The fact that the conjunction, *gar*, joining these verses is a causal conjunction makes this relationship even more obvious.

To argue that Gen 3:16 is merely a prediction rather than God's decree, and that only women under the OT Law were to be in subjection,[84] is contrary not only to Paul's use of the passage, but is contrary to the Genesis passage, itself, which presents God as the cause for the curses pronounced. The allegation that the results of the Fall, listed in Gen 3:16, are removed in Christ, so that they do not apply to believers, would still leave all women who are not in Christ under Gen 3:16. Only women in Christ, and these only while engaged in church activities would

be excluded. In addition, such a position is denying the validity of the argument of 1 Tim 2:14 as well as disagreeing with numerous statements of both the OT and NT. It is also a theologically frivolous argument, since none of the temporal results of the Fall have been erased by Christ's death. Christian men still must work. Thorns and thistles still grow in gardens, even those of believers. Christian women still bear children in pain, and Christians, both men and women, still die. The results of the Fall, including the woman's subjection to man, are universally still in effect.

Another attempt to nullify the force of this as a universal prohibition is to argue that *gar*, "for," is not illative in this verse. However, the relationship is clearly causal or illative even if there were no conjunction. Since *gar* commonly functions in an illative sense there can be no question in this context. Payne claims that the *gar* in v 13 is explanatory rather than causal.[85] Scholer apparently interprets the *gar* in the same way when he says that vv 13, 14 are "the explanatory rationale for" vv 11, 12.[86] However, the explanatory rationale *for* some statement is really a causal or illative use. Payne's argument for an "explanatory *gar*" in this passage has been more than adequately refuted by Moo.[87] The "explanatory" *gar* is rare in the Pauline epistles. Paul's "normal" use of *gar* is causal.[88]

It is not enough to argue that *gar* in this passage is "explanatory" merely on the basis that there is such a use of *gar*. There must be some evidence that this is the case in this instance, particularly when the causal or illative use is common to Paul, the "explanatory" use is rare, and the relationship of the concepts in 1 Tim 2:11-14 is so clearly inferential that the causal use is demanded here. The attempts, however, to explain the "explanatory" use of *gar* in this passage are so awkward that they show the improbability of such a use in this verse. Scholer's "explanatory rationale for," as mentioned earlier, is not really explanatory but causal. Payne's explanation not only must import the idea of false teaching into his explanation, but as Moo points out, his explanation of his "explanatory" interpretation shows that it is actually causal. Payne, in any case, is not using "explanatory" in the same sense meant by the grammarians,[89] so that his reliance on

Robertson is illusionary.[90] If *gar* in v 13 is explanatory, then what do vv 13, 14 explain in vv 11, 12 to which they are connected by *gar*? They explain nothing in these verses other than explaining the *reason* for Paul's prohibition, but this means that the relationship is causal or illative.

To take these verses as an explanatory addition is to ignore Paul's normal use of *gar*, to ignore that the causal relationship fits the context, and to assume that in a discussion of the relationship of men and women Paul merely drops a comment mentioning that Adam was created first, and that Eve was deceived. Since the incident in Gen 3:1-16 resulted in woman's subjection to man; that is, the woman's action was one of the primary causes of her subjection, it is improbable in a context concerning subjection that it should be taken in some other way. The statement that Adam was "first formed" can only relate as a universal principle. Payne ignores this statement when he argues that these verses cannot be an "anthropological norm." He also argues that "nothing in 1 Tim 2:11-15 extrapolates from Eve's deception to the nature of women in general.[91] He has ignored the obvious relationship which is revealed in the Old Testament context. The woman's deception was one reason for the woman's subjection to the man (Gen 3:1-16). This is exactly the relationship in 1 Tim 2:11-15, where the reason for her subjection and the stated prohibition is the order of creation and her deception and actions in the Fall. To view this prohibition as other than an "anthropological norm" is to ignore both the Old Testament and New Testament contexts.

Scholer states as an additional argument that if 1 Tim 2:11, 12 is timeless, one is faced with the "uneasy possibility that women are by nature deceivable in a way that men are not."[92] This is, of course, not an exegetical argument, but is conditioned entirely by the present sociological outlook. However, he misses the fact that this verse refers specifically to Eve in one instance, the Fall, and does not refer to other actions of Eve or women in general. Paul does not argue that every woman is repeating Eve's example, but that Eve's action is one of the primary reasons, together with the order of creation, for the hierarchial relationship between man and woman. Just

as Adam's one act has extended to all humanity, so Eve's one act has effected all women.

The practice prohibited in 1 Tim 2:12 is obviously in contrast to learning in silence (or a submissive spirit) as stated in the preceding verse and as stated again at the end of v 12. It is not contrasted with error. The arguments from the order of creation and the woman's deception both relate to authority. The two aspects from the Genesis account do not relate only to some local, temporary, or wrongful conduct, but relate to an "anthropological norm" or universal principle. The results of the order of creation and the woman's deception are universal, not local.

Does 1 Timothy Apply to the Assembly Only?

Some, while recognizing that 1 Tim 2:12 is a general principle, restrict its application only to the assembly of believers,[93] such as the Sunday service. They would not apply Paul's prohibition to other groups, such as Sunday School classes, seminary classes, Bible studies, etc. The prohibition according to this view has a very restricted application.

The verse precludes such a restriction

1 Tim 2:12 says nothing to imply that its application is restricted only to the assembly. It is impossible to give credence to the details of the passage and at the same time restrict it to the assembly. The woman is prohibited from teaching or having authority over a man. This is the issue. She is not prohibited from teaching or exercising authority over women. Since the verse only prohibits teaching or having authority over men, it cannot refer *only* to a situation where the woman would be teaching and having authority over both men and women, such as the assembly or an official leadership position in the church. If this verse referred specifically, or only to the assembly, the woman would be prohibited from all teaching and authority, over both men and women, not merely from that over men.

Neither can this verse be confined only to the assembly on the idea that the prohibition is to protect the pastors and elders from women who were trying to teach during the assembly. The

verse says nothing regarding the relationship between church leaders and women. Not only women, but also men would be prohibited from usurping the authority of the leaders during the assembly or in the church. Nor would the restriction be limited only to teaching or authority over men. The prohibition applies only to women and they are only prohibited from authority over a man. The verse, therefore, cannot refer to any practice equally improper for a man. The prohibition is not because of any official gathering (assembly) or due to any official function, but because one party is woman and the other is man. The issue is not the assembly or official position, but gender.

The immediate context

The immediate context of 1 Tim 2:12 gives no implication that the prohibition is restricted to the assembly alone, or to any specific situation. Paul's exhortation to pray for all men, particularly leaders, is not restricted to the assembly only, nor is the command that men pray *in every place* apart from wrath and argument. Are women to have appropriate demeanor, dress, and do good works during the Sunday service only? Is it logical to view vv 9-11 as applying to other situations and suddenly restrict v 12 to the assembly? The immediate context contains no implication that 1 Tim 2:12 is restricted only to the assembly.

The general perspective

Sufficient evidence has already been given to show that the prohibition in 1 Tim 2:12 is a universal prohibition. Although it may be used with reference to a specific activity in Ephesus, the nature of the prohibition itself, the basis in the Fall of Adam and Eve, and the fact that there are no stated restrictions of the principle in the passage show that the prohibition itself is not restricted to one situation. The specifics of the verse and the immediate context are against such a narrow application. To restrict this *only* to the assembly there must be some specific evidence to this effect. A standard argument for this circumscribed view is that the context deals with "church

worship"[94] and that 1 Tim 3:15, "that you may know how to conduct yourself in the house of God," gives the purpose of the book.[95] Therefore, it is concluded that 1 Tim 2:12 is restricted to conduct in the "house of God." However, it is debatable that 1 Tim 3:15 states the purpose of the book, it is also improbable that 1 Tim 3:15 refers specifically to the assembly, nor does the purpose of an epistle necessarily limit the overall meaning and extent of application of universal principles or prohibitions used within the epistle. Is there any indication that the truths of 1 Timothy are restricted to the assembly by the purpose of the epistle? The entire epistle is contrary to such a concept.

The general context of 1 Tim 2:12

There are numerous statements in the epistle which are neither specifically for the assembly nor restricted only to the assembly. The need for correct doctrine (1:3-11) is not restricted to the assembly, nor does 1:18-20 apply only in the assembly. Elders and deacons (3:1-13) are not restricted in their functions only to the assembly, nor is the acceptability of marriage and meat restricted to the assembly. The instructions to Timothy (4:6-11) and the admonition to be an example (4:11-16) are definitely not restricted to the assembly, nor are these instructions inapplicable to other Christian workers. Is it permissible to rebuke elders (5:1, 2) except in the assembly? Are offspring only responsible for parents (5:3, 4) in the assembly? Are the young widows to marry and bear children, Timothy to drink wine, slaves to obey, and Christians to be content only in the assembly? Obviously, neither the purpose of the book nor 1 Tim 3:15 restrict the statements of 1 Timothy to the assembly only. The verse, immediate context, and general context are all contrary to any confinement of 1 Tim 2:12 to the assembly only, or only to official function in the church.

The purpose of 1 Timothy is not restricted to action in the assembly

It is questionable that 1 Tim 3:15 states the purpose of the book, but even more doubtful that it refers to the "official" assembly only, if at all. 1 Tim 1:3-5, 18 seems to state the purpose of the book. Not only at the beginning, but in 4:11ff, 6:2ff, 6:14, 6:20 the same concepts and terms are repeated, and the overall content of the book agrees. If 1 Tim 3:15 refers only to the assembly rather than the local group of believers, then "house (*oikos*) of God" in this verse must mean the assembly, in the sense of the Sunday worship service. Then "church" or "assembly" (*ekklēsia*) in this verse would also mean only the Sunday worship service, and the Sunday service would be the "pillar and ground" of the truth. Not only is this unlikely but as just shown, the epistle itself is against taking this as *only* applicable to the "official assembly."[96]

Oikos, "house," occurs 114 times in the New Testament. In no other case is it used as equivalent to the Sunday service. Over sixty times it refers to a literal building which is definitely not the meaning here. It is often used to refer to someone's household in the sense of the family or extended family; that is, to refer to the people in the group (such as the house of Israel, of David, or of Cornelius). In this very chapter it is used in this way in 1 Tim 3:4, 5. Other examples are 1 Tim 5:4; Tit 1:11; and Heb 11:7. In particular the concept of "the house of God" can be seen in Heb 3:2-6 (cf. Num 12:7), Heb 8:8, 10; 1 Pet 2:5 and 4:17 (cf Gal 6:10; Eph 2:19 using *oikeios*). The same term, "house of God," occurs in Heb 10:21 referring to the church universal rather than to an "assembly." The "house of God" in 1 Tim 3:15 refers to the believers and does not imply in any way that they are "assembled."

The word "church (*ekklēsia*) is also used 114 times. In only fifteen of these is it possible to construe it to mean the assembly (1 Cor 6:4, 11:8, 14:4, 5, 12, 19, 23, 28, 33, 34, 35; Col 4:16; Heb 2:12; 3 Jn 6, 10). Even some of these do not necessarily mean "the official assembly." The most common meaning for "church" in the New Testament is to refer to the believers apart from any reference to an assembly or some official meeting which differs from other groups of saints.

The equation of this term and the term "house of God" in 1 Tim 3:15 requires that this refers to believers in general rather than to an assembly.

Since in 1 Tim 3:15 the term "church" is equivalent to "the house of God," and is "the pillar and ground of the truth," it is contrary to the evidence derived from a study of the use of "house of God," the use of "church," and contrary to the fact that it is described as the "pillar and ground of the truth" to refer this verse only to one official meeting, such as the Sunday service. Rather, it refers to "believers" apart from any implication of an "assembly." 1 Tim 3:15 states that Timothy is to know how to conduct himself in relation to believers. It does not specifically refer to any assembly. Understood in this sense the verse fits well with the purpose expressed in verses, such as 1 Tim 1:3-5, etc.

Logical objections to such a restriction

If the prohibition against women teaching or exercising authority over men is not based on the general principle that the woman is subject to the man, then what is the reason for restricting her even in the assembly, or only in the assembly? Yet, if it is a general principle, then what logic is there in attempting to restrict it only to the assembly? For example, if women are forbidden to teach or have authority over any men in the assembly, then by what form of logic can it be concluded that she can teach those who are the very leaders of the church in a seminary? It is logically inconsistent to argue that 1 Tim 2:12 prohibits a woman from teaching in the assembly where she would be teaching the average Christian, but to allow her to teach at the highest level of teaching, in a school or seminary training the leaders of the church. It is inconsistent to hold that she may teach those who will teach the believers, but is herself forbidden from teaching the believers. What strange, sacramental or ritualistic view of the "assembly" rules out teaching by a woman, yet would allow her to teach at a higher level? What strange view of women would allow her to teach and have authority in general, including at the highest level, and yet for some reason exclude her from this in the assembly? According to this logic it is not wrong for a woman to

teach or exercise authority over a man, since she can do so freely. What then can be the reason which prohibits this in the assembly? It seems clear that she is restricted from teaching and having authority in the assembly, not because "the assembly" is so special, but because she is prohibited in general from teaching or exercising authority over a man.

Another logically inconsistent concept akin to the previous is the idea that the woman is only prohibited from teaching Bible or theology to a man. If she is not prohibited in general from authority over a man, why is she excluded from these two items? This view would be logical only if there were no other way to exercise authority than to teach Bible or theology. She is prohibited from teaching without any specification of subjects taught, since teaching itself is authoritative. This view ignores the fact that she is prohibited not only from teaching (Bible, theology, and other subjects) but from having any authority over a man.

Since 1 Tim 2:12 appears to be a general principle without limitation and the stated basis of the prohibition is a universal principle deriving from the time of Adam and Eve, why restrict it to one very narrow situation -- the assembly? It will be helpful to notice some logical questions and the assumptions involved in such a view. This view assumes that the Bible describes a special local church assembly which has special rules that do not apply to other activities and gatherings of believers. Is there any evidence that biblical rules for one gathering of the saints do not apply to other gatherings? Do the principles Paul states regarding the Lord's Supper apply only during "the assembly" so that they can be dispensed with if a group holds the Lord's Supper elsewhere (in a seminary chapel)? Do the statements specifically directed to the assembly, that the assembly is to be orderly, the speech edifying, and the other restrictions in 1 Corinthians 14 apply *only* to the assembly, so that these restrictions can be neglected in other gatherings, such as classes, etc.? Is it likely that Paul disallowed the authority or teaching by women only during this one weekly meeting yet would allow them to teach men in his sessions, for example, at the school of Tyrannus? Is it reasonable to hold that the subordinate position of women only applied for one meeting per

week and was elsewhere ignored or inapplicable? Since the restriction in 1 Tim 2:12 only refers to teaching men, is it reasonable to suppose that women are only restricted from teaching men during this one general assembly, but they were allowed to teach women and children during the general assembly? How could this be without bedlam? Why is this restriction applicable in the assembly if it does not apply in general? How many principles and commands are there in the New Testament which, apart from specific statements to that effect, apply only to the assembly?

The context of the passage is contrary to any restriction to the assembly, since the other principles mentioned are universal and there are no restrictions implied. The epistle as a whole is contrary to such a view since there is little, if any, of the book which applies *only* in the "assembly." Finally, even if the verse could be shown to be *directed* to a specific situation in the assembly, this does not restrict its *application*, since a universal principle is commonly addressed to a specific situation which it covers. The entire passage and Paul's argument show that this prohibition is universal and applies generally to men and women rather than only to one specific situation, the assembly. To restrict this prohibition only to the church assembly is contrary to normal interpretational procedure.

The Meaning of 1 Tim 2:12

This verse, 1 Tim 2:12, is clear and remarkably devoid of exegetical difficulty. It is internally consistent, makes good sense, and is appropriate in its context when the argument, context, syntax, and vocabulary are treated normally. The alleged difficulties are not in the verse, but are due to attempts to make a clear verse conform with a cultural perspective contrary to the verse. In contrast to the numerous attempts to avoid the clear meaning of the verse, the obvious meaning must be stated.

The clear meaning

The passage discusses the different roles of men and women in general. The immediately preceding verse (v 11) commands women (not men, not everyone) to "learn in silence in all

subjection." The prohibition of the verse, itself, ends with this same concept, "to be in silence." It is clear that the verse concerns the authoritative relationship between men and women, and that the woman is to be in subjection. Paul states that he does not permit a woman (any woman) to teach nor have authority over a man (any man). Paul, himself, follows this principle, supports his prohibition by two universally true arguments from Genesis, and clearly expects Timothy to also follow this procedure. It is definitely stated as a universally true prohibition.

The force of the construction *didaskein . . . . oude authentein*, "to teach nor to have authority over," is definitely against the concept that only teaching or "authoritative teaching" is prohibited. Paul prohibits both teaching and having authority. *Oude* in this type of construction normally joins two or more concepts which have some common factor relating to an overall concept including the parts. The factor common to both *didaskein* and *authentein* is authority. Any idea of negative authority or teaching is contrary to the verse which restricts only women from this practice.

Although some have attempted to divest *didaskō*, "teach," of any aspect of authority[97] it not only obviously has such a connotation in this context, the verb inherently has this nuance. One who instructs another, particularly in aspects where the student is expected to obey the concepts, is automatically in an authoritative relationship. In Matt 10:24, 25 Jesus parallels the relationship of student and teacher to that of servant and master. Often in the gospels someone addresses Jesus as "teacher" and asks Jesus to tell them what they should do. One of the crowd in Luke 12:13 addresses Jesus as "teacher" and says "tell my brother to divide the inheritance with me." The Pharisees say "Teacher, admonish your students" (Luke 19:39). In the upper room Jesus reminds His disciples that normally a teacher and master does not wash the feet of His followers, (John 13:14). Teachers are next to apostles and prophets as leaders in the church (1 Cor 12:28) and are grouped with leaders in Eph 4:11. In Matt. 7:29 the verb *didaskō* is used in the statement "He was teaching them as one having authority." This is describing the fact that Jesus taught on His

own authority rather than on the authority of the rabbis. This shows that the teacher is an authority or represents authority; authority is involved in teaching. Such expressions as "they did as they were taught" (Matt 28:15), and "teaching them to obey" (Matt 28:20) imply authority. In John 9:34 the religious teachers say to Jesus "Are you teaching us?" clearly indicating that authority is the issue. Paul expects obedience when he says "Just as I teach everywhere in all the churches" (1 Cor 4:17). To deny that authority is involved in the use of the verb *didaskō* in 1 Tim 2:12 is contrary to the normal meaning of the verb, contrary to the context which is discussing authoritative relationship, contrary to the parallel with *authenteō*, and contrary to human experience.

The verb *authentein*, as we have seen, means, "to exercise authority" or "to have authority." In this verse *authentein* functions as an independent entity which is prohibited in addition to the prohibition of teaching. The construction with *oude* is never used in a way which has one of the items function as a modifier restricting the scope of the other; rather, each aspect functions as an entity which taken with the others is inclusive of the overall issue under discussion. Despite this normal use, Hurley and others argue for the meaning, in 1 Tim 2:12, to authoritatively teach.[98] However, not only is his interpretation contrary to the evidence of this construction, it is not apparent in this verse. There is no logical reason why his argument that "quiet learning inversely parallels (verbal) teaching and full submission inversely parallels exercising authority"[99] leads to the conclusion that this means to authoritatively teach. The *oude* construction does not function this way. There is no reason why Paul cannot prohibit teaching as contrary to submission and add the overall concept prohibiting all authority. It is clear from the passage itself that the woman is prohibited from teaching because otherwise she is not in submission. The issue is authority. If she is not prohibited from teaching a man on the basis of authority and submission, upon what basis is she prohibited? If she can have authority over a man then why prohibit teaching? Yet, if she cannot have authority, then why go against the plain meaning of the passage and say this does not prohibit her from authority?

The final and convincing argument for the independence of *authentein*, in addition to the *oude* construction, is the verse itself. The teaching and having authority is contrasted with learning in silence and in all subjection (v 11). This is again contrasted with the statement "to be silent," in v 12. That which contrasts with *learning* (in quietness and all subjection) is not *authoritative* teaching, but *any* teaching. This is even more apparent if the contrast is to learn *in silence* versus teaching. It is inappropriate to contrast the verses with authoritative teaching only and allow for other teaching. She is to *learn* not *teach*. The concept, "authoritatively teach," is contrary to the exegetical evidence. The verse prohibits women from exercising any kind of authority, including teaching, over men. The precise nuance is, "I do not permit a woman to teach nor to exercise any other authority over a man." Whether *ēsychia* in 1 Tim 2:12 means "silence" or "quiet and submissive spirit,"[100] the restriction from a role of authority is equally clear. "Silence" seems a natural contrast with teaching and is a common meaning of the term.[101] The verse gives no limitations other than the statement that a woman is prohibited from this action with respect to men.[102] There are no statements restricting this to any official meeting or official role.

Miscellaneous interpretations

Some state that this verse refers to women who are not properly instructed.[103] A somewhat similar concept is that the women of that day were not allowed to teach because they were not educated, however, since today's women are educated they may teach men. Where is any indication in the Scripture that education qualifies one for church leadership, or that men were allowed to teach because they were educated? It is arrogant to say the least to assume that none of the women in New Testament times, including Lydia, were qualified to teach men, but that today's women are. This view is impossible in this verse. There is no intimation in this verse (or in any verse) that this is the reason she may not teach. The reasons, Creation and the Fall, are stated, however. If this were the case uninstructed men would also be prohibited not merely women. The prohibition would not apply only to teaching men, uninstructed teachers (men or

women) would not be allowed to teach anyone. Such a view is not plausible.

Another view is that the woman is only prohibited from being an official overseer.[104] This is also impossible for this verse. This would require the verse to say that she cannot be an official overseer over men, but would allow her to be an official overseer over women. However, there is no such thing as an official overseer or elder only over women and children. In any case it would still allow her no teaching or authority over men.

Both R. Kroeger[105] and Scholer, argue that the instruction that the woman is not to be adorned in gold, pearls, or costly garments is not followed by the church, therefore, the argument is cultural. If this verse does in fact preclude wearing of these items, who is to say it is only cultural? In any case it cannot be argued that if these are cultural all else in the passage is cultural. However, the verses in question (vv 8-10) are not basically cultural. The fact that men are to pray everywhere apart from wrath and argument is not cultural. Perhaps "lifting up the hands" is, but the emphasis is "holy, apart from wrath . . . ." Likewise the stress with the women is on sober demeanor, good works, etc., in contrast to flagrant dressing. The gold, hair, etc. are specifics to convey the idea. No cultural specifics such as appropriate dress or teaching methods of that day are mentioned in 1 Tim 2:12, therefore, the "cultural" allegations of Kroeger and Scholer are based on an improper parallel.

Another attempt to eliminate a general application of this verse is the claim that it only applies to wives having authority over their husbands. It is somewhat implausible to think that Paul would write that the church should not allow wives to teach or exercise authority over their husbands. Such a prohibition could hardly apply to a public gathering where many husbands and wives would be present. Would such terms refer to practises in private at home? If it were permissible for a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, what would be the reason for prohibiting wives over their own husbands? This verse would then allow a wife to teach or exercise authority over any group as long as her husband was not present, thus, she could be an elder as

long as her husband was not in the church. The passage, however, says nothing to imply that specifically husbands and wives are in view. For example, it does not say "a woman is not to teach *her own* man." The same individuals are discussed in verses 8-15. Is it reasonable to think that Paul only desires that husbands pray, or that only wives have proper demeanor? The reasons for the prohibition are from Genesis and apply to all men and women. If this referred to husbands and wives generically rather than individually, then wives could teach single men, single women, and other wives, but not married men. Although wives could have authority over single women, and single women could have authority over all husbands, by some strange logic wives could not have authority over husbands. This whole position is implausible. It is interesting how single, career women are so ready to relegate married women to lower status in order to promote their own authority. The Bible would seem to give an authoritative preference to wives over single women. To even suppose that a single woman would be allowed to have authority denied to a married woman is a failure to grasp the biblical concepts on this subject.

Summary

To interpret 1 Tim 2:12 in a sense other than the view which has been normally accepted during the history of the church is to hold a position contrary to the evidence, a position based on a series of improbable "possibilities" (which are not really possible) in contrast to a normal approach to vocabulary, syntax, argument and context.

1 Tim 2:12 does not relate to some specific situation or action that is in itself negative so that it would also be wrong for a man. When Paul states that he does not permit a woman to teach or have any other authority over a man, the issue from the context and argument is the universal principle of the authority of the man in relation to the woman. To argue that the scripture does not teach such a concept elsewhere is to ignore the "anthropological norm" established in Genesis 3, the entire tenor of the Old Testament and the gospels, and rests upon incorrect and abnormal interpretation of other passages in the New Testament.[106] To argue that

established in Genesis 3, the entire tenor of the Old Testament and the gospels, and rests upon incorrect and abnormal interpretation of other passages in the New Testament.[106] To argue that women in the New Testament exercised various ministries and were deaconesses is in no way evidence that they taught or exercised authority over men. 1 Tim 2:12 cannot be restricted only to a specific situation, nor to an improper teaching or exercise of authority, nor only to the assembly. The universal arguments and Genesis 3:16 show that the principle applies universally. Paul states it as a practice of his and gives it as the basis for his command to the church.

It is an indication of the state of the evangelical church and how far it has succumbed to modern secular sociological dogma that some can argue that 1 Tim 2:12 only prohibits a woman from "authoritative teaching;" others, that it only prohibits from preaching in the assembly; others, that it only prohibits a woman from holding the office of elder, and any or all of these views can be considered as "conservative."

Conclusion

A study of the standard lexicons and grammars shows that although an emphatic or intensive usage of *oude* is well attested, there is no mention of a use equivalent to a hendiadys. There is no hint that *oude* functions this way, a fact which is borne out by a study of its New Testament usage. Nothing in the lexicons, grammars, New Testament usage, context, or the syntax of 1 Timothy implies such a meaning. Why then attempt to interpret it in this way so that the verse is restricted, when the normal meanings make perfect sense in the verse and passage?

The same may be said of *authenteō*. The lexicons indicate that it would normally be interpreted as neutral, although in some contexts it may be negative. Why this inclination to view it as basically negative so that the verse is restricted when it makes perfect sense taken normally? It is common knowledge that *gar* functions causally and this use fits well in 1 Tim 2:12, 13. However, other explanations of *gar* which restrict the verse do not fit well. The present tense of *epitrepō* and its subject are clear. To apply this to a distant church in only one instance is unusual,

but the normal meaning fits well. To attempt to divest "teach" of an authoritative aspect is foreign to scripture and experience, yet the normal authoritative aspect fits well in the verse.

To deny the universal nature of the prohibition while arguing that it prohibits only wrongful action by a woman is inconsistent; to think that Paul would prohibit only women from some sinful authority and that only over men is illogical; to deny the universality of the prohibition when it is supported by the order of creation and the woman's conduct in the Fall, which resulted in her subordination to man, is contrary to logic. These views are promulgated despite the fact that the universal aspect of the prohibition fits well in the context, fits well in scripture as a whole, and fits the anthropological norm established in Genesis 3.

Few would restrict the principles and prohibitions of the New Testament only to the assembly. In particular there are few if any statements in 1 Timothy which apply *only* to the assembly. In the immediate context of 1 Tim 2:12 the statements are not for the assembly only, nor are there any restrictions in the verse.

This series of improbable interpretations, many of which defy normal rules of interpretation, some of which are self contradictory or internally inconsistent, none of which are probable in the context, and which result in a hodge podge of interpretation does not arise from any difficulty or implication in the verse. This verse is clear. It is sometimes essential, if a verse requires it, to take one aspect of a verse in an unusual or improbable way if all the other aspects and the argument of the passage point in that direction. It is another situation entirely to take a verse which makes good sense and which fits its context when each aspect is treated normally, and then to interpret each aspect in an improbable way often based on precarious evidence and all oriented merely to denying the "normal" meaning. The "feminist" interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12 is similar to, "this word does not necessarily mean, and if that does not nullify the verse, then this word may mean other than the accepted meanings, and this is not necessarily a universal principle, etc." This is similar to a lawyer who is trying to avoid the sense of a law on the basis of technicalities.

Each Christian can decide for himself whether to obey the Bible or not. However, an interpreter is not free to use his training to create the impression that a clear verse is ambiguous or that it teaches what it obviously does not teach. 1 Tim 2:12 excludes women from teaching or exercising any other authority over a man. The question of the woman's role in the body of Christ is significant enough that the apostle Paul discussed it several times. However, as crucial as that may be, even more crucial is the attempt to obviate the meaning of scripture, not due to anything in the passage but in order to conform it with present sociological views. Rather than accusing the Apostle Paul, as many do, of demonstrating his cultural prejudice in writing such verses, it is more accurate to realize that many modern interpreters are by their interpretations demonstrating their cultural prejudice by such improbable interpretations of 1 Tim 2:12.

END NOTES

1.James B. Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub., 1981) 201.

2.Philip B. Payne, "*Oude* in 1 Timothy 2:12," A paper presented at the Evangelical Theological Society Meeting in Atlanta, Georgia on November 21, 1986, 4.

3.Ibid, 1, 4. Payne's statement that *oude* joins expressions such as "night 'n day" is erroneous. It is more accurate to say "neither night nor day," which is entirely different.

4.*The Oxford English Dictionary; H-K*, 5.222, and *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language*; 2nd ed., 848.

5.Payne only discusses Pauline usage of *oude* and only two thirds of these. His paper is one of the few exegetical attempts to discuss the issues. Very few give more than a passing comment on the grammar of this passage. His paper is flawed, however, in that it is contrary to normal interpretational procedure, grammar, and logic.

6.BAG 591 lists this as an accepted meaning for *oude*.

7.This would be the meaning if Matt 25:13 were interpreted in an equivalent manner to the hendiadys view of 1 Tim 2:12.

8.To interpret Matt 12:19 as only referring to one very specific form of quarreling, but allowing other forms and loud boisterous behavior is contrary to the verse. Matt 24:21 is describing the tribulation as a kind "which has not happened since the beginning of the world (*oude*) nor shall it happen again." The second clause carries force; it is not merely a modifier restricting the first

part to a specific type. Rather, it is intensifying the basic overall concept that this tribulation is the only one of its kind. Each part of the expression is necessary. This kind has not occurred before nor will it ever occur again. Other verses which clearly do not function as a hendiadys, but seem to intensify the overall concept which is common to both parts are: Matt 24:36; Luke 12:33 (not merely one kind of thief), 16:31, 18:4, 20:36, 23:15; John 1:13, 25, 6:24, 8:11, 11:50, 16:3; Acts 7:5, 9:9, 16:21, 17:25, 24:13; Heb 9:12; 1 Pet 2:22; 1 John 2:23, 3:6; Rev 5:3, 7:16, 9:4, 12:8, 20:4, 21:23. None of these functions as a hendiadys. There are over forty occurrences in this category. They are also consistent in the sense that taking these as a hendiadys in the same sense as many do 1 Tim 2:12 (eliminate the second concept as an entity and use it to restrict the first concept) implies the opposite of the true meaning.

9.The verses are Matt 5:15, 6:15, 7:18, 9:17, 10:24, 11:27, 16:10, 21:27, 32, 22:46, 23:14, Mark 11:26, 33, 13:32; Luke 6:43, 44, 11:33, 17:21, 20:8; John 13:16; Acts 2:27; Heb 9:18, 25.

10.In Matt. 16:9, Jesus asks the disciples, "do you not yet understand nor remember the five loaves and the 5000"? Rather than, "do you not yet rememberingly understand but you have some other type of understanding," the thrust seems to be intensive to the effect "do you not yet understand what is happening or even remember the feeding of the five thousand"? Mark 4:22 (Luke 8:17) can hardly be rendered as a hendiadys. It would make an extremely awkward construction to render the second clause as an adjective modifying the first clause. John 14:17 does not mean that the world fails to behold the Holy Spirit in a knowing way but may in some other way. Acts 8:21 hardly means that Simon does not have a "lot type of part" but he may have some other part. Acts 16:21 does not refer only to a "doing type of acceptance," but some other kind of acceptance is permissible. In none of these passages does *oude* function as a hendiadys. Paul is not claiming in Acts 24:18 that he was not causing a riotous type of crowd in contrast to a peaceful one, since the actual description of the event indicates no crowd was involved until his

accusers voiced their complaint. Rather he means that there was no disturbance or upsetting of the normal routine. Heb 10:8 certainly does not mean that God did not pleasurably desire sacrifices, but desired them in some other way, nor does Heb 13:5 mean that God promised not to abandoningly forsake believers but will forsake in some other way. In each of these verses the repetition of similar concepts is for emphasis and reinforces the basic idea. It does not function as a hendiadys. 2 Pet 1:8 certainly does not mean believers will not be fruitlessly idle, but could be idle in some other way.

11.Payne, "*Oude*," 2.

12.Payne often states his view in a way which blurs the basic issue. If, as he says, the second member in 1 Cor 11:16 "may specify the extent included in the less specific 'we' just as 'to domineer a man' in 1 Tim 2:12 may specify the sort of teaching," it also nullifies the second part which specifically states that other churches are involved, and changes the meaning of the first item, totally losing the emphatic nature of the verse. (Payne, "Oude," 3.)

13.Gal 1:17 can hardly function as Payne interprets it. The statement, "I did not consult with flesh and blood nor did I go up to Jerusalem to the apostles," is not referring only to the apostles so that "flesh and blood" equals the apostles only. Can Paul be arguing that he carefully avoided the apostles, but consulted any other Christians; that he garnèred his information from everyone available but the most knowledgeable? His point is that he received his information from God rather than any man. He received it from no flesh and blood, not even from the apostles.

14.Payne, "*Oude*," 3.

15.Ibid., 3. "Free-load" is Payne's terminology.

16.Payne ("Oude," 2) argues not from any translation which is reasonably close to the original,

but from the rendering of *Today's English Version*. How can any accurate nuance of a Greek word be derived from a free English rendering not at all close to the original? The *TEV* (according to Payne), "After all, who is a real Jew, truly circumcised? Not the man who is a Jew on the outside whose circumcision is a physical thing," contains repetition which is not in the original, and changes words from one clause to another. To render this verse as a hendiadys would result in something like "Not the man who is a circumcision on the outside type of Jew on the outside . . . ."

17.John Beekman and John Callow, *Translating the Word of God* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1974) 297.

18.Textual variants have not been taken into account in this translation.

19.Payne, "*Oude*," 3.

20.BAG 120, for example.

21.*LPGL*, 263.

22.BAG, for example, gives the meanings, "have authority, domineer," which allow for both the basic idea, "to have authority," and that the word may, in some contexts, have a negative connotation such as "to domineer."

23.BAG 847, 849.

24.Catherine C. Kroeger, "Ancient Heresies and a Strange Greek Verb." *The Reformed Journal* (March, 1979) 12-14.

25.J. L. Louw, *Semantics of New Testament Greek* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982) 23-37. Moises Silva, *Biblical Words and Their Meaning* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983) 35-51, and others.

26.George W. Knight III, "*Authenteō* in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2:12," *NTS* 30 (1984) 143-57.

27.Kroeger, "Strange Verb," 12-14. Despite this logical flaw, the inclusion of the nouns and adjectives does not in this case change the outcome of an objective study of *authenteō*.

28.Payne, "Oude," 9.

29.Leland E. Wilshire, "The TLG Computer and Further Reference to *AUTHENTEO* in 1 Timothy 2:12," *NTS* 34 (1988) 120.

30.*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, Computer printout on *authenteō*, unpublished material (Irvine, California: University of California)

31.Wilshire "TLG Computer," 121.

32.Ibid. 129, 130. Wilshire mentions a papyrus (P. Leid. W.$^{VI\ 46}$) apparently overlooked by Knight, however, this is not an occurrence of the *verb*, but the noun. In any case, the expression "O ruling, sun," can only carry a neutral connotation for the word *authenta*, "ruling."

33.Ibid., 125-127, 130.

34.Ibid., 130.

35.Kroeger, "Strange Verb," 13.

36.Armin J. Panning, "*Authenteō*, - A Word Study," *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* 78 (1981) 188, 189.

37.Kroeger, "Strange Verb," 13.

38.Caroll D. Osburn, "*Authenteō*, (1 Timothy 2:12)," *Restoration Quarterly*, 25 (1982) 1-8.

39.Panning "*Authenteō*," 185-91.

40.Catherine C. Kroeger, "1 Timothy 2:12: A Classicist's View," *Women, Authority and the Bible* (ed. A. Mickelsen; Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 1986) 226.

41.Ibid., 231.

42.Ibid., 232.

43.Walter L. Liefeld, "Response," *Women, Authority and the Bible*, (ed. A. Mickelsen; Downers Grove, Illinois; Intervarsity Press, 1986) 245, 246.

44.Catherine Kroeger, "The Apostle Paul and the Greco Roman Cults of Women," *JETS* 30 (March, 1987) 32.

45.This is a common failing of "feminist" exegesis. It does not deal with the grammatical facts of the passages involved.

46.Kroeger, "Strange Verb," 13, and Knight, 144, 145 (Philodemus *Volumina Rhetorica* 3:133, ed. S. Sudhaus, Leipzig, 1896).

47.Osburn, "*Authenteō*," 5, 6.

48.Knight, "*Authenteō*," 145.

49.Payne, "*Oude*," 11.

50.Ibid., 9.

51.Payne argues that the "crucial letters distinguishing between the verb and noun are missing

from the text, and the word it modifies has only the first two letters extant, *an*, letters which begin hundreds of different words in Greek." (Payne, "Oude," 11.) Assuming that Knight has copied the passage accurately the Greek phrase in question is *sun authent[ou]sin an[axin]* (The text as reconstructed by Sudhaus). No form of the nouns *authentia* or *authentēs* will fit in this instance where there is the root *authent.*, a gap of two or three letters, and the ending *sin.* However, several constructions of the verb fit easily. In addition, although there may well be hundreds of Greek words beginning with *an*, there are not many beginning with *an* of approximately six letters which will also fit this context. For a comparison, admitting that the New Testament has a more restricted vocabulary than classical Greek, notice that Greenlee lists about 280 words in the New Testament beginning with *an*, (J. H. Greenlee, *A New Testament Greek Morpheme Lexicon*, Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, 9-14.), but few seem to be of the proper length to fit in this text, and none seem to fit in this context. It would be helpful if Payne would provide a reasonable noun construction which fits the context, rather than merely stating that there is doubt regarding this reconstructed text.

52.Knight, "*Authenteō*," 144 referring to Aeschylus *Eum.*, 42a.

53.*BGU* 1208, 37-42.

54.Knight, "*Authenteō*," 145.

55.Payne, "*Oude*," 10.

56.*BGU* 1208, 42-44.

57.Payne states that the individual did not have authority, so that his actions must have been contentious. His arguments are that the word "consent" is used, that the other individual responded "in the hour," and that the other would not have lied to or disobeyed someone in authority.

(Payne, "Oude,"10.) The Greek verb *epichoreō*, "consent, concede, yield," implies nothing, however, regarding superiority or subservience. The expression "in the hour" does not mean the other waited an hour to act but just the opposite. To anyone who has been in authority, the argument that those subservient would not lie or disobey is completely unrealistic. Payne also argues that the preposition *pros* used with the accusative implies a hostile relationship ("Oude," 10). The very lexicon which Payne quotes for his evidence, states that one of the many nuances of *pros* and the accusative is in a hostile or *friendly* relationship. Not only the context, but in particular the *verb* indicates the nuance of *pros,* so that the "hostile" relationship occurs with "verbs of disputing" (BAG 709, 710). The preposition does not give insight into the nuance of the verb, as Payne implies, rather the verb provides the nuance. *Pros* with the accusative can occur in "friendly" contexts, and, in fact, most often occurs in neutral contexts. His argument that none of the uses of *pros* implies authority ("*Oude*," 10.) not only overlooks *pros* with verbs of sending or leading, but falls due to the fact that the preposition *pros* indicates nothing regarding the ranking of the parties involved.

58.Many of these are ecclesiastical writers, often discussing and influenced by 1 Tim 2:12, therefore their evidence is questionable for the point at issue.

59.Ptolemy *Tetrabiblos* 3.13 (LCL) 338, 339.

60.Payne regards the meaning as "domineer" based on the English translation and partly on a misunderstanding of the English word "dominate," which he apparently equates with "domineer." However, "dominate" is actually neutral in meaning. In addition, the English translator states in a footnote that he means "to dominate" in the sense of "exercise rulership" (*Tetrabiblos* LCL, 339). An English translation is not definitive, but the context is. It is improbable that the author is stating that an inanimate object, Saturn, is ruling the other planets in a harsh, arrogant, or tyrannical way.

61.Payne, "*Oude*," 10, is apparently, once again, mistakenly, equating "dominate" with "domineer."

62.TLG "*Authenteō*," (Johannes Chrysostomus, *In Gen.* MPG 54.595.1).

63.*LPGL* 262, 263.

64.Kroeger, "Classicist's View," 232, 237.

65.Walter L. Liefeld, "Women and the Nature of Ministry," *JETS* 30 (1987), 52.

66.Ibid.

67.*LPGL* 262 lists a few occurrences of the verb under "assume authority; act on one's own authority." However, these are not basically inceptive, but mean to act on one's own.

68.Kroeger, "Strange Verb," 13.

69.The first, although it mentions the instigator of the action, does so as only one of the group described by *authentēs*, who are not originators. This group is contrasted with the total number who are connected in any way with the situation. Those described by *authentēs* are either "leaders," or "doers" (LSJ 275 includes these as possible meanings for *authentēs*). An inceptive idea is improbable. The second reference refers to a situation where the individual in question was ordered by the king to massacre a village, therefore, he was not the originator but the "doer" or "leader." Although the passage in question (D.S. 16.61) could be taken in the sense that many merely thought he was the instigator, this is not likely since there was a common suspicion that the king ordered the massacre and the inquiry described was to determine if this were so.

70.LSJ 275 gives the meaning "take in hand," for the verb *authentizō*. Knight ("*Authenteō*," 146, 147) lists the two other occurrences.

71.Liefeld, "Women," 52.

72.Liefeld, "Response," 245, criticizes Kroeger's unwarranted additions, but seems to fall prey to the same error.

73.*LPGL* 262.

74.TLG "*Authenteō*."

75.Gordon D. Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus* (San Francisco: Harper and Row, 1984) 35-39; Kroeger, "Classicist's View," 226-244; Philip B. Payne, "Libertarian Women in Ephesus: A Response to Douglas J. Moo's article 'I Timothy 2:11-15: Meaning and Significance'" *Trinity Journal* 2 (1981) 177-191; David M. Scholer, "1 Timothy 2:9-15 and the Place of Women in the Church," *Women, Authority and the Bible*, (Downers Grove, Illinois: Intervarsity Press, 1986) 199.

76.Ibid.

77.Scholer, "1 Timothy," 195-202.

78.Kaiser's view that the women are "likewise" encouraged to engage in public prayer, is grammatically impossible (Walter J. Kaiser, "Paul, Women and the Church," *Worldwide Challenge*, Sept. 1976, 10). He bases his argument on the word "likewise," which will only sound reasonable to someone unfamiliar with Greek. However, it is impossible in the Greek. The main verb *boulomai*, "I desire," has Paul as its subject and the two infinitival clauses containing *proseuchesthai*, "pray," and *kosmein*, "adorn," as objects. The two infinitive clauses are parallel and the main verb *boulomai* functions as the main verb for both clauses. This can only be interpreted as "I desire that the men pray everywhere . . . and likewise I desire that the woman adorn themselves . . . ." It is incorrect to import part of the previous infinitival clause (v. 8) regarding prayer into the second and parallel infinitival clause (v. 9) as Kaiser does. In Kaiser's construction the infinitive

kosmein is left dangling. His construction requires that the accusative, "women," function together with "men" as the subject of the first infinitive. This impossible view is also held by Aida B. Spencer, *Beyond The Curse* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson Pub., 1985) 73.

79.Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy*, 35.

80.Payne, "Libertarian Women," 170-73. Most of Payne's discussion of *epitrepō* is irrelevant.

81.Ibid., 170.

82.Ibid., 170, 171.

83.Scholer, "1 Timothy," 211.

84.Patricia Gundry, *Heirs Together*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980) 86, 87; and Mary Hayter, *The New Eve in Christ*, (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 137-139.

85.Payne, "Libertarian Women," 175-77.

86.Scholer, "I Timothy," 211.

87.Douglas J. Moo, "The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15: A Rejoinder," *Trinity Journal* (1981) 198-222. Moo points out that Payne relies on A. T. Robertson in contrast to most grammarians, that explanatory *gar* is rare, and that in Paul's writings, particularly in this type of discussion, the causal *gar* is common.

88.It is astounding that anyone familiar with Pauline literature would claim that the explanatory *gar* is common, and that in this context an illative use of *gar* is incorrect. BDF 235 characterizes *gar* under "causal conjunctions." Robertson, himself, in his *Historical Grammar* (p 1190) gives the Greek description as *sundesmos aitiologikos* (causal).

89.Moo, "Rejoinder," 20. The grammarians, including Robertson (Payne's main support), use "explanatory" in the sense of "explain."

90.Payne's other arguments are also weak. For example: he argues that *gar* is often untranslated in English versions, in some way assuming that this supports his position. However, this is a matter of English style, and a causal *gar* may also be left untranslated. Such translation, however, has little to do with any particular nuance of *gar.*

91.Payne "Libertarian Women," 176, 177.

92.Scholer, "1 Timothy," 211.

93.Hurley, *Man and Woman*, 200, 201; *The NIV Study Bible*, ed. Kenneth Barker (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1985) 1833-39.

94.*NIV Study Bible*, 1833.

95.Ibid., 1838, 1839.

96.Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy*, 54, and J. N. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1963) 87, for example, both regard *oikos* as "family."

97.For example: Payne argues ("Libertarian Women," 173, 174) that *didaskō* does not imply authority. As in his discussion of *authenteō,* he seemingly ignores the fact that a word depends on its context for its precise meaning. Teaching refers primarily to communication of concepts, but in most cases an aspect of authority is also inherent in a situation where one instructs another. Payne's argument that some teaching is not authoritative because it is unsound, is not logical, since authority and soundness are not necessarily related.

98.Hurley, *Man and Woman*, 201.

99.Ibid.

100.Payne, "Libertarian Women," 169, 170.

101.Moo ("Rejoinder," 198, 199) has shown that *ēsychia* does mean "silence," as well as "quiet." In this passage, which refers to prayer and teaching, and contrasts *ēsychia* with teaching as well as authority, the more natural meaning is silence, as most have translated it.

102.Payne ("Libertarian Women," 175, and "*Oude*," 5), makes a logically impossible argument that if 1 Tim 2:12 is one coherent idea (equivalent to a hendiadys) then "man" can modify both verbs, but that if the two verbs each carry individual force, the very same grammatical construction cannot refer to both. However, as Moo points out ("Rejoinder," 202) this is perfectly natural Greek. If "man" does not qualify "teach" then the only other possibility is that this verse does not allow women to teach anyone. In addition, the fact that no one practices this is not an exegetical argument against it, as Payne assumes ("Oude," 6).

103.*NIV Study Bible*, 1838.

104.Ibid.

105.R. Kroeger, "A Plea for Restraint," *Priscilla Papers*, (August, 1987) 1, 2,; and Scholer, "1 Timothy." 200-202.

106.To show that verses such as 1 Cor 11:2-16, Gal 3:28, etc., harmonize with this interpretation, is not difficult, but cannot be included in this paper.

CONTEXTUALIZED INTERPRETATIONS OF 1 Timothy 2:12: AN ANALYSIS

by
Thomas R. Edgar
Professor of New Testament
Capital Bible Seminary

Perhaps the most significant verse in the "feminist" controversy is 1 Tim 2:12. This verse apparently teaches that a woman is not to teach nor to have authority over a man. The verse is not complicated, the argument of the passage seems clear, and the normal lexical meanings of the terms seem to fit well. Much of the modern interpretation has been to restrict the meaning or the application of the verse. For example, such interpretations may restrict the meaning of "teach nor exercise authority" to "teach domineeringly" (or authoritatively), or restrict the prohibition to a specific situation in Ephesus. These interpretations consistently restrict the meaning in some way so that Paul's prohibition is not applicable today. The result is a meaning which is in agreement with the present culture, but which is almost the opposite of the "traditional" meaning.

The Significance of Oude

The oude construction in I Tim 2:12 is frequently interpreted with the force of a hendiadys. The resultant meaning is a prohibition of "domineering teaching" or something similar. Many traditionalists interpret this as a prohibition against "authoritative teaching." In these cases the verb authenteō does not function as a separate entity, but is merely a modifier of the verb didaskō which restricts the scope of didaskō. This, by definition, is a hendiadys.[1] Rather than prohibiting two separate facets, didaskō and authenteō, which encompass a broad range of actions (inclusive), the prohibition is confined to a restricted scope for only one

---

[1]*The Oxford English Dictionary; H-K*, vol 5, p 222, and *Webster's New Twentieth Century Dictionary of the English Language;* 2d ed., p 848.

of them. The prohibition against exercising authority is eliminated, and only one type of teaching is prohibited. Payne, in arguing for the interpretation "domineering teaching," states that oude in Paul's epistles is used to join "two closely related items," "to join together elements which reinforce or make more specific a single coherent idea."[2] However, since the two elements didaskō and authenteō may reinforce or make more specific a single coherent prohibition against any kind of authority, such a definition is not specific enough to support the suggested interpretation. The issue is not whether oude joins two elements in some closely related way or to reinforce a single concept, but whether the elements relate in very specific way where one is merely functioning as an adjective limiting the scope of the other.

A study of LSJ (p 1268) and BAGD (p 591), as well as other lexicons, reveals no evidence for such a restrictive (hendiadys) force for two items joined by oude; rather, the meaning is inclusive ("and not, nor, neither") or intensive ("not even").

NT Evidence other than Paul

There are 144 occurrences of oude in the NT. In a small percentage of occurrences oude seems to function as a negative rather than correlating two concepts; therefore, there is no possibility of a hendiadys. However, oude, in these cases, apparently has the intensive nuance, "not even." The meaning in Matt 6:29 is not merely that Solomon was not dressed thus (others may be), but "not even Solomon was dressed thus"; no one, not even Solomon, was thus dressed. Matt 27:14 does not mean that Jesus did not answer with one word (He answered with two or more), but He did not answer at all, "not even one word." There are approximately twenty-five such

---

[2]Philip B. Payne, "Oude in I Timothy 2:12", a paper presented at the ETS annual meeting in Atlanta Georgia on Nov. 21, 1986.

occurrences of oude.

There are numerous cases where the precise nuance of oude when one or more elements are correlated seems clear. The relationship is not adjectival (hendiadys) or restrictive, but one of reinforcement or intensification of a concept to which both elements relate. The statement in Matt 25:13, "you do not know the day nor the hour," does not mean "you do not know the hourly (hour type) day." It means "you do not know the day nor even the hour"; the hearers do not at all know the time. The second concept, "hour," is not eliminated as a separate concept so that they could possibly know the hour (cf. the proposed view of I Tim 2:12, which prohibits only a specific type of teaching and allows exercise of authority). Matt 6:26 does not mean that the birds do not sow in some way adjectivally defined by reaping or gathering but that they may sow in other ways (cf. I Tim 2:12). It means they do nothing at all to provide their food. All of the individual aspects, "sowing," "reaping," and "gathering," are necessary to convey the overall inclusive idea that they do nothing at all. To treat this as a hendiadys would imply that the birds made some other type of provision and teach the opposite meaning of the verse. This is true of all such occurrences of oude. There are over forty such occurrences in non-Pauline NT literature.

There are a number of occurrences (approximately twenty-three) involving longer segments which are extremely difficult to state, even theoretically, as a hendiadys. The construction reinforces or intensifies a basic concept common to both elements without eliminating or restricting either individual element. There are a few occurrences where the intensive nuance is less obvious (Matt 25:45; Mark 12:10; Luke 7:7; John 15:4; Heb 8:4). However, none of these instances functions as a hendiadys, with an adjectival or restrictive nuance.

Of the 109 non-Pauline occurrences of oude there are only fourteen which could be forced into a hendiadys. However, none are likely as a hendiadys, but seem to be inclusive-intensive in nuance. In these cases the related concepts are synonymous or approximately so. Such repetition of similar ideas is a customary practice to intensify or reinforce an overall basic idea. One of the concepts does not cease as a separate entity and merely restrict the other. Matt 6:28 does not mean that the lilies do not laboriously spin but may spin otherwise (cf. I Tim 2:12), or that they "do not labor, that is, spin," but may otherwise work. The meaning is inclusive-intensive. They do nothing at all, "neither labor nor spin." Matt 13:13, "they neither hear nor understand," is not restricting the hearing to only one type and at the same time allowing for them to understand; i.e., eliminating "they do not understand" as an independent concept. The idea is intensive. They do not really hear (listen) and they do not really understand. They are not at all responding. Jesus is not narrowly restricting the lack of hearing and allowing the possibility of their understanding.

Pauline usage of oude

None of the 109 non-Pauline occurrences of oude is clearly or even probably a hendiadys (adjectivally restrictive). The common nuance is just the opposite; rather than restrictive, it is inclusive-intensive. The thirty-five Pauline occurrences exhibit the same characteristics. Payne argues that in eight instances, (Rom 3:10; 9:16; I Cor 2:6; 5:1; 11:16; Gal 1:17; II Thess 3:8 and I Tim 6:16), "oude specifies with greater clarity the meaning of one word or phrase by conjoining it with another word or phrase."[3] However, each of these instances is better understood as

---

[3]Payne, "Oude", 2,3.

intensive-inclusive rather than restrictive. In each, both concepts are necessary and reinforce the overall concept common to both. In Rom 3:10, "there is none righteous, not one," the two concepts joined by oude are synonymous. The construction not only reflects Hebrew rather than Greek but is different than I Tim 2:12 since the word dikaios in the first concept must also be understood as the basic part of the second concept. This is merely a more emphatic repetition of the same statement; the anarthrous dikaios is defined more specifically by heis dikaios. Oude functions as a negative in its own clause rather than as a connective. The construction is emphatic (intensive), as Payne also describes it, rather than restrictive. The second concept does not cease to function and allow the possibility that there may be heis dikaios. Rom 9:16, "therefore it is not of the one who desires nor the one who runs," is understood by Payne as "desire expressed through effort."[4] Is it probable, however, that Paul, who is arguing that God shows mercy and compassion completely on His own initiative and terms, would then conclude this same discussion "therefore, it is not of desire expressed through effort (one specific type of desire, other types are possible), but of God who shows mercy." Such an interpretation which eliminates "effort" (running) as an independent entity and uses it to narrowly restrict the scope of "desire" (cf. hendiadys view of I Tim 2:12) seems unlikely and does not really correlate with the all inclusive clause which follows, "but of God who shows mercy?" The more probable nuance is that neither human desire of any sort nor human effort is involved. In I Cor 2:6, "a wisdom not of this age nor of the rulers . . .," it is improbable that Paul is referring to only one of these concepts; rather, the construction is inclusive, or intensive. I Cor 5:1, "fornication which is not even among the Gentiles," is merely an emphatic negation

---

[4]Payne "Oude," 3.

and does not function as a correlation of two concepts. The nuance is intensive. The statement, "we do not have such a custom nor the churches of God" (I Cor 11:16), is certainly inclusive and can hardly be taken as referring to a restricted meaning of only one of the concepts. Is Gal 1:16, 17, "I did not consult with flesh and blood nor did I go up to Jerusalem to the apostles . . .," referring only to a narrowed focus of one of the two concepts, to the apostles only? Can Paul be saying that he carefully avoided the apostles, but consulted any other Christian he encountered; that he garnered his information from everyone available but the most knowledgeable? His overall point is that he received his information from God rather than any man (not merely the apostles). Is it likely that II Thess 3:7,8, "we were not disorderly (idle) among you, nor did we eat bread as a gift," is merely emphasizing one of these concepts rather than inclusive-intensive of both? I Tim 6:16, "whom no man has seen nor is able to see," is stressing the transcendence of God (inclusive-intensive) rather than referring only to a restricted aspect of one of the concepts.

The Pauline uses of oude give no clear support for a restrictive usage comparable to the proposed interpretation for I Tim 2:12; rather, there is consistent support for an intensive-inclusive nuance.

Conclusion regarding oude

The evidence is amazingly one sided. Of the 143 other occurrences of oude in the NT none seems to function as a hendiadys or similar to the proposed interpretation for I Tim 2:12. When more than one item is joined by oude the two reinforce a basic concept which encompasses both, which is at the least broad enough to include all the individual concepts, and may be broader than either. Neither does the evidence favor a basically appositional usage (teaching equals authority), which, in any case, would prohibit either all forms of teaching or all authority and not merely

prohibit one narrowly restricted form of teaching. The proposed interpretation depends not on a general unity of the two concepts, but on dismissal of one as an independent entity and on a narrow restriction of the other. In the case of a prohibition it virtually reverses the sense of the normal meaning of such a construction. The evidence is contrary to such an interpretation. Since the passage does not indicate such an interpretation, from whence does it arise?

The Meaning of Authenteō

There is a difference of opinion regarding the precise nuance of the verb authenteō. The generally accepted opinion, supported by the lexicons, indicates that authenteō, when it refers to authority, is neutral or positive. As might be expected, in some contexts it may refer to a negative use of authority. Some insist that the verb is basically negative, meaning "domineer" or to wrongfully use authority. I Tim 2:12 would then prohibit a women only from some wrongful teaching or wrongful authority. This interpretation depends on the negative meaning, since there is no implication in the context to take the verb negatively. It also depends on the invalid hendiadys view of oude.

The context is against a negative meaning

Any negative meaning for the practices prohibited in I Tim 2:12 is highly improbable in the context. The passage concerns the relationship between men and women, not some practice wrong in itself. Only women are prohibited from the practice, which implies that it is acceptable for men; therefore, it is not some practice such as domineering teaching which is wrong for both men and women. In addition, women are only prohibited from this action with respect to men. The implication is that they can act this way with respect to women or children. When these two aspects are combined

the conclusion is even more forceful. Not only does the prohibition apply only to women, but only to women with respect to men. The prohibited action is wrong only because a woman practices it with respect to men. She is not prohibited due to inability, lack of education, or some other negative trait. She is prohibited solely because she is a woman. This concept is, of course, anathema to our culture. This is the perspective of the entire passage which concerns male-female hierarchial relationships, rather than sinful practices such as domineering or teaching false doctrine. To object that the prohibition of the woman does not imply the practice is allowable for men, is contradictory to the entire sense of the passage which concerns the actions of women in contrast to men, and is contradictory to any normal perspective of communication. If a guard says "women are not allowed in this area" the very fact that he specified "women" rather than "no one" implies that men are allowed and would be accurately interpreted that way. Language is meaningless if this verse does not indicate that men may teach anyone and that women may teach other women and children.

The linguistic evidence for authenteō

The proposed meanings for authenteō concern a precise difference in nuance, a neutral versus a negative exercise of authority. Since adjectives, nouns, and verbs from the same root may have distinct differences in meaning (cf. aphistēmi, apostasia, and huphistēmi, hupostasis) such a precise nuance of meaning for authenteō must be determined from the verb rather than by a basically etymological approach using adjectives or nouns of the same root. Considering only the word in question is in accordance with modern linguistic and semantic procedure.

The main lexicons do not list a negative meaning as the primary meaning for authenteō. The extant instances of the verb before or during

Paul's day are apparently neutral. Those after Paul's time may be affected by I Tim 2:12. Even if the nouns, adjectives, and later instances are considered, a study of the standard lexicons, the instances mentioned in various studies, and the occurrences listed in the TLG computer printout on authenteō[5] indicates that the basic conclusions are the same. Wilshire's recent study argues for the meaning "to murder," but provides no evidence that authenteō is basically negative when it refers to authority.[6]

There are, apparently, only three extant uses of authenteō before or during the time of Paul, Philodemus ***Volumina Rhetorica*** (ed. S. Sudhaus, 133), Aeschylus ***Eum.*** 42a, and BGU 1208.37-42. It seems clear that the instance from Aeschylus means "to murder" and is, therefore, irrelevant to this study. Knight concludes that the verb is positive or neutral.[7] Payne faults Knight for using the verb only, and argues that the noun and adjective should also be considered as evidence for the verb. However, he inconsistently also argues that the instance from Philodemus is from a reconstructed text, and thus it could be a noun; therefore, it cannot be evidence for the verb. A study of the text reveals that the editor was almost certainly correct in understanding this as the verb. It is a challenge to find any other form which will fit the extant letters and the lacunae. In any case, the tone of the passage is not negative but positive. The instance in BGU 1208, despite Payne's arguments to the contrary, is definitely positive or neutral. Anyone who has worked with BGU 1208 will realize that it is difficult to translate. However, it seems clear

---

[5]***Thesaurus Linguae Graecae***, University of California, Irvine, CA., Computer printout on occurrences for authenteō, 1987.

[6]Leland E. Wilshire, "The TLG Computer and Further Reference to Authenteō in I Timothy 2:12," NTS 34(1988) 120-34.

[7]George W. Knight III, "Authenteō in Reference to Women in I Timothy 2:12," NTS 30(1984) 143-57.

that the writer's main point is to defend his own actions to his superior, including those described by authenteō, as proper. Therefore, it is unlikely that he would use authenteō if the verb had a negative connotation.

Later occurrences also bear out the neutral connotation. Ptolemy ***Tetrabiblos*** 3:13 can hardly mean "domineer," as Payne states,[8] since the subject of authenteō is a planet, an inanimate object.[9] Although Chrysostom uses the verb in a few cases in a negative sense, he also uses it in a positive or neutral sense (for example, of Christ).

Conclusion regarding authenteō

This verb has, basically, a neutral connotation when it refers to some aspect of authority. The neutral meaning, "exercise authority," fits in I Tim 2:12 and in its context; however, a negative connotation is contrary to the verse and context. Neither the lexicons, nor linguistic evidence, nor the verse, nor the context implies a negative meaning of authenteō. From whence does this interpretation arise? Based on the normal nuance of oude and authenteō, the proper translation for I Tim 2:12 is "I do not permit a woman to teach nor to exercise authority over a man." The nuance is intensive-inclusive and, in effect, means "I do not permit a woman to teach nor to exercise any other authority over a man."

Liefeld, arguing for an inceptive meaning for authenteō, asserts that "usage close to the time of the New Testament suggests two meanings in particular, 'to take charge' and 'to originate'," and concludes that authenteō indicates "the way authority is gained -- that is, by arrogation

---

[8]Payne, "Oude," 10. In several cases Payne confuses the neutral word "dominate" and the negative term "domineer."

[9]Ptolemy ***Tetrabiblos*** 3:13 (Loeb Classical Library) 338,339. The translator of the Loeb Library volume, referring to another place in the same context, states that "to dominate" means "to exercise rulership."

to oneself, not just by receiving."[10] However, there is no evidence that the verb authenteō means "originate" and evidence for the meaning "to take charge" is both scarce and later than the NT. Therefore, neither is likely as a primary meaning. Neither "take charge" nor "originate" means "self-arrogation of authority," nor does either indicate the "way" any action is taken. The few instances used as evidence for the meaning "take charge" are 6th century AD and do not refer to any improper gaining or self-arrogation of authority. Any inceptive idea comes from the context and the Greek construction. Is it at all probable that I Tim 2:12 prohibits a woman from "originating" a man, or from merely "taking charge" (inceptive) rather than from exercising authority over a man?

Universal or Local?

Various attempts have been made to prove that the prohibition in I Tim 2:12 is local, not universal and, therefore, not applicable today. Those who insist that the prohibition refers to some sinful practice, such as domineering or teaching false doctrine, at the same time often argue that the prohibition is not universal. Payne in various statements, for example, argues that the prohibition refers to teaching domineeringly, that it refers to teaching false doctrine in Ephesus, and that it is prohibited because it would offend the local culture. Other "biblical" feminists also hold one or more of these views. However, this results in a prohibition where only women (not men) are prohibited from teaching false doctrine (and that only if they teach domineeringly) only to men (it is permissible to domineeringly teach false doctrine to women and children), only in Ephesus, and that only because it is offensive to the current Ephesian culture not because it is universally wrong. Obviously there is a logical fallacy in

---

[10]Walter L. Liefeld "Women and the Nature of Ministry" JETS 30(1987)52.

such an approach, which is the result of an attempt to nullify the force of the verse piecemeal without consideration of the result. Even to regard the verse as only a prohibition of domineering teaching can hardly be considered as applicable only in Ephesus.

Although both Fee and Payne[11] argue that the present tense of epitrepō implies that the prohibition of I Tim 2:12 refers not to a general prohibition but only to a specific situation, the normal meaning of the present tense implies just the opposite. However, they as well as others miss the more obvious point that the subject of epitrepō is Paul. He is not in Ephesus, nor does he confront the specific situation. This is his practice everywhere (present tense). On the basis of Paul's general practice, Timothy is to follow the same rule. To interpret Paul's statement, that Paul, himself, "does not permit," as not referring to Paul's practice, but as a command only for a group in another geographical area, and that not as a normal practice but only for a specific unmentioned situation, is not at all a realistic interpretation of this verse.

The context

This passage deals with the hierarchial relationship between men and women. The other statements in the context do not concern some sinful practice nor are they applicable only in Ephesus. A study of the entire epistle reveals that there is little in the book that is applicable only in that specific situation. Almost every statement of practice or principle in this epistle is universally true. The directions to Timothy, and the statements concerning elders, for example, are universally applicable.

---

[11]Gordon D. Fee, ***1 and 2 Timothy, Titus*** (San Francisco; Harper and Row, 1984) 35, and Philip B. Payne, "Libertarian Women in Ephesus; A Response to Douglas J. Moo's article 'I Timothy 2:11-12: Meaning and Significance.'" Trinity Journal 2 (1981) 170-73. Payne's arguments would also rule out I Cor 7:6, 7, 8, 40; etc., as applicable to the church in general.

Nothing in this context limits the application of the prohibition nor does it even imply a limitation. Since the context and the epistle imply no limitation, from whence arises the desire to limit the application? The fact that a principle may be directed to a local situation does not deny universal applicability. Most of the general principles in the NT are stated in reference to a local situation, and apply to that situation because they are universally applicable.

The reason for the prohibition

Paul gives as the reasons for the prohibition that Adam was created first, and that the woman, Eve, was deceived and hence transgressed. These reasons are so obviously universal in scope, and so obviously apply to all men and women, that it is amazing that some make an attempt to explain them as referring only to a local prohibition. The fact that Adam was created first is a timeless universal truth that does not depend on or vary with any specific incident in any church. This fact, in this context, can only relate to the issue of priority or authority. It is not relevant to some otherwise sinful activity. Paul's second reason relates to the woman's conduct in the Fall. As a result of her actions God tells her that she will bear children in pain, that her desire will be to her husband, and that he will rule (have authority) over her (Gen 3:16). The punishments, subjection and child bearing, are the two issues in I Tim 2:11-15. The woman's conduct in the Fall is, according to Genesis, a primary reason for her universal, timeless subordinate relationship. "Eating by the sweat of one's brow" and bearing children in pain are not applicable only to the specific situation in Ephesus, nor is the subjection of the woman. Feminists often argue that Christ's death erased these results of the Fall for believers. This would mean that all female unbelievers are to be in subjection. Their argument is frivolous since it is certain that Christian

men still work for their food, still have thorns and thistles in their gardens, that Christian women still bear children in pain, and that Christians, both men and women, still die. These results of the Fall, including the woman's subjection to man, are universally still in effect. I Tim 2:12 appears to be a general principle. The context refers to the general issue of the relationship of man and woman not to some specific. The arguments from Genesis precisely fit a general principle. Nothing implies or requires a limitation. Why then try to prove that this is only locally applicable? Scholer argues that this is not a timeless principle since Paul is selective in the material he uses from Genesis.[12] Who argues for any point (universal or specific) without selecting his evidence? Must Paul repeat the entire Genesis account to prove a universal principle? He has selected the two specific items relating to his point, the universal subjection of women.

Both Payne, and Scholer argue that the gar in v 13 is explanatory rather than illative or causal; therefore, the Genesis incidents are not reasons for the prohibition but are explanatory.[13] However, gar is normally illative and the causal relationship of these verses is so clear that it would be obvious even if there were no connective. Moo has thoroughly refuted this claim showing that it is contrary to most grammarians, that explanatory gar is rare although causal gar is common, that Payne's explanation of his "explanatory" interpretation is actually causal, and that his use of "explanatory" is not in the sense of the grammarians

---

[12]David M. Scholer, "1 Timothy 2:9-15 and the Place of Women in the Church's Ministry," ***Women, Authority and the Bible***, ed. A. Mickelsen (Downers Grove: IVP, 1986) 209-211.

[13]Payne, "Libertarian Women," 175-77. Scholer; "Timothy," 208-11.

upon whom he relies for such a use.[14] Scholer, himself, describes vv 13, 14 as the "explanatory rationale for" v 12. However, this is a reason.[15] The "explanatory" explanations not only depend on the idea that the woman is engaged in some wrongful practice, but are so awkward that they alone indicate the improbability of this view. What do vv 13, 14 "explain" in vv 11, 12 to which they are connected by the gar? They can explain nothing relative to these verses other than the reason for Paul's prohibition. This, however, means the relationship is causal. Why reject the obvious argument of the passage, the obvious nature of the Genesis arguments, and the normal use of gar which fits the passage, and depend on an improbable use of gar which is difficult to explain in the context?

Some argue that this refers to a situation in Ephesus where the women are teaching false doctrine or usurping authority. This is contrary to the passage which cannot refer to some practice sinful in itself, and it is also logically inconsistent to argue that the prohibition of a sinful practice is not universally true. The practice is prohibited only to women. It is contrasted with learning in silence rather than with some error. The passage concerns male-female hierarchial relationship, not truth versus error. Finally, there is no evidence that the women in Ephesus were involved in these proposed practices.

Conclusion

Although an emphatic or intensive usage of oude is well attested, there is no mention of a use equivalent to a hendiadys. Neither lexicons, grammars, New Testament usage, context, nor the syntax of I Tim 2:12 implies such a meaning. Why then interpret it in this restrictive way when

---

[14]Douglas J. Moo, "The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15: A Rejoinder," Trinity Journal 2 (1981) 202, 203.

[15]Scholer, "Timothy," 211.

the normal meanings make perfect sense in the passage?

The same may be said of authenteō, which, as the lexicons indicate, is normally neutral in meaning. Why this inclination to view it as basically negative when it makes perfect sense taken normally? It is common knowledge that gar functions causally, a use which fits well in I Tim 2:12, 13. Other explanations of gar do not fit the passage. The present tense of epitrepō and its subject are clear. To apply this prohibition to a distant church for one specific problem is unusual, but the normal meaning fits well.

To deny the universal nature of the prohibition while arguing that it prohibits a wrongful action is inconsistent; to think that Paul would prohibit only women from some sinful authority and that only over men is illogical; to deny the universality of a prohibition which is supported by the order of creation, and the woman's conduct in the Fall which resulted in her subordination to man, is contrary to logic. This is particularly so when the universal aspect of the prohibition fits well in the context, the Scripture as a whole, and the anthropological norm established in Genesis 3.

This series of improbable interpretations, many of which defy normal rules of interpretation, many of which are self contradictory or internally inconsistent, none of which are probable in the context, cannot arise from any difficulty or implication in the verse. This verse is clear.

I Tim 2:12 excludes women from teaching or exercising any other authority over a man. The more radical feminists who feel no need to contextualize this verse are often in conformity with the "traditional" interpretation. As crucial as the issue of the women's role may be, even more crucial is the attempt to obviate the meaning of Scripture in order to

conform it with present sociological views. Rather than accusing the Apostle Paul of demonstrating his cultural prejudice in writing such verses, it is more accurate to realize that many modern interpreters are demonstrating their cultural prejudice by such improbable contextualized interpretations of I Tim 2:12.