construction so that it eliminates the idea of a prohibition against authority and reduces the
interpretation itself. It is also explicitly stated by interpreters such as Payne, who interpret the
phrase as a prohibition against authority rather than interpreting it as a separation of authority and
submission. To interpret authority as eliminating a separate item and is used only to modify and
complement the phrase "of an authority," or to "teach in a dominating manner," The verse would then mean, "I
am not permit a woman to dominate another, or to exercise authority over a man." The verse states that the construction which involves a model, in this verse is counterintuitive to reach in
the interpretation which restricts the meaning of I Tim 2:12 is based on the

The Significance of One in I Tim 2:12

agreement with the present culture, but which is the opposite of the "traditional" meaning.

The result is a meaning which is in agreement with the present culture, but which is the opposite of the "traditional" meaning.

Of Restrictive Interpretation

I Timothy 2:12: An Analysis
request to give only one word (He gave more), but that He did not answer at all, "not even one
intensive nuance "not even." For example, see Matt. 7:14 which does not mean that Jesus
there is no possibility of a Hendriad, "These show that used in a negelative rather than a correlation between two concepts; therefore, in these cases
primarily as a negelative rather than a correlation between two concepts; therefore, in these cases
some grouping of the occurrences will be helpful. In a small percentage of cases used functions
unless other sources provide some rare insight into the term. Due to the number of occurrences,
used specifically. There are enough occurrences in the New Testament that this will be sufficient
of these uses so that some sense of the normal nuance may be established before studying Pauline
There are 144 instances in the New Testament where used is used. It will be helpful to study all
have authority" has no real significance except to adverbially restrict or modify clauses, "to teach."
New Testament usage of used.

For used (Hendriads) is not borne out by a study of used.
the verse but actually contradicts the apparent and traditional meaning of the verse. Such a usage
the verse but actually contradicts the apparent and traditional meaning of the verse. Such a usage
that this device is properly every kind of authority and almost every kind of
nuance of teaching (domesticating or authoritative, etc.) that it also is virtually eliminated. A verse
man of teaching as authoritative and the prohibition against teaching is so restricted to one specific
concepts relate in such a way that one merely functions as an adjective modifying the other is a
would be kept in mind that such an interpretation as "domesticating teaching" or "authoritative teaching"
provide their food. The single idea of not working to provide food is reinforced by the individual
they could be gathering teaching and something in other ways; rather they are doing nothing to
12:27) the birds are not working in some way exception of the obvious meaning of the verse. In Mark 6:26 (Luke
headlights untilled and even contemn the obvious meaning of the verse. To interpret this as a
specific type of day), but reinforce and intensifies the overall thought. To interpret this as a
eliminated as a separate concept (so that they may know the hour and the time specific concept is not
in time. Specifically it refers to their lack of knowledge of the time. The second concept is not
less minutes, seconds, and probably the week, month, etc. The unifying concept relies
not know the day not even the hour and specifically means the hours do not all know the
not mean "you do not know the hourly day" or "the hour type of day" rather it means "you do
relate. For example, the statement in Matt 25:13: "you do not know the day not the hour," does
itself (headlights) but reinforcement or intensification of a concept to which both elements
similar to 1 Th 2:12 where the nuance is clear. In these clear occurrences the relationships is not
unchangeable, neither of which occur in 1 Th 2:12 will be considered later. There are numerous cases
Cases where longer clauses, such as clauses of conditional sentences are correlated by
they could not even find an opportunity to eat. The same nuance holds true in Mark 1:45:8:9.
they could not find time to eat but could find opportunity for relaxation; rather they were so busy
the concept is not merely that
ode leads to reinforcement or intensification the basic concept. In Mark 6:1 the concept is not merely that
could be with other things. Rather it means he could not be bound "even with a chain but
seen in Mark 5:3 where the nuance is not that the demoniac could not be bound with a chain but
7:9) is stressing that "not even in Israel (God's elect) have I found The same force may be
be" but that "not even Solomon with all his riches and glory was dressed thus. Mark 8:10 (Luke
word." Mark 6:29 (Luke 12:27) does not mean that only Solomon was dressed thus (others may

3
make a anaphor type of break in and only refer to a specific type of city while excluding the
day. Matt 6:20, "where thieves neither break in nor steal," can hardly mean "where thieves do not
way. Matt 6:20. "where thieves neither break in nor steal," can hardly mean "where thieves do not
idea. Regardless of the presence of one, synonymous concepts or terms are often used in this
ideas. Regardless of the presence of similar ideas, a customary practice is intensity or reinforcing a common
symptoms of repetition of similar ideas is a customary practice to intensify or reinforce a common
concepts which are related by one are synonymous or approximatively so. The use of several
John 1:17; Acts 1:1-2; 16:21; 2:41-8; Heb 1:6; 10:8, 13:5; and 2 Pet 1:18. In most of these cases the
meaning of these verses. The verb tense are Mark 6:20, 28:13:13; 10:9; Mark 4:22; 8:17; Luke 8:17;
forced into a handshakes. The intrinsic use, however, seems to capture more accurately the

Of the 109 non-Pauline uses of one there are only two which apparently could be

instance, functions is a handshake with an adjectival or restrictive nuance.

obvious (Mal 2:14-15; Mark 1:1-2; Acts 7:11). John 1:14; Heb 8:4). However, none of these

There are a number of occurrences (approximate frequency of three) involving longer segments,

i.e., they in fact say. The same holds true in the remaining verses in this category.

Certain meaning of the verses, so that they are interpreted to mean almost the opposite of what

real it as a handshake in the same way many do. Thus 2:12 is not merely inaccurate but increases the

each of these cases it is impossible to construe the one construction as a handshake. To
can. In each of these cases it is impossible to construe the one construction as a handshake. To

one intensifies the case that none of them, including David and all with him, were permitted to

certain type of David was not permitted to cast of the showdown, rather, the construction with

the opposite of the clear meaning of the verse. In Matt 12:4 Jesus does not mean that only a

handshakes (as many do in Matt 2:12) would imply that the hands possibly did work and thus teach

necessary to convey the overall intrinsic idea that they do nothing at all. To treat this as a

specifics correlated by one. All of the individual aspects, "sovereign," "teaching," and "catholic" are
Pauline usage of αὐθεντεῖσθαι
demonstrate a preponderance of usage. A study of Pauline usage of this word reveals that Paul uses the word in the same way as the other New Testament authors. It does not occur in a number of passages which is not at all subject to discussion.

There is no one instance in the 109 non-Pauline uses of αὐθεντεῖσθαι that supports the concept of autonomous. The other verses give the same evidence. In fact, understanding the other verses give the same evidence. In fact, understanding the other verses means understanding the word to the implication that they may, construction than it is merely a hendiadys opening the door to the implication that he may, understanding. Therefore, it is much more likely that Paul has the concept by his understanding. The context rules out any possibility for them to understand the context. Both their lack of understanding and their lack at the same time allow for them to understand. It does not restict their lack of hearing to only one concept seems to be that they are not listening and they lack any real understanding: that is, they lack the basic concept. In Phil. 1:20, "and although they hear they do not hear nor understand," the basic concept is nothing at all, God provides for them. They do nothing to acquire their clothing. This is the nothing that they do not work to earn nor do they spin to make their own clothing. Rather, it means that they do not labor that is spin, but may otherwise work. Rather they do not allow their spin at labor but may do some other kind of labor. It does not mean that they do not labor but may do some other kind of labor. Rather, it means that they do not labor that is spin, but may otherwise work.
of God who shows mercy. Such a view is improbable but is equivalent in approach to the
idea that it is not an effort to please God, but may be of other kinds and could be of effort (but
the all inclusively clause which follows, "but of God who shows mercy," so that this would only mean
desire and for effort. Does such a narrow focus on one specific type of desire really correlate with
narrowing the statement down to one very narrow type of desire, and allowing for other types of
desire, but it could be of other kinds (but of God who shows mercy)"? Does Paul seem to be
part of desire, but it could be of other kinds (but of God who shows mercy) expressed by effort (not of one specific type)
some discussion concludes, "therefore it is not of desire expressed by effort (not of one specific type)
as this implies, that God shows mercy completely on His own initiative and terms, and then in this
by Pauine as equivalent to a hortatory, desire expressed by effort." However, would Paul argue,
Rom 9:16. "Therefore it is not of the one who desires nor of the one who runs, " is regarded
narrow the extent of his failure to be in supplication, would destroy the inherent of the verse.
the idea that the unbeliever lacks the capacity to be in supplication and use this concept rather to
equivalent. The local construction involving one emphases the lack of supplication. To eliminate
is able, "cannot accurately be rendered as "he is not in an ability type of supplication" or some
that there may be real divisions. Rom 8:7, "It is not in supplication to the law of God, for neither
rather than restrictive. The second concept does not cease to function and allow the possibility
a negation in its own clause rather than a connective. The construction is emphatic (intensive)
statement, the antithetical divisions is repeated more specifically by ἢδεα δικαίωσεν. One function as
the basic part of the second concept. This is merely a more emphatic repetition of the same
construction in 1 Tim 2:2, since the word ἐλεημονεῖν in the first concept must also be understood as
construction not only reflects Hebrew usage, rather than Greek, but it is different than the
concept, there is none righteous, not one." The two concepts joined by ἀδικώτως are synonymous. The
occurrences will help. Certain occurrences are relatively obvious and also relatively brief. In Rom
occurrences number to gain a definite idea of the flavor of ἀδικώτως in Pauls Letters. A group of the
overall concept. There are thirty-five occurrences of ἀδικώτως in the Pauline epistles. This is a
Taking free meals... Rather, it is the combination of illness and taking free meals from
headaches. Paragraphs in text 3:38 or a general of two separate issues, illnesses and
headaches. Paragraph 3:38 are all definitely interesting to reinforce a basic mutual concept; none if a
rather than a restrictive concept required by a headachy (Gal 1:1, 2, 7:1, 2; 15:13, 16; 2 Cor 7:12) Due to the following phrase this must be an inclusive total concept rather
we and leaving out the churches in general as the headachers view would require. Rather
we and leaving out the churches in particular (as well as other things) teach you. I Cor 11:16 seems likewise to be
even nature in particular (as well as other things) teach you. I Cor 11:16 seems likewise to be
11:14 means that nature does not teach them, but other things may rather, it means "does not
11:14 means that nature does not teach them, but other things may rather, it means "does not
4:5 seem to be inclusive rather than functionally as headachers. It is hardly possible that I Cor
4:5 seem to be inclusive rather than functionally as headachers. It is hardly possible that I Cor
rather than grasp the emphatic, inclusive, and inclusive basis of the construction. I Cor 3:2 and
rather than grasp the emphatic, inclusive, and inclusive basis of the construction. Since narrowly restricts the meaning
view consistently weakens the force of the once construction since it narrowly restricts the meaning
but to emphasize that no one of this age including the rulers, knows this wisdom. The headachers
they are of this age. The inclusion of "the rulers" is not to merely restrict the meaning of "this age" type of "this age."
The inclusion of "the rulers" is not to merely restrict the meaning of "this age" type of "this age."
In addition, it is contrary to the exclusive context to think that Paul refers only to one
the specific (v 8) Paul specifically refers to the "rulers of this age" as not knowing the wisdom
the specific (v 8) Paul specifically refers to the "rulers of this age" as not knowing the wisdom
This is the rule of 1 Cor 2:6. "This age" not the rules of this age. It is improbable that the
This is the rule of 1 Cor 2:6. "This age" not the rules of this age. It is improbable that the
or endeavor is involved. From 1:21 can hardly be interpreted as a headachers, but is inclusive:
human desire (of any sort, not just one type) not human effort that is no form of human wishing
accurate nuance is emphasized, joining two concepts, "desire" and "effort" is emphasized that neither
for that verse (that there is an unlimited range of other possibilities which are allowed. The
it is only one specific type of desire and claim (as the headachers propose of 1 Tim 2:12 claim
in the context of Rom 9:16: to interpret this as restricted to desire only. It is even worse to restrict
headachers or accidental view of 1 Tim 2:12. It is contrary to the inclusive nature of Paul's argument
case it is not a heuristics. Rom 2:7 combines two longer clauses by **aude.** Each of the elements
previous two verses in the context, the idea does seem to reinforce the basic concept. In any
stated in Rom 4:15. The intensive idea may not be apparent, but when considered with the
of Romans is that the Law actually produces and is characterized by violation. This is specifically
function as a heuristics and thus mean "where there is no violation, there is no
Rom 4:15, "where there is no law, neither (aude) is there violation, definitely does not
other

emphasis rather than a construction where one clause modifies or restricts the meaning of the
emphasize, this also supports the fact that the repetition of the two clauses in Rom 2:25 is for
following verse (Rom 2:29), which functions together with Rom 2:28 in a negative argument
are repeated the same basic idea, but one refers to the person specifically, the other to a physical
anyone who attempts to stifle it as a heuristics. The two clauses joined by **aude,** in Rom 2:28,
Rom 2:28 contains a longer construction connected by **aude.** This verse is a challenge to

Timothy

nuance may not be as obvious should be discussed prior to analysis of the three occurrences in I
a free verse in which the precise
aspect "free meals" is eliminated as a specific entity (cf. heuristics view of 1 Tim 2:12), while
of free meals intensifies the overall meaning rather than restricting it. In addition, if the second
but may have in other ways? It seems certain that Paul was not lazy in any respect. The specific
the heuristics interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12. There is little possibility that the verse means Paul was
other.

This somewhat nebulous statement is not demonstrating anything equivalent to the
as is every other use of one.

either one. It does not function as a Hendel'sas his view of 1 Tim 2:12 requires. It is insufficient

However, it is an inclusive idea which contains both elements rather than restricting or eliminating

statement that in 1 Tim 6:16 one joins two elements to convey a single coherent idea, "a God, not in fact is able to see Him. Perhaps

seeing (but possibly has some other way)? Rather, the basic concept, the transcendency of God, is

verse. 1 Tim 6:16 does not mean that no man has seen God with an "able to see" type of

it as merely restricting what one is capable to bring to the world, would destroy the meaning of

no place in eternity. To virtually eliminate the second concept as a valid entity and then to regard

Giving part of the total concept, they intuitively or reinforce the idea that material possessions have

this as a Hendel'sas. The two classes joined by one cannot relate adequately. Together, each

our "God." No matter which variant is included as the concept, it is virtually impossible to constitute

I Tim 6:7 states, "For we have brought nothing into the world, nor are we able to take anything

There are three occurrences of one in the Pastoral Epistles, all of which are in 1 Timothy.

hardly be a Hendel'sas.

is definitely emphatic, meaning "For not even the circumcised, the uncircumcised, keep the Law." It can

overall aspect that they did not do at all look down on Paul. Gal 6:13, if considered in this context,

restrict the scope of the despising to only one particular (a Hendel'sas) but are in intensity the

Obviously the two similar terms joined by one ("despise," and "loathe") are not to
despite him." Since the next clause states that they received Paul as a messenger of God (did not

construction cannot mean merely mean that they did not loathingly despise Paul (but may have despised

that the Galatians did not despise or hate Paul's appearance. The second part of the

the principle common to both. It is impossible to construe this as a Hendel'sas. Gal 4:14 states

states the same basic principle and the rejection of the concepts serves to emphasize or intensify

...
Inclusive range of sectrics from which she is prohibited, the context obviously concerns the
and convey the more inclusive principle of which each is a part. This principle covers the more
These two words, however, do not imply the sectrics from which she is prohibited. They intently
in two specific actions described by the verbs da'asaq, "reach," and auhurah, "exercise authority,"
constitutional combination aside in I Tim 2:12 indicates that the woman is prohibited from exercising
it indicates the exact opposite so that she can exercise authority in every way but one. The
that a woman is in exercise no authority of any kind over a man, the headship approach makes
interpret I Tim 2:12 in the sense of a headship. Rather than the actual meaning of I Tim 2:12,
itself. There is no justification either theologically, conceptually, psychologically, or lexically to
The line sense interprets and even broadens the scope of the individual parts without excluding
intended by turning it into a mere modality, is actually the opposite of the line sense.
regards the constitutional as restricting or narrowing the scope of one of the aspects and elimin-
regards the elimination of the second concept as a separate entity. This is not merely a view apart
such an interpretation which from any evidence of any kind but is contrary to the evidence. It also
appropriately so that it merely qualifies the other concept in some way so as to restrict it. It is also
referred to as authority (or authoritative). · · · "Requires that the one concept functions
woman to each component (or authoritative) · · · "Requires that the one concept functions
the opposite of that which it really means. The view that I Tim 2:12 means "I do not permit a
constitution of a headship actually destroys the real meaning of the verse, by forcing it to teach
constituted by only the two reinforce a basic concept which relates to both of them. To teach the
fact that only is inclusive of or pertaining to some basic concept. When more than one item is
however, it would not convey the same basic nuance. The evidence overwhelmingly supports the
such as "head," and "or." For," could be substituted and the expression would still make sense;
(excluding I Tim 2:12), which functions as a headship. In many of the cases another Greek word,
the evidence is amply one side. There is not one instance of the 143 occurrences.

Conclusion Regarding Rule
The context is determinative of the precise nuance of a word. The difference in the proposed translation does not, in itself, have a negative connotation. It comes only from the context.

For example, the word ζηλος, "zeal" in certain contexts means "zeal" in the negative sense of "zealous." The word ζηλος does not, in itself, have a negative connotation. This is common in Greek, as is in English. For contrast, the word "zealous" is common in Greek, as is in English.

In some contexts, the word "zealous" is used to denote authority to be basically neutral, yet in some contexts, the word "zealous" is used to denote authority to be basically negative. It is not unusual for there to be no implication in the passage to regard the verb as negative. It is not unusual for there to be no implication in the passage to regard the verb as positive. Such an interpretation depends solely on the alleged negative meaning for "zealous." Since a woman from some powerful exercise of authority can hardly be meant in I 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.

Another common meaning for "authority," "exercise authority," and "have authority," "exercise authority," and "have authority." The standard lexicons agree that "authority" means to have authority, "exercise authority," and "have authority." The meaning of "authority" combination of both. Therefore, the meaning of "authority" must be considered.

The restrictive (usually femminist) interpretations depend upon the incorrect and unsupported argumentative flow of the passage.

Exercise authority over a man. The common interpretation, "I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man," is not recognized as a position commonly connected with authority, and the verb "authority" is commonly recognized as a relationship of authority and submission between men and women. The verb "teach" concerns a
preclude sociological thinking. This, however, is the perspective of the entire passage which
She is prohibited solely because she is a woman. This concept is, of course, antithetical to the
forward to men. She is not prohibited due to inability, lack of education, or some other negatable trait.
respect to men. The prohibited action is wrong only because a woman practices it, while respect
even more forceful. Not only does the prohibition apply only to women, but only to women with
wrongfully reach women and children. When these two aspects are combined, the conclusion is
Paul would hardly prohibit only women from wrongful teaching. Nor would he allow them to
They obviously are ALLOWED to engage in this action with respect to others, women or childen.
women. In addition, women are only prohibited from this action with respect to one group—men,
therefore, it is not some practice such as domino-stacking teaching which is wrong for both men and
in itself. Only women are prohibited from the practice, which implies that it is acceptable for men:
context. The passage concerns the relationship between men and women, not some practice wrong
Any negatable meaning for the practices prohibited in 1 Tim. 2:12 is highly improbable in the

The context is essential to negating a negatable meaning

Authority can only come from the context.

arguing that various views reveals that this “standard” view is incorrect. Any negatable conclusion for
it may in some cases have a negatable conclusion. A study of authority and of the literature
is that when authority refers to authority it is basically neutral, although supported by the standard lexicon,
always has a negatable meaning. The general opinion, however, supported by the standard lexicon,
the “negatable” interpretation must demonstrate that the verb is in itself, negatable; that is, that it
Since the context of 1 Tim. 2:12 gives no implication of a negatable meaning for authority,
"domineer,"

exercise authority, it is unlikely in some contexts referring to a negatable use of authority such as “to
nuance of approximately the same meaning. It is entirely natural for a word which means “to
meanings for authority is not one concerning two entirely different concepts, but of a more precise
variety of meanings, cannot indicate precise nuances. It is a basic linguistic and semantic principle that the meaning of a word is determined by the context in which it is used.

The noun "authentic" carries a variety of meanings such as "true" or "original", whereas the verb "authenticate" carries a different meaning as the verb. Words from the same root as "authentic" carry a variety of meanings such as "true" or "original", but 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 "authentic" have different meanings, but the noun and verb from the same root have entirely different meanings. The noun "authentic" means "true" or "original", whereas the verb "authenticate" means "to verify" or "to authenticate". The verb "authenticate" has the reflexive construction "to itself" or "of itself".

In other words, it is impossible to determine precise distinctions in the nuance of a word by studying authenticated meanings. For example, the meaning of the verb "authenticate" is not a negative exercise of authority. Although the bandy over the verb positive exercise of authority, the proposed meanings for "authenticate" concern a precise difference in nuance. The proposed meanings for "authenticate" are invalid.

Any descriptions mentioned in this passage, which further imply that the prohibition is due to gender rather than the specific men who may be allowed to teach and exercise authority, are not consistent with the argument presented. The passage does not indicate that men are a gender group, and that language is employed in the sense of "women" does not indicate that men are a gender group. The passage does not imply that the prohibition is due to gender, and the proposed meanings for "authenticate" are invalid.

If a gender says "women are not allowed in this area", the very fact that he speaks "women" only refers his statement to men, and is contradictory to any normal perspective of communication of women in contrast to men. The statement that the prohibition concerns the actions of women in contrast to men is contradictory to the specific statement that the prohibition concerns the actions of all women. To expect that the prohibition of the woman does not imply the practice teaching false doctrine. To expect that the prohibition of the woman does not imply the practice concerns male-female hierarchical relationships, rather than similar practices such as commuting or commuting, and educational arguments are invalid.
negative. Therefore, even if the nouns, adjectives, and later occurrences are considered, a study of meaning connected with authority is found for the word authenized, although, and that there is evidence of authority; before, during, and after the time of Paul where some sort of meaning connected with authority is found for the word authenized, as authority, and that there is evidence of authority, before, during, and after the time of Paul, where some sort of meaning connected with authority is found for authenized, and in context is that in the partitive evidence the predominant meaning for authenized and its cognates is meaning prior to partitive lines, other than the one instance discussed by Knight. He also states Wirshing argues for the basic meaning "to render" but he gives no instances of the verb with this the same root, when referring to authority, give no evidence for a basically negative meaning. Although only the verb is the proper subject of this study, the nouns and adjectives from the verb prior to Paul's time are those discussed by Knight, although the verb and its cognates, and, in fact, almost entirely to the cognates. The extract instances of authenized prior to the time of I Timothy, the 3.4 occurrences mentioned by Wirshing refer to authenized prior to the time of I Timothy, neither the TLG principal nor Wirshing's article adds any new occurrences of the verb. Neither are in fact, few extraneous occurrences of the verb prior to the time of I Timothy of occurrences of the term. However, Knight, since he is referring to instances of the "etymological fallacy" and improperly criticizes Knight for examining only the occurrences of the verb, is false. Wirshing's helpful article on authenized falsifies Knight's statement that there is a fundamental flaw in Kroeger's argument for a negative connotation, which claims to dismiss the modern discussion of authenized falls prey to the "etymological fallacy" of using other words from a basically positive or neutral property uses only the verb for his analogy. In contrast, much of the study of authenized concludes that the verb, when referring to authority, is of a word (verb) be determined by studying other words (nouns, adjectives) from the same root, that the meaning of a word cannot be determined from its etymology, nor can the precise nuance
authenticity refers to women who claimed a feminine spirituality and power of creation superior to
in the article, and is grammatically impossible in this verse. In another article she states that
false interpretation does not disprove any of her proposed meanings for authentically, which she gave earlier.
false points out, her articles which apart from any evidence she connects with authentically. As Lefebvre points out, her
about twenty pages she develops these to authentically, and the rest to be a proposed gloss on the
states that it means "to represent himself as the originator or source of man." In this article of
same article she also states that it could mean to claim sovereignty or authorship, and finally
authentically represents a "natural act of conscious and personal insight..." In a later writing she states that
been thoroughly reduced by both Ouspensky and Panhuis. In a later writing she states that
impossible interpretation for Mrs. Z. In order to define a sexual connotation. Her article has
in another instance she must look at the changes earlier for a sexual reference to support an almost
by ship, proves that the word "house" has natural connotations since it occurs together with "ship." By ship's
statement. Her arguments are equivalent to arguing that the statement, "the horse was transported
there is not the slightest indication that the word "sword" has any sexual connotations in this
was a phallic symbol, therefore authentically, a different word than "sword" has sexual connotations,
is where the verb means "wander" and is said to be "by a sword." She concludes that the word
example, only two of which concern the verb, are based on incorrect interpretation. One case
returning to "common," Greek in contrast to the more literary Alth. Greek. Her other
from two early grammarians, that the verb is "course," apparently failing to realize that they are
many interpretations of this verb is an refinement for a sexual connotation. She refers to statements
Kroeger is one of many who argue for a negative connotation for authentically. Among her

authority the meaning is basically neutral.

the TSG computer program indicates that the basic connotations are the same. When referring to
of the standard lexicon, the instances mentioned in various studies, and the occurrences listed in
conclusions relationship and inference the verb is used to describe push or conclusive authority.

Page 54 lists several untenable arguments, claims that the context of this passage refers to a most important document, and prefers the interpretation of authority and exercise of authority, perhaps the early occurrence in a papyrus dated 2726 B.C. (BEY 1298). He feels that it is perhaps the case that the verb a"e\mu\upsilon\nu\omicron\alpha\upsilon\nu means "to misunderstand" and to another

Knights also refers to an instance where the verb clearly means "to misunderstand." It regards a"e\mu\upsilon\nu as positive and not negative.

Wrong to be against those described by a"e\mu\upsilon\nu. Therefore, the author of the statement definitely context is positive or neutral rather than negative since the tone of the passage implies that he is in instance of the verb. Concerning the basic issue, the form a"e\mu\upsilon\nu, whether verb or noun, in this and the normal forms of the noun will not fit it seems beyond reasonable doubt that this is an improbable. Although several constructions of the verb will fit easily in this reconstructed text, it is doubtful that many noun forms can be made to fit. Since the verb seems to fit the context, in addition, this statement that this could well be a noun is highly possible. In addition, the verb a"e\mu\upsilon\nu. Therefore, he concludes that this cannot be used as evidence for the verb rather than the verb. Therefore, he concludes that this has been reconstructed and thus may be a noun.

Page objects that due to missing letters this text has been reconstructed and thus may be a noun. Conclusion that this instance refers to those who rule in a positive and commendable sense. Rhetorical, Her "sexual" interpretation of this instance is adequately refuted by Obumor. Knight refers to one instance by Philodemus which is apparently from this Papyrus a"e\mu\upsilon\nu. Therefore, he concludes that this instance refers to those in a sexual or Philodemus.

There are few external examples before or during the time of Timotheus of the verb.

Traditional and obvious meaning of the verb is...
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 construction. The second century occurrence in Plutarch’s Terence 1.13, later occurrences of the verb are later than 1 Tim. 2:12.88 (or positive) construction. The other external uses of the verb are later than 1 Tim. 2:12.88

The external uses of authenticated prior to and during the time of Paul consistently support a neutral reason to regard the verb in this document as having a neutral or positive tone. The evidence of a context he would describe his own actions by a verb which is negative in tone. There is definite his own actions by authenticated. 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 reference to the first but is somewhat psychologically in nature. The author of BCF 120 is describing the context and the actions of this individual are regarded as positive in nature. The second factor is context and the actions of this individual are regarded as positive in nature. The second factor is context in which is just and right by obtaining a payment which is proper due to a third party. The entire construction in BCF 120. The individual who is the subject of authenticated is attempting to do that which is not authenticated does not carry a negative nuance of authenticated do not stand up under examination. The meaning “men are concerned to prove the negative,” concerned passions are arguments to prove the negative,” concerned passions are arguments to prove the negative,” concerned passions are arguments to prove the negative.”
for an "inceptive" meaning for authenticated in the time of the New Testament. He asserts that
because the creation of a woman, which is not a man, she is somehow "authentic" in the meaning "inceptive," create, into a representation.

Yet when the verb is used in a positive or neutral sense in the construction of God and of
children (apparently uses the verb in the sense of "authentic" or "inceptive" rather than that it is
inceptive or "inceptive" when it refers to authority. The very few extant instances of these verbs have no evidence from any period for an inceptive meaning to have authority, but redefining and concluding, not only support the
meaning of "inceptive" but also exercise authority, exercise influence, etc. could easily have negated
that the verb itself has a negative construction. On the contrary, they imply, as one might expect,
these authorities. And many more positive or neutral uses for authenticated, they cannot be claiming
on. One of Kroeger's views is based on interpreting authenticated in the sense of "inceptive" or

Authenticated is not inceptive.

Authenticated all support a positive or neutral construction.

Authenticated in a given context just as any of the neutral English words, "rule," exercise authority,
that a verb meaning "inceptive," exercise authority, exercise influence, etc. could easily have negated
that the verb itself has a negative construction. On the contrary, they imply, as one might expect,
these authorities. And many more positive or neutral uses for authenticated, they cannot be claiming
on. One of Kroeger's views is based on interpreting authenticated in the sense of "inceptive" or

Authenticated is not inceptive.
and furnishes no support for a basically inceptive nuance for *authentic*. To say that *authentic* has
evidence for such a use of the noun or adjective. All the more, such use, even for the noun "risk of *"authority". There is no evidence for an inceptive nuance for *authentic*, nor is there clear
seem to be Pfr. 22:14:2 and D'S 16:16, neither of which appears to use the noun *authentic* as
difficult to know which statements of Josephus or Epistles are mean. The other two references
refers to Josephus, Diedouros of Sicily, Epistles and Rophtus. Since she gives no references it is
referred to earlier, is impossible in the context and supported by few (if any) interpreters. She also
of the noun, none of which is definitely inceptive. Finally, her interpretation of Mt 11:26,
several of her interpretations, she gives no evidence from the text but relies only to a few uses.
Although Krogager depends on an inceptive meaning for *authentic* such as "create, originate" for
sense of primary or authoritative (common nouns of the root *authent*), not in an inceptive sense.
this process nothing regarding the verb, and with respect to the adjective means "primary" in the
particularly in Pauline’s day. Although LXX gives "originate" as a meaning for the adjective *authentikos*.
interprets in the verb and it is improbable as a meaning for any of the external occurrences.
Analysis of *authentikos* reveals that an inceptive idea such as "originate" is not
authoritative. An analysis of *authentikos* reveals that an inceptive idea such as "originate" is not
The standard lexicons BDAG, IDT and PGEL give no such meaning as "originate" for

evidence for the assertion that *authentic* is basically inceptive.

charge", "originate", "create", "not *existent* in one self will in 1 Th, 2:12. Likewise, provides no
charge", "originate", "create", "not *existent* in one self will in 1 Th, 2:12. Likewise, provides no
charge", "originate", "create", "not *existent* in one self will in 1 Th, 2:12. Likewise, provides no
charge", "originate", "create", "not *existent* in one self will in 1 Th, 2:12. Likewise, provides no
In addition, though deduction may be based on some unusual combination of
"take charge" implies anything referring to the way the action took place, much less that it is self-
meaning in any case. Thus deduction suffers also from a logical problem. Neither "original" nor
first from the fact that "take charge" is at best a rare use of "authority" and "original" is not the
drawn that authority determines the "way authority is viewed" and that is by self-iteration. If
The deduction that from the two ideas "take charge" and "original" the conclusion may be
New Testament times were "take charge" or "original".

In illustration for the idea that authority is basically incapable of that the two primary meanings in
ideas lies in the context and the point less rather than in the verb authority. There is no
idea lies in the context and the Greek construction. In the other occurrences any incapable
authority that here from the context and the Greek construction. In the other occurrences any incapable
possessed. Any idea of "initiating" the exercise of authority (incapable) comes not from the verb
antecedent authority, since the person is regarded by another to exercise authority over
not previously possessed, not does it refer to an improper gaining of authority, partially to "self-
BEV 10:33, does not imply "take charge" or "assume authority" in the sense of gaining
the first, of which are this century A.D. and therefore much later than New Testament times. The first
charge". One occurrence is listed by ISJ and two additional occurrences are given by Kühnelt. All
these are few occurrences of authority which are offered as evidence for the meaning "take
although it may stress the attribution of the act of authority it does not exclude the conclusion
idea of "original" or "author" as primary or authority. Likewise, other alleged primary meaning
"author" in words of the authority part comes not from any inherent incapable idea but from the
"author" in order to "create" and has no other implication. However, the idea of "original" or
"I feel" alleged primary meaning, "original", implies nothing regarding authority. If means

An incapable nuance is contrary to the evidence. To say that it is a primary use in New Testament
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does not make sense. Neither of Liebelt's proposed primary meanings, "for authorized in New anywhere as a meaning for authorized, but is impounded into the context, since "officially" optionally
meaning "to represent oneself as an official" is not the same as "to officialize" nor is it to be found.
meaning "to translate authorized by "officialize" but by "represent oneself as the officializer." The
alleged meaning, "officialize," reduces it is not plausible. In order to have a sensible translation the
peremptory woman to teach not to represent herself as the officializer or source of man "upon the
officialize (creàte) a man." Kreeger, who attempts to build her unusual translation, "I do not
of authority? Is it at all probable that Paul mean "I do not permit a woman to teach not
merely deals with the implication of the relationship but is primarily concerned with the exercise
not permit a woman to teach not take charge of a man," where "take charge" is incapable and
not permit a woman to teach not take charge of a man. "neither "take charge of a man." The
The crux of the matter of course is 1 Tim 2:12. Is it all possible that Paul mean "I do
authority means "self-assertion of authority."
"officialize" is a basic use of authorized, not does either meaning lead to the conclusion that
result in the conclusion that it means "witty spirit or summer spirit." Neither "take charge" or
authority." The word "prefer" means "wink" and it also means "spirit." However, this does not
authoritative. However, from this it cannot be deduced that authorized has the meaning to "assertable
authority." However, from this it cannot be deduced that authorized has the meaning to "assertable
authoritative definition means "to murder" in some contexts, and in others if means "to execute
either "officialize" or "take charge." If cannot mean a selective combination of the two. The verb
procedure. Even if Liebel's alleged meanings for authorized were reliable the verb would mean
only is this based on improbable meanings for authorized, but it is a hypothesis that plausible
must be deriving the authority aspect from "take charge" and the "self," aspect from "officialize." Not
meanings, "take charge of "officialize" can in itself mean "self-assertion of authority." In Lidgett
indication of whether the authority is authoritative or self-asserted. Since neither one of these two
and therefore can have no nuance of self-assertion of authority, and "take charge" gives no
the two ideas "officialize" and "take charge." Since "officialize" denotes nothing regarding authority
principle to be observed today, or in an attempt to restrict its application only to the church. Other attempts to restrict the meaning of the verse center in a denial that it is a universal

The Prohibition is Universal

of I Tim. 2:12, which considers only the prohibition of a woman's actions with regard to men.

construction in I Tim. 2:12 is a heading. This is not only incorrect but will not fit the context.

Some have tried to incorporate these meanings with the incorrect opinion that the

prohibition of authority. These claims are borne out by the evidence not only by the evidence of I Tim. 2:12 in a negative way, such as "self-chained and meaner" have been

Although certain neutral ideas such as "theft," "elicit," and "take charge" have been

evidence to contradict this conclusion.

A study of the use of authority provided by the TLG computer program no

under scrutiny. A study of the use of authority provided by the TLG computer program no

and not from the verb itself. None of the arguments for a basically negative conclusion hold up

for authority in New Testament times and later. Any negative conclusion comes from the context

All of the evidence supports a neutral meaning, "to exercise authority," as the basic meaning

Conclusions

authority by a woman is only prohibited if it is over men.

claim of authority, and it is even more unreasonable to suppose that an unwarranted claim of

unreasonable to think that Paul would prohibit only women from a self-aggrandizement of unwarranted

context, not from the verb itself. The context of I Tim. 2:12 is negative such a meaning. It is

Since there are numerous other meanings for authority, this category can only be derived from the

on one's own authority." However, these are not necessarily unwarranted authority and are rare.

"It does not refer to occurrences of authority under the category "authorize authority," but

2:12, nor is Kroeger's view possible.

I Tim. 2:12 means that "take charge" (in an inclusive sense) or "of itself." At I Tim.
A universal principle may apply to a specific situation only if a prohibition of domineering teaching can hardly be considered as applicable only in Ephesians. The force of the verse proceeds without consideration of the result. Even to regard the verse as universal is insufficient to domineering teaching. Only in Ephesians, and perhaps further in Titus 2.3-5, is there any direct prohibition of teaching. The force of the verse is to prohibit, but it also recognizes the prohibited practice as already existing. Only if the prohibition of domineering teaching is applied to Ephesians, and perhaps further, is there any direct prohibition of teaching. Otherwise, the prohibition is only a prohibition of teaching. In Ephesians, the prohibition is not applicable to the teaching of women and children. Therefore, the prohibition is not applicable to teaching. However, the prohibition is applicable to a prohibitory requirement only in Ephesians.
There is no logical correlation between "domestic" issues and false teaching. In addition, there is no logical reason why the fact that a 15 is "domestic" in any way connects it with false teaching, or "domestic" is hardly a rare insight and is not of several of the proposed views for a 15. To regard a 15 as to the statements in vy 11.1-14, and its interpretation will not affect 12. To regard a 15 as concerning false teaching by the woman? However, a 15 is merely a mollifying contradiction that if it refers to a "domestic" issue. He then somehow argues that since it is domestic, 2:12. Schoeller, for example, argues that a 15 is crucial to the meaning of 1 Tim 2:1, and to teach false doctrine, not do their statements show any connection of this concept with 1 Tim 2:12, and so forth. None of their evidence supports the fact that the woman were involved in attempts between 1 Tim 2:12 and their allegation that this verse applies to women involved in false teaching despite numerous pages of discussion, their "fossils" are irrelevant and show no logical correlation between the two. And Schoeller all present this position. It is one of the key points in their overall argument, Payne and Schoeller all present this position. It is one of the key points, and except the falsification, referring to and except the falsification, referring to is a fact without giving any evidence for it. Kreeger's implication of his in the verse, passages; connect, or in the epistle itself, this view is both logically and that 1 Tim 2:12 prohibits only this. Apart from the fact that there is not the slightest popular to feminism is the allegation that the woman in Ephesians are involved in false teaching in itself sufficient thereby, opening the door for a woman to engage in any ministry. A concept proposed feminist interpretations hope to assert, but this in no way limits its universal applicability. Most of the specific church addressed, but this in no way limits its universal applicability. Most of the discussion in 1 Tim 2:12 certainly applies of the flesh, in action with universal ramifications. The problem in 1 Tim 2:12 certain applies of the flesh. An incident on a specific incident. The reasons for the prohibition are from the Genesis account reference only to a specific incident. The verse deals with men and women in a gender sense rather than with statements is universal. The verse deals with men and women in a gender sense rather than with the prohibition itself (for example: are any specific restrictions stated? and the reasons, if any, given). The only way to determine the universality of non-universality of a prohibition is by
mollifying statement. 1 Tim. 2:12 occurs in a different and logical discussion of the absence of women from church leadership. This last verse is not part of the argument, but an additional statement. (v. 15), that despite Eve's actions, which have affected women universally, the woman will not be saved in child-bearing. This last verse is not part of the argument, with the exception of some disagreement about the woman's role in creating Adam, which leads to the conclusion, "This is supported by reference to the prior creation of Adam and to the deception of Eve." Paul adds an additional verse that becomes more specific in v. 11, where the woman is to learn in silence, in all subjection, property with good works, and to be silent (v. 9-11). This differentiation in roles continues, highlighting the role of men who are to lead everywhere and women who are to adorn themselves, between men and women in the body of Christ. The verse beginning the paragraph (v. 8) discusses some basic differences or relationships between men and women in the body of Christ.

The context is universal in nature.

The verse in its own passage is also exceptionally tolls (or shown as "agreed") to be part of the literary context of universal. Not only is it exceptional tolls to be part of a literary context apart from evidence, but also apparent that the proposition that the proposition is local rather than universal. Even if it refers to a specific ritual activity allowing women to teach, there are other verses due to the fact that women are allowed to teach or have authority over men. This is what respect to mean. If this verse refers to any false teaching or heresy in Ephesus, it is only highlighted with regard to mean. False teaching will not be the only issue is that women are prohibited with allowed to teach false doctrine to women and children. Only women are prohibited and that only also prohibited (but they are only prohibited from teaching men). Women alone prohibited, which would not be true if false teaching were involved (men would be prohibited from false teaching, but from teaching and having authority over men. Not only are women involved in false teaching at Ephesus, the verse itself precludes this view. The woman are to the fact that there is no information in the verse or passage of the idea that v. 12 refers to
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 hierarchical 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, particularly 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: "Do not permit (epitrapeō)." 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 epitrapeō 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." Payne makes similar observations. 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 epitrapeō "particularly in the first person
singular present indicative active usually does not refer to a continuing state..." is less
with Paul as the subject. Are the principles revealed in these verses only for those in Ephesus in
passage to the same church, in I Tim 2:1, 8 the first word in each verse is a present tense verb
(even in response to specific problems) where the principle applies to all Christians. In this same
relationship of men and women? There are numerous instances where Paul makes statements
specific instance, are not to permit, and does not refer to his own General approach to the
specific situation. says "I do not permit" he actually means "you in another city", only in this
the specific situation, says "I do not permit" he actually means "you in another city", only in this
situation, says "I do not permit" he actually means "you in another city", only in this
situation, says "I do not permit" he actually means "you in another city", only in this
specific circumstances, it must be a universally true principle for the church.

was a general principle at the time concerning the relationship of men and women, regardless of
but that it implies Paul's General principle at the time regardless of any specific situation. Since it
missed the point. However, the issue is not that the term ἀνθρώπου, in itself, implies permanence,
al though they are written to a specific situation, they are universally true. Paradise has completely
destroyed Paradise forever, since they are the present indicative active first person singular and
disappear apply only to a specific situation at that particular time in Corinth. Those verses, in fact,
which he definitely implies. Are we to actually believe that all these verses on marriage and
that these verses from Corinthians are only for Corinth and not permanently valid or universal.
is only for Ephesus and not universal since it also uses the same tense, voice, etc., logically requires
Cor. 7:6, 7, 8, 12, 17, 22, 26, 28, 29, 32, 35, 40-8. His attempt to use this to prove that I Tim 2:12
only gives his own personal advice when he uses the first person singular present indicative in 1
commendations. This is a serious misunderstanding of the passage. He also argues that Paul was
only Paul's advice, to be differentiated with regard to validity and permanence from the Lord's
fact, is potentially dangerous. He implies that Paul's statements in 1 Cor. 7:6, 10, 12, 25, 40 are
no tense, mood, voice, or person implies. Therefore, most of his discussion is irrelevant, some, in
the NT, XX). Further, he apparently means "continuing" in the sense of permanent, an aspect which
impressive when one finds out that I Tim 2:12 is the only occurrence of this form in Biblical Greek
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The context and argument of 1 Tim 2:13, 14 give us the first support of the prohibition in v. 12 the fact that Adam was created universal or specific. The details of the context reveal that the principle is to be taken universal or specific. The text of selection in itself, has no logical bearing on whether or not the issue is to the issue, the fact of selection, in itself, has no logical bearing on whether or not the issue is to support the statement. There would be no reason to mention other details which do not relate to the statement: Paul has selected these specific details from the Genesis account of the Fall which accounts for the use from Genesis 3. What would be the purpose of reproducing the entire statement he uses from Genesis? The reason for the prohibition in v. 12 is not universal or universal since Paul is selective in several ways. Scholar agrees that 1 Tim 2:12 is not literal since Paul is selective in the reason for the prohibition in v. 12. The rather obvious argument has been developed in revealed by the fact that rather than local circumstances, the example of Adam and Eve is given.

The reason is not a special principle rather than a specific local instance is also

The reasons are universal

exercise any authority over any man.

It must apply whenever any woman attempts to do any teaching or teaching of erroneous teaching or erroneous authority, since the prohibition only applies to women with teaching or exercising authority are in view. If any woman is shown that the passage cannot practice another that makes it to mean that, the issue is whether there are both men and women, and whenever the principle is phrased and wherever there are both men and women, and whenever the statement itself is given without any restrictions or limitations or specifications. The only specifications of other churches.

states "do not . . . She shall master something that is not related to his own practice or to the expected practice of other churches. What Paul fails is to show and is really necessary for his argument is that although Paul suggests, what Paul looks to apply is that Paul expects to apply to other a specific situation and are not principles followed by Paul or not expected to apply to other
under Gen 3:16. Only women in Christ, and those only while engaged in church activities would
Christ, so that they do not apply to believers, would still have all women who are not in Christ
curses pronounced. The allegation that the results of the Fall, listed in Gen 3:16, are removed in
passages, but is contrary to the Genesis passage. Instead, which presents God as the cause for the
women under the OT Law were to be in subjection, is contrary not only to Paul’s use of the
women in 1 Tim 2:13, but is even more obvious.

Even more obvious.

That the confusion, “can joining these verses is a causal confusion makes this relationship
is, according to Genesis, a primary reason for the universal, immune subordination relationship. The
not applicable to the context. The women’s conduct in the Fall, referred to in 1 Tim 2:13, 14,
and Eve’s actions, which resulted in her submission to man, a local or temporary situation is
Paul uses as argument for the prohibition, that universal principle that man has authority over the woman.
result of Eve’s disobedience is the universal principle that man has authority over the woman.
that women bear children in pain relate only to those involved in false teaching in Ephesus. The
pronouncement in the woman. Does the fact that man must “eat the fruit of his brow” and
pronouncement in the woman, deal with submission (have authority) over her. The two sentences God pronounces on the woman deal with subjection
and with child bearing, the same issue referred to in 1 Tim 2:13-15. Just as the sentences passed
that she will bear children in pain, that her desire will be to her husband, and that he will rule
This is specifically referred to in 1 Tim 2:14. As a result of Eve’s actions, God tells her (Gen 3:16)
account in Genesis describes how Satan deceived Eve and she in turn involved Adam in her sin.
The rest of Paul’s “selected” argument relates to the woman’s conduct in the Fall. The
authoritative. It does not have any bearing on a restriction of some otherwise sinful activity.
context the statement that Adam was “formed first” can only relate to the issue of priority or
2:11-14 relates to the authoritative or hierarchical relationship between men and women. In such
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is not using "explanatory" in the same sense meant by the grammarians, so that his reliance on
explanation of his "explanatory" interpretation shows that it is actually causal. Payne, in any case,
only must import the idea of causal teaching into his explanation; but as Miao points out, the
relevant view is a mentioned earlier, is not really explanatory but causal. Payne's explanation not
so awkward that they show the improbability of such a use in this verse. Scholars' explanation
are demanded here. The attempts, however, to explain the "explanatory" use of γὰρ in this passage are
the relationship of the concepts in 1 Tim 2:11-14 is so clearly interpretative that the causal use is
particularly when the causal or illogical use is common to Paul, the "explanatory" use is rare and
there is such a use of γὰρ. There must be some evidence that this is the case in this instance.
If it is not enough to argue that γὰρ in this passage is "explanatory" merely on the basis that

use of γὰρ is causal.

adequately reduced by Miao. The "explanatory" γὰρ is rare in the Pauline epistles. Paul's "normal"
appropriately interpreted by Miao. The explanation, however, the explanatory rationale for some statements is really causal
in this context. Payne claims that the γὰρ in v 13 is explanatory rather than causal. Scholar
were no contradiction. Since γὰρ common causal in an illogical sense there can be no question
"for" is not illogical in this verse. However, the relationship is clearly causal or illogical even if there
Another attempt to nullify the force of this as a universal prohibition is to argue that γὰρ,
dic. The results of the Fall, including the woman's subjection to man, are universally still in effect.
beliefs. Christian men still bear children in pain and childbirths in tears. Both men and women, still
death. Christian men still must work. Thorns and thistles still grow in gardens, even those of
virulent affront, since none of the temporal results of the Fall have been crossed by Christ's
well as disagreeing with numerous statements of both the OT and NT. It is also a theologically
be excluded. In addition, such a position is denying the validity of the argument of 1 Tim 2:14 as
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Together with the order of creation, the hierarchical relationship between man and woman, just as the prohibition is reflecting Eve's example, but that Eve's action is one of the primary reasons, Paul does not argue that fall, and does not refer to other actions of Eve or women in general. However, he misses the fact that this verse refers specifically to Eve in one instance, the outlook. Nevertheless, the perspective that this verse refers specifically to Eve in one instance, the "uncanny" possibility that women are by nature decedent in a way that men are not. This scholar states an additional argument that if I Th. 2:11, 12 is irrelevant, one is faced with Testament contexts.

Testament contexts. Prohibition at other than an "anthropological norm" is to ignore both the Old Testament and New Testament contexts. The prohibition is the order of creation and her deception and actions in the fall. To view this sentence prohibition is the order of creation and her deception and actions in the fall. That is exactly the relationship in I Th. 2:11-15, whereas the reason for her supplication and the context. The woman's deception was one reason for the woman's supplication in the men (Gen. 3:15).

He also ignored the obvious relationship which is revealed in the Old Testament in general. He has ignored the obvious relationship which is revealed in the Old Testament argues that "nothing in I Th. 2:11-15 contraposes from Eve's deception to the nature of woman". The statement that Adam was first formed can only relate as universal principle. Paying ignore the improbable in a context concerning supplication that it should be taken in some other way. The reason for Paul's prohibition, but this means that the relationship is causal of nature.

To take these verses as an explanatory addition is to ignore Paul's normal use of γὰρ, to explain nothing in these verses other than explaining the reason for Paul's prohibition, but this means that the relationship is causal of nature.

I Th. 2:12 which they are connected by γὰρ? They explain nothing in these verses other than explaining Robertson is illusory. '99 If γὰρ in v. 13 is explanatory, then what do v. 13, 14 explain in v. 11.
Neither can this verse be confined only to the assembly on the idea that the prohibition is
and women, nor merely from that over men
to the assembly, the woman would be prohibited from all teaching and authority over both men
assembly or an official leadership position in the church. If this verse referred specifically, or only
the woman would be teaching and having authority over both men and women, such as the
only prohibitive teaching or having authority over men, it cannot refer only to a situation where
issue. She is not prohibited from teaching or exercising authority over women. Since the verse
assembly, the woman is prohibited from teaching or having authority over a man. This is the
is impossible to give precedence to the details of the passage and at the same time restrict it to the
I Tim 2:12 says nothing to imply that its application is restricted only to the assembly. If
The verse precluded such a restriction.

According to this view has a very restricted application
in other groups, such as Sunday School classes, seminar classes, Bible studies, etc. The prohibition
assembly of believers, such as the Sunday service. They would not apply Paul’s prohibition
some, while recognizing that I Tim 2:12 is a general principle, restrict its application only

Does I Timothy Apply to the Assembly Only?

Results of the order of creation and the woman’s deception are universal, not local.
compromised, or wrongful conduct, but relate to an anthropological norm or universal principle. The
reformist, the result of authority. The two aspects from the Genesis account do not relate only to some
contrast with each other. The arguments from the order of creation and the woman’s deception both
submissive spirit (as stated in the preceding verse and as stated again at the end of v. 12). It is not
The practice prohibited in I Tim 2:12 is obviously in contrast to learning in silence (or a
as Adam’s one act has extended to all humanity, so Eve’s one act has affected all women.
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effect. A standard argument for this circumstantial view is that the context deals with church
application. To restrict this only to the assembly there must be some specific evidence in this
situation. The sections of the verse and the immediate context are again a narrower
interpretation of the principle in the passage show that the prohibition itself is not restricted
no strict limitations of the principle. It is based in the fall of Adam and Eve, and the fact that these are
universal prohibitions. Although it may be used with reference to a specific activity in Ephesians, the
surrounding context has already been given to show that the prohibition in 1 Tim. 2:12 is a

The General Perspective

Implication that 1 Tim. 2:12 is restricted only to the assembly.

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

The Immediate Context

Gender:

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

The General context of I Tim 2:12

concerns are all contrary to any confinement of I Tim 2:12 to the assembly only of the immediate context, and general

concern only in the assembly? Obviously, neither the purpose of the book nor I Tim 3:15 restrict

windows to marry and bear children. Timothy to drink wine, slavish to obey, and Christians to be

impeccable to other Christian workers. Is it permissible to rebuke elders (3:1, 2) except in the

example (4:4) are definitely not restricted to the assembly, nor are these instructions

example (6:1-16) are definitely not restricted to the assembly, nor are these instructions

restricted to the assembly? The instructions to Timothy (4:4-6:11) and the admonition to be an

restricted in their functions only to the assembly, not in the assembly is the accessibility of marriage and mean

Elders and deacons (3:1-13) are not not restricted to the assembly, nor does I Tim 2:12 apply only in the assembly. The need for correct doctrine (1:3-11) is not restricted to the

There are numerous statements in the epistle which are neither specifically for the assembly

restricted to the assembly by the purpose of the epistle. The entire epistle is contrary to such a

prohibitions used within the epistle. Is there any indication that the truths of I Timothy are

necessarily limit the overall meaning and extend of application of universal principles of

it is also improbable that I Tim 3:15 refers specifically to the assembly, not does the purpose of

in the "house of God." However, it is debatable that I Tim 2:12 states the purpose of the

guess the purpose of the book. Therefore, it is concluded that I Tim 2:12 is restricted to conduct

worship "and that I Tim 3:15, that you may know how to conduct yourself in the house of God."
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any reference to an assembly or some official meeting which differs from other groups of saints.

Heb 2:2.3 3 In 6.10). Even some of these do not necessarily mean "the official assembly." The

The word "church" (ekklesia) is also used 114 times. In only eleven of these is it possible

not imply in any way that they are "assembled.

rather than to an "assembled." The "house of God" in 1 Tim. 3:15 refers to the believers and does

The same term, "house of God," occurs in Heb 10:21 referring to the church universal


are I Tim 5:4, Tit 1:1, and Heb 11:7. In particular the concept of "the house of God" can be

Deut. of Corinthisis). In this very chapter it is used in this way in 1 Tim. 3:4. Other examples

or extended family, that is, to refer to the people in the group (such as the house of Israel) or

not the meaning here. It is often used to refer to someone's household in the sense of the family

equivalent to the Sunday service. Over sixty times it refers to a literal building which is definitely

Other "house" occurs 114 times in the New Testament. In no other case is it used as

against taking this as only applicable to the "official assembly." It

"pillar and ground of the truth. Not only is this unlikely but as just shown, the epistle itself is

this verse would also mean only the Sunday Worship Service, and the Sunday service would be the

assembly, in the sense of the Sunday Worship Service. Then, "church" or "assembly" (ekklesia) in

rather than the local group of believers, then "house (oikos) of God" in this verse must mean the

are repeated, and the overall concern of the book agrees. If 1 Tim 3:15 refers only to the assembly

of the book. Not only at the beginning, but in 1 Tim. 2:2, 6:14, 6:20 the same concepts and terms

that it refers to the "official" assembly only, if at all). 1 Tim 3:5, 18 occurs to state the purpose

If is questionable that 1 Tim. 3:15 states the purpose of the book, but even more doubtful

The purpose of 1 Tim. 3:15 is not restricted.
exclude her from this in the assembly. According to this logic it is not wrong for a woman to
behead and have authority in general, including at the highest level, and yet for some reason
woman, yet would allow her to reach at a higher level? Whal strange view of women would allow
believers. Whal strange, sacramental or literalistic view of the "assembly" rules would produce
that she may teach those who will teach the believers, but is herself forbidden from teaching the
leaders in a school or seminary teaching the leaders of the church. It is inconsistent to hold
where she would be teaching the average Christian, but to allow her to teach at the highest level
logically inconsistent to argue that 1 Tim 2:12 prohibits a woman from teaching in the assembly
concluded that she can teach those who are the very leaders of the church in a seminary. It is
conceded that she can teach those who are the very leaders of the church in a seminary. But of
reach or have authority over any men in the assembly, then by what form of logic can it be
is where in attempting to restrict it only to the assembly. For example, if women are forbidden to
be even in the assembly, or only in the assembly. Yet if it is a general principle, then when logic
the general principle that the woman is subject to the man, then what is the reason for restricting
if the prohibition against women teaching or exercising authority over men is not based on

legal objections to such a restriction

as 1 Tim 1:3-5, etc.

understood in this sense the verse This well with the purpose expressed in verses, such
assembly. It does not specifically refer to any
it refers to "believers", apart from any implication of an "assembly". I Tim 3:15 makes clear that Timothy
of the truth" to refer this verse only to one official meeting, such as the Sunday service. Rather,
of God" the use of "church," and contrary to the facts that it is described as the "pillar and ground
and ground of the truth" is contrary to the evidence derived from a study of the use of "house
since I, Tim 3:15, the term "church", is equivalent to "the house of God" and is "the pillar
believers in general rather than to an assembly.

The equation of this term and the term "house of God" in I Tim 3:15 requires that this refers to
Is it reasonable to hold that the subordinate position of women only applied for one meeting per assembly or would allow them to teach men in other sessions, for example, at the school of Tyransus? Is it likely that Paul disallowed the authority of teaching by women only during this one weekly assembly, so that these restrictions can be neglected in other gatherings, such as classes, etc.? Is it to be ordered, then, that a special edifying and the other restrictions in 1 Corinthians 14 apply only to (in a seminary chapel)? Do the statements specifically directed to the assembly that the assembly "the assembly" so that they can be dispensed with if a group holds the Lords Supper elsewhere to other gatherings? Do the principles Paul states regarding the Lords Supper apply only during the assembly? There is no evidence that Paul had rules for one gathering of the saints do not apply to believers. Is there any evidence that Paul had rules that do not apply to other gatherings? Local church assembly which has special rules that do not apply to other activities and gatherings and the assumptions involved in such a view. This view assumes that the Bible describes a special situation in such a view. It will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assembly? If so, it will be helpful to note some logical questions if so very narrow situation -- the assemble
The verse does discuss the different roles of men and women in general. The immediately preceding verse (v. 11) commands women (not men, nor everyone) to "remain in silence in all assemblies, and that they teach and exhort, but not in public." The clear meaning must be stressed.

This verse, 1 Tim 2:12, is clear and remarkably devoid of exegetical difficulty. It is internally consistent and makes good sense, and is appropriate in the context when the argument, context, syntax, and vocabulary are read 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.

The normal interpretational procedure, according to the church assembly, is contrary to the context, the assembly. To restrict this prohibition only to the church assembly is contrary to the entire passage and Paul's argument. 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, which it covers. The entire passage and Paul's argument show that this "assembly," finally, even if the verse could be shown to be directed to a specific situation in the assembly, is contrary to such a view since there is little, if any, of the book which applies only 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 to the assembly, since the other New Testament writings, apart from specific statements to that effect, apply only to the assembly. How could this be without pedantry? Why is this restriction applicable in the general assembly if it does not apply in general? How many principles and commands are there in the General Assembly which are not applicable in the General Assembly?
was teaching them as one having authority. This is describing the fact that Jesus taught on His
grounded with leaders in Eph 4:11. In Matt 7:29 the verb "dikaiosko" is used in the statement "He
I:3:14), Teachers are next to apostles and prophets as leaders in the church (1 Cor 12:28) and are
His disciples that normally a teacher and master does not wash the feet of His followers, (John
practises say "Teacher, ennounce your students" (Luke 19:39). In the upper room Jesus reminded
12:13 addresses Jesus as "teacher" and says "tell my brother to divide the inheritance with me," The
Jesus as "teacher" and asks Jesus to tell them what they should do. One of the crowd in Luke
of student and teacher is that of servant and master. Once in the gospels someone addresses
is authoritative in an authoritative relationship. In Matt 10:24, 25 Jesus parallels the relationship
who instructs another, particularly in aspects where the student is expected to obey the concepts.
only obliquely has such a concentration in this context. The verb "renounce" has this nuance. One
Although some have attempted to direct "dikaiosko," "teach" or any aspect of authority is not
practice

of negative authority or teaching is contrary to the verse which restricts only women from this
including the parts. The factor common to both "dikaiosko" and "renounce" is authority. Any idea
normally joins two or more concepts which bear some common factor relating to an overall concept
prohibited. Paul prohibits both teaching and having authority. Only in this type of construction
authority over," is definitely against the concept that only teaching of "authoritative teaching" is
The force of the conjunction "dikaiosko...and renounce," "teach...and authority," to teach, not to have
follow this procedure. It is definitely stated as a universally true prohibition.
prohibition by two universally true arguments from Genesis, and clearly expecta Timothy to also
Teach not have authority over a man (any man), Paul himself, follows this principle, supports the
the woman is to be in subjection. Paul states that he does not permit a woman (any woman) to
It is clear that the verse concerns the authoritative relationship between men and women, and that
subjection." The prohibition of the verse itself, ends with this same concept, "to be in silence"
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cannot have authority, then why go against the plain meaning of the passage and say this does not

is she prohibited? If she can have authority over a man then why prohibitive teaching? Yet, if she

is not prohibited from teaching a man on the basis of authority and submission, then what basis

prohibitive teaching because otherwise she is not in submission. The issue is authority. If she

prohibitive from teaching because the woman is submissive to the man, then she is not overall

concerned prohibitive authority. It is clear from the passage itself that the woman is not

way. There is no reason why Paul cannot prohibitive teaching as contrary to submission and add the

conclusion that this means to authority, especially in the case of submission and full submission, which clearly

parallels (Israel's) teaching and full submission. However, the other is not the evidence of the conclusion. It is not

apparent in this verse. There is no logical reason why his argument that "sublime learning" is not

normal use. Hurley and others argue for the meaning, in 1 Tim 2:12, "to authority" versus 99

culture which taken with the of the overall issue under discussion. Despite this

items function as modality restricting the scope of the other; rather, each aspect functions as an

prohibition of teaching. The construction with and is never used in a way which has one of the

in this verse function as an independent entity which is prohibited in addition to the

The verb authoritative, as we have seen, means "to exercise authority" or "to have authority." The verb relationship, contrary to the parallel with authoritative, and contrary to human experience.

contrary to the normal meaning of the verb, contrary to the context which is discussing authority-

(1 Cor 4:17). To deny that authority is involved in the use of the verb didasko in 1 Tim 2:12 is

is the issue. Paul expects obedience when he says "Just as I teach everywhere in all the churches

John 9:3:4 the religious teachers say to Jesus "Are you teaching us?" clearly indicating that authority

as they were taught" (Matt 28:20) and "teaching them to obey" (Matt 28:20) imply authority. In

authority or representatives authority, authority is involved in teaching. Such expressions as "they did

own authority rather than on the authority of the Rabbi. This shows that the teacher is an
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Some scholars that this verse refers to women who are not properly instructed. A somewhat

**Miscellaneous Interpretations**

There are no statements restricting this to any official meeting or official role. The verse gives no

limitations other than the statement that a woman is prohibited from this action with respect to

natural contrast with teaching and is a common meaning of the term. The verse gives no

submissive spirit. The restriction from a role of authority is equally clear. "Silence" seems a

obedient authority over a man. Whether speaking in 1 Tm 2:12 means "silence" or "quiet and

obedient authority," the verse prohibits women from exercising any kind of authority, including

excessed evidence. The verse prohibits women from exercising any kind of authority, including

obedient authority. She is to learn not teach. The concept, "authoritative teach," is contrary to the

other teachings. It is not appropriate to contrast the verse with authoritative teaching only and allow for

teaching, but any teaching. This is even more apparent if the contrast is to learn in silence versus

in 1 Tm 2:12, which contrasts with learning (in ignorance and all subjection) is not authoritative

in silence and in all subjection (1 Tm). This is again contrasted with the statement "to be silent"

out of construction, is the verse itself. The teaching and having authority is contrasted with learning

The final and convincing argument for the independence of authority in addition to the
authority over any group as long as her husband was not present; thus, she could be an elder as
prophesying wives over their own husbands? This verse would then allow a wife to teach or exercise
permissable of a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, what would be the reason for
wives would be present. Would such a verse refer to practices in private at home? If it were
husbands' such a prohibition could hardly apply to a public gathering where many husbands and
would with that the church should not allow wives to teach or exercise authority over their
apples to wives having authority over their husbands. It is somewhat implausible to think that Paul
Another attempt to eliminate a general application of this verse is the claim that if only
Scholar are based on an improper parallel.
of that day are mentioned in 1 Tim 2:12, therefore, the "cultural" allegations of Kroeger
specifics to convey the idea. No cultural specifics such as appropriate dress or teaching methods
is on social demeance, good works, etc., in contrast to Ignatian dressings. The Gold, plain, etc., are
"I likewise the stress with the woman
hands", but the emphasis is "why sprit from wrath . . . . Likewise the stress with the woman
are to pray everywhere apart from wrath and argument is not cultural. Perhaps "praying up the
hence, the "cultural" However, the verses in question (vv 8-10) are not basically cultural. The fact that one
in any case it cannot be assumed that all these are cultural all else in the passage is
cultural. If this verse does in fact prejudice wearing of these items, who is to say if it is only
dressed in gold, pearls, or costly garments is not followed by the church, therefore, the argument
Both R. Kroeger 106 and Scholer argue that the instruction that the woman is not to be
would still allow her no teaching or authority over men.
is no such thing as an official overseer of elder only over women and children. In any case it
overseer over men, but would allow her to be an official overseer over women. However, there
is also impossible for this verse. Thus would require the verse to say that she cannot be an official
Another view is that the woman is only prohibited from being an official overseer. For
women) would not be allowed to teach anyone. Such a view is not plausible,
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incorrect and abnormal interpretation of other passages in the New Testament. To argue that established in Genesis 3, the entire tenor of the Old Testament and the Gospel, and rests upon scripture does not teach such a concept elsewhere is to ignore the "anthropological norm" universal principle of the authority of the man in relation to the woman. To argue that the text or any other authority over a man, the issue from the context and argument is the text. If it would also be wrong for a man, when Paul states that he does not permit a woman to approach to vocabulary, syntax, argument and context a series of improbable "possibilities" (which are not really possible) in contrast to a normal during the history of the church is to hold a position contrary to the evidence, a position based on To interpret 1 Tim 2:12 in a sense other than the view which has been normally accepted.

Summary

A woman is a failure to grasp the biblical concepts on this subject. To even suppose that a single woman would be allowed to have authority denied to a married authority. The Bible would seem to give an authoritative preference to wives over single woman. Women are so ready to recognize married women to lower status in order to promote their own authority over husbands. This whole position is implausible. It is interesting how single, correct single woman could have authority over all husbands, by some strange logic wives could not have other wives, but not married men. Although wives could have authority over single men, and single women are traditionally rather than individually, then wives could teach single men, single woman, and wives especially in terms of issues and problems and the prohibition from Genesis, and apply to all men and women. If this referred to husbands and all husbands that husbands pray or that only wives have proper development. The reason for her own man. The same individuals are discussed in verses 8-15. Is it reasonable to think that specifically husbands and wives are in view. For example, it does not say "a woman is not to teach long as her husband was not in the church. The passage, however, says nothing to imply that
...and is subject to clear. To apply this to a specific church in any one instance is unusual. However, other explanations of 8a, which restrict the verse do not fit well. The present use of 13, as basically negative so that the verse is restricted when it makes perfect sense taken normally interpreted as neutral, although in some contexts it may be negative. Why this inclination to view the same may be said of 8b, the lexicon indicates that it would normally be restricted, when the normal meanings make perfect sense in the verse and passage.

In the position implied by a meaning, why then attempt to interpret it in this way so that the verse is restricted? Nothing in the lexicon, grammars, New Testament usage, context, or the syntax of 13 suggests that one function in this way, a fact which is borne out by a study of the New Testament no hint that one function this way, there is no mention of a verb equivalent to a Hendrickson. There is no use of one is well attested, there is no mention of a verb equivalent to a Hendrickson. There is a study of the standard lexicons and grammars shows that although an emphatic or intensive

Conclusion

be considered as "conservative" that it only prohibits a woman from holding the office of elder, and any or all of those views can from "authoritative teaching" others, that it only prohibits from preaching in the assemblies: others, modern secular sociological debate that some can argue that I Tim 2:12 only prohibits a woman from a "office of elder," and give it as the basis for this command to the church.

Paul states it as a practice of his and gives it as the basis for his command to the church. The universal argument and Genesis 3:16 show that the principle applies universally to a specific situation, not to an improper teaching or exercise of authority; not only is the evidence that they translated or exercised authority over men. I Tim 2:12 cannot be restricted only women in the New Testament exercised various ministries and were deacons is in no way incorrect and abnormal interpretation of other passages in the New Testament. To argue that established in Genesis, the entire tenor of the Old Testament and the Gospels, and rests upon
to a lawyer who is trying to avoid the scope of a law on the basis of technicalities.

than the accepted meaning, and this is not necessarily a universal principle, etc. This is similar
does not necessarily mean, and if that does not nullify the verse, then this word may other
denying the “normal” meaning. The “terminus” interpretation of I Thm 2:12 is similar to “this word
each aspect in an imponderable way often based on precarious evidence and all other means to
each sense and which fits his context when each aspect is read normally, and then to interpret
of the passage point in that direction. It is another situation entirely to take a verse which makes
one aspect of a verse in an unusual or imponderable way if all the other aspects and the argument
imagination in the verse. This verse is clear. If sometimes essential if a verse requires it, to take
consider, and which result in a host of pole of interpretation does not arise from any difficulty or
some of which are self-contradictory or internally inconsistent, none of which are defendable in the
verse to interpretation, many of which defy normal rules of interpretation.

This sets of imponderable interpretations, many of which defy normal rules of interpretation,
not are those any restrictions in the verse.

assembly. In the immediate context of I Thm 2:12 the statements are not for the assembly only,
assembly. In particular there are few if any statements in I Thm 2:12 which apply only to the
assembly. To the contrary the principles and prohibitions of the New Testament only to the

The anthropological norm established in Genesis 3.

universal aspect of the prohibition this well in the context, this well in scripture as a whole, and this
universal aspect of the prohibition is contrary to logic. Those views are promulgated despite the fact that the
support from the order of creation and the woman’s conduct in the Fall which resulted in her
authority and that only over men is illegal, to deny the universality of the prohibition when it is
action by a woman is inconsistent; to think that Paul would prohibish only women from some situations,

To deny the universal nature of the prohibition while arguing that it prohibishes only women is
so subtle and experience, yet the normal authoritative aspect this well in the verse.

but the normal meaning this well. To attempt to drive “each” of an authoritative aspect is foreign
cultural prejudice by such improbable interpretations of 1 Tim. 2:12.

Apostle Paul, as many do, of demonstrating his cultural prejudice in writing such verses, is more in the passage but in order to conform it with present sociological views. Rather than accepting the may be, even more crucial is the attempt to override the meaning of scripture, not due to anything is significant enough that the apostle Paul discussed it several times. However, as crucial as that exercising any other authority over a man. The question of the woman's role in the body of Christ or that it teaches what it obviously does not teach. 1 Tim. 2:12 excludes women from teaching or interpreter is not free to use his listener to create the impression that a clear verse is ambiguous. Each Christian can decide for himself whether to obey the Bible or not. However, an
8 To interpret Matt 1:19 as only referring to one very specific form of marriage, but

without other forms and local differences between the verse. Matt 2:43 is describing

the Hebrew view of 1 Tim 2:12.

This would be the meaning if Matt 2:13 were interpreted in an equivalent manner to the

6 BAG 591 lists this as an accepted meaning for one.

interpretational procedure, grammar, and logic.

on the grammar of this passage. His paper is flawed, however, in that it is contrary to normal

of the few exegetical attempts to discuss these issues. Very few give more than a passing comment

of Paul only discusses Pauline usage of one and only two-thirds of these. His paper is one


It is more accurate to say „neither night nor day„ which is essentially different.

3 Ibid., 1. 4 Payne's statement that one joins expressions such as „night in, day in, etc. is erroneous.

Theological Society Meeting in Alanta; Georgia on November 21, 1986. 4

2 Philip B. Payne, „One in 1 Thess 2:12, A paper presented at the Evangelical

1981 (201)

James R. Hughey, Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective (Grand Rapids: Zondervan Pub.)

END NOTES
peculiar one, since the actual description of the event indicates no crowd was involved until the
is not claiming in Acts 2:4:18 that he was not causing a托福of type of crowd in contrast to a
of acceptance is permissible. In none of these passages does one function as a handmaidens. Paul
other part, Acts 1:6:22 does not refer only to a "death" type of acceptance" but some other kind
way; Acts 8:21 hardly means that Simon does not have a "lot of part" but may have some
not mean that the world fails to behold the Holy Ghost in a knowing way but may in some other
construction to render the second clause as an adjective modifying the first clause. John 14:17 does
(Luke 8:17) can hardly be rendered as a handmaidens. It would make an extremely awkward
understand what is happening or even remember the reading of the five thousand.
Mark 4:42 understand what is happening or even remember the reading of the five thousand.
Rather than "do you not yet understand?" do you not understand or remember the five
10:1 In Matt. 16:9, Jesus asks the disciples, "do you not understand?" do you not understand
The verses are Matt. 5:15, 6:15, 7:18, 9:17, 10:24, 11:22, 16:10, 21:27, 32:22:6, 22:46, 23:14, Mark
concise (implies the opposite of the true meaning)
concepts (eliminates the second concept as an entity and use it to restrict the first
as many do in Tim 2:12) eliminate the second concept as an entity and use it to restrict the first
category. They are also consistent in the sense that taking these as handmaidens in the same sense
not merely one kind of these, 16:4:1, 18:4, 20:36, 23:15, John 1:13, 25, 6:24, 8:11, 11:50, 16:33
seem to intensify the overall concept which is common to both parts are: Matt 24:6, Luke 21:33
before not will it ever occur again. Other verses which clearly do not function as a handmaidens, but
the only one of his kind. Each part of the expression is necessary. This kind has not occurred
part to a specific type. Rather, it is intensifying the basic overall concept that this intimation is
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rather than any man. He received it from no flesh and blood, not even from the apostles.

available but the most knowledgeable. His point is that he received his information from God the apostles, but consulted no other Christians; that he garnered his information from everyone so that "flesh and blood" equals the apostles only. Can Paul be arguing that he carefully avoided flesh and blood not did I 1 or up to Jerusalem to the apostles, is not referring only to the apostles, is not consulting with 13:26-1:17 can hardly function as a page of interpretations in the statement. I did not consult with


which specifically states that other churches are involved, and changes the meaning of the first item, dominates a man in 1 Th 2:2 may specify the sort of teaching. It also nullifies the second part member in 1 Cor 11:6 may specify the context included in the less specific we, just as in to

2:12 argue often states his view in a way which brings the basic issue. If, as he says, the second

be idle in some other way.

as a hypothesis. 2 Pet 1:18 certainly does not mean believers will not be foolishly idle, but could

repetition of similar concepts is for emphases and reinforces the basic idea. It does not function to abandoningly forsake believers but will forsake in some other way. In each of these verses the

the normal routine. Heb 10:25 certainly does not mean that God did not pleasantly deserve the acoustic voices their complainer. Rather he means that there was no disturbance or upstaging or
Jesus, not the man who is a circumcision or the outside type of Jew on the outside. . . .

Like "not the man who is a circumcision or the outside type of Jew on the outside. . . .

The translation 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 LXX according to

others.

37 Moses Silva, Biblical Words and Their Meanings (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983) 35-31, and
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P.1 page argues that the crucial letters distinguishing between the verb and noun are missing.

Soibid. 9.

4.9 Paul, "Order", II.


47 Osburn, "Authentication", 5.


45 This is a common falling of "erroneous" exegesis. It does not deal with the grammatical facts.

March, 1879 (32).


42 Ridic, 232.

41 Ridic, 231.

Reconstructed text

construction which his context, rather than merely stating that there is doubt regarding this no more seem to lie in this context. It would be helpful if Payne would provide a reasonable non-Rapids: Zondervan, 1983, 9-14), but few seem to be of the proper length to lie in this text, and Testament beginning with an, J. H. Greven, V. New Testament Greek Morphology, Grand Testament vocabulary than classical Greek notice that Greven lists about 260 words in the New which will also fit this context. For a comparison, examining that the New Testament has a more Greek words beginning with an, there are not many beginning with an of approximately six letters several constructions of the verb fit easily. In addition, although there may be hundreds of where there is the root authority, a gap of two or three letters, and the ending sin. However, reconstructed by Studhans. No form of the nouns authority or authorities will fit in this instance the passive accurately the Greek phrase in question is sin autoritet/sin autoritetus (The text as hundreds of different words in Greek, "Paige, "Oude", I). Assuming that Knight has copied from the text, and the word it modifies has only the first two letters extant, an, letters which begin
Therefore their evidence is questionuble for the point at issue.

Many of these are ecclesiastical writers, often discussing and influenced by 1 Tim 2:12,

the fact that the preposition pros indicates nothing referring the ranking of the parties involved
authority ( comparative Psa, 10) not only overlooks pros with verbs of sending or leading, but falls due to
in fact, most often occurs in neutral contexts. His argument that none of the uses of pros implies
rather the verb provides the nuance. Pros with the accusative can occur in "friendly" contexts, and
(Acts 7:9, 110). The preposition does not give insight into the nuance of the verb as Payne implies,
indicates the nuance of pros, so that the "hostile" relationships occur with verbs of disfigure (BAG
accusative is in a hostile or friendly relationships. Not only the context, but in particular the verb
lesekon which Payne quotes for this evidence, states that one of the many nuance of pros and the
preposition pros used with the accusative implies a hostile relationship (Oude, 10). The very
chosen which Payne quotes for his evidence, states that one of the many nuance of pros and the
those substantiation would not be or possibly is completely unfounded. Payne also argues that the
in hour to get just the opposite. To anyone who has been in authority, the argument that
regarding suppository or substantiation. The expression "the hour" does not mean the other waited
(meaning, "case", implying nothing, however;

(\textit{Psa} 4, Oude, 10). The Greek verb 

44
146. 147) The two other occurrences:

70.71 ST 275 gives the meaning "take in hand," for the verb "authentic," Knauf ("authoritative".

King ordered the messengers and the inquiry described was to determine if this were so.

merely thought he was the instigator, this is not likely since there was a common suspicion that the
"leader." Although the passage in question (12, 1661) could be taken in the sense that many
ordered by the king to massacre a village, therefore, he was not the instigator, but the "door" of
idea is improbable. The second reference refers to a situation where the individual in question was
"leader," or "door." (ST 275 includes these as possible meanings for "authentic"). An imperative
number which are connected in any way with the situation. Those described by "authoritative" are either
those described by "authentic," who are not instigators. This group is connected with the total
69.3: The first although it mentions the instigator of the action, does so as only one of the


Authoritative." However, these are not basically imperative, but mean to act on one's own.

ST 275 gives a few occurrences of the verb under "Authoritative," not on one's own
66 bid.


63: P.G. 26, 263.

62: T.L.G. "Authorised" (Provisional Chirography, in Gen. MGP 54.505.1).

"dominance":

61: Page, " note, 10. is apparently, once again, mistakenly, equating "dominance" with
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second and parallel infinitive clause (v. 9) as Kaiser does. In Kaiser's construction the initial

It is incorrect to import part of the previous infinitive clause (v. 8) regarding prayer into the

and likewise I describe that the woman adorn themselves . . .

boulomai functions as the main verb for both clauses. 

This can only be interpreted as I describe

boulomai. I describe "has Paul as its subject and the two infinitive clauses are parallel and the main verb

boulomai. I describe "has Paul as its subject and the two infinitive clauses are parallel and the main verb

are parallel and the main verb

is somehow unfamiliar with Greek. However, it is impossible in the Greek. The main verb

is somehow unfamiliar with Greek. However, it is impossible in the Greek. The main verb

is impossible in the Greek. However, it is impossible in the Greek. The main verb

September 1976, 10). He bases his argument on the word "likewise" which will only sound reasonable

grammatically impossible (Walker, J. Kaiser, "Paul, Women and the Church" Worthwhile Challenge;

78 Kaiser's view that the women are "likewise" encouraged to engage in public prayer is


76 Ibid.

Women, Authority and the Bible (Downers Grove, InterVarsity Press, 1986) 199.


Kroeger, "Classics, View," 226-244; Philip B. Payne, "Libertarian Women in Ephesus: A


74 TLG, "Annehmen."

73 TLG 262.

TLG, "Annehmen."

to the same error.

72 Tliefeld, "Response," 245; critics Kroeger's unwarranted additions, but seems to fall prey

71 Tliefeld, "Women," 52.
characteristics, the Greek description as synonymous adiaphora (causal).

explanation, and that in his context an illative use of 

88.1 it is astounding that anyone familiar with Pauline literature would claim that the discussion, the causal gar is common.


84. Partida, Gundy, Helps Together, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1980) 86, 87; and Mary Hauer,


82bid., 170, 171.

81bid., 170.


79. Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, 35.


with "men" as the subject of the first infinitive. This impossible view is also held by Alida B.

Kosmin is left dangling. His construction requires that the accusative, "women," function together

1190) gives the Greek description as synonymous adiaphora (causal).
authority and soundness are not necessarily related.

Payne's argument that some teaching is not authoritative because it is unsound is not logical, since in most cases an aspect of authority is also inherent in a situation where one instructs another. Teaching requires primarily the communication of concepts, but authority, as in the discussion of authority, he seemingly ignores the fact that a word depends on authority. For example, Payne argues ("Libertarian Women," 173, 174) that a word does not imply "family.

(...) Grand Rapids: Baker, 1963), 87, for example, both regard oaks as "family."

96. Fee, I and 2 Timothy, 54, and 1. N. D. Kelly, A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles

95. Ibid., 1838, 1839.

94. NIV Study Bible, 1833.


92. "Scholar," 1 Timothy, 211.


However, has little to do with any particular nuance of "far.

This is a matter of English style, and a casual far may also be left untranslated. Such translation, untranslated in English versions, in some way assuming that this supports his position. However, other arguments are also weak. For example, he argues that a word is often "explanation" in the sense of "explain."

89. "Moore, "Response," 20. The Grammarians, Including Robertson (Payne's main support), use
interpretation is not difficult but cannot be included in this paper.

106. To show that verses such as I Cor. 11:2-16, Gal. 3:28, etc., harmonize with this

Timothy 200-202


104 Ibid.

103 NIV Study Bible, 1984

argument against it is the phrase assumes ("Oudeg," G).

allow women to teach anyone. In addition, the fact that no one practices this is not an exceptional

Greek. If "man" does not qualify "teacher" then the only other possibility is that this verse does not

cannot refer to both. However, as Moo points out ("Reformed," 202) this is perfectly natural

verbs, but that if the two verbs each carry an individual force, the very same grammatical construction

verbs, but that if the two verbs each carry an individual force, the very same grammatical construction

that if I Tim. 2:12 is one coherent idea (suggestion to a husband and "man" can modify both

102 Payne,"Liberation Women," 175, and "Oudeg," 5), makes a logically impossible argument

authority, the more natural meaning is silence, as most have translated it.

In this passage, which refers to prayer and teaching and contrasts prophecy with teaching as well as

101 Moo ("Reformed," 198, 199) has shown that prophecy does mean "silence", as well as "quiet."


99 Ibid.


1 Thessalonians 2:12, "An Analysis of Contextualized Interpretations"

Perhaps the most significant verse in the "Feminist" controversy is...
ET's annual meeting in Atlanta, Georgia on Nov. 21, 1986.

2 Timothy 2:12, a paper presented at the.


of all, "not even one word." There are approximately twenty-five such
answer with one word (he answered with two or more), but he did not answer
so Solomon was thus dressed. Matt 27:14 does not mean that Jesus did not
(otherwise may be), but "not even" Solomon was dressed thus! no one, not even
meaning in Matt 6:29 is not merely that Solomon was not dressed thus
the one in these cases, apparentlv has the interpretive nuance, "not even." The
other two concepts! Therefore, there is no possibility of a heuristics. However,
the occurrences above seems to function as a negative rather than corroborating
these are 14 occurrences of above in the NT. In a small percentage
NT Evidence other than Paul

"not even" (not even)...

...items found by above rather, the meaning is inclusive (and not, our
cons, reveals no evidence for such a restrictivt (heuristics) force for two
A study of LSJ (p. 1269) and BDAG (p. 597), as well as other text-

interpreting the scope of the other.

related to very specific text where one is merely functioning as an adjective
related way or to reinforce a single concept, but whether the statements
then, the issue is not whether above joins two statements in some closely
a definition is not specific enough to support the suggested interpretation.
specific as a single coherent proposition against any kind of authority, such
since the two statements which reinforce or make more specific a single coherent idea. However,
interpreting "domineering teaching," states that only one type of teaching is prohibited. Payne, in arguing for the
of them. The proposition against exercising authority is eliminated, and
adjectival or restrictive nuance. 

8:4. However, none of these instances functions as a headword, with an
either independant element. There are a few occurrences where the intense
a basic concept common to both statements without qualifying or restricting
theoretically, as a headword. The contrast construction reinforces or intensifies
invoking longer segments which are extremely difficult to state, even

There are a number of occurrences (approximately twenty-three)

Pauline NT literature.

Such occurrences of one. There are over forty such occurrences in non-
provision and teach the opposite meaning of the verse. This is true of all
this as a headword would imply that the birds made some other type of
to convey the overall intuitions that they do nothing at all. To treat
the independant aspects, "sowing," "reaping," and "gathering," are necessary
of I Tim 2:12. It means they do nothing at all to provide their food. All of
defined by reaping or gathering but that they may sow in other ways (cf.
Matt 6:26 does not mean that the birds do not sow in some way adjectival
[.]

It is only a specific type of teaching and allows exercise of authority.
Possibly know the hour (cf. the proposed view of I Tim 2:12, which would
concept, "hour," is not distinguished as a separate concept so that they could

Even the hour! the hours do not at all know the time. The second
know the hour (hour type) day." It means "you do not know the day nor
know the hour." You do not know the day nor the hour. does not mean "you do not
23:13. You do not know the day nor the hour." The statement in Matt
formation of a concept to which both statements relate. The statement in Matt
adjectival (headwords) or restrictive, but one of reinforcement or intensi-
or more elements are correlated seems clearer. The relationship is not
occurrences of nude.
However, each of these instances is better understood as the meaning of one word or phrase by confounding it with another word or phrase. 1:17 II Thess 3:8 and I Tim 6:16, "praise, etc." with greater charity, argues that in eight instances, (Rom 3:10; 9:16; I Cor 2:6; 5:11; 11:16; Gal 3:12), the opposite: neither than restricts. It is productive-intensifies. The common nuance is just none of the 109 non-poulite occurrences of ἀληθεία or even Poulite usage of one understanding.

Restricting the lack of hearing and allowing the possibility of their understanding. They are not at all responsive. Jesus is not normally heard as intensives. They do not really hear (λιστείν) and they do not really hear as intensives as an independent concept. The 1:6, "εἰσχωρίζουν, they do not understand, as on independent concept. The to only one type. At the same time allowing for them to understand; 1:15, "they neither hear nor understand, as not restricts the hearing. Nevertheless, they do not hear nor understand (in) and they hear or spin. 'What do not hear, that is, spin" but may otherwise work. The meaning is justly, inaptly spin but may spin otherwise (cf. I Tim 2:12), or that they do merely restrict the other. Matt 6:28 does not mean that the 1112s do not basic idea. One of the concepts does not cease as a separate entity and similar ideas is a customary practice to intensity or reinforce an overall and the related concepts are synonymous or approximate so such repetition of hendadys. But seem to be productive-intensify in nuance. In these cases, which could be forced into a hendadys. However, none are ἀληθεία as a of the 109 non-poulite occurrences of ἀληθεία there are only fourteen
Rather, the construction is poetic, or intense, or intense; I Cor 5:1; For PCA... impossible that Paul is referring to only one of these concepts.

It is involved. In I Cor 2:6, no wisdom not of this age nor of the future.

probable nuance is that neither human desire of any sort nor human effort

justifies cause which follows, "but of God who shows mercy." The more

The 2:12) seems unlikely and does not really correlate with the all

uses it to narrowly restrict the scope of "desire" (cf. handouts view of I

protection which extenuates "effort" (running) on an independent entity and

other types are possible), but of God who shows mercy. "Such an inter-

it is not of desire expressed through effort (one specific type of desire,

it is not of desire expressed through effort. "It is the prodable, however, that Paul

"desire expressed through effort." His argument that God shows mercy and compassion completely on His own

who is arguing that God shows mercy and compassion completely on His own

the possibility that there may be "heal dikaiosynas. Rom 9:16, therefore it is

then restrictive, the second concept does not cease to function and allow

construction is emphatic (intense, intense), so Payne also describes it, rather

functions as a negative in the same clause rather than as a connective. The

another root word is defined more specifically by "heal dikaiosynas. Payne

This is merely a more emphatic repetition of the same statement; the

concept must also be understood as the basic part of the second concept.

but is different than I Tim 2:12 since the word dikaiosynas in the first

synonyms. The construction not only reflects Hebrew rather than Greek

"there is none righteous, no one," the two concepts joined by pudce are

necessary and reinforce the overall concept common to both, in Rom 3:10.

intense-intense rather than restrictive. In each, both concepts are...
There is consistent support for an intense-righteous nuance.

The passage uses of which give no clear support for a restrictive righteous rather than referring only to a restricted aspect of one of the concepts. Rather, the passage refers to the transcendence of God (intense-righteous) as stress. "Is it really that II Thess 3:7, 'we are not disorderly (διαταξτήριον) among you, nor did we

... the most knowledgeable... His overall point is that he received his information from everyone available but encountered that he garnered his information from everyone available but

certainty avoided the apostles, but consulted any other Christian he

Jerusalem to the apostles..." referring only to a narrowed focus of one

1:16, 17, 'I did not consult with flesh andblood nor did I go up to

referring to a restricted meaning of only one of the concepts. It is
gal of God (Col 1:16), is certainty intense and can hardly be taken as

intense, The statement, "we do not have such a custom or the churches

and does not function as a corollary of two concepts, The nuance is

Concussion regarding one
way with respect to women or children. When these two aspects are combined, this action with respect to women. The implication is that they can act this way for both men and women. In addition, women are only portrayed from the perspective, which is therefore, it is not some practice such as domesticating teaching which is portrayed from the practice, which implies that it is acceptable for men? between men and women, not some practice wrong in itself. Only women are highly improbable in the context. The passage concerns the relationship any negative meaning for the practice proposed in I Thm 2:12 as The context is against a negative meaning also depends on the inferred meaning, view of one.

There is no implication in the context to take the verb negatively. Since authority. This interpretation depends on the negative meaning, since would then portray a woman only from some wrongful teaching or wrongful negative, meaning "domesticate" or to wrongfully use authority. I Thm 2:12 to a negative use of authority. Some insist that the verb is passively neutral or positively, as might be expected, in some contexts it may refer to a negative use of authority. The generally accepted opinion, supported by the lexicons, indicates that against the verb authority, the generally accepted opinion, regarding the precise meaning of

There is a difference of opinion regarding the precise meaning of The meaning of authority

On interpretation, from whence does it arise?

An interpretation, since the passage does not indicate such an interpretation, the normal meaning of such a construction, the evidence is contrary to such the other. In the case of a pronunciation it virtually reverses the sense of dissociated of one as an independent entity and on a narrow restriction or preeminence not on a general unity of the two concepts, but on a restricted one narrowly restricted form of teaching. The proposed

7
meaning for authentic. The exact instances of the verb before or during

The main lexicons do not let a negative meaning as the primary

with modern linguistic and semantic procedure.

of the same root, considering only the work in question is in accordance
rather than by a prescriptive etymological approach using derivatives or nouns
precede nuances of meaning for authentic must be determined from the verb
meaning (cf. apostrophe, apostostem, and apostostems, hyperstases, such as a
nouns, and verbs from the same root may have distinct differences in
a neutral versus a negative exercise of authority. Since adjectives,
the proposed meanings for authentic concern a precise difference in nuance.

The linguistic evidence for authentic

women and children.

does not introduce that men may teach anyone and that women may teach other
accurately interpreted that way. Language is meaner less if this verse
woman” rather than “no one” implies that men are allowed and would be
women are not allowed in this area the very fact that he speaks
contradictory to any normal perspective of communication. If a guard says
passage which concerns the actions of women in contrast to men, and is
practice is allowable for men, it is contradictory to the entire sense of the
trine. To object that the promotion of the woman does not imply the
rather than stating practices such as domineering or teaching false doc-
the entire passage which concerns make-female-hierarchical relationships,
concept is, of course, antithetical to our culture. Thus is the perspective of
negative trait. She is prostitute mostly because she is a woman. Thus
is not prostitute due to stupidity, lack of education, or some other
action is wrong only because a woman practices it with respect to men. The
only to women, but only to women with respect to men. The prostitute
the construction is even more forced. Not only does the prostitution apply


Phylologus Language GREACE, University of California, Irvine, CA.

William realise that it is difficult to translate. However, it seems clear
is definitely positive or neutral. Anyone who has worked with Beu 128
text. The instance in Beu 128, despite Payne's arguments to the contrary,
recognise, in any case, the tone of the passage is not negative but post-
challenge to find any other form which will fit the extract letters and the
almost certainly correct in understanding this as the verb. It is a
evidence for the verb. A study of the text reveals that the editor was
recognised text, and thus it could be a noun; therefore, it cannot be
incongruity also argues that the instance from Philodemus is from a
adjective should also be considered as evidence for the verb. However, he
faults Knight for using the verb only, and argues that the noun and
this study. Knight concludes that the verb is positive or neutral. Payne
instance from Aschylus means "to murder" and is, therefore, irrelevant to
132), Aschylus Eum, 429, and Beu 128, 37-42. It seems clear that the
or during the time of Paul, Philodemus VOLUMINA RHETORICA (ed. S. Suhm,)
there are, opportunely, only three extract uses of authenticae before
that authenticae is basically negative when it refers to authority.
recent study argues for the meaning "to murder," but provides no evidence
authenticae and the occurrences listed in the computer program are
considered, a study of the standard lexicons, the instances mentioned in
by I Tim 2:12, even if the nouns, adjectives, and adjectival cases
Paul's day are opportunely neutral. Those other Paul's time may be affected
some context, states that "dominate" means "to exercise authority".

"The word "dominate" means "to exercise authority.""

The proper translation for the New Testament suggests two meanings in that usage close to the time of the New Testament. In effect, means "I do not permit a woman to teach nor to exercise authority over a man." From this interpretation arises the normal usage of "only and authorized," the proper translation for I Tim 2:12. From whence does this interpretation arise? This verse has traditionally, a neutral connotation when it refers to a positive or neutral sense (for example, of Christ).

In the context, however, a negative connotation is introduced. The neutral meaning, "execute authority," the verb's main point is to define his own actions to his supporter.

because it is unanimously wrong. Obviously there is a colossal fallacy in
and that only because it is offensive to the current culture (due to
confused teachings about false doctrine to women and children, only in Ephesians.

that only if they teach domineering or teaching false doctrine and
where only women (not men) are prohibited from teaching false doctrine (and

b) hold one or more of these views. However, this results in a contradiction
because it would offend the local culture. Other "practica femenista" also
it refers to teaching false doctrine in Ephesians, and that it is prohibited
example, argues that the contradiction refers to teaching domineeringly,
that the contradiction is not universal. Payne in various statements, for
as domineering or teaching false doctrine, at the same time often argue
Those who insist that the contradiction refers to some stupid practice, such
Tim 2:12 is local, not universal and, therefore, not applicable today.
Various attempts have been made to prove that the contradiction in

Universal or Local?

Rather than from exercising authority over a man
woman from "mortgagating" a man, or from merely "taking charge" (trumpet)

Greek construction. So it is all probable that I Tim 2:12 prohibits a
aggregation of authority. Any inceptive idea comes from the context and the
are 6th century AD and do not refer to any improper-gaining of self-
 token. The few instances used as evidence for the meaning "take charge"
aggregation of authority, nor does either indicate the "way" any action is
as a primary meaning, neither "take charge" nor "mortgagating" mean "self-
charge" is both scarce and later than the NT. Therefore, neither is strictly
the word "mortgagating" means "mortgaging" and evidence for the meaning "to take

to oneself", not just by regarding "to take"
Statements concerning elders, for example, are universally applicable.

In this situation, the direction to Timothy applies generally to practice everywhere (present tense). On the basis of Paul's general statement, "do not permit," does not permit, a study of the entire Epistle reveals that there is little in the book that is applicable only to women. The other statements in the context do not concern some special practice nor are they applicable only in Ephesus. A study of the entire Epistle and the context with the hierarchal relationship between men and women.

The passage deals with the hierarchal relationship between males and females.

Although both Fee and Payne argue that the present tense of 1 Thess. 2:12 refers not to a general consideration as applicable only in Ephesus, they consider as applicable only in Ephesus.

The verse as only a pronouncement of宣讲 teaching can hardly be the verse as only a pronouncement of the result. Even to regard such an approach, which is the result of an attempt to nullify the force of the verse, which is the result of an attempt to nullify the force of the verse.
Their argument is frivolous since it is certain that Christian
women's conduct in the Fall is, according to Genesis, a primary reason for
the punishment, and childbearing, are the two issues in I Tim 2:11-15. The
punishments, that he will rule (have authority) over her (Gen 3:16), The punishment's
are not the subjection or authority. However, any specific text that does not depend on the Fall
as referring only to a local proclamation. The fact 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
because they are universally applicable.

The reason for the proclamation.

Most of the general principles in the NT are
stated in reference to a local situation, and apply to that situation
universally applicable. Most of the general principles in the NT are
imposition, from whence arises the desire to limit the proclamation. The
imposition does not deny the desire to limit the proclamation. Since the context and the purpose imply no
nothing in this context implies the application of the proclamation nor does
and that this use of "explanatory" is not in the sense of the grammarians. Payne's explanation of his "explanatory interpretation is actually cause, ... mortars, that explanatory γίγνεται is more than cause γίγνεται as common, that thoroughly reveals this claim showing that it is contrary to most grammar—

that it would be obvious even if there were no parenthesis. What has normally understood and the causal relationship of these verses is so clear for the proposition but are explanatory. If, however, γίγνεται is rather than γίγνεται or causal, therefore, the genders interact with one another both Payne and Schoeter argue that the γίγνεται in v. 13 is explanatory subject of women.

has selected the two specific items regarding to this point, the universal.

Paul reports the entire gender account to prove a universal prudence. He must repeat the entire gender account to prove a universal prudence. The arguments from gender predicted the general prudence of man and woman not to some specific. The context refers to the general issue of the relationship of man and woman not to some specific. I Tim 2:12 appears to be a general prudence. The context refers to the introducing the woman's subjection to man, the universal still in effect. Christians both man and women, still dōxa, the slope results of the Fall, gardened, that Christian women still bear children in pain, and that men still work for their food, still have thorns and thistles in their
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sentence "Tertio, "Tertio, They are engaged in some wrongful practice, but are so awkward that they alone induce the improbability of this view, what do v. 12. The "explanatory exposition must not only depend on the idea that the woman upon whom he refers for such a use, the Schorder, himself, descended v. 12. I5

Constitution

Ephesuses were involved in these proposed practices.

Truth versus Error. Finally, there is no evidence that the woman in error. The passage concerns male-female hierarchies, not women. It is contrasted with teaching in instance rather than with some practice is not universally true. The practice is prohibited only to to the passage which cannot refer to some practice similar in itself, and it women are teaching faith doctrine of unerring authority. This is contrary to the normal use of θητεποίησις, the obvious nature of the genealogies, and argument of the passage, the obvious nature of the genealogies, and his, however, means the relationship is causal. Why reject the obvious relationship to these verses other than the reason for Paul's prohibition. 11, 12 to which they are connected by the γαρ? They can explain nothing in this paragraph of this view, what do v. 12. The "explanatory exposition must not only depend on the idea that the woman upon whom he refers for such a use, the Schorder, himself, descended v. 12.
more crucial is the attempt to obviate the meaning of Scripture in order to interpret it. As crucial as the issue of the woman’s role may be, even contextually, this verse is often in conflict with the “traditional” construction of this verse is often in conflict with the “traditional” authority over a man. The more radical feminists who feel no need to exclude women from teaching or exercising any other office.

I Tim 2:12 excludes women from teaching or exercising any other office.


clear.

arses from any difficulty or implication in the verse. This verse is internally inconsistent, none of which are productive in the context, cannot normal rules of interpretation, many of which are self-contradictory or this verse of interpretable interpretations, many of which defy

Gen 3.

Scripture as a whole, and the anthropological norm established in when the universal aspect of the proposition fits well in the context, the in her subordination to man, is contrary to logic. This is contrary to logic, so the order of creation, and the woman’s conduct in the Fall which resulted by it objections: to deny the universality of a proposition which is supported by it produces a wrongfull action is inconsistent; to think that Paul would to deny the universal nature of the proposition while arguing that the normal meaning fits well.

The normal meaning fits well.

prohibition to a distinct church for one specific problem is unusual, but present tense of appetite and the subject are clear. To apply this Tim 2:12, 13. Other explanations of appetite functions causally, a use which fits well in I common knowledge that appetite functions causally, a use which fits well in I basically negative when it makes perfect sense taken normatively. It is basically neutral in meaning. Why this construction to view it as the same may be said of authentically, which, as the lexicon indicates, the normal meanings make perfect sense in the passage.

16
Interpretations of 1 Tim 2:12.

demonstrating their cultural prejudice by such improbable contextualized verses. It is more accurate to realize that many modern interpreters are 

Apostle Paul of demonstrating his cultural prejudice in writing such 

conform to with present sociological views. Rather than accounting the