

# Οὐδέ in 1 Timothy 2.12:

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

## CONTENTS

Introduction	1
A. The meaning and force of οὐδέ	1
A.1 Negative correlatives	4
A.1.1 BDF §445.4	6
B. Translation of 1 Timothy 2.12	7
B.1 The meaning of ἀθηντέω	8
B.2 Is ἀνδρός the object of διδάσκειν?	8
B.3 Objections	12
C. 'A single idea'	13
C.1 Hendiadys	14
C.2 Epexegetis	17
C.3 The fallacy of the undistributed middle	18
C.4 'A single idea' illustrated	19
C.5 Plutarch 269 D	21
C.6 Pairs of terms in 1 Tim 2	23
D. Paul's use of οὐδέ	24
D.1 Exclusions	24
D.1.1 οὐδέ γὰρ	25

D.1.2	ἀλλ` οὐδέ	26
D.1.3	Non-coordinate clauses	27
D.1.4	Ascensive οὐδέ	28
D.2	Sixteen texts	28
D.2.1	'And' and 'and not' in negative sentences	31
D.2.2	1 Thess 2.3	32
D.2.3	2 Cor 7.12	33
D.2.4	1 Cor 2.6	34
D.2.5	1 Cor 11.16	35
D.2.6	1 Tim 6.16	36
D.2.7	2 Thess 3.7–8	37
D.2.8	Gal 3.28	38
D.2.9	1 Thess 5.5	39
D.2.10	Rom 9.16	40
D.2.11	Gal 1.16–17	41
D.2.12	Conclusion: Paul's use of οὐδέ	42
D.3	The comparison with Luke-Acts	42
E.	Origen on 1 Timothy 2.12	43
F.	'Positive' and 'negative' concepts	45
F.1	Two final cases	47
Conclusions		48

# Οὐδέ in 1 Timothy 2.12: A Response to Philip Payne

## Introduction

The text of 1 Timothy 2.12 reads:

διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ ἀθηνεῦν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ.<sup>1</sup>

It is agreed with Philip B. Payne in his 2008 *New Testament Studies* article, '1 Tim 2.12 and the Use of οὐδέ to Combine Two Elements to Express a Single Idea', that οὐδέ is serving here as a coordinating conjunction, joining the infinitive διδάσκειν ('to teach') to the infinitive phrase ἀθηνεῦν ἀνδρός ('to exercise authority over a man').<sup>2</sup> What is not agreed is the force of οὐδέ when it fulfills this function. Payne claims that Paul (in particular) uses the word to 'combine two elements to express a single idea'.<sup>3</sup> He contends that the second element can act to specify the meaning of the first, so that the two in combination are of more limited extent than either individually. It will be shown in response that all grammars and lexicons are in agreement that, on the contrary, in this coordinating role, οὐδέ simply connects one word or phrase or clause or sentence to another in an additive way, and should be translated 'nor' or 'and not'. While it may sometimes be possible to express the combination of the two elements as a single idea, this will be greater in extent than either element individually, and will encompass both.

## A. The meaning and force of οὐδέ

The word οὐδέ almost certainly derives from οὐ δέ and most grammarians have viewed this as its essential meaning. Thus both BDAG, and Louw and Nida, describe it as a combination of οὐ and δέ, and the entry in Liddell and Scott likewise begins simply with 'οὐ δέ' in a parenthesis. Smyth says that οὐδέ is to be 'broken up into the negative οὐ . . . and δέ'.<sup>4</sup> Denniston appends his discussion of οὐδέ to the section on δέ, and explains that 'the same varieties of meaning are found in the negative form' as they are in δέ.<sup>5</sup> Winer, in his *New Testament grammar*, writes that 'That οὐδέ and οὔτε run parallel with the conjunctions δέ and τε, and must in the first instance be explained from the meaning of these particles, admits of no doubt.'<sup>6</sup> Robertson asserts that 'οὐδέ was originally just οὐ δέ ('and not,' 'but not') and is often so printed in Homer.'<sup>7</sup> Later, in discussing its use, he says that it is 'merely οὐ δέ'.<sup>8</sup>

According to the Bauer-Danker Lexicon (BDAG), δέ 'is used to connect one clause with another when it is felt that there is some contrast between them, though the contrast is often scarcely

---

1 *Novum Testamentum Graece*: Nestle-Aland, 28<sup>th</sup> edition (Stuttgart: German Bible Society, 2012) All Greek Testament citations from this version unless otherwise stated.

2 *NTS* 54 (2008) 235–253, at 236.

3 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 235.

4 H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, ed. G. M. Messing (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1984) §2930.

5 J. D. Denniston, *The Greek Particles* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1978<sup>2</sup>) 190.

6 G. B. Winer, *A Treatise on the Grammar of New Testament Greek*, tr. W. F. Moulton (Edinburgh: Clark, 1882<sup>o</sup>) 612.

7 A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (New York: Hodder & Stoughton, 1914) 1164.

8 Robertson, *Grammar*, 1185

discernible.<sup>9</sup> According to the same source, it is translated ‘*but*, when a contrast is clearly implied; *and*, when a simple connective is desired, without contrast,’ or may not be translated at all. Similarly, Winer distinguishes between an adversative use of *δέ* when it ‘connects while it opposes, i.e., it adds something different, distinct, from that which precedes’; and a use when ‘the writer merely subjoins something new, different and distinct from what precedes, but on that account not sharply opposed to it’.<sup>10</sup>

Smyth explains that ‘*δέ* serves to mark that something is different from what precedes, but only to offset it, not to exclude or contradict it’.<sup>11</sup> Likewise, Robertson says that *δέ* introduces ‘something new’ and cites with approval Abbott’s view that in classical Greek ‘*δέ*, calling attention to the second of two things, may mean (1) *in the next place*, (2) *on the other hand*.’<sup>12</sup> According to Levinsohn, the ‘basic function of *δέ*’ is to ‘mark new developments, in the sense that the information it introduces builds on what has gone before and makes a distinct contribution to the argument.. it also introduces background material’.<sup>13</sup> To summarise, *δέ* adds a new or second thought, distinct from what precedes, sometimes with contrast and sometimes without.

The use of *οὐδέ* takes three main forms. First, as a conjunction it ‘connects two or more whole clauses’.<sup>14</sup> By classical times, in Attic prose, *οὐδέ* was ‘used only to join a negative clause to another clause itself negative’.<sup>15</sup> *Καὶ οὐ* was used to join a negative clause to a preceding positive clause. This pattern of use was maintained in the New Testament. Thus BDF §445 states that ‘the connective after a negative clause is *οὐδέ* (*μηδέ*), after a positive *καὶ οὐ* (*καὶ μή*). All of this remains the same as in classical.’<sup>16</sup> Smyth also points out that in Attic prose *ἀλλ’ οὐ* or *καὶ οὐ* was used for the sharply adversative ‘but not’, and gives the meaning of *οὐδέ* as the simply continuative ‘and not’ or ‘nor’. Cooper concurs, describing *οὐδέ* as a ‘connective’ used after a preceding negative with the meaning ‘and not’.<sup>17</sup> Thus it simply adds one negative to another. Jelf says that *οὐ . . . οὐδέ* is used when the second clause ‘comes in as an addition to the first’.<sup>18</sup> Likewise, Winer writes that *οὐδέ* and *μηδέ* ‘add negation to negation’, and that *οὐ . . . οὐδέ* or *μή . . . μηδέ* are employed ‘when to one negation another is annexed, and negation strung upon negation’.<sup>19</sup> Levinsohn describes *οὐδέ* simply as a ‘negative additive’.<sup>20</sup>

As a coordinating conjunction, *οὐδέ* may join not only clauses and sentences but also individual words or phrases. In this respect it differs from *δέ*, which rarely if ever connects individual words in a continuative way, this function being performed in a positive expression by *καὶ*, or in some styles also by *τε*.<sup>21</sup> As to position in this coordinating role, *οὐδέ* is ‘invariably first word in sentence, clause, or word group.’<sup>22</sup>

---

9 F. W. Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2000<sup>3</sup>) *δέ*.

10 Winer, *Grammar*, 551–2.

11 Smyth, *Grammar*, §2834.

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

13 S. H. Levinsohn, *Discourse Features of the Greek New Testament*, (SIL International 2000<sup>2</sup>) 112.

14 Smyth, *Grammar*, §2832.

15 Smyth, *Grammar*, §2833.

16 F. A. Blass, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (Cambridge: University Press, 1961) 230.

17 G. L. Cooper, *Attic Greek Prose Syntax*, Vol. 2 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1998) §69.50.1, 1397.

18 W. E. Jelf, *A Grammar of the Greek Language* (Oxford: Parker, 1866<sup>4</sup>) 480.

19 Winer, *Grammar*, 612, 614.

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

21 Denniston, *Particles*, 162.

22 Denniston, *Particles*, 199.

The other two main uses of οὐδέ, which are of less direct concern to this study, are both adverbial. First, οὐδέ may add a negative idea, usually to another ‘negative idea either expressed or implied’, with the meaning ‘not . . . either’.<sup>23</sup> Sometimes it may be translated ‘also . . . not’, as another way of rendering this simple addition. This use differs from the coordinating use in that the terms joined are not of the same kind. Very often, οὐδέ stands at the head of the primary clause or apodosis, following a dependent protasis.

Second, οὐδέ may be used with a sense of climax, that is ‘ascensively’, with the meaning ‘not even’. Typically, it occurs in the middle of a clause, immediately before the term it is modifying ascensively, and without a preceding negative.<sup>24</sup> It also has this sense if it stands at the beginning of the whole sentence or follows an οὐ within the same clause.<sup>25</sup>

The three main uses of οὐδέ correspond to the three sections of its entry in BDAG: 1) ‘and not, nor’; 2) ‘also not, not either, neither’; 3) ‘not even’. It happens that in each section of BDAG, the first example given of its use comes from the sixth chapter of Matthew, and these texts can serve to illustrate the difference in sense and function between the three categories of meaning:

1	Matt 6.20	θησαυρίζετε δὲ ὑμῖν θησαυροὺς ἐν οὐρανῷ, ὅπου οὔτε σὴς οὔτε βρῶσις ἀφανίζει καὶ ὅπου κλέπται οὐ διορύσσουσιν οὐδέ κλέπτουσιν·	But store up for yourselves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust destroys, and where thieves do <i>not</i> break in <i>or</i> steal, <sup>26</sup>
2	Matt 6.15	ἐὰν δὲ μὴ ἀφήτε τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οὐδὲ ὁ πατὴρ ὑμῶν ἀφήσει τὰ παραπτώματα ὑμῶν.	But if ye forgive not men their trespasses, <i>neither</i> will your Father forgive your trespasses. [ASV]
3	Matt 6.29	λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐδὲ Σολομὼν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ δόξῃ αὐτοῦ περιεβάλετο ὡς ἐν τούτων.	yet I say to you that <i>not even</i> Solomon in all his glory clothed himself like one of these.

It is apparent that οὐδέ serves in negative sentences and clauses some of the functions that καὶ undertakes in positive sentences and clauses. Cooper begins his treatment of οὐδέ with the summary statement that ‘Οὐδέ (μηδέ) is the negative form of καὶ as also of δέ, if used in a connective sense’.<sup>27</sup> Blass observes that the ‘positive term corresponding to’ ascensive οὐδέ (‘not even’) ‘is καὶ “even,” as the positive equivalent for οὐ . . ., οὐδὲ etc. is a series of words strung together by καὶ’.<sup>28</sup> Robertson writes that ‘In accord with the copulative use of δέ we frequently have οὐδέ and μηδέ in the continuative sense, carrying on the negative with no idea of contrast’. Then often, ‘we have οὐδέ in the sense of “not even”’. In other cases, including Matt 6.15, ‘οὐδέ means “not also”’ (or ‘also . . . not’ as other have it). Robertson concludes that ‘All three uses of καὶ are thus paralleled in οὐδέ’.<sup>29</sup>

23 Denniston, *Particles*, 194.

24 A. Buttmann *A Grammar of the New Testament Greek* (Andover: Draper, 1891) 369.

25 BDF §445.2.

26 *New American Standard Bible* (La Habra: Lockman Foundation, 1995) All English New Testament verses from this version unless otherwise stated.

27 Cooper, *Greek Syntax*, §69.50.0, 1397.

28 F. Blass, *Grammar of New Testament Greek* (London/New York: Macmillan, 1905<sup>2</sup>) 265.

29 Robertson, *Grammar*, 1185.

While the strongly adversative sense 'but not' may have been taken over by ἀλλ' οὐ or καὶ οὐ, this does not mean that οὐδέ can not carry a lightly adversative sense, which may perhaps be rendered by 'nor yet', with a degree of contrast to what precedes. While acknowledging that the continuative sense ('and not', 'nor') is much more common, the Liddell Scott Lexicon gives 'but not' as οὐδέ's first meaning. Winer describes οὐδέ as disjunctive, based on his view that 'δέ is properly *but*'. In his notes on the translation of 1 Thessalonians 2.3:

1 Thess 2.3	ἡ γὰρ παράκλησις ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδὲ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδὲ ἐν δόλω,	For our exhortation does <i>not</i> come from error <i>or</i> impurity <i>or</i> by way of deceit.
----------------	---	---

Ellicott suggests guidelines for the translation of οὐ . . . οὐδέ when it is used to continue a negation. He prefers the translation 'not . . . neither', when the connected words or clauses are 'simply parallel and coordinate'.<sup>30</sup> He thinks that 'not . . . nor' is appropriate when 'there is some sort of connexion in thought, or accordance in meaning' between the terms. Finally, 'where there is less accordance, and where the latter clause has somewhat of a climacteric character', he gives 'not . . . nor yet'. Thus in 1 Thessalonians 2.3, where 'error' and 'deceit' seem more connected in meaning than either are to 'impurity', Ellicott translates: 'For our exhortation is not of error, nor yet of uncleanness, nor of guile'.

## A.1 Negative correlatives

Given that Payne's entire thesis rests on the meaning and function of οὐδέ, it is remarkable that he cites no lexical definitions of the word, and devotes only two sentences, plus a later footnote, to what has been established about its use by the labours of grammarians and linguists. He refers to only one section of one grammar, BDF at §445, and this he misunderstands, attributing to οὐδέ the designation of 'correlative' which in fact belongs to οὔτε. In support of his contention that 'Paul typically uses οὐδέ to join together expressions that reinforce or make more specific a single idea', Payne asserts that 'BDF §445 calls οὐδέ a "correlative" and a "connective" indicating "correlation" of members and contrasts its use with "independent continuation"'.<sup>31</sup> These assertions can be traced to three separate portions of BDF §445, of which the first is the opening statement:

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

It would appear that Payne has taken the reach of the colon after the heading 'Negative correlatives' to extend as far as the full stop and thus to include both οὐδέ and μηδέ. In fact, it is only οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . and μήτε . . . μήτε . . . which are the correlatives. BDF (Blass-Debrunner-Funk) is abstracted with revisions from Blass's New Testament Greek Grammar, and in this earlier prose text the distinction between the conjunctions is expressed without ambiguity (with the emboldening in the original):

The use of **correlative negative clauses** with οὔτε . . . οὔτε or μήτε . . . μήτε respectively, and of οὐδέ or μηδέ respectively as a **connecting particle** after **negative** sentences (and of καὶ οὐ, καὶ μή after **positive** sentences) remains the same as in classical Greek.<sup>32</sup>

Thus, BDF §445 should indeed be read as calling οὐδέ a connective, as Payne says, but not a correlative. Correlative conjunctions occur in pairs and bring two terms, which are usually well

30 C. J. Ellicott, *A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, with a Revised Translation*, (Cambridge: University Press, 1866<sup>3</sup>) 143–4.

31 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 236.

32 Blass, *Grammar*, 265.

balanced, into mutual relationship. Examples include καὶ . . . καὶ . . . (‘both . . . and . . .’) and τὲ . . . τέ . . . (‘as . . . so . . .’, ‘not only . . . but also . . .’). Οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . means ‘neither . . . nor . . .’, and its use was contrasted with that of οὐ . . . οὐδέ . . . by Winer who wrote that whilst οὐδέ and μηδέ ‘add negation to negation’, οὔτε and μήτε ‘divide a single negation into parts (which, naturally, are mutually exclusive).’<sup>33</sup> For his first illustration, Winer cites Matt 7.6a:

Μὴ δώτε τὸ ἅγιον τοῖς κυσὶν μηδὲ βάλητε τοὺς μαργαρίτας ὑμῶν ἔμπροσθεν τῶν χοίρων,	Do <i>not</i> give what is holy to dogs, <i>and</i> do <i>not</i> throw your pearls before swine,
--	---

and comments that ‘two different actions [are] equally negated, i.e. forbidden’. It can be taken that the comment regarding the function of μηδέ in this verse applies equally to οὐδέ. Winer’s second illustration, with οὐδέ this time, is Matt 6.26a:

ἐμβλέψατε εἰς τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ὅτι οὐ σπείρουσιν οὐδέ θερίζουσιν οὐδέ συναγουσιν εἰς ἀποθήκας,	Look at the birds of the air, that they do <i>not</i> sow, <i>nor</i> reap <i>nor</i> gather into barns,
--	--

Here, there are three activities that birds do not engage in. Winer illustrates the use of οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . with Matthew 12.32b:

ὃς δ’ ἂν εἴπη κατὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου, οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται αὐτῷ οὔτε ἐν τούτῳ τῷ αἰῶνι οὔτε ἐν τῷ μέλλοντι.	but whoever speaks against the Holy Spirit, it shall <i>not</i> be forgiven him, <i>either</i> in this age <i>or</i> in the age to come.
---	--

and comments that ‘the single negation οὐκ ἀφεθήσεται is distributed into two parts, in regard to time’.<sup>34</sup> Winer summarises the difference between οὔτε and οὐδέ as follows:

‘Accordingly, οὔτε and μήτε regularly point to another οὔτε or μήτε (or to τε or καὶ), just as τε . . . τε (τε . . . καὶ) correspond to each other; whereas οὐδέ and μηδέ attach themselves to a preceding οὐ or μή, – as indeed δέ always looks to something which has gone before. It may therefore be truly said, – it follows indeed from the meaning of τε and δέ, – that a closer connexion is expressed by the sequence οὔτε . . . οὔτε than by οὐ . . . οὐδέ’<sup>35</sup>

Thayer, following Winer, agrees, writing that:

‘the connection of clauses made negative by οὔτε is close and internal, so that they are mutually complementary and combine into a unity, whereas clauses negated by οὐδέ follow one another much more loosely, often almost by accident as it were’;<sup>36</sup>

The second portion of BDF §445 that Payne appears to refer to is sub-section 3, which reads in full:

‘The correlation of negative and positive members is, of course, admissible, though it is not common in the NT. E.g. Jn 4:11 οὔτε ἀντλημα ἔχεις, καὶ φρέαρ ἐστὶν βαθύ (οὐδέ D sy<sup>s</sup>, which seems to be better Greek).’

This seems to be the source of Payne’s claim that BDF §445 says that the use of οὐδέ indicates “‘correlation” of members’, and it is certainly the source of his assertion on page 251 that:

33 Winer, *Grammar*, 612.

34 Winer, *Grammar*, 612.

35 Winer, *Grammar*, 613.

36 J. H. Thayer, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1896<sup>4</sup>) οὐδέ.

‘BDF §445 states that the use of οὐδέ in the "correlation of positive and negative members, is of course, admissible".’

In fact, as can be seen, BDF §445.3 concerns the correlation of the negative correlative member οὔτε with the positive correlative member καὶ. It may be that Payne thought that the text in Codex Bezae: ουδε αντλημα εχεις και το φρεαρ εστι βαθυ, would be an example of οὐδέ being used as a correlative. But if this were the text, the meaning would be ‘you do not even have a bucket, and the well is deep’, since οὐδέ is in an ‘ascensive’ adverbial position at the beginning of the woman’s address, and would not be being used as a conjunction at all, let alone as a correlative one.

A possible reason for BDF’s comment about the variant being ‘better Greek’ can be deduced from another occurrence of οὔτε . . . καὶ . . . in the New Testament, which BDF cites subsequently:

3 John 1.10b	καὶ μὴ ἀρκούμενος ἐπὶ τούτοις οὔτε αὐτὸς ἐπιδέχεται τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τοὺς βουλομένους κωλύει καὶ ἐκ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐκβάλλει.	and not satisfied with this, he himself does <i>not</i> receive the brethren, either, <i>and</i> he forbids those who desire to do so and puts them out of the church.
-----------------	--	--

Here, one can see the structure typical of correlatives. One idea, that Diotrophes does not receive the brethren, is split into two parts: first, he does not receive them himself, and second, he forbids others from doing so. In contrast, the two elements of John 4.11, that Jesus does not have a bucket, and that the well is deep, might perhaps have been considered by Blass to lack something of the symmetry that is characteristic of correlatives.

In conclusion, BDF §445 should not be read as referring to οὐδέ as a correlative, and it does not make any reference to the word being used in a correlative way. As an aside, even if οὐδέ were a correlative conjunction, this would not favour Payne’s thesis. If Paul had constructed his prohibition with οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . . rather than with οὐ . . . οὐδέ . . . , the meaning would have been along the lines of ‘I allow a woman neither to teach nor to exercise authority . . .’. As Winer puts it, a single prohibition would have been in view, but split into two parts, with both teaching and the exercise of authority included in it.

### A.1.1 BDF §445.4

In a final reference to the treatment of οὐδέ in BDF §445, Payne maintains that the grammar ‘contrasts its use with “independent continuation”’.<sup>37</sup> He finds this in §445.4, which begins: ‘Καὶ οὐ after negative clauses does not indicate correlation but an independent continuation (Buttman 316), e.g. Mt 15: 32, . . .’ In his New Testament grammar, Alexander Buttman had written: ‘But when καὶ οὐ or καὶ μὴ is introduced after a negated sentence, the two sentences do not stand in a corresponsive relation [corresponsiven Verhältnis], but are to be regarded more as independent sentences or clauses; as, Matt. xv. 32; Luke xii. 29; xviii. 2, etc.’<sup>38</sup> Of these scripture references, the only one that pertains to καὶ οὐ rather than καὶ μὴ is Matthew 15.32, being also the text cited by BDF, which reads:

37 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 236.

38 Buttman, *Grammar*, 369; A. Buttman, *Grammatik Des Neutestamentlichen Sprachgebrauchs* (Berlin: Dümmler, 1859) 316.



Mt 15.32	Ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς προσκαλεσάμενος τοὺς μαθητὰς αὐτοῦ εἶπεν· Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ τὸν ὄχλον, ὅτι ἤδη ἡμέραι τρεῖς προσμένουσίν μοι καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν τί φάγωσιν· καὶ ἀπολῦσαι αὐτοὺς νήστεις οὐ θέλω, μήποτε ἐκλυθῶσιν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ.	And Jesus called His disciples to Him, and said, "I feel compassion for the people, because they have remained with Me now three days and have nothing to eat; <i>and</i> I do <i>not</i> want to send them away hungry, for they might faint on the way."
-------------	---	--

The negative clause ‘καὶ . . . οὐ θέλω . . .’ (‘and I do not want . . .’) follows another negative clause ‘καὶ οὐκ ἔχουσιν . . .’ (‘and they do not have . . .’), in an exception to the rule, laid down at the outset of BDF §445, that the connective after a negative clause is οὐδέ, that after a positive καὶ οὐ. The exception is more apparent than real, however, for the καὶ οὐ clause is following in thought from the main clause of the previous sentence ‘Σπλαγχνίζομαι ἐπὶ . . .’ (‘I feel compassion for . . .’), which is positive, and not from the negative clause, which forms part of the compound subordinate clause beginning with ὅτι (‘because’). To mark this lack of connection between the two negative clauses, the editors of the Greek text have placed a semi-colon, which is reproduced also in the NASB. The καὶ οὐ clause is thus a continuation of the earlier positive clause, ‘independent’, as it were, of the immediately preceding negative clause; this may be what BDF means by an ‘independent continuation’.

There is little reason if any to suppose that the statement in BDF that ‘Καὶ οὐ after negative clauses does not indicate correlation’ implies that the use of οὐδέ after a negative clause does indicate correlation. In Blass’s earlier text, the same statement follows on without pause from the discussion of the combination of negative and positive correlatives (οὔτε, μήτε, καὶ and τε) that is summarised in BDF §445.3. The natural point of comparison is with the correlatives, not with οὐδέ. Likewise, Buttman’s statement that a καὶ οὐ sentence does not ‘stand in a corresponsive relation’ with a previous negative sentence, can hardly be taken to imply that an οὐδέ sentence does have a corresponsive relation with a previous negative sentence (or clause). Buttman’s immediately preceding discussion had concerned the use of καὶ οὐ after a positive clause, with examples like ὠμολόγησεν καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο (‘he confessed and did not deny’, John 1.20) and εὐλογεῖτε καὶ μὴ καταρᾶσθε (‘bless and do not curse’, Rom 12.14), where the two terms could well be described as ‘corresponsive’, and so if there is any reference to other grammatical constructions in Buttman’s statement, it is more likely to be with this one, than with οὐδέ after a negative.

Conceivably, it could be argued that BDF’s statement that καὶ οὐ after negative clauses indicates an ‘independent continuation’, would imply, or at least lend weight to the thought that the use of οὐδέ does not involve the type of sharp break between clauses that is evident in Matthew 15.32. But this may be granted, since it has never been suggested that the use of οὐδέ after a preceding negative indicates such a discontinuity as would be marked by a semi-colon, as it is in the Matthean text. Rather, οὐδέ simply adds a further negative to a previous one, with the degree of association between the terms being dependent upon the closeness in thought of the concepts that are being connected, rather than upon the conjunction itself.

## B. Translation of 1 Timothy 2.12

In its role as a coordinating conjunction, according to all grammars and all lexicons, οὐδέ connects one negative to another in an additive way. It thus has the same force and function as 'and not' or 'nor' in English.

## B.1 The meaning of αὐθεντέω

Payne maintains that αὐθεντεῖν should be translated ‘to assume authority’, rather than to have or exercise authority. He relies on the definition offered in BDAG, namely ‘to assume a stance of independent authority’, upon ‘lexical and contextual evidence’, and upon the analysis in his own book.<sup>39</sup> In reply, with regard to lexical evidence, it may be observed that the entry in BDAG goes on to give as English equivalents ‘give orders to, dictate to’, and for 1 Timothy 2.12 it suggests for αὐθεντεῖν ἄνδρος ‘tell a man what what to do’. All three of these English expressions concern the exercise rather than the assumption of authority. Liddell-Scott-Jones, the primary classical lexicon, gives ‘to have full power or authority over’ as its definition. There are only two early instances, in Aristonicus’s commentary on the Iliad, and in Ptolemy’s *Tetrabiblos*, where αὐθεντεῖν is used transitively with the object in the genitive.<sup>40</sup> In the first case, it is hard to see how ὁ αὐθεντῶν τοῦ λόγου could refer to the one ‘assuming authority’ over the word or speech. In the second, the leading English translation renders αὐθεντήσας τοῦ τε Ἑρμοῦ καὶ τῆς σελήνης as ‘dominates Mercury and the moon’. If the aorist participles in this text allow for the possibility of an ingressive sense, this hardly provides support for such a sense in 1 Timothy 2.12, where the verb is in the present tense.

With regard to contextual evidence, and the analysis in Payne’s book, it may be noted that he employs his understanding of the meaning of οὐδέ in 1 Timothy 2.12, in at least one of his arguments for preferring one meaning of αὐθεντέω over others.<sup>41</sup> To then take this meaning as a given in his analysis of οὐδέ is to engage in circular reasoning. It seems preferable to acknowledge that the data is too scanty to determine the meaning with such precision. The broader term ‘to exercise authority’ is preferred in this paper, but without prejudice to alternative renderings.

## B.2 Is ἄνδρος the object of διδάσκειν?

In 1981, in the course of an exchange with Payne, Douglas Moo suggested that ἄνδρος may be taken as the grammatical object of διδάσκειν, maintaining that ‘the construction is a perfectly natural one.’<sup>42</sup> He pointed out that ‘objects and qualifiers of words which occur only in the second in a series must often be taken with the first also’, citing Acts 8.21 in support:

Acts 8.21a	οὐκ ἔστιν σοι μερίς οὐδέ κληρος ἐν τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ,	You have <i>no</i> part <i>or</i> portion in this matter,
------------	---	---

1 Tim 2.12	διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἄνδρος,
------------	--

As Payne observes, one difference between this text and 1 Timothy 2.12 is that in the latter the words before οὐδέ can stand alone, διδάσκειν commonly being used absolutely.<sup>43</sup> In contrast, μερίς can hardly stand alone, but creates an expectation of a qualifier to explain what it was that Simon the magician had no part in.

A second difference between the two texts is that whereas μερίς and κληρος both put the qualifier in the dative in their own right, the object of διδάσκειν normally stands in the accusative. Moo refers

39 P. B. Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul’s Letters*, (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009) 361–97.

40 Aristonicus, of Alexandria, [*Peri sēmeiōn Iliados*] *reliquiae emendatiores* (Gottingae: In Libraria Dieterichiana, 1853) 170; Ptolemy, *Tetrabiblos* (Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press, 1940) 3.13.10.

41 Payne, *Man and Woman*, 384.

42 D. J. Moo, ‘The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11–15: A Rejoinder’, *Trinity Journal* 2 NS (1981) 198–222, 202.

43 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 249.

to the statement in Smyth's grammar that the 'case of an object common to two verbs is generally that demanded by the nearer', and it may be accepted that a genitive noun could stand as the common object of διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν.<sup>44</sup>

A more important difference between the texts may be the word order. μερίς and κληρος stand either side of οὐδέ, and so may quite naturally be taken together, whereas διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν are widely separated. Thus, Payne wrote in 1981 that ἀνδρός 'is too far removed from "to teach" to be understood naturally as qualifying the meaning of that verb as well'.<sup>45</sup> Bill Mounce, on the other hand, averred that it 'is not too far removed', arguing that διδάσκειν is brought forward for emphasis, while allowing that it may be separated 'further than perhaps expected'.<sup>46</sup>

Ronald Fung supported Payne, maintaining that 'if Paul's intention had indeed been to say "I do not permit a woman to teach men or to have authority over a man", then he would have written it differently.<sup>47</sup> Fung makes two different suggestions as to how the sentence might have been constructed, citing two New Testament texts as precedents:

1 John 3.6b	πᾶς ὁ ἁμαρτάνων οὐχ ἑώρακεν αὐτὸν οὐδὲ ἔγνωκεν αὐτόν.	no one who sins has seen Him or knows Him.
John 14.17a	τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας, ὃ ὁ κόσμος οὐ δύναται λαβεῖν, ὅτι οὐ θεωρεῖ αὐτὸ οὐδὲ γινώσκει·	that is the Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive, because it does not see Him or know Him,

With reference to 1 John 3.6, in which the object is simply repeated, Fung suggests '*didaskain andra . . . ouk epitrepo oude authentein andros*' for 1 Timothy 2.12, but acknowledges that this might be considered too clumsy. With reference to John 14.17, in which the object of the second verb is understood to be that of the first also, his suggestion is: '*didaskain andra . . . ouk epitrepo oude authentein [sc. andros]*'.

In view of the difference in scholarly opinion on this matter, a search was made in biblical and extra-biblical literature for texts in which two verbs, joined in a coordinate way by οὐδέ, have a common object or complement. 107 texts were identified. In the New Testament, a total of four texts were found in addition to the two already cited. In two, the object is placed before both verbs:

Gal 4.14a	καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε,	and that which was a trial to you in my bodily condition you did not despise or loathe,
Heb 10.8 part	θυσίας καὶ προσφορὰς καὶ ὀλοκαυτώματα καὶ περὶ ἁμαρτίας οὐκ ἠθέλησας οὐδὲ εὐδόκησας,	"Sacrifices and offerings and whole burnt offerings and sacrifices for sin you have not desired, nor have you taken pleasure in them"

44 Smyth, *Grammar*, §1634.

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

46 W. D. Mounce, R. P. Martin, L. A. Losie, & 1 more, *Word Biblical Commentary Vol. 46, Pastoral Epistles* (Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000) 123.

47 R. Y. K. Fung, 'Ministry in the New Testament', *The Church in the Bible and the World* (ed. D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987) 199.

In the other two New Testament texts, Acts 16.21 and 1 Tim 6.16, the common object is a relative pronoun and so stands before both verbs by necessity.

Six texts were found in the Septuagint in which a common object is placed after οὐδέ. In every one, the first verb is positioned immediately before οὐδέ:<sup>48</sup>

Psalm 21.24	ὅτι οὐκ ἐξουδένωσεν οὐδέ προσώχθισεν τῇ δεήσει τοῦ πτωχοῦ <sup>49</sup>	because he did not despise or scorn the petition of the poor, <sup>50</sup>
Proverbs 30.30	σκύμνος λέοντος ἰσχυρότερος κτηνῶν ὃς οὐκ ἀποστρέφεται οὐδέ καταπήσσει κτήνος	a lion's whelp, strongest of the animals, which does not back-off nor fears any animal,
Isaiah 64.3	ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκούσαμεν οὐδέ οἱ ὀφθαλμοὶ ἡμῶν εἶδον θεὸν πλὴν σοῦ	From ages past we have not heard, nor have our eyes seen any God besides you,

This pattern is common in extra-biblical literature, with 27 examples found, including:

Plut Tranq. an. 475.D.3	Ὅθεν οὐ δεῖ παντάπασιν ἐκταπεινοῦν οὐδέ καταβάλλειν τὴν φύσιν <sup>51</sup>	Therefore we should not altogether debase and depreciate nature <sup>52</sup>
Plut., Fort. Alex. 331.C.5	οὐκ ἐγκαλυπτόμενον οὐδέ κατακρύπτοντα τὰς οὐλάς,	He did not cover over or hide his scars,
Polyb., Hist. 3.94.4.4	τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὴν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ὑπόθεσιν οὐδαμῶς κρίνων ἐκκυβεύειν οὐδέ παραβάλλεσθαι τοῖς ὄλοις,	and partly because he adhered to his former resolve not to risk or hazard a general engagement,

In only three cases was the first verb separated from οὐδέ by intervening terms:

Plut., Rom. Quest. 278.E.8	‘Διὰ τί, δυεῖν βωμῶν Ἡρακλέους ὄντων, οὐ μεταλαμβάνουσι γυναῖκες οὐδέ γεύονται τῶν ἐπὶ τοῦ μείζονος θυομένων;	Why, when there are two altars of Hercules, do women receive no share nor taste of the sacrifices offered on the larger altar?
Plut., Broth. Love 487.F.2	οὐκέτι κρατεῖν ἐν τοῖς μείζουσιν οὐδέ καταπαύειν τὸ φιλόνηκον δύνανται καὶ φιλότιμον.	until they are no longer able to control or subdue their contentious and ambitious spirit in more important matters.
Plut., Wheth. Affect. 501.D.9	οὕτως οἱ κατὰ ψυχὴν χειμῶνες βαρύτεροι στείλασθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἐῶντες οὐδ’ ἐπιστῆσαι τεταραγμένον τὸν λογισμόν·	so these storms of the soul are more serious which do not allow a man to compose or to calm his disturbed reason;

48 See also Isa 11.9, DanTh 3.50, SusTh 1.48.

49 *Septuaginta*, ed. A. Rahlfs (Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1935; repr. in 9th ed., 1971) All LXX texts are from this edition.

50 A. Pietersma, *A New English Translation of the Septuagint, and Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included under That Title: The Psalms* (New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000) All LXX verses from this version ('NETS') unless otherwise stated.

51 Non-biblical texts are from the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*.

52 English translations of non-biblical texts are from the Loeb Classical Library, unless otherwise stated.

The last case especially provides some support for the notion that ἀνδρός could be the object of διδάσκειν in 1 Timothy 2.12, with two terms separating στείλασθαι from οὐδὲ, with one of them a verb of permission taking the infinitive, and the other the subject of the infinitive verbs:

διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός,	στείλασθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον οὐκ ἔωντες οὐδ’ ἐπιστῆσαι τεταραγμένον τὸν λογισμόν·
---	---

Against this it may be urged, firstly, that the case is rare; secondly, that it is from an Atticist, whose style is not directly comparable to that of the New Testament; and thirdly, that the object is in the same case as that of στείλασθαι would be expected to have. Moreover, the emphatic position of διδάσκειν at the start of the verse, creates a contrast with the μανθανέτω ('should learn') of the previous verse. It seems more natural to understand Paul as drawing a contrast between learning on the one hand and teaching on the other, rather than between learning on the one hand and teaching a man on the other.

Perhaps decisively, at least two of the earliest Greek commentators understood διδάσκειν as intransitive in 1 Timothy 2.12. As discussed below, Origen cited the text as '. . . καὶ διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω ἀπλῶς ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός', with the two verbs separated clearly by ἀλλά. Likewise, in his commentary on the passage, Chrysostom treats the first prohibition on its own, citing it as 'Γυναικὶ δὲ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω διδάσκειν.' ('I do not permit a woman to teach.')

It seems implausible that both these students of the text, writing much nearer to the time of its composition, would misunderstand the grammatical connection between the words. Therefore, with regard to syntactical structure, we find ourselves in agreement with Payne's statement in his 1981 paper that the Greek text 'reads, literally: "To teach, however, on the part of a woman I am not permitting, nor to lord it over a man."' In similar vein, William Kelly (1913) gives the sense of the Greek text as 'But to teach I permit not a woman nor to exercise authority over a man'; Ellicott (1856) renders it in his translation as 'But I suffer not the woman to TEACH, nor yet to have authority over the man'; Alford (1865) as 'to a woman I permit not to teach, nor to lord it over the man'; Fairbairn (1874) as (translation) 'But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to lord it over the man,' and (commentary) 'But to teach . . . I permit not a woman . . . nor to lord it over the man'; Plummer (1888) as 'But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man'; Faulkner Brown (1917) as 'but teaching I do not allow to a woman, nor to govern a man'; Lock (1924) as 'I do not allow a woman to be herself a teacher, nor to dictate to men'; Barrett (1963) as 'I do not permit a woman to be a teacher, nor must woman domineer over man'; Levinsohn (2011) as 'I do not permit a woman to teach nor to have authority over a man'. Likewise, in the commentaries by Bengel (1742), Ellicott (1856), Huther (1885), Bernard (1899), St John Parry (1919), and J N D Kelly (1963), it is assumed without comment or discussion that διδάσκειν is to be read intransitively. This seems to be the natural way to read it.

A straightforward translation of 1 Tim 2.12 could therefore be:

διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ’ εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ.	I do not permit a woman to teach, nor to exercise authority over a man, but to be in quietness.
---	---

53 *The Homilies of S. John Chrysostom, Archbishop of Constantinople, on the Epistles of St. Paul the Apostle to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon* (Oxford: Parker, 1843) 70; MPG 62.544.

54 Payne, *Libertarian*, 175.

55 All commentaries at the verse; Levinsohn, *1 Timothy*, 12. He gives 'nor even' as a possible alternative rendering to 'nor'.

### B.3 Objections

Payne objects that if 1 Tim 2.12 contains a prohibition of women teaching then it 'contradicts Paul's statements that approve women teaching' and his 'affirmations of women teaching' that are 'particularly prominent in the Pastoral Epistles'.<sup>56</sup> He finds such an affirmation in the exhortation of 1 Tim 3.1–2 to aspire to the office of overseer, pointing out that the ability to teach is one of the requirements, but neglecting to mention another condition that he is to be *μῖς γυναικὸς ἄνδρα*, husband of one wife. Likewise, Payne believes that Paul would have had both men and women in mind in his exhortations to the believers in 1 Cor 14.26 and Col 3.16 to teach one another. In the light of the strong injunctions to silence of 1 Cor 14.33–38, this seems unlikely.

In 1 Cor 11.5 Paul gave instructions regarding the prophetic ministry of women. Payne maintains that prophesying 'often entails teaching'. But prophecy is inspired utterance, whereas teaching in the church is the communication and impartation of a body of doctrine, and the two are frequently distinguished in scripture, for example in 1 Cor 12.9, Acts 13.1, and Eph 4.11.

Payne observes from 2 Tim 1.5 and 3.15 that Timothy learned the holy scriptures from his mother Lois and grandmother Eunice, and then quotes 2 Tim 3.16 to the effect that the scriptures are 'useful for teaching (*διδασκαλία*)'. The specific term *διδασκαλία* is employed for the use that Timothy was to make of the scriptures, not for the process by which he learned them, which may have been primarily through having them read to him.

In 2 Tim 2.2, which concerns the transmission of doctrine to those who will be able to teach others also, Payne translates *ἄνθρωποις* as 'persons', claiming that the word 'encompasses men and women'. But while *ἄνθρωπος* certainly can stand for 'human being', it can also refer to a man, a male person, even a husband, as for example in 1 Cor 7.1, Eph 5.31, Matt 19.5,10, and 1 Tim 2.5.

In Titus 2.3–4, Paul exhorts the older women to be 'teachers of what is good' (*καλοδιδασκάλους*), so that they may train (*ἵνα σωφρονίζωσιν*) the young women to love their husbands and children, to be to be sensible, pure and kind, to work at home and to submit to their husbands. *ἵνα* is a conjunction which is used in a final sense to denote purpose, aim or goal, and as Marshall says at this verse, here 'expresses the purpose of their being teachers'.<sup>57</sup> Payne comments in a footnote that Paul 'lists one of the groups (younger women) they are to teach and some of the things they are to teach, but neither is exhaustive, as 2 Tim 1.5 and 3.14–17 show.' While it may be true that the purpose clause does not in itself exclude other forms of teaching activity, it does serve to specify what Paul has in mind. Ellicott observes that this is not 'public teaching, but as the context implies by its specifications', takes place 'in domestic privacy'.<sup>58</sup> Likewise, Fairbairn writes that the clause serves 'to specify what more especially should be taught'.<sup>59</sup> Marshall comments that 'In view of the prohibition of women teaching in the church meeting in 1 Tim 2, some commentators think that the injunction here implies that the women are to devote themselves to this form of teaching the younger women only and are excluded from other forms'. He considers that the verb *διδασκεῖν* at 1 Tim 2.12 'connotes the task of conveying authoritative instruction in a congregational setting'.<sup>60</sup> No real difficulty presents itself in reconciling a prohibition of this form of teaching with the instruction of young women in their home lives.

---

56 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 248.

57 I. H. Marshall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1999) 247.

58 C. J. Ellicott, *A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles, with a Revised Translation* (London: Parker, 1856) 180.

59 P. Fairbairn, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1874) 272.

60 Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 455.

No inconsistency has been found between a literal translation of 1 Tim 2.12, as Payne once referred to it, and Paul's other teaching about women. Rather, it coheres well with his injunctions to silence in the assembly in 1 Cor 14.33–38, to submission in marriage in Eph 5.22–24, Col 3.18 and Titus 2.5, and with his teaching on male headship in 1 Cor 11.3.

### C. 'A single idea'

Payne's extraordinary thesis is that Paul does not in fact prohibit women from teaching at all. All that he prohibits is teaching combined with the assumption of authority over men. To give this thought a readable form, he expresses it by claiming in the last sentence of his paper that 1 Tim 2.12 'simply prohibits women from assuming for themselves authority to teach men.' He thus finally abandons the coordinate construction which he has hitherto accepted, and seems to make διδάσκειν an infinitive complement of ἀθεντεῖν, itself an infinitive complement of ἐπιτρέπω. No evidence is provided that ἀθεντεῖν can in fact govern the infinitive.

To illustrate and support his thesis, Payne turns to the English language. He writes on page 241 that 'Paul's overwhelmingly dominant use of οὐδέ to combine two elements is to express a single idea', and then in an accompanying footnote claims that 'Paul's use of οὐδέ parallels in many respects the English oral idiom 'n, as in "hit 'n run", "eat 'n run", "night 'n day" and "black 'n white". Both typically convey a single idea.' In his book, 'Man and Woman, One in Christ', Payne explains what sort of parallel he sees:<sup>61</sup>

"Don't eat 'n run!" prohibits leaving immediately after eating. It does not prohibit either eating or running by itself. "Don't hit 'n run" prohibits the *combination* of hitting someone with a vehicle, then fleeing the scene of the accident. Similarly, 1 Tim 2.12a viewed as a single idea does not prohibit teaching in itself . . .

It may be admitted that both these English expressions have in common with 1 Timothy 2.12 the coordination of two verbs by a conjunction. But the combinations 'eat and run' and 'hit and run' have been employed so frequently with a particular meaning, that they have passed into the English language as terms in their own right. 'Hit and run' has its own entry in the OED, and 'eat and run' is found in at least one dictionary of idiom.<sup>62</sup> For this reason, they easily maintain their form in a negative sentence, with the retention of the positive conjunction 'and'.

In the same way, καί may be retained in a negative sentence in Greek, when it combines two terms into a single conception. Examples include:

Gal 1.16	εὐθέως οὐ προσανεθέμην σαρκὶ καὶ αἵματι	I did not immediately consult with flesh and blood,
Matt 10.38	καὶ ὃς οὐ λαμβάνει τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀκολουθεῖ ὀπίσω μου, οὐκ ἔστιν μου ἄξιος.	And he who does not take his cross and follow after Me is not worthy of Me.
Luke 12.29	καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ ζητεῖτε τί φάγητε καὶ τί πίνητε	And do not seek what you will eat and what you will drink,

61 Payne, *Man and Woman*, 344–5.

62 C. Ammer, *The American Heritage Dictionary of Idioms* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 2013) Entry for "eat and run".

Buttmann writes of the usage of *καί* found in Matt 10.38 that it 'connects the following clause so closely with the preceding clause (already negated) that it is brought with the latter under the influence of the same negative, so that *καί* then completely takes the place of the *οὐδέ* (*μηδέ*) used by the Greeks under such circumstances.'<sup>63</sup>

*σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* was a Greek expression, referred to by BDAG as a 'unit', which denotes 'a human being in contrast to God and other transcendent beings'.<sup>64</sup> Obviously, Paul is not telling the Galatians that he did not confer with blood, or with flesh, considered separately. Just as the English translations do not render this as 'I did not confer with flesh or blood', so in Greek the positive conjunction is retained. An English expression like 'eat and run' seems to be comparable to a Greek expression like *σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα*, rather than to the coordination of clauses or phrases with *οὐδέ*.

## C.1 Hendiadys

Payne makes two references to hendiadys (from *ἐν διὰ δυοῖν* 'one by means of two'), a figure of speech in which a single complex idea is expressed by two words connected by a conjunction.<sup>65</sup> In the first, he says that he will avoid what he considers a 'useful term' because of disputes over definition, thus implying that he would have used it otherwise.<sup>66</sup> Secondly, he writes in a footnote that:

Ten out of seventeen occurrences in the accepted letters of Paul specify meaning. In Titus 2.13 also, hendiadys specifies meaning: 'our blessed hope, (*καὶ*) the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior Jesus Christ' RSV; cf. NIV, BDF §442 (16).<sup>67</sup>

The 'also' in the second sentence seems to imply that hendiadys occurs with *οὐδέ* in many of Paul's letters. Certainly, the definition of hendiadys is very similar to the function of *οὐδέ* that Payne claims to exist, and to be manifest in Paul's letters in particular, namely to join two terms to express a single idea. In accepted usage, however, hendiadys applies to the joining of single words by a positive conjunction, rather than to longer terms or to negative conjunctions.

An example commonly given of hendiadys in English is the expression 'nice and warm', meaning much the same as 'nicely warm'. Because 'nice' functions as an adverb modifying 'warm', rather than as an adjective, it would be possible to say, for instance, 'it's a horrible room, but nice and warm'. In a negative sentence, one might conceivably say 'it's not nice and warm, but it's still a nice room'. This negation of A with B, and simultaneous affirmation of A, is what Payne is claiming for 1 Tim 2.12. But examples in English are rare and idiomatic. Hendiadys does not occur in English with negative conjunctions: if something is not nice *or* warm, then it cannot be nice. Indeed, it occurs only with 'and'.<sup>68</sup> A different type of hendiadys occurs in English with certain verbs including 'go' and 'try'. 'Try and do better' means 'try to do better'; 'go and buy' means to go to buy. But this can be of no relevance to 1 Tim 2.12 since the verbs are in the reverse order, and with verbs in English there is again no hendiadys with negative conjunctions.

---

63 Buttmann, *Grammar*, 368.

64 BDAG, *σὰρξ*, §3a.

65 "hendiadys, n." *OED Online*. (Oxford University Press, December 2014) Web. 2 February 2015.

66 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 235, n.2.

67 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 240, n.11.

68 H. W. Fowler, *Fowler's Modern English Usage* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004<sup>3</sup>) 357.



In Greek, hendiadys takes a different form. Typically, two nouns or other substantives are connected by a copulative conjunction to express a single complex idea. One acts to modify the other as if it were an adjective or an attributive genitive.<sup>69</sup> Smyth gives three illustrative examples:

Demosthenes, On the False Embassy 19.123	αἶ τε πόλεις πολλαὶ καὶ χαλεπαὶ λαβεῖν αἱ τῶν Φωκέων, μὴ οὐ χρόνῳ καὶ πολιορκίᾳ:	The Phocian cities were numerous, and not easy of capture, unless by protracted siege.
Euripides, Helen 226	ὁ δὲ σὸς ἐν ἀλὶ κύμασί τε λέλοιπε βίοντον,	your husband has lost his life in the salty waves, [E P Coleridge]/ in the waves of the sea [Smyth]
Sophocles, Electra 36	ἄσκευον αὐτὸν ἀσπίδων τε καὶ στρατοῦ δόλοισι	alone, and by stealth, without the aid of arms or large numbers, [Jebb]

The Phocian cities could not be captured except (μὴ οὐ) by time and siege (χρόνῳ καὶ πολιορκίᾳ). Clearly, time alone has no value in capturing a city unless it is combined with an assault. It is a long siege that will be effective, and this can be considered to be a single idea or concept, most easily rendered in English with an adjective. In the second example, ἐν ἀλὶ κύμασί τε may mean either 'in salt and waves', or 'in sea and waves'. If the former, then it can again be translated adjectivally as 'salty waves'. If the latter, then this may be seen as specification: the thought could be that 'he drowned in the sea, and it was the waves of the sea in particular which overcame him'. It may be given in English with a genitive: 'in the waves of the sea'.

For his third example, Smyth proposes that in ἄσκευον . . . ἀσπίδων τε καὶ στρατοῦ (not equipped . . . with shields and army) the noun pair should be read as ὀπλισμοῦ στρατοῦ, armed force. But as Sansone points out, 'it is not necessary to take it thus. Apollo is telling Orestes two separate things: that he should dispense with an army (i.e. to act alone) and that he should dispense with defensive armor (i.e. to act by stealth).<sup>70</sup> In Jebb's translation, likewise, the disjunctive 'or' conveys the absence of two distinct elements of military force, weaponry and numbers.

This third example brings to light a fact that is pertinent to 1 Timothy 2.11-12, namely that even where two or more elements combine into a single conception in a positive injunction or command, the negative counterpart may be composed of separate elements. For example, if a captain says 'move quickly and silently', which may convey a single impression of what is desired, the opposite is not to say 'don't be slow and noisy', but 'don't be slow or noisy'. He is prohibiting all slow movement, and all noisy movement, as well as the combination of the two. In their analysis of the meaning of οὐδέ in 1 Timothy 2.12, a study group which included Clifford Kuehne made the same point with a homely example:<sup>71</sup>

Take, for example, the instruction, "I want you to go to bed cheerfully." That means, stated negatively, "I don't want you to stay up" and "I don't want you to go to bed grumpy," not simply, "don't go to bed in a grumpy manner." Learn in submissiveness. That means "don't be a teacher" and "don't exercise authority over a man."

No reference has been found in the literature on hendiadys to any instances of it being formed with οὐδέ. The author has found one possible example in Polybius:

69 Smyth, *Grammar*, §3025.

70 D. Sansone, 'On Hendiadys in Greek', *Glotta* 62 (1984) 16–25, at 22.

71 'Combined Effort', 'The meaning of οὐδέ in 1 Timothy 2.12', *Journal of Theology*, Church of the Lutheran Confession (Sep 1995) 6.

Plb. Hist. 1.74.5.3	τῶν δὲ θηρίων βιασαμένων εἰς τὴν παρεμβολήν, οὐ δυνάμενοι τὸ βάρος οὐδὲ τὴν ἔφοδον οἱ πολέμιοι μείναι πάντες ἐξέπεσον ἐκ τῆς στρατοπεδείας.	When the elephants forced their way into the camp, the enemy unable to face the weight of their attack all evacuated it.
------------------------	---	--

The enemy could not face the weight (τὸ βάρος) and the attack (τὴν ἔφοδον) of the elephants. Since the actual physical weight of the elephants must surely be in view, it might perhaps be more precise to render the thought in English as 'their weight in their attack' rather than 'the weight of their attack'. The meaning could even be conveyed adjectivally as 'their weighty attack', showing that the form is similar to that of Smyth's first example. It may be, therefore, that is not impossible for a hendiadys to be formed with οὐδέ. It will be noted that this single possible example has the classic form of hendiadys with καί, with two substantives in close proximity as the terms being combined into a single idea.

Verbal hendiadys in Greek is less widely accepted. Winer writes that to 'find a hendiadys in the verb . . . is altogether absurd'.<sup>72</sup> Nevertheless, according to Denniston, a second verb may serve to qualify adverbially another verb with which it is coordinated.<sup>73</sup> Thus, for example, he considers that ἄρχουσι καὶ τυραννοῦσι ('they rule and rule absolutely') means 'they rule despotically', so that the meaning is narrowed down to a specific type of ruling. In all the thirteen examples he gives, the two verbs are joined by καὶ or τε καὶ and are close together, and in all but three they are immediately either side of the conjunction or conjunctions.

In a positive sentence, it is natural to add a more specific verb to a less specific one. 'They rule, and (what's more) they rule despotically', one may say. In a negative sentence, there is no reason to deny something more specific if the general has already been denied. Rather, one might possibly say 'they do not tyrannise, and in fact they do not rule at all', adding the more general denial to the specific.

Because combinations of events tend to be improbable, there is in general more reason to affirm them than to deny them. One might say 'in the excitement, he was running and shouting and clapping his hands'; but it would hardly be of interest to deny this particular combination of activities. One might, however, deny all three and say that 'despite the excitement, he was not running or shouting nor even clapping his hands'. This means that he was not running and he was not shouting and he was not clapping his hands. Whereas the English 'or' is used in positive sentences most characteristically as a disjunctive, to indicate a choice between mutually exclusive options, here in a negative sentence, it functions in effect as an additive connective. What the two kinds of use have in common is that the coordinated elements remain distinct and separate.

Considerations of this sort may give reason to expect that negative connectives will tend to be more disjunctive and less conjunctive than positive ones. Certainly, it is unsafe to assume that language features that occur in positive expressions will necessarily have a negative counterpart. They may do, but this would have to be demonstrated with evidence. The case for verbal hendiadys with οὐδέ is so far entirely bereft of such evidence. The only type of hendiadys accepted in grammars of the New Testament is that formed with nouns and with positive conjunctions. As William Mounce observes, the nouns are usually placed side by side, whereas in 1 Tim 2.12 διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν are separated by five words.<sup>74</sup> They are verbs rather than nouns, and the conjunction is negative. For these three reasons, the type of hendiadys that is known to occur in Greek does not provide any support for the notion that there is a merging or combining of two ideas into one in 1 Tim 2.12.

<sup>72</sup> Winer, *Grammar*, 786.

<sup>73</sup> Denniston, *Particles*, 62–3.

<sup>74</sup> Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 128.

## C.2 Epexegetis

According to Payne, Paul commonly uses οὐδέ 'to specify meaning'.<sup>75</sup> In defence of this notion, he appeals to Titus 2.13:

προσδεχόμενοι τὴν μακαρίαν ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν τῆς δόξης τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,	looking for the blessed hope and the appearing of the glory of our great God and Savior, Christ Jesus,
---	--

Certain translators have understood the first καὶ to be introducing an explanation or definition of the nature of 'the blessed hope': that it is 'the appearing of the glory of . . .'. Thus, as Payne points out in his footnote, the RSV renders it as 'our blessed hope, the appearing of . . .', so that it is one thing that is being awaited and not two.<sup>76</sup> If καὶ does in fact have such an epexegetical force in this text, then it could be perhaps be said that it serves to combine the two concepts of 'hope' and 'appearing' into a single conception of a hope which is understood objectively as the thing hoped for, which is the appearing.

Payne is incorrect, however, when he refers to this as a hendiadys. The epexegetical use of καὶ should be distinguished from its employment in the formation of a hendiadys. In BDF for example, the epexegetical use of καὶ is treated at §442.9, and hendiadys at §442.16. If it were a true hendiadys, then ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν could be rendered as either the 'hope of the appearing', or the 'hoped-for appearing'. According to §442.16, a hendiadys is employed in order to avoid a series of dependent genitives. It would appear therefore that BDF understands ἐλπίδα καὶ ἐπιφάνειαν to be equivalent in meaning to ἐλπίδα τῆς ἐπιφανείας ('hope of the appearing . . .'), rather than to the epexegetical 'hope: that is, the appearing . . .'. In the first case, καὶ binds the two nouns together into a single conception; in the second, καὶ serves to separate them, introducing a long epexegetical explanation of what the hope is.

It is not certain that this is an example of either hendiadys or epexegetis. Ellicott, for example, sees ἐλπίδα and ἐπιφάνειαν as sharing the definite article τὴν, and bound together by it. He sees τῆς δόξης as dependent on ἐλπίδα as well as upon ἐπιφάνειαν, the two nouns being united closely by καὶ:<sup>77</sup> it is a hope of glory and an appearing of glory, combined closely together. Bernard and Hillard, likewise, both take ἐλπίδα with τῆς δόξης, thus maintaining a distinction between ἐλπίδα and ἐπιφάνειαν.<sup>78</sup> Robertson also seems to have the same view, using wording almost identical to that of Ellicott.<sup>79</sup>

Payne's example concerns καὶ and not οὐδέ. While it is generally accepted that καὶ may have an epexegetical function, the same is not true of οὐδέ. The CLC Study found many references to epexegetical καὶ in the three lexicons and seven grammars that it searched in, but none to epexegetical οὐδέ.<sup>80</sup> A more extensive search by the author has yielded the same result. The fact that some functions of καὶ in positive expressions are carried out by οὐδέ in negative expressions, is no guarantee that all are. To take one example, the counterpart to the correlatives καὶ . . . καὶ . . . (both . . . and . . .) is οὔτε . . . οὔτε . . ., not οὐδέ . . . οὐδέ . . . . An epexegetical function for οὐδέ would

75 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 240.

76 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 240 n. 11.

77 Ellicott, *Pastoral Epistles*, 187.

78 J. H. Bernard, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Cambridge: University Press, 1899) 171; A. E. Hillard, *The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul: the Greek text* (London: Rivingtons, 1919) 121.

79 Robertson, *Grammar*, 786.

80 'Combined Effort', *The meaning of οὐδέ*, 3.

have to be demonstrated from actual data, and Payne has made no attempt to do this, nor referred to any such demonstration.

If οὐδέ were functioning exegetically in 1 Tim 2.12, then the meaning would be along the lines of: 'I do not permit a woman to teach, for that would be to allow her to exercise authority over a man'. Lenski took this view, claiming that this is 'explicative οὐδέ, for "neither to exercise authority over a man" states the point involved in the forbidding "to teach".<sup>81</sup> J N D Kelly had a similar view, writing that for 'a woman to teach in church, [Paul] suggests, is tantamount to her wielding authority over a man . . . and this, he implies, is contrary to the natural order.'<sup>82</sup> Thus, like Payne, they see only a single prohibition, but this is by no means the same as the prohibition that Payne sees. One is of teaching in the church, the other is of assuming authority to teach men.

### C.3 The fallacy of the undistributed middle

The Oxford English Dictionary defines a sentence as a 'series of words in connected speech or writing, forming the grammatically complete expression of a single thought'. It is entirely to be expected therefore that in many cases two elements of a sentence will together form a unified conception, since this may well be a step towards the end of attaining coherence in the whole. But there is more than one way in which ideas and concepts can combine into one.

Of particular relevance to Payne's thesis is the question of whether the addition of the second element extends or restricts the referent. For example, consider the following sentence: 'I do not permit cats in the flat.' If the idea 'dogs' is added to that of cats, then the prohibition of both may well be understood as the single overarching idea of a general prohibition of household pets. The prohibition has been extended, and continues to include all cats. On the other hand, if the idea 'black' is added to that of cats, then the two terms combine to form the single idea of the prohibition of black cats. In this case, the prohibition has been restricted and most cats are now permitted. Finally, if the idea 'domestic feline' were to be added exegetically, so that the sentence read: 'I do not permit cats, domestic felines, in the flat', then the referent would be neither extended or restricted.

Payne's proposal is that the addition of οὐδέ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός to the prohibition διδάσκειν δὲ γυναῖκί οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω serves to create a single more limited prohibition. In order to build his case, he refers to texts where the addition of a second term with οὐδέ serves to extend the referent to what may be conceived of as a single idea which encompasses the two terms. He also refers to texts where the second term may possibly be an exegetical addition which neither extends nor restricts the referent. He fails to distinguish between these three forms of combination, referring to the result of all three simply as 'a single idea'.

He then argues as follows. First, he claims that 'Paul's overwhelmingly dominant use of οὐδέ to combine two elements is to express a single idea.'<sup>83</sup> Then, by induction, he proposes that it is highly probable that the two elements joined by οὐδέ in 1 Tim 2.12 likewise express a single idea. He goes on to propose a reading of 1 Tim 2.12 which can be said to express a single idea. He concludes that this is almost certainly the right reading because it expresses a single idea.

---

81 R. C. H. Lenski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians : To the Thessalonians, to Timothy, to Titus and to Philemon* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing, 1961) 563.

82 J. H. D. Kelly, *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles : I Timothy, II Timothy, Titus* (London: Black, 1963) 68.

83 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 241.

The final stage of the argument is fallacious, the fallacy being in essence that of the undistributed middle. In its simplest form it runs: 'All cats are mammals. This animal is a mammal. Therefore this animal is a cat.' Suppose, for sake of argument, that there are three ways in which two elements can combine into a single idea, and that these are the extended, the equivalent, and the restricted, as outlined above. Call these A, B, and C. As will be seen below, Payne finds examples of all these types, but refers to them indiscriminately as 'a single idea'. Call this D. Suppose also, for sake of argument, that Payne is correct in saying that Paul almost always uses οὐδέ to express a single idea. Then one may find strength in the inductive argument that 1 Tim 2.12 probably expresses a single idea. Payne claims to find a few cases of C, where the combination of elements restricts the meaning. All C are D. 1 Tim 2.12 is probably D. Therefore 1 Tim 2.12 is probably C, or so Payne seems to argue. This is a fallacy, since even if it is D, it may be A or B rather than C. In other words, even if it is a single idea, it may be an extended or equivalent one, rather than a limited one.

#### C.4 'A single idea' illustrated

Kostenberger provides forty-seven examples from outside the New Testament of οὐδέ connecting two infinitives governed by the same negated finite verb.<sup>84</sup> In his fifth footnote, Payne cites ten of these as 'Non-Pauline examples of οὐδέ joining two infinitives in order to convey a single idea.' In four or five cases, the two verbs are more or less similar in meaning. For example:

Plb. Hist. 31.12.5	τὴν δὲ σύγκλητον οὐ τολμήσειν ἔτι βοηθεῖν οὐδὲ συνεπισχύειν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Λυσίαν τοιαῦτα διεργασαμένοις.	while the senate would <i>not</i> go so far as to help <i>and</i> support Lysias after his conduct.
Plu. Tranq. Mind 475 D3	ὅθεν οὐ δεῖ παντάπασιν ἐκταπεινοῦν οὐδὲ καταβάλλειν τὴν φύσιν	Therefore we should <i>not</i> altogether debase <i>and</i> depreciate Nature

There is overlap between the lexical ranges of βοηθεῖν and συνεπισχύειν and so it could be that they are effectively synonyms in the Polybius text. On the other hand, the underlying meaning of βοηθεῖν is to respond to a cry (βοή), while that of συνεπισχύειν is to help to strengthen, so there may rather be some measure of distinction between the two, and perhaps an element of progression: first to run to the aid of someone and then to assist them. What is certain is that the senate did neither. Payne makes no suggestion with regard to this text that the second term limits the first, so that it was only the combination of the two actions that the senate did not dare to do, and that in fact they did run to the aid of Lysias without then strengthening him.

In the Plutarch text, there is a discernible difference between ἐκταπεινοῦν, meaning to lower and thus to disparage or minimize; and καταβάλλειν, meaning to throw down or overthrow and thus also to cast off or reject. Nevertheless we may agree with Payne that the two ideas may well combine in the mind of the reader to express a single idea of disparaging or rejecting nature. As in the previous text there may be a hint of progression or ascension: 'we should not disparage, let alone reject'. The same two verbs (ἐκταπεινοῦντος . . . καὶ καταβάλλοντος) are joined together by καί in the same work by Plutarch, and here the translator renders them as 'both debases and destroys'.<sup>85</sup> The second verb does not restrict the meaning of the first but rather extends it. Plutarch cannot mean that we may debase or disparage nature so long as we do not depreciate or reject it.

84 A. J. Köstenberger, 'A Complex Sentence: The Syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12', *Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9–12* (ed. A. J. Köstenberger and T. R. Schreiner; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005) 53–84, 63–71. In his example no. 21, the infinitives are coordinated by ἀλλ' οὐδέ, and οὐδέ is adverbial.

85 Plutarch, *Moralia*, tr. W. C. Helmbold, Vol. 6 (London: Heinemann, 1962) 471 D.

In the other five or six cases, οὐδέ joins two clauses which are, or may appear to be, similar in meaning. For example:

Isa 42.24 (part)	καὶ οὐκ ἐβούλοντο ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς αὐτοῦ πορεύεσθαι οὐδέ ἀκούειν τοῦ νόμου αὐτοῦ	and they would <i>not</i> walk in his ways <i>nor</i> hear his law
Jos. Ant. 7.127	Τοῦτο τὸ πταῖσμα τοὺς Ἀμμανίτας οὐκ ἔπεισεν ἡρεμεῖν οὐδέ μαθόντας τοὺς κρείττονας ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν,	This defeat did <i>not</i> persuade the Ammanites to remain quiet <i>or</i> to keep the peace in the knowledge that their enemy was superior.

It may readily be agreed, with regard to the Isaiah text, that a refusal to walk in God's ways is closely allied to an unwillingness to listen and hearken to his law. But these are not exactly the same thing. Clearly, the second clause focuses the attention onto the word of God (יהוה) and presumably thus onto his commandments. The first clause could be thought of as the broader of the two, or it could be that they are complementary, with the first being less formal and dealing more with matters of the heart. Whatever exact nuances of meaning were intended, both are negated. The two together may perhaps be thought of as a single idea which includes both. But it is certainly not that the Israelites were in fact walking in God's ways, except in the matter of hearing his law.

In the Antiquities, the phrase ἡσυχίαν ἄγειν carries the meaning 'keep quiet, be at peace or at rest'.<sup>86</sup> Ἠρεμέω has a very similar lexical range, but can also mean to 'acquiesce in a verdict'. The participial phrase μαθόντας τοὺς κρείττονας (having learnt [their enemies to be] stronger) suggests that there may be a progression in view. First, they were not subdued and quieted by their defeat; second, despite being inferior in strength, they did not make a strategic decision to keep the peace. William Whiston's translation keeps the participial phrase in its position between the two infinitives, and thus gives more of a sense of such a progression: 'This defeat did *not* still induce the Ammonites to be quiet, *nor* to own those that were superior to them to be so, and be still, . . .'.<sup>87</sup>

According to Payne, Josephus here communicates 'a single idea'.<sup>88</sup> He says that the second clause in the Loeb translation, 'to keep the peace in the knowledge that their enemy was superior' is a reiteration of the first, 'to remain quiet'. But clearly, at the least, the second clause adds the subsidiary idea of an appraisal of the relative strength of the opposing forces. It is agreed with Payne that this is not 'a separate idea', but this does not in itself mean that it combines or merges with the first clause to form 'a single idea'. The second clause does reinforce the first, but it also adds something new. Since it does reiterate and reinforce the first clause, it certainly does not limit it, so that it could be said that the Ammanites actually did remain quiet, except with regard to keeping the peace.

Payne comments upon one other of these ten texts, again giving insight into the way in which he sees it expressing a single idea:

Plb. Hist. 30.5. 8	οὐκ ἐβούλοντο συνδύαζειν οὐδέ προκαταλαμβάνειν σφᾶς αὐτοὺς ὄρκους καὶ συνθήκας,	they did <i>not</i> desire to run in harness with Rome <i>and</i> engage themselves by oaths and treaties, [Loeb]	and they therefore did <i>not</i> choose to bind <i>or</i> hamper themselves beforehand with oaths and treaties; [Shuckburgh] <sup>89</sup>
-----------------------------	---	---	---

86 H. G. Liddell, *A Greek-English lexicon*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996<sup>9</sup>) ἡσυχία.

87 Josephus, *The Works*, tr. W. Whiston (London: Ward, 1878) 188.

88 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 245.

89 Polybius, *The Histories*, tr. E.S. Shuckburgh, Vol. II (London: Macmillan, 1889) 411.

In this case, one translator understands οὐδέ to be coordinating two infinitives with a common object; whereas the Loeb translator reads συνδυάζειν as absolute, with the second clause added to it with οὐδέ. Liddell and Scott take the latter view, suggesting the meaning 'combine' for this text.<sup>90</sup> Generally, the word means 'to join two together, to couple or pair'. Payne claims that the 'content after οὐδέ clarifies that "to run in harness" is to "engage themselves by oaths and treaties [to Rome]". Together these express the one idea of alliance with Rome.<sup>91</sup> In other words, he seems to see οὐδέ as being expegetical in function in this text, with a meaning such as 'that is,'.

There is however no need to introduce a previously unknown force for οὐδέ. Both translators have made good sense of the text with οὐδέ functioning as a simple connective, either adding a new clause or coordinating two verbs. The cognate verb καταλαμβάνω is used specifically of binding with oaths, so it seems reasonable to suggest that προκαταλαμβάνω can mean to bind beforehand with oaths. The second term may therefore add the idea of permanence through oath to the first idea of coupling.

Even if, for sake of argument, οὐδέ did have an expegetical force in this text, the second term would not limit the first. Far from it, for in that case, they would be equal in extent. It could certainly not then be that the Rhodians did in fact desire to couple themselves with Rome so long as it did not involve binding themselves with oaths and treaties.

The other five examples that Payne cites are similar in character, with the second term being more or less close in meaning or import to the first. The effect of the second term therefore is, if anything, to reinforce the first, not to limit it. Payne writes on page 236 that 'Paul typically uses οὐδέ to join together expressions that reinforce or make more specific a single idea.' Here he acknowledges a distinction between reinforcement and limitation. It is noteworthy that it is to this sentence that the ten examples from non-Pauline sources are appended. Later, he gives seven Pauline texts where he believes οὐδέ 'joins equivalent expressions to convey a single idea'. Of these he writes that the 'second expression in each case reinforces the single idea'.<sup>92</sup> Later again, he makes it clear that he does not believe that 1 Tim 2.12 is of this type. He does not suggest that διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν ἄνδρός are similar in meaning. On the contrary, he stresses that they are not, and places them in a different category of οὐδέ joining 'conceptually different expressions to convey a single idea'.<sup>93</sup> In his view, αὐθεντεῖν ἄνδρός serves to 'specify' or limit διδάσκειν, not reinforce it. None of the ten non-Pauline texts that Payne cites provide any support for this thesis, since in every case the second term reinforces and extends the meaning of the first. Payne himself does not argue for a specifying or limiting function for the second term in any of these cases.

## C.5 Plutarch 269 D

Payne offers one example from non-Pauline sources of οὐδέ being used in the way that he claims it to function in 1 Tim 2.12. This example is of singular importance to his thesis, since without it, he has no basis upon which to build his case for Pauline usage. It cannot be that Paul used οὐδέ in a way unknown in other literature, since if he did, he would hardly have been understood. The text occurs in the course of an attempt by Plutarch to explain the unequal interval between the three fixed dates of the Roman month, the Kalends, the Nones, and the Ides:

---

90 Liddell, *Lexicon*, συνδυάζω, §II.

91 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 244-5.

92 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 238.

93 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 238, 243. This is his Category 3.

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

Concerning this passage, Payne says:

Plutarch's explanation praising the progress of astronomy shows that he regards the pursuit of exact calculations positively. He opposes exact calculation here only because it is *in combination with* casting aspersions on approximate reckoning.<sup>94</sup>

Payne appears to be claiming that Plutarch is opposed to the most exact calculation of the number of days only if this exact calculation is combined with casting aspersion on positive reckoning. The proposed meaning could possibly be rendered as: 'As you pursue exact calculations, do not criticise those who use more approximate methods', or something with similar effect. This is most extraordinary since it conflicts not only with the known grammatical function and lexical meaning of οὐδέ, but also with the English translation that Payne provides. All the grammars and lexicons say that οὐδέ adds one negative to another and can be translated 'nor', as here, or 'and not'. Babbitt's translation conveys clearly an exhortation not to follow out the most exact calculations, and in addition a further injunction not to criticise those who content themselves with less precise methods.

Other English translators have retained the normal sense of οὐδέ in this passage, also translating it as 'nor':

but in this we are not to search out exactly the just number of daies, nor upon a small default to slander and condemne this maner of reckoning, [Holland] <sup>95</sup>	But we must not insist on an exact calculation of the number of days, nor quarrel with them over small errors, [Rose] <sup>96</sup>
--	---

Payne has never suggested that the English disjunctive 'nor' can fulfill the function he is claiming for οὐδέ. On the contrary, he has used examples with 'and', such as 'hit 'n run' to convey the English equivalent of this function.

The existing English translations make good sense. Plutarch points out that despite the progress in the science of astronomy, there is still a limit to the degree of accuracy that can be attained in predicting the movements of the moon. Because of the 'irregularity' (ἡ ἀνωμαλία) of the moon's movements, there was no advantage in pursuing exactness beyond the level of understanding that had so far been attained. In his *Life of Aristides*, Plutarch gave two different dates for the same battle according to two different calendars, and then wrote:<sup>97</sup>

We must not wonder at the apparent discrepancy (ἀνωμαλίαν) between these dates, since, even now that astronomy is a more exact science, different people have different beginnings and endings for their months.

94 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 252.

95 Plutarch, *Romane Questions*, tr. P. Holland, ed. F. B. Jevons (London: Nutt, 1892) 37.

96 Plutarch, *The Roman Questions*, tr. H. J. Rose (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1924) 129.

97 Plutarch, *Lives*, tr. B. Perrin (London: Heinemann, 1914) 274–5.



In the third century AD, Censorinus wrote that 'the astronomers do not agree on how much more than 365 days the sun takes in a year and how much less than thirty days the moon takes in a month.'<sup>98</sup> There would be no point in pursuing exactness beyond the limitations of the science.

What is more, if this were a single injunction against casting aspersions while pursuing exact calculation, then one could expect the reason for it to contain some reference to both aspects. But in fact, the reason given in the subordinate clause beginning with ὅπου ('since') refers only to the matter of exactness and not to that of casting aspersions, and makes much better sense as support for a caution against over-exactness. In conclusion, there seems to be no reason to depart from the normal sense of οὐδέ in this text.

## C.6 Pairs of terms in 1 Tim 2

Payne finds support for his thesis in an argument advanced by Craig Blomberg that earlier in the second chapter of 1 Timothy, Paul uses pairs of terms to 'define one single concept'.<sup>99</sup> Blomberg refers to an earlier article for his definitions of the single concept.<sup>100</sup> There he claims that Paul has a 'propensity throughout 1 Timothy 2 to utilize hendiadys (two co-ordinate nouns with one acting as an adjective to define the other) or pleonasm (two parallel expressions where the second is largely redundant)'. In fact, he seems to find pleonasm but not hendiadys. Thus, he says that 'petitions' and 'prayers' define the single concept of 'prayer', not prayerful petitions; 'kings and all those who are in authority' define 'authorities', not authoritative kings or kingly authorities; 'godliness and holiness' define 'godliness'; 'herald and apostle' define 'apostle'; 'wrath and wranglings' define 'anger'; and 'decency and propriety' define 'propriety'. To comment briefly, he seems to miss the extra meaning conveyed by one term or the other.

In one case, in 1 Tim 2.9, he sees the two terms as defining a higher level (in the taxonomic sense) concept, to which they are both in a hyponomous semantic relationship. He says that 'gold and silver' [sic: the text reads 'gold and pearls'] define the concept 'jewellery'. The example is instructive:

μη̄ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ,	not with braided hair and gold or pearls or costly garments,
---	--

Blomberg does not take the view that the gold (or the gold and pearls) should be combined with the braided hair to convey the single concept of braided hair interlaced with gold, and in this he is almost certainly correct. Huther rejected this view, saying that it 'is wrong to connect χρυσίῳ with the previous πλέγμασιν as a hendiadys for πλέγμα χρύσιον' (golden braiding).<sup>101</sup> Instead, with other commentators, he suggested that the 'καὶ divides the ornament into two parts, πλέγματα belonging to the body itself, and what follows being the things put on the body.' The two occurrences of the disjunctive particle ἢ ('or') naturally join together the three terms 'gold or pearls or costly garments', which have in common the matter of expense.

Nevertheless, it is not beyond the bounds of possibility to suggest, as Blomberg does, that gold and pearls be taken together, even as a sub-group, to represent jewellery. If this be granted for the sake of

98 Censorinus, *The Birthday Book*, tr. H. N. Parker (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2007) 42.

99 C. L. Blomberg, 'Neither Hierarchicalist nor Egalitarian: Gender Roles in Paul', *Two Views on Women in Ministry* (ed. J. R. Beck and C. L. Blomberg; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001) 329–72, at 364.

100 C. L. Blomberg, 'Not Beyond What Is Written', *Criswell Theological Review* 2, (1988) 412.

101 J. E. Huther, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles of St. Paul to Timothy and Titus*, tr. D. Hunter (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1885) 104.

argument, then several points need to be noted. First, the fact that the two terms are connected by the disjunctive  $\eta$  means that it cannot be the force of the particle itself which is combining them into a single idea. Second, according to Blomberg's own definition, if this were a hendiadys, then the two terms would convey a single idea like 'golden pearls', more specific than either, not an overarching concept more general than either. Theoretically, if Paul were warning only against the wearing of 'golden pearls', then women would remain free to wear simple gold or pearls without concern. But if he is cautioning against the wearing of jewellery, as Blomberg in fact proposes, then both gold and pearls would be included in the apostolic instruction. Third, it is clear that there remain two discrete referents, gold and pearls. They are not merged, nor does one modify the other adjectivally. Whether or not they combine to define a single concept is a matter of exegesis, not of linguistics or reading comprehension.

In none of the eleven cases that Blomberg identifies in 1 Tim 2.1–9 does he suggest that two terms combine to define a single concept more limited than either.<sup>102</sup> He does not think, for example, that it is only angry disputings that Paul is concerned about in verse 8, and that less emotional disputes are acceptable in the men's prayer meetings. Whatever the merits or otherwise of his case, it provides no support for Payne's thesis of two ideas combining into a more limited one.

## **D. Paul's use of οὐδέ**

The centre-piece of Payne's paper is his attempt to identify and analyse every use by Paul of οὐδέ as a coordinating conjunction. He begins by distinguishing between what he calls Paul's 'disputed' and 'undisputed' letters, and analyses them separately. Since 1 Tim 2.12 is in one of the disputed letters, there seems little advantage in so doing. If the letter is genuine then it can be included with the rest. If it is not genuine, then it is doubtful if it can be compared with the others at all. The only other occurrence of οὐδέ in the so-called disputed letters is in 2 Thessalonians. If it were considered that this could be spurious, but 1 Timothy genuine, then this one case could be considered separately and less weight given to it in the analysis.

It is particularly surprising to find the two other texts in 1 Timothy placed outside the primary group of texts. Of all the texts, these would seem to be the most immediately relevant, and their pertinence could not be affected by one letter or another being considered to be spurious. It seems more practical to treat together all the letters that name Paul as the author, and this is the approach adopted here.

### **D.1 Exclusions**

Payne aims to exclude from consideration those instances where Paul uses οὐδέ other than in a coordinating way. He correctly identifies eight such cases, but there are in fact a further eight where it is used adverbially. These are outlined below, along with relevant texts from Luke-Acts, which Payne also examines as a point of comparison to Paul's letters.

---

102 Blomberg finds a twelfth, 'God and Saviour', in verse 5, defining the single concept 'God'. But this is not in the text.

### D.1.1 οὐδὲ γάρ

In five instances, coordinate clauses are joined by οὐδὲ γάρ:

Luke 20.35	οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀποθανεῖν ἔτι δύνανται, ἰσάγγελοι γὰρ εἰσιν καὶ υἱοὶ εἰσιν θεοῦ τῆς ἀναστάσεως υἱοὶ ὄντες.	<i>for they cannot even die anymore, because they are like angels, and are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection.</i>
Acts 4.12	καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἄλλῳ οὐδενὶ ἢ σωτηρία, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον ὑπὸ τὸν οὐρανὸν τὸ δεδομένον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς.	"And there is salvation in no one else ; <i>for</i> there is <i>no</i> other name under heaven that has been given among men by which we must be saved."
Acts 4.34	οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐνδεής τις ἦν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὅσοι γὰρ κτήτορες χωρίων ἢ οἰκιῶν ὑπῆρχον, πωλοῦντες ἔφερον τὰς τιμὰς τῶν πιπρασκομένων	<i>For</i> there was <i>not</i> a needy person among them, for all who were owners of land or houses would sell them and bring the proceeds of the sales
Rom 8.7	διότι τὸ φρόνημα τῆς σαρκὸς ἔχθρα εἰς θεόν, τῷ γὰρ νόμῳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐχ ὑποτάσσεται, οὐδὲ γὰρ δύνανται·	because the mind set on the flesh is hostile toward God ; for it does not subject itself to the law of God, <i>for</i> it is <i>not even</i> able to do so,
Gal 1.11– 12	Γνωρίζω γὰρ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τὸ εὐαγγελισθὲν ὑπ' ἐμοῦ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν κατὰ ἄνθρωπον· (12) οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου παρέλαβον αὐτὸ οὔτε ἐδιδάχθην, ἀλλὰ δι' ἀποκαλύψεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.	For I would have you know, brethren, that the gospel which was preached by me is not according to man. (12) <i>For I neither</i> received it from man, nor was I taught it, but <i>I received it</i> through a revelation of Jesus Christ.

Payne excludes from consideration the three texts in Luke and Acts, on the grounds that οὐδέ is not serving as a coordinating conjunction, but not the two in Romans and Galatians. In fact, οὐδέ is almost certainly functioning adverbially in all five.

Both οὐδέ and γάρ may function either as an adverb or as a coordinating conjunction. In the case of καὶ γάρ, at least in classical Greek, the combination of the two particles may either mean ‘and indeed’, with καὶ as conjunction and γάρ as adverb, or ‘for even, for also’, with the roles reversed.<sup>103</sup> According to Smyth, οὐδὲ γάρ serves as the negative equivalent of both uses of καὶ γάρ, and can therefore mean either ‘nor indeed’, with οὐδέ serving as a coordinating conjunction, or ‘for not even, for neither, for also.. not’, with οὐδέ as an adverb.<sup>104</sup>

In its entry for οὐδέ, BDAG gives the same meaning ‘for.. not’ for all five cases, with γάρ apparently functioning as the coordinating conjunction, and οὐδέ as a simple negative. For Romans 8.7, BDF suggests the rendering ‘for it can not either’.<sup>105</sup> Winer says that οὔτε can follow οὐδέ in Galatians 1.12, contrary to the usual pattern, because οὔτε has ‘nothing to do with οὐδέ as a

103 Smyth, *Grammar*, §2814–5.

104 Smyth, *Grammar*, §2814–5.

105 BDF §452.3b.

*conjunction*’ in this instance.<sup>106</sup> Ellicott, Meyer and Burton suggest ‘for neither’, and Eadie agrees, saying explicitly that ‘γάρ supplies the ground’.<sup>107</sup> Blass prefers ‘since not even’, but all these authorities agree that it is γάρ which is serving as the coordinating conjunction in this verse.<sup>108</sup>

Payne uses the NRSV translation of Romans 8.7, with ‘indeed it cannot’ for the last clause, οὐδὲ γὰρ δύναται. Payne says on page 237 that he ‘italicizes all English translations of οὐδέ’, but here he italicizes ‘indeed’, which translates γάρ. Even if a case can be made for γάρ being adverbial here, and οὐδέ the conjunction, it is clear that its presence will affect the nature of the relationship between the clauses that are being joined, and render it less directly comparable to 1 Timothy 2.12. It seems preferable to exclude these two occurrences in Paul’s letters, the more so since all three cases of οὐδὲ γάρ in Luke and Acts are excluded in Payne’s analysis.

### D.1.2 ἀλλ’ οὐδέ

The particle ἀλλά derives from ἄλλα (the neuter plural of ἄλλος), meaning ‘otherwise’. It therefore ‘expresses difference, division, separation’.<sup>109</sup> Robertson gives its fundamental meaning as ‘this other matter’.<sup>110</sup> Thus ‘it is a mistake to infer that ἄλλος means “something different”. In itself it is merely “another”. Like δέ the thing introduced by ἀλλά is something new, but not essentially in contrast.’<sup>111</sup>

In its entry for ἄλλα, as its third category of usage, BDAG says that it is used ‘before independent clauses, to indicate that the preceding is to be regarded as a settled matter, thus forming a transition to something new’, and thus introduces ‘other matter for additional consideration’. All five instances of ἀλλ’ οὐδέ in Luke-Acts and Paul’s letters are included within this third section of the BDAG entry for ἄλλα:

Luke 23.15	ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ Ἡρώδης, ἀνέπεμψεν γὰρ αὐτὸν πρὸς ἡμᾶς, καὶ ἰδοὺ οὐδὲν ἄξιον θανάτου ἐστὶν πεπραγμένον αὐτῷ·	"No, nor has Herod, for he sent Him back to us; and behold, nothing deserving death has been done by Him.
Acts 19.2	εἶπέν τε πρὸς αὐτούς· εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἐλάβετε πιστεύσαντες; οἱ δὲ πρὸς αὐτόν· ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ εἰ πνεῦμα ἅγιον ἔστιν ἠκούσαμεν.	He said to them, "Did you receive the Holy Spirit when you believed?" And they said to him, "No, we have <i>not even</i> heard whether there is a Holy Spirit."
1 Cor 3.2	γάλα ὑμᾶς ἐπότισα, οὐ βρῶμα· οὐπω γὰρ ἐδύνασθε. ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἔτι νῦν δύνασθε,	I gave you milk to drink, not solid food ; for you were not yet able to receive it. <i>Indeed, even now</i> you are not yet able,
1 Cor 4.3	ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν, ἵνα ὑφ’ ὑμῶν ἀνακριθῶ ἢ ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας· ἀλλ’ οὐδὲ ἐμαυτὸν ἀνακρίνω.	But to me it is a very small thing that I may be examined by you, or by any human court ; <i>in fact</i> , I do <i>not even</i> examine myself.

106 Winer, *Grammar*, 617.

107 Commentaries, at the verse.

108 Blass, *Grammar*, 265 n. 2.

109 Jelf, *Syntax*, §773.1.

110 Robertson, *Grammar*, 1185.

111 Robertson, *Grammar*, 1185.

Gal 2.3	ἀλλ' οὐδέ Τίτος ὁ σὺν ἐμοί, Ἕλληγ ὢν, ἠναγκάσθη περιτμηθῆναι·	<i>But not even Titus, who was with me, though he was a Greek, was compelled to be circumcised.</i>
------------	---	---

In Luke 23.15, the coordinate structure is only implicit, but can be seen if one reads ‘εὔρεν κ.τ.λ’ to give: ‘No, neither has Herod (found any guilt . . .)’. In every case then, ἀλλά may be seen as serving as a coordinating conjunction. Οὐδέ, standing in second position, is always adverbial, with the meaning ‘not even’ or ‘neither’.

Payne excludes Acts 19.2 and Galatians 2.3 on the grounds that οὐδέ is not serving as a coordinating conjunction, but includes the other three texts in his comparison with 1 Timothy 2.12. All five should be excluded, if his criterion is to be employed consistently.

### D.1.3 Non-coordinate clauses

On three occasions, Paul employs οὐδέ in the apodosis of a conditional sentence:

Rom 11.21	εἰ γὰρ ὁ θεὸς τῶν κατὰ φύσιν κλάδων οὐκ ἐφείσατο, [μή πως] οὐδέ σοῦ φείσεται.	for if God did not spare the natural branches, He will <i>not</i> spare you, <i>either</i> .
1 Cor 15.13	εἰ δὲ ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν οὐκ ἔστιν, οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται·	But if there is no resurrection of the dead, <i>not even</i> Christ has been raised;
1 Cor 15.16	εἰ γὰρ νεκροὶ οὐκ ἐγείρονται, οὐδὲ Χριστὸς ἐγήγερται·	For if the dead are not raised, <i>not even</i> Christ has been raised;

Payne excludes the two verses in Corinthians from his comparison with 1 Timothy 2.12, on the grounds that οὐδέ is not serving as a coordinating conjunction, but includes Romans 11.21. All three cases are listed in section 2 of BDAG’s entry for οὐδέ, with the adverbial meaning ‘neither’, ‘not either’, and whether or not μή πως is read in Romans 11.21, it is clear that the clauses are not coordinate, and that this text also should be excluded from the comparison.

In two further cases, οὐδέ occurs in a dependent clause:

1 Tim 6.7	οὐδὲν γὰρ εἰσηνέγκαμεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον, ὅτι οὐδὲ ἐξενεγκεῖν τι δυνάμεθα·	For we have brought nothing into the world, so we <i>cannot</i> take anything out of it <i>either</i> .
1 Cor 5.1a	Ὅπως ἀκούεται ἐν ὑμῖν πορνεία, καὶ τοιαύτη πορνεία ἣτις οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν,	It is actually reported that there is immorality among you, and immorality of such a kind as does <i>not exist even</i> among the Gentiles,

Payne is mistaken in understanding οὐδέ to be functioning as a coordinating conjunction in these texts.

### D.1.4 Ascensive οὐδέ

There are two further occurrences of οὐδέ which Payne classifies as coordinating, but which are clearly adverbial and ascensive:

Acts 7.5a	καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκεν αὐτῷ κληρονομίαν ἐν αὐτῇ οὐδέ βῆμα ποδός	But He gave him no inheritance in it, <i>not even</i> a foot of ground,
Rom 3.10	καθὼς γέγραπται ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν δίκαιος οὐδέ εἷς,	as it is written, "there is none righteous, <i>not even</i> one;

Both texts are cited in the third section of the BDAG entry for οὐδέ, with the meaning 'not even', and with the function of strengthening the negative. In 1 Corinthians 5.1, οὐδέ appears in an adverbial position in the relative clause. It may be admitted that these two texts are coordinate in structure, with οὐδέ connecting two nouns or two adjectival substantives. But in both cases, the final term is dependent upon the previous term for its meaning, and thus lacks the independence that is characteristic of a coordinate construction. This is especially clear in Rom 3.10, where εἷς must mean 'one righteous person', not 'one person'. In the same way βῆμα ποδός means a foot of ground of inheritance. Even if a case were to be made that οὐδέ is technically coordinating in these two verses, its use is clearly different in type to its use in 1 Tim 2.12, and it seems far preferable to exclude them from the analysis.

### D.2 Sixteen texts

There remain eighteen occurrences of οὐδέ in Paul's letters, in sixteen texts, which may be examined to gain insight into his use of the word as a coordinating conjunction. Payne approaches the task by assigning each text to a category according to the semantic relationship of the coordinated elements. In the first category he places those texts which feature the coordination of two or more elements which are, in Payne's view, equivalent in meaning. He says that together they convey a single idea. Clearly if both elements are saying the same thing, then only one thing is being said, and nothing is required of οὐδέ except to connect the two elements together in its normal additive way. Whether or not Payne is right in seeing equivalence of meaning is strictly beside the point with regard to his main thesis, since even if he is right, no support is provided for the phenomenon which he is arguing for in 1 Tim 2.12. If I were to say 'I don't like cats; and I don't like domestic felines', then I would be expressing a single idea, but it would not be one that allows me then to say 'I do like cats in general, only not the combination of cats and domestic felines'.

Nevertheless, if Payne were right, it would raise questions about the accepted understanding of οὐδέ that, like δέ, it usually adds something new and distinct to what has gone before. Therefore it seems imperative to consider each text briefly to ascertain whether the two elements are indeed equivalent as Payne contends. First, there are three texts in which οὐδέ joins whole clauses:

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

Rom 9.6b–7	οὐ γὰρ πάντες οἱ ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ οὗτοι Ἰσραήλ· (7) οὐδ' ὅτι εἰσὶν σπέρμα Ἀβραὰμ πάντες τέκνα, ἀλλ'· ἐν Ἰσαὰκ κληθήσεται σοι σπέρμα.	For they are <i>not</i> all Israel who are descended from Israel; (7) <i>nor</i> are they all children because they are Abraham's descendants, but: "through Isaac your descendants will be named."
1 Cor 15.50	Τοῦτο δέ φημι, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα βασιλείαν θεοῦ κληρονομήσαι οὐ δύναται οὐδέ ἡ φθορὰ τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν κληρονομεῖ.	Now I say this, brethren, that flesh and blood <i>cannot</i> inherit the kingdom of God; <i>nor</i> does the perishable inherit the imperishable.

With regard to Rom 2.28, the purpose of the second clause becomes manifest in the following verse, which is part of the same sentence. Anarthrous περιτομή may refer either to the state of being circumcised, in which case the referent is almost identical to that of Ἰουδαῖός, or to the act of circumcision. With περιτομή καρδίας ἐν πνεύματι ('circumcision of the heart by the Spirit'), attention is drawn to the inward process of purification and separation from sin. Reference is made also to Old Testament scripture pertaining to the the circumcision of heart (Lev 26.41, Deut 10.16 etc). While outward circumcision and outward Jewishness may be almost identical in thought, it is less certain that the opposite is true. Is being a Jew in secret the same thing as having one's heart circumcised by the Spirit? This is less clear, and it is this that is referenced in the two negative clauses that are joined by οὐδέ, once they are explicated by the rest of the sentence. Therefore the second of the elements connected by οὐδέ does bring in new material, especially through its connection with the parallel περιτομή clause in the following verse.

To say, in Rom 9.6–7, that not all that come from Israel (ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ, probably referring primarily to the patriarch) are Israel is not at all the same as to say that not all the seed of Abraham are to be considered his children. With regard to Israel, the distinction is drawn according to spiritual condition; with regard to Abraham, the distinction is drawn according to line of descent, those of Ishmael and Esau being excluded. As Sanday and Headlam describe the relationship between the two elements connected by οὐδέ: 'The grammatical connexion of this passage with the preceding is that of an additional argument; the logical connexion is that of a proof of the statement just made.'<sup>112</sup> Godet comments that the second element 'has almost the same meaning' as the first, 'but with a different shade intimated by the particle οὐδέ, *neither further*.'<sup>113</sup> Thus he demonstrates that he understands the function of οὐδέ as being to introduce something new or distinct or 'further'.

To a statement of fact, in 1 Cor 15.50, that our mortal bodies cannot inherit the kingdom of God, is added a statement of principle, that corruption does not inherit incorruption, both ἡ φθορά and ἡ ἀφθαρσία being abstract nouns and the present tense κληρονομεῖ also indicating the unchangeable nature of the principle. While 'flesh and blood' may refer particularly to the weakness and frailty of our physical bodies, 'corruption' points directly to the working of death in these bodies. The addition of the second clause with οὐδέ both deepens and provides grounds for the first.

In three further texts, οὐδέ connects two noun phrases or two single verbs:

Gal 1.1a	Παῦλος ἀπόστολος οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων οὐδέ δι' ἀνθρώπου	Paul, an apostle ( <i>not</i> sent from men <i>nor</i> through the agency of man,
----------	---	---

112 W. Sanday, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*, (New York: Scribner's 1895<sup>5</sup>) 240.

113 F. L. Godet, *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1883) 347.

Gal 4.14a	καὶ τὸν πειρασμὸν ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ σαρκί μου οὐκ ἐξουθενήσατε οὐδὲ ἐξεπτύσατε,	and that which was a trial to you in my bodily condition you did <i>not</i> despise or loathe,
Phil 2.16b	ὅτι οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον οὐδὲ εἰς κενὸν ἐκοπίασα.	because I did <i>not</i> run in vain <i>nor</i> toil in vain.

In Gal 1.1, it is hard not to see a clear distinction between the two terms connected by οὐδέ, with the change in both preposition and number. Eadie writes that 'On purpose [Paul] puts the fact very distinctly: he was an apostle, not from men ἀπό, referring to remote or primary source; nor by man, δία, referring to medium or nearer instrumental cause.'<sup>114</sup> As Bruce puts it, 'Paul's apostolic commission was not derived "from men" (οὐκ ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων). It was not even derived through a human intermediary (οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπου)'.<sup>115</sup>

The first of the two verbs connected by οὐδέ in Gal 4.14, ἐξουθενέω, derives from οὐδέν ('nothing'), and means to despise or to set at nought. The second word, ἐκπτύω, meant literally to spit out, and was normally used in this way. The metaphorical meaning could either be to feel disgust for, or to reject. Without entering into the exegetical difficulty that the grammatical object of the verbs is πειρασμὸν ('trial'), it is not hard to see that Paul was adding something with the second verb. Lightfoot renders the sense as 'ye did not treat with contemptuous indifference or with active loathing'.<sup>116</sup> Meyer suggests that 'ἐξεπτύσατε expresses the sense of ἐξουθ. figuratively and by way of climax, adding the idea of detestation'.<sup>117</sup> There is no reason to suppose that there is no distinction between the two terms.

When Paul says in Phil 2.16 that he did not run in vain (οὐκ εἰς κενὸν ἔδραμον), he is employing a metaphor from the stadium to indicate that he did not compete so as to lose the prize. The other verb, κοπίαω, may either mean to toil, or to become exhausted. It is used frequently by Paul to refer to ministerial labour, both by himself and others (Rom 16.12, 1 Cor 15.10, 16.16, Gal 4.11, Col 1.29, 1 Thess 5.12). Since he uses the same word also of his own manual labour, there may be said to be two metaphors in view, one from the race-track, and one from the workshop.<sup>118</sup> The first may suggest, as Eadie put it, 'previous training . . . and violent exertion, the putting forth of utmost power in direction of the goal and the garland', while 'the second verb has in it the broader notion of continuous and earnest effort'.<sup>119</sup>

Payne proffers the translation 'I had not run in the race and exhausted myself for nothing', from the Jerusalem Bible. Against this, it may be urged that the verb κοπίαω never has this sense of becoming exhausted in any of its other thirteen occurrences in Paul's letters. The exact expression to toil in vain (οὐ κοπιάσουσιν εἰς κενὸν) is used in Isaiah 65.24 of physical labour, and the very similar μήπως εἰκῆ κεκοπίακα ('lest I have laboured in vain') of Paul's ministerial labour. It almost certainly has this meaning here, and should be translated in the usual way, with a distinction maintained between running and labouring.

It may be added that if Payne's rendering were accepted as a possibility, it would not be an example of the joining of equivalent expressions since 'to run' and 'to become exhausted' are far from being

114 J. Eadie, *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1869) 3.

115 F. F. Bruce, *The Epistle of Paul to the Galatians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1982) 72.

116 J. B. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians*, (London: Macmillan, 1866<sup>2</sup>) 173.

117 H. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistle to the Galatians* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1873) 245–6.

118 P. T. O'Brien, *The Epistle to the Philippians: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1991) 300.

119 J. Eadie, *A Commentary on the Greek Text of the Epistle of Paul to the Philippians* (New York: Carter, 1859) 145.



synonyms. Finally, it may be pointed out that Payne does not suggest that it is only the combination of the two terms that is negated, so that Paul may in fact have run in vain, but without becoming exhausted. So the second term would not serve to limit the first in the way that he is proposing in 1 Tim 2.12.

### D.2.1 'And' and 'and not' in negative sentences

Payne offers a translation of Rom 2.28 from Weymouth's New Testament, and points out that οὐδέ is rendered by 'and not', rather than by 'nor' or 'neither' as in the majority of English versions.<sup>120</sup> Likewise, the translations he presents for Rom 9.6-7 and 1 Cor 15.50 also employ 'and not' for οὐδέ. He seems to find significance in this but does not explain what this might be. For Gal 4.14 and Phil 2.16, Payne provides translations which join the two terms with 'and' rather than with 'or' or 'nor' or 'neither' as in most English versions.

It will be recalled that Payne claims that 'Paul's use of οὐδέ parallels in many respects the English idiom 'n, as in "hit 'n run"'.<sup>121</sup> In other words, he is seeking to show that οὐδέ may function as 'and' occasionally does in negative sentences. If one says, 'No bread and butter, thanks' at the meal table, it is conceivable in principle that one might still like some unbuttered bread. The second term limits the extent of the first, specifying what kind of bread is being referred to.

This is not true in general, however, of terms linked by 'and' in negative sentences. In English, it is allowable to say, for example, 'I don't like cats and dogs' rather than 'I don't like cats or dogs'. In the second case, it is as if each animal is considered separately, and the feeling registered for each one. In the first case, it is as if cats and dogs are considered together as a class, and the feeling for that class registered. One is not however referring only to the combination of cats and dogs. If it is only being with cats and dogs together in the same place and at the same time that one does not like, then one has to use extra words like 'together' to communicate this fact. One cannot say that one dislikes cats and dogs, but that one is nevertheless fond of cats.

It is often idiomatic in English to use 'and' in negative sentences for near-synonyms. Thus one might perhaps say 'I don't like mauves and purples and violets, nor yellows or greens', because the first three are conceived of as a class. But all five colours are included in the negation. Also, we may use 'and' in negative sentences with complementary terms like 'arms and ammunition' or 'food and drink' because they are conceived of as two parts of a whole. Again, both terms individually are included in the negation. We cannot say 'they had no food and drink, but they did have food'.

Because καί is not normally used as the coordinating conjunction in negative sentences, the choice that exists in English between using 'and' and 'or' does not exist in Greek. Robertson and others have been quoted as pointing out that οὐδέ may fulfill in negative sentences some of the functions that καί fulfills in positive sentences. It may accordingly be quite legitimate to translate οὐδέ with 'and' in some circumstances. The difference in meaning may be only a matter of nuance and style. Goodspeed's 'scorn and despise' in Gal 4.14, as quoted by Payne, is only slightly different in meaning from 'scorn or despise'. It does not allow for the Galatians actually to scorn while not despising.

Finally, it should be pointed that 'and not' tends to separate two terms at least as sharply if not more so than 'or' or 'nor'. The two terms in 'he had no courage or valour', for example, are separated more than in 'he had no courage and valour', but less than in 'he had no courage and no valour'. So when

---

120 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 237.

121 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 241, n. 13.

Payne gives translations in which whole clauses are connected by 'and not', as in Rom 2.28, Rom 9.6–7 and 1 Cor 15.50 above, he is providing evidence against his own thesis and not for it.

### D.2.2 1 Thess 2.3

There is one further text in which Payne suggests equivalence in meaning between the terms joined by οὐδέ, but with less certainty:

ἡ γὰρ παράκλησις ἡμῶν οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης οὐδέ ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας οὐδέ ἐν δόλω,	For our exhortation does <i>not</i> come from error or impurity or by way of deceit;
--	--

Payne claims that both the first and third nouns (πλάνη and δόλος) 'commonly mean "deceit",' appealing to their respective entries in BDAG. But the definitions given there: 'taking advantage through craft and underhand methods' for δόλος, and 'wandering fr. the path of truth' for πλάνη, are very different. While the translation gloss 'deceit' occurs in both entries, in the case of πλάνη it is qualified by 'to which one is subject'. What is in view is not the active process of deceiving others, but passively being deceived and the resulting error into which one may have fallen. Whenever BDAG gives an English equivalent for πλάνη in its illustrative texts, it is 'error' or 'delusion' and never 'deceit'.

It is true that the BDAG entry for πλάνη contains a reference to Horsley for frequent use of the word in the papyri in the sense of 'deceit'. Upon inspection, however, the entry for the word in 'New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity' does not refer to the frequency of such use but to its rarity. Horsley says that too much had been made of a single example in Moulton and Milligan (BGU 4 1208.6), in which the text had been partly restored and πλάνη had been 'taken to mean "deceit"'. He goes on to say that the 'meaning of πλάνη as found in the NT, "error, delusion" . . . is in fact attested by a number of examples'.<sup>122</sup> The BDAG entry seems therefore to be itself in error with regard to this reference to Horsley. With this discounted, the BDAG entry contains no support for translating πλάνη with 'deceit' rather than 'error'.

There is virtual unanimity among commentators that the sense of οὐκ ἐκ πλάνης is that their exhortation was not 'from error', that is, did not have its source in error.<sup>123</sup> ἐξ ἀκαθαρσίας refers either to impurity of motive, or to sexual immorality. ἐν δόλω refers to underhand methods. The Majority Text has οὔτε in place of the second οὐδέ. With regard to this, Lightfoot points out that 'Each clause disclaims an entirely distinct motive, and therefore the disjunctive particle οὐδέ is preferable: "not from error, nor yet from impurity, nor again in guile."<sup>124</sup> Likewise, Fee summarises the sense of the three terms as being, first, that Paul's ministry did not have 'its source in "error" or mere "delusion" . . . . Second, his preaching was not based on "impure motives." . . . . Third, Paul's preaching was not a concealed attempt to "trick you" into believing.'<sup>125</sup>

Payne contends that it is 'ambiguous' whether the three terms 'are closely interrelated, equivalent expressions . . . conceptually different expressions that convey a single, internally-cohering idea . . . or three distinct ideas.'<sup>126</sup> He says that ἀκαθαρσία refers to 'impure motives', and then says that both these and 'deceit' point to 'impure intent'. The fact that two concepts both 'point to' a third concept

122 G. H. R. Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1977*, Vol. 2 (Liverpool: University Press, 1982) 94.

123 See Ellicott (1858), Findlay (1904), Milligan (1908), Frame (1912), Plummer (1918), Wanaker (1990), Fee (2009), at the verse.

124 J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St Paul from Unpublished Commentaries* (London: Macmillan, 1895) 21.

125 G. D. Fee, *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009) 59–60.

126 Payne, οὐδέ, 241.

does not mean that the two are equivalent. Deceit and guile concern method not motive, and indeed are on occasion employed with the best of motives, as in the case of Rahab for example. The three expressions are 'conceptually different' and therefore 'distinct'. Whether or not they together 'convey a single, internally-cohering idea' depends on what is meant by a single idea. Certainly, they may merge together in the mind of the reader to convey an overall impression that might be expressed positively with words like integrity and honesty and sincerity and truth. But if so, it is something larger that encompasses the three smaller ideas, not something narrower and more limited.

### D.2.3 2 Cor 7.12

In one case, where οὐδέ is employed as a coordinating conjunction, Payne acknowledges that it joins two 'clearly-distinguishable' ideas:

<p>ἄρα εἰ καὶ ἔγραψα ὑμῖν, οὐχ ἕνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικήσαντος οὐδὲ ἕνεκεν τοῦ ἀδικηθέντος ἀλλ' ἕνεκεν τοῦ φανερωθῆναι τὴν σπουδὴν ὑμῶν τὴν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς ἐνώπιον τοῦ θεοῦ.</p>	<p>So although I wrote to you, it was <i>not</i> for the sake of the offender <i>nor</i> for the sake of the one offended, but that your earnestness on our behalf might be made known to you in the sight of God.</p>
--	--

Paul says first that he is not writing on account of the offending party, that is presumably, to bring him to justice. Secondly, he is not writing on account of the injured party, that is presumably, that he might receive just recompense. Not only are these two discrete individuals, but here are two different possible reasons for Paul writing which are negated. Payne claims that these two ideas are 'a natural pair', and later he says that they 'form a single natural pair that united together contrasts with the ἀλλά clause'.<sup>127</sup> He places them in one of two categories he has created for texts where he considers that οὐδέ connects two members of a 'natural pair'. In contrast, in 1 Tim 2.12, according to Payne, διδάσκειν and αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός 'are unrelated verbs and are not a natural pair', with the result that the two texts are not in parallel.<sup>128</sup> By this means, he places the two texts in separate categories and in effect quarantines one from the other.

In response, it has to be said that it seems to be entirely arbitrary to divide the texts according to supposed features of the semantic relationships between the terms. Payne gives no reason why the force or function of οὐδέ should be different because the two terms form a 'natural pair'. This type of methodology has much potential for excluding any given text from consideration. For example, a category could be created for texts with three terms. 1 Thess 2.3 would be placed in this category and 1 Tim 2.12 without it. It might be admitted that three distinct ideas were in view in 1 Thess 2.3, but this would no longer provide a precedent for distinct ideas in 1 Tim 2.12 because the two texts were in different categories and not parallel.

It must be questioned whether there is value in assigning texts into categories according to the supposed semantic relationships between the terms, which can be as varied as the meanings of the texts themselves. What is necessary is to establish the function of οὐδέ in each text, and ascertain whether it conforms to the description given in the lexicons and grammars. It will be agreed that in 2 Cor 7.12, Paul adds one possible reason for writing to another, both of which are negated with οὐ . . . οὐδέ. Both are individually included in the negation. It serves as another example of the normal use of οὐδέ. Clearly, it was not only the combination of the two reasons that Paul was excluding, so that he might in fact have been writing on account of the offending party.

127 Payne, οὐδέ, 240, 245.

128 Payne, οὐδέ, 241.

## D.2.4 1 Cor 2.6

1 Cor 2.6– 7a	Σοφίαν δὲ λαλοῦμεν ἐν τοῖς τελείοις, σοφίαν δὲ οὐ τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου οὐδὲ τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου τῶν καταργουμένων· (7) ἀλλὰ λαλοῦμεν θεοῦ σοφίαν ἐν μυστηρίῳ τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην,	Yet we do speak wisdom among those who are mature; a wisdom, however, <i>not</i> of this age <i>nor</i> of the rulers of this age, who are passing away; (7) but we speak God's wisdom in a mystery,
---------------------	--	--

In his own translation, Payne renders οὐδέ with 'and specifically not', and then says that the 'οὐδέ construction' here should be understood as 'focusing specifically on the rulers of this age.'<sup>129</sup> In reply, it may be agreed that this is a possible way of understanding the text, but observed that it lies within the range of the normal use of οὐδέ. Thus, Meyer gives the sense of the word here as 'also (in particular) not', which is not dissimilar to Payne's rendering, although more accurate in that he places the words that indicate specification in parentheses, since they do not belong to οὐδέ per se, so much as to the context in which it lies.<sup>130</sup> The point is that the function of οὐδέ here is simply to add a second term, but the second term may be viewed as more specific than the first. In other words, if 'the wisdom of the rulers of this age' is viewed merely as a specific aspect or facet of 'the wisdom of this age', then οὐδέ has indeed served to introduce a specific focus, but its grammatical function is still simply additive.

In 1 Cor 2.2, καί is used in exactly this way in a positive phrase to add a specification:

οὐ γὰρ ἔκρινά τι εἰδέναι ἐν ὑμῖν εἰ μὴ Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον.	For I determined to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ, <i>and</i> Him crucified.
--	---

Here, more certainly, 'Him crucified' can be viewed as a more specific aspect or focus of 'Jesus Christ'. Robertson and Plummer write that 'The force of καὶ τοῦτον is definitely to specify the point on which, in preaching Jesus Christ, stress was laid . . . the effect being that of a climax.'<sup>131</sup> On 'the force of καί' itself, Ellicott states that it is 'here adding the special and enhancing . . . to the more general and unqualified'.<sup>132</sup> Καί can add something specific to something more general, and a focus may even go on to this second term by way of climax, but the first term is not thereby negated or qualified in any way. Paul still resolved to know Jesus Christ, as well in particular as Him crucified.

In the same way, if Payne and others are correct in saying that the second term added by οὐδέ in 1 Cor 2.6 is more specific than the first, and may even be the focus of the negation, this does not mean that the first term loses its force or is limited to the narrower range of the second term. Paul is still denying that he is speaking a wisdom of this age in general, as well more specifically as the wisdom of the rulers of this age.

In fact, it is by no means certain in 1 Cor 2.6 that the second term should be viewed only as a specific form of the first. Even if the rulers are earthly rulers, their wisdom may be different in type to the general wisdom of the age. What is more, many commentators have understood the ἀρχόντων to refer to spiritual powers, who worked through earthly rulers to crucify the Lord (v.

129 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 239.

130 H. A. W. Meyer, *Critical and Exegetical Hand-book to the Epistles to the Corinthians* (New York: Funk & Wagnalls, 1884) 48.

131 A. Robertson, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, (Edinburgh: Clark, 1914<sup>2</sup>) 31.

132 C. J. Ellicott, *St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: Longmans, 1887) 34.

8).<sup>133</sup> In this view, the wisdom of the rulers of the age would probably be of a nature quite distinct from the wisdom of the age itself. Thus, if Rufinus' Latin version is reliable at this point, Origen commented that 'In this passage, wishing to describe the different kinds of wisdom, he points out that there is a wisdom of this world, and a wisdom of the princes of this world, and another wisdom of God.'<sup>134</sup> If this text is an authentic rendition of the original, then it serves as an instructive example of an early Greek scholar understanding οὐδέ as connecting two very distinct ideas.

Payne refers the reader to the translation in the Jerusalem Bible, which reads: 'But still we have a wisdom to offer those who have reached maturity: not a philosophy of our age, it is true, still less of the masters of our age, which are coming to their end.'<sup>135</sup> In a note, the translators indicate their preference for taking the ἀρχόντων to refer to 'evil powers or demons' rather than human rulers, or to both, the former using the latter as their tools. By rendering οὐδέ with 'still less', the translators distinguish between the two ideas, the second being more strongly denied than the first. The translation therefore does not support Payne's claim, made in the introductory remarks to the category in which the text is placed, that it 'conveys one idea rather than two'.

#### D.2.5 1 Cor 11.16

Εἰ δέ τις δοκεῖ φιλόνηκος εἶναι, ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν οὐδέ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ θεοῦ.	But if anyone is disposed to be contentious—we have <i>no</i> such custom, <i>nor</i> do the churches of God. [NRSV]
--	--

Payne cites the Philips version of the text: 'We and the churches of God have no such custom', and then says that 'Paul's consistent identification with the churches elsewhere supports this understanding', referring to two further texts in 1 Corinthians. Payne's thought seems to be that Paul is associating ἡμεῖς ('we') and αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ θεοῦ ('the churches of God') together to the degree that they can be conceived of as a single group which does not have the 'custom'. Payne then sees structural parallels between this text and 1 Tim 2.12, and so finds support from it for interpreting the latter similarly as 'a single idea'.

In reply, it may be questioned, firstly, whether the two texts do in fact support an 'identification' of Paul with the churches. In 1 Cor 4.17, he speaks of what he teaches in every church, and in 1 Cor 7.17 of what he directs in all the churches. Clearly, he is not teaching or directing his own person, so these statements in fact serve to differentiate him from the churches. As Ellicott suggests, ἡμεῖς may refer to Paul and 'other teachers whom the apostle knew to be of like mind as himself', or simply to 'we Apostles'.<sup>136</sup> Likewise, Edwards takes the term to refer to 'himself and fellow-Apostles, as distinguished from the Churches'.<sup>137</sup> Taking οὐδέ to be serving its normal function, Paul says that this group, however constituted, have no such practice, and adds that the same is true of the churches.

The Greek text from ἡμεῖς onwards could be said to have a second implied clause, if τοιαύτην συνήθειαν . . . ἔχουσιν ('have such a custom') be understood as the implied predicate of αἱ ἐκκλησίαι. Most English translations follow suit, with 'nor' or 'neither' introducing a second implied

133 A. C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians : A Commentary on the Greek Text* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 233–9.

134 Origen, *De Principiis*, 3.3.1, in: A. Roberts & J. Donaldson (eds.), *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Vol. 4 (New York: Scribner's, 1913) 334.

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

136 Ellicott, *1 Corinthians*, 209.

137 T. C. Edwards, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1885<sup>2</sup>) 282.

clause in the same way as οὐδέ does in the Greek text. Philips reduces this to a single clause, combining the two subjects into one.

Payne objects to the usual translation with two clauses, saying that if οὐδέ 'separates “we” from “the churches of God”', then Paul is 'categoriz[ing] himself as separate from the churches'. This is to confuse syntax with semantics, and words with what they signify. If John says 'I don't like red meat, and neither does Mary', rather than 'Mary and I don't like red meat', the fact that he has used two clauses instead of one does not mean that he has been separated from his wife, nor can any other inference about their relationship be drawn from the syntax he employs. So there is no reason to reject the usual translation and usual sense of οὐδέ in this verse.

It should be noted that even if the Philips version is adopted, there results little practical difference to the sense of the text. The negation still extends to both parties, 'we' and 'the churches of God'. It is not as if it is in some way only the combination of the two that do not have this practice. It is not, for example, that it is only when Paul is in association with the churches that he does not have this practice, whereas at other times he does have it. He could not have added to 'We and the churches have no such practice' the qualification 'but we sometimes do.'

Concerning the supposed 'structural parallel' between 1 Cor 11.16 and 1 Tim 2.12, it could perhaps be said that there is a certain resemblance in word order, with the first term occurring early in the sentence and before the main verb. But in the text before us, the terms are subject rather than predicate, and nouns rather than an infinitive plus infinitive phrase. So the similarity in syntactical structure is more real than apparent.

In any case, and more importantly and fundamentally, there is no reason to suppose that if two sentences are similar in syntactical structure, then there will also be similarity between the semantic relationships within the sentences. 'I like bread and jam' has the same syntactical structure as 'I like fish and poultry', but 'bread and jam' will probably be understood as a single item since the two foods are commonly eaten together, whereas 'fish and poultry' will probably be understood as separate items since they are normally eaten on separate occasions. The connective 'and' has little semantic content of its own in the above examples, serving simply to connect the two words grammatically, and thus to place them together semantically. What the nature of their semantic relationship is, the reader determines through his or her knowledge of what the words mean and how the things signified combine in real life. Likewise, in its connective, coordinating role, οὐδέ has little semantic value of its own, tending to stay in the background, like a simple connecting bolt in a larger artefact.

Finally, for sake of argument only, if there were a semantic parallel between the two texts, this would not support Payne's thesis, since in 1 Cor 11.16 both the terms joined by οὐδέ are separately negated. Neither Paul and his fellow-workers, nor the churches, had the custom referred to. If the texts were parallel, then accordingly, neither teaching nor exercising authority over a man would be permitted.

#### D.2.6 1 Tim 6.16

. . . ὃν εἶδεν οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων οὐδὲ ἰδεῖν δύναται . . .	. . . whom <i>no</i> man has seen <i>or</i> can see . . .
---	---

Payne says that the two terms together 'specify God's invisibility'.<sup>138</sup> It may be agreed that the two terms complement each other. First, concerning the past, Paul writes that no one has seen God. He then adds that it is not possible for man to see God. This supplies a principle behind or explanation for the first statement of fact, but also implies that the same will be true for the indefinite future. The second statement thus serves to extend and reinforce the first. The translation Payne supplies, with 'and' and a repetition of the negative for οὐδέ, has the same meaning. It is not just the combination of having seen and being able to see that is negated, so that if a man were not able to see he might in fact have seen. Οὐδέ serves its normal function, connecting the two clauses, and adding one thought to the other.

#### D.2.7 2 Thess 3.7–8

<p>. . . οὐκ ἠτακτήσαμεν ἐν ὑμῖν (8) οὐδὲ δωρεὰν ἄρτον ἐφάγομεν παρά τινος, . . .</p>	<p>. . . we did <i>not</i> act in an undisciplined manner among you, (8) <i>nor</i> did we eat anyone's bread without paying for it, . . .</p>
---	--

Paul states first that he and his companions were not idle or disorderly among the Thessalonians, and then adds that they did not receive their sustenance gratis from anyone. Payne makes the extraordinary claim that the second clause, taken on its own, is untrue. He proposes that it is only the combination of walking disorderly and eating bread freely that Paul is denying, and that they were in fact eating free bread but were not at the same time walking disorderly. He argues that Paul would have accepted invitations to meals, not financially reimbursing his host, one reason being that 1 Cor 10.27 'commands acceptance of hospitality'.<sup>139</sup> Payne also cites the fact that 1 Cor 9.3–14 supports the right to maintenance as evidence that he actually did receive food freely.

In reply, it is generally accepted that the expression 'to eat bread from someone' does not refer to enjoying occasional hospitality but to receiving ongoing support. BDAG gives the meaning of ἄρτον φαγεῖν παρά τινος as to 'receive support from someone'.<sup>140</sup> Frame says that 'In view of παρά τινος', the expression 'means not "take a meal," and not simply "get food," but more broadly "receive the means of support," "get a living."<sup>141</sup> According to BDAG, the use of παρά with the genitive case of a person 'indicates that something proceeds from this person'.<sup>142</sup> Frame notes in contrast the use of the dative case in Tobit 8.20 **Σ**, where ἔσθων καὶ πίνων παρ' ἐμοὶ means 'eating and drinking with me'.<sup>143</sup> Plummer says specifically that "'Eat bread" means more than an occasional meal; it implies sustenance generally.'<sup>144</sup>

That this is Paul's meaning becomes more certain in the text following, where he says first that their purpose was not to be a burden to anyone, and then that it was not that they did not have the right. It is unlikely that voluntarily offering occasional meals could be considered a burden, and more decisively, it does not seem possible that Paul would refer to having a right (ἐξουσίαν) to receive occasional hospitality, when this would have been a normal part of life, as Payne points out. They were choosing not to exercise their right to support (1 Cor 9.4–15), so as to be an example to those who were walking in a disorderly manner. The passage gives a good sense with the normal

138 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 243.

139 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 243.

140 BDAG, *παρά*, §A.3.β.

141 J. E. Frame, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1912) 301–2.

142 BDAG, *παρά*, §A.

143 Frame, *Thessalonians*, 301. For the Sinaiticus text, see H. B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek* (Cambridge: University Press, 1891) 835.

144 A. Plummer, *A Commentary on St. Paul's Second Epistle to the Thessalonians* (London: Scott, 1918) 99.

translation, and οὐδέ being understood simply to add the second negative clause to the first in the normal way.

The translation that Payne supplies for the two clauses does not support his interpretation: 'we were not idle when we were with you, and we did not eat anyone's bread without paying for it'. By rendering οὐδέ with 'and . . . not', the NRSV clearly distinguishes the two clauses, each of which is equally negated. No English reader could understand this as saying it was only the combination of the two ideas that was being denied, and that they were in fact eating bread for free.

It is noteworthy that in his italicisation, Payne mistakenly renders οὐδέ as 'and' rather than 'and . . . not'.<sup>145</sup> Whether accidental or not, he does appear to be treating οὐδέ as if it were a positive conjunction rather than a negative one. 'We were not idle and getting meals off someone for free' may approximate to the sense of a single idea that Payne is contending for. Apart from the lack of correspondence with the Greek text, a meaning like this would make the passage incoherent. When Paul says in verse 9 that he does have the right, this can not be to the combination of being disorderly and receiving free hospitality, it can only be to the latter. So the two coupled clauses would have to be immediately de-coupled before the following text could be understood. Clearly, this is impossible.

While this is conclusive against Payne's understanding of the text, it may be pointed out that even if it were granted, it would provide little if any support for the meaning he proposes of 1 Tim 2.12. Here he is claiming that the first term limits the second, and not the other way around. He is not saying that Paul meant that he was in fact disorderly, except in the matter of eating food for free.

#### D.2.8 Gal 3.28

οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδέ Ἕλληγν, οὐκ ἔνι δοῦλος οὐδέ ἐλεύθερος, οὐκ ἔνι ἄρσεν καὶ θῆλυ· πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἷς ἐστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.	There is <i>neither</i> Jew <i>nor</i> Greek, there is <i>neither</i> slave <i>nor</i> free, there is no male and female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus. [ESV]
---	--

Taken literally, the text says that in Christ there is no Jew, no Greek, no slave and no free. Payne says that these statements are 'obviously false', presumably because, speaking in ordinary terms, we can see that one who is a Christian can also be one of these things. But if the text is to be subject to this sort of objection, then it should also be said that the last clause is also false, since many people can not be one person. Clearly, Paul is communicating a spiritual truth, which may not conform to earthbound categories of thought. Elsewhere, Paul says that a Jew is not one who is so outwardly, but inwardly (Rom 2.28–9); and a slave is the Lord's freeman, and a free man is Christ's slave. If a slave is free, and a free man is in slavery, then it is reasonable to conclude that there is no slave or free. These are spiritual truths which do not prevent Paul speaking of these states of life in the ordinary way in other places.

Payne claims that the text means that there is no "Jew-Greek" or "slave-free" dichotomy in Christ, and finds support in a number of translations that translate οὐδέ as 'and'. In response, it must be objected that οὐδέ is a negative conjunction and does not mean 'and'. Payne says that καὶ 'replaces' οὐδέ in the same couplets in Col 3.11 and Rom 10.12. But in the latter text, Paul says that there is no distinction (διαστολή) between Jew and Greek, and he uses the correlatives τε καὶ, not καὶ alone, to join the two words. If anything, this text provides evidence against Payne's interpretation, since it tends to suggest that when Paul wished to focus on the difference or distinction between the Jew and Greek, he made this explicit with a term to convey this meaning.

<sup>145</sup> Payne, *οὐδέ*, 242.



Col 3.11 (part)	ὅπου οὐκ ἔνι Ἑλλην καὶ Ἰουδαῖος, περιτομὴ καὶ ἀκροβυστία, βάρβαρος, Σκύθης, δοῦλος, ἐλεύθερος,	Here there is not Greek and Jew, circumcised and uncircumcised, barbarian, Scythian, slave, free; [ESV]
-----------------	--	---

In the first two pairs of words, in Col 3.11, καί places the two words together, in a way which may well bring to the mind of the reader the dividing wall between Jew and gentile. But with the next terms, it is doubtful that the reader would think of an abolition of a barbarian-Scythian dichotomy, but may tend to think in terms of a fading away of such earthly distinctions in the place of the renewed man. There seems to be no reason why the couplets in Gal 3.28 should have exactly the same signification as those in Col 3.11 and Rom 10.12. The very fact that different conjunctions are used may suggest the opposite.

It may be doubted whether there is much actual difference between the abolition of identities and the abolition of the distinctions between them. Payne objects that there really are Jews and Greeks in Christ. But if so, are there not also distinctions between them? And if the distinctions (or dichotomies) between them are broken down, then in what sense do the identities still exist? Do they not need distinctions for their definition? It may be that the two ways of looking at the matter are practically equivalent. Since Paul's meaning is clear either way, it must be preferable to retain a literal rendition, with οὐδέ retaining its normal sense.

Finally, it should be noted that the way Payne understands Gal 3.28 hardly provides support for his understanding of 1 Tim 2.12. If applied there, the meaning would presumably be that Paul does not permit a distinction or dichotomy between a woman teaching and a woman exercising (or assuming) authority over a man, and this is of course not what is being proposed for that text.

#### D.2.9 1 Thess 5.5

πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας. Οὐκ ἐσμὲν νυκτὸς οὐδὲ σκότους·	for you are all sons of light and sons of day. We are <i>not</i> of night <i>nor</i> of darkness;
--	---

Payne offers a translation from Beck's New Testament with 'night and darkness' for νυκτὸς οὐδὲ σκότους, and cites also the Living Bible which has 'darkness and night'. Thus he again prefers translations which render οὐδέ as 'and' rather than the lexical 'and not' or 'nor'. As observed above, the difference may not be great if the 'darkness' and 'night' are near-similes. He gives no reasons for rejecting the usual translations with 'nor' or 'or', which allow for a possible distinction between the two concepts. Payne goes on to say that 'Οὐδέ joins night with darkness to specify the single, internally cohering idea of night viewed as darkness'. Here he seems to be proposing an explicitly exegetical use of οὐδέ, which could perhaps be rendered in English by 'not of night, that is, not of darkness'.

In reply, it has been shown above that the grammars and lexicons do not recognise an exegetical use of οὐδέ, as they do for καί. There must be some basis for departing from normal usage, and this has not been offered by Payne. Moreover, an examination of the passage shows that there may well be a distinction in meaning to be found between 'night and day'. Verse 1 concerns the times and seasons, and in particular the day of the Lord, which is coming as a thief in the night. The Thessalonians, according to Frame, 'are "sons of light," that is, belong to Christ; and with a slight

advance of meaning, are “sons of day,” that is, belong to the realm of future light and salvation'.<sup>146</sup> Findlay says that “Day” is here not a mere synonym for “light” in general; it takes up again the “day of the Lord” of vv. 2, 4. Now receiving the light of Christ's truth and assimilated to it, the sons of light will be ready for “that day.”<sup>147</sup>

Findlay goes on to make a corresponding distinction between night and darkness. His view is that night 'as the opposite of “day,” is the period, or the state, of ignorance and estrangement from God', while darkness 'is the element and empire of night', characterised by ignorance and sin. 'Darkness' looks back to verse 4, and the spiritual darkness that results in being caught unprepared by the day of the Lord. 'Night' looks forward to verses 6 and 7, where the physical time of day comes into view. Again, there seems to be benefit in maintaining a distinction between the two terms.

Finally, it may be observed that Payne's proposed understanding of this text, even if accepted, would provide no support for his reading of 1 Tim 2.12. He is not saying that teaching should be viewed as exercising authority, or assuming authority, over a man.

#### D.2.10 Rom 9.16

ἄρα οὐκ οὐ τοῦ θέλοντος οὐδὲ τοῦ τρέχοντος ἀλλὰ τοῦ ἐλεῶντος θεοῦ.	So then it does <i>not</i> depend on the man who wills or the man who runs, but on God who has mercy.
--	---

Payne provides his own translation: 'It does not, therefore, depend on man's desire *and* effort, but on God's mercy'. Again, he renders οὐδέ with the positive conjunction 'and', contrary to the normal lexical definition. He then argues that if the normal translation is adopted, with both palyrticipial substantives individually negated, then the text is in contradiction with Paul's teaching in Rom 9.31–32. There, it is implied that Israel failed to attain to what they sought because they did not pursue it by faith. Therefore, according to Payne, 'Paul . . . must not oppose desire for righteousness itself'. This may be granted in general terms, even though technically Israel's pursuit seems to have been for a law of righteousness rather than righteousness per se. The pursuit of righteousness is in any case certainly enjoined in 1 Tim 6.11 and 2 Tim 2.22. Payne sees this affirmation of a desire for righteousness as in conflict with Paul's earlier statement that it is not of man's will or desire. To resolve the apparent problem, he proposes that it is only the combination of desire and effort that is being negated.

In reply, it must be said simply that Paul never opposes desire for righteousness. Verse 16 concerns election. He has just said that it was not because of anything on Jacob's part that he was preferred to Esau. Likewise, we can not attain to salvation by our own choice or striving, but are dependent upon God's mercy and choice. Paul does not say that we should not desire or strive for righteousness, only that this cannot save us.

It may be added that διώκω (the verb employed in verse 31) is if anything closer in lexical range to τρέχω ('run', also 'strive to advance') than it is to θέλω ('will', 'desire'). It can mean 'hasten', 'run', 'pursue', and 'persecute', and figuratively 'strive for' and 'aspire to'. If verse 32 were in conflict with verse 16, it would seem to be at least as much so with the second term in it as the first.

Furthermore, the fact that the article is repeated in the Greek text does not favour Payne's proposal that the two concepts are somehow combining or merging together. What the text presents is one individual willing and one running or striving. It is harder to conceive of these two discrete persons

<sup>146</sup> Frame, *Thessalonians*, 184.

<sup>147</sup> G. Findlay, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Thessalonians* (Cambridge: University Press, 1898) 111.

combining or merging together in some way than it is of two abstract concepts like 'desire' and 'effort'. In conclusion, since there does not appear to be any difficulty in reconciling the two texts, there is no reason to reject the normal sense of οὐδέ in Rom 9.16.

#### D.2.11 Gal 1.16–17

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

According to the normal, lexical meaning and function of οὐδέ, Paul says that he did not consult with human beings, and that he did not go up to Jerusalem from where he was in Damascus, but went away into Arabia. Payne contends that the first statement is false, on the grounds that he actually did consult with Ananias in Damascus. He describes the visit to the blinded Paul, described in Acts 22.12–16, as 'Ananias's consultation with Paul'. Payne also refers to Acts 9.19b, which relates that Paul spent a few days with the disciples in Damascus, and then claims that 'if Gal 1.16 denies any human consultation, it contradicts Luke's record of Paul's consultation with Ananias and other disciples in Damascus.'<sup>148</sup>

There is, however, no record of Paul 'consulting' with Ananias in the ordinary sense of the English word. The Greek word προσανατίθημι, employed in Gal 1.16, was in fact used with the dative of a person to mean 'consulting with someone', for example with a soothsayer or interpreter of dreams.<sup>149</sup> Ananias came to Paul, not the other way around, and not to consult but to impart. Furthermore, γάρ ('for') in verse 13 introduces material to support his assertion in 1.11–12 that the gospel that he preached was not received from man, nor taught to him, but was by revelation from Jesus Christ. As Burton puts it, 'the force of γάρ' in verse 13 'extends in effect into . . . the second chapter', so including 1.16.<sup>150</sup> The record we have in Acts 22.13–16 of the words spoken by Ananias to Paul hardly touch upon the content of the gospel. In fact, Ananias says that Paul has been appointed by God to hear an utterance from the mouth of Jesus.<sup>151</sup> In Acts 26.18, Luke records words spoken directly by revelation from Jesus Christ to Paul which do contain the core of the gospel message. Thus Luke's account is confirmatory of Paul's claim that he received his gospel directly from God. If Paul did consult with Ananias about the gospel, then this would be in contradiction to the point he is making from Gal 1.11 onwards.

The translation Payne provides does not support his case: 'When that happened, without consulting any human being, without going up to Jerusalem to see those who were apostles before me, I went off at once to Arabia . . .' [NEB]. Ronald Fung, in his commentary on Galatians, renders the text with this same translation, and then comments that 'vv. 16B–17 emphasize the fact that immediately after his conversion Paul did not consult anyone, least of all the apostles in Jerusalem'.<sup>152</sup> It is true that there is a difference between this translation and the NASB, which takes εὐθέως primarily with οὐ προσανεθέμην ('I did not immediately consult'), so that the sense is that Paul did not consult with anyone immediately, that is in Damascus, nor did he go up to Jerusalem to consult there. The NEB takes εὐθεως primarily with ἀπῆλθον ('I went off at once'), so that the sense may be that Paul did

148 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 240.

149 BDAG, προσανατίθημι, §2. E. D. W. Burton, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians* (New York: Scribner's, 1920) 54.

150 Burton, *Galatians*, 44.

151 Acts 22.14.

152 R. Y. K. Fung, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988) 68–9.

not consult with anyone at all, and that in particular he did not go up to Jerusalem to consult there. Both are legitimate readings, and neither allow for any human consultation.

#### **D.2.12 Conclusion: Paul's use of οὐδέ**

No evidence has been found that Paul's use of οὐδέ as a coordinating conjunction departs in any respect from the usual. In every case, it is employed to add one negative to another. In every case, the second term adds meaning that is distinct from the first. In no case does the second term limit the scope or effect of the first.

### **D.3 The comparison with Luke-Acts**

Payne contends that Luke's use of οὐδέ differs significantly from that of Paul, with more frequent adverbial use, less frequent use to express a 'single idea', and more frequent use to convey 'two separate ideas'.<sup>153</sup>

In reply, it should be pointed out that there is no reason in principle why there should not be wide differences among authors in their usage of words, within the bounds of their known range of meanings. With regard to the adverbial use of οὐδέ, it may be noted that it is much less common in the Septuagint than in certain secular authors. Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus and Isaiah were found to contain a total of eighty-one occurrences of οὐδέ, of which an estimated sixty-nine were coordinating. By contrast, of thirty-one occurrences of οὐδέ in the first book of Josephus's Jewish Wars, only an estimated seven are coordinating. Paul and Luke both stand in the middle ground between these extremes. Of thirty-five occurrences in Paul's letters, nineteen are coordinating, and of thirty-eight occurrences in Luke, twenty-two are coordinating. Contrary to Payne's assertion, adverbial use is thus in fact more frequent in Paul than in Luke, if only slightly so.

With regard to the coordinating use of οὐδέ, it has been argued above that there will be a variety of semantic relationships between the terms, dependent almost entirely on the meanings of the terms themselves, and very little on the conjunction, which simply serves to connect them together in an additive way. What matters with regard to Payne's thesis is whether there is any real evidence for a previously unknown combining or specifying function for οὐδέ. None has been found for Paul's letters, and Payne does not claim to have found any such function in Luke-Acts. There is therefore no need to examine the texts in detail.

Nevertheless, one claim by Payne is sufficiently striking to be worthy of examination. He says that Luke uses οὐδέ nine times to 'join conceptually distinct concepts to convey two separate ideas', whereas he has not found 'even one unambiguous case' where Paul does this.<sup>154</sup> In one of the nine cases, Luke 23.15, οὐδέ is employed adverbially. Of the rest, according to Payne's own categories, Acts 9.9 ('neither ate nor drank') should surely be considered a 'natural pair'. In Luke 12.27, spinning could be considered a specific form of toiling. The rendering in the KJV, 'they toil not, they spin not', allows for the second term to be considered in this way. In Acts 16.21, the acceptance of customs can hardly be said to be independent of their practice, since the first should almost certainly be considered a precondition for the second. In Acts 24.18, the 'uproar' cannot be considered separate from the 'crowd', since according to BDAG, the word that it translates, θόρυβος, can be used 'of the noise and confusion of excited crowds'.<sup>155</sup> In his commentary, Lumby

---

153 Payne, οὐδέ, 241–2.

154 Payne, οὐδέ, 242.

155 BDAG, θόρυβος, §3.b

refers to the two terms together as 'The gathering of a crowd and raising a disturbance', showing their relatedness with the use of the positive conjunction 'and'.<sup>156</sup>

In Luke 12.33, the two terms 'thief comes near' and 'moth destroys' are not far from what Payne calls equivalent expressions; and in Luke 18.4, 'fear God' and 'respect man' could reasonably be termed a natural pair, especially since the same word ἐντρέπομαι which is used in the second term, is used also of 'reverencing' the beloved son of the owner of the vineyard in Luke 20.13. In Acts 17.24–5, the idea of God not dwelling in temples made with hands is not entirely separate from him not being served with human hands, since it may be service in such temples that is in view. Gloag, for example, takes the second term to refer to the offering of sacrifices and the like.<sup>157</sup> Alternatively, the building of the temples could perhaps be seen as a specific form of such service. Finally, with regard to Acts 24.12–13, one of the charges made against Paul (see 24.5) was that he had been stirring up dissension among the Jews. In 24.12, he rebuts this particular charge with regard to his recent visit to Jerusalem, and then adds that his opponents cannot prove their charges. The second term is thus a generalising extension of the first.

When these nine texts are examined more carefully, therefore, it would appear that in most cases the second term is distinct from the first, but related to it, rather than being separate in meaning. Whatever difference remains in the pattern of semantic relationships between the terms may be accounted for by normal differences in style between authors and by the fact that Luke is writing historical narrative rather than letters to the churches. As a coordinating conjunction, οὐδέ serves its normal function, connecting one negative term to another in an additive way, as it does in Paul also.

## E. Origen on 1 Timothy 2.12

In his commentary on 1 Cor 14.34–35, Origen argued against the Montanist practice of allowing women to prophesy in the assembly. He examined in turn the prophetic ministry of Philip's daughters, Deborah, Huldah, Anna and Miriam, and maintained that in no case was it exercised in the assembly of God's people. He then repeated the second half of verse 35 and joined it with καί to the first part of 1 Tim 2.12, but with the addition, presumably as his own comment, of the words ἀπλῶς ἀλλά between οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω and οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν:

<p>αἰσχρὸν γὰρ γυναικὶ λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ, καὶ διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω ἀπλῶς ἀλλ' οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός.<sup>158</sup></p>	<p>“For it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church,” and “I permit not a woman to teach” – absolutely (that is, without qualification), and (what is more) – “nor to have dominion over a man.”<sup>159</sup></p>
--	--

Ἀπλῶς means first of all 'simply', and can serve to give emphasis to a statement, or to signify that it is without qualification.<sup>160</sup> As shown above (D.1.2), ἀλλά does not necessarily express contrast but may serve to introduce something new and different. Origen first states the prohibition on a woman teaching, emphasises it, and then adds the further prohibition on the exercise of authority over a man. The text continues:

156 J. R. Lumby, *The Acts of the Apostles* (Cambridge: University Press, 1890) 331.

157 P. J. Gloag, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles*, Vol. 2 (Edinburgh: Clark 1870) 157.

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

159 Scripture quotations from the ASV.

160 G. W. H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961) ἀπλῶς.

Καὶ ἄλλοθεν δὲ τοῦτο παραστήσω, εἰ καὶ ἐκεῖνο ἀσφαλέστερον εἴρηται περὶ τοῦ μὴ τὴν γυναῖκα ἡγεμόνα γίνεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ἀνδρός·	But also from elsewhere I will demonstrate this (last) point, even though that (former) point has been made more securely concerning the woman not becoming leader of the man in speech.
---	--

Origen distinguishes between 'this' (τοῦτο), and 'that' (ἐκεῖνο). Τοῦτο refers to something nearer, that is, said most recently, and ἐκεῖνο to something further away, that is, said previously. There seem to be two possibilities. Τοῦτο could refer to οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, and ἐκεῖνο to διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω. In this case, the prohibition on teaching would be said to have been made 'more securely' (ἀσφαλέστερον) in the preceding prohibition on speaking in the assembly. If a woman may not speak at all, then clearly she may not teach.

Alternatively, τοῦτο might refer to the whole citation of 1 Tim 2.12, and ἐκεῖνο to that of 1 Cor 14.35. In this case, the prohibition on speaking in the assembly, would be said to have been made 'more securely' in the whole preceding passage, with its many examples from the Old and New Testaments, intended to demonstrate this same point that a woman may not speak in the assembly.

Whatever 'that' (ἐκεῖνο) is, it is said by Origen to concern 'the woman not becoming leader of the man in speech' (μὴ τὴν γυναῖκα ἡγεμόνα γίνεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ἀνδρός). Also, whatever precedes ἐκεῖνο, and which says the same thing 'more securely', is described in the same way. It seems certain, therefore, that it includes the prohibition of a woman speaking in the assembly, which is the subject of the passage, and possible that it includes the prohibition on a woman teaching. Both of these concern speech, making Origen's expression a suitable one.

With reference to this passage, Payne claims that 'Origen explains this οὐδέ construction as a single prohibition', and that 'After quoting [1 Tim] 2.12, Origen describes it as “concerning woman not becoming a ruler over man in speaking” (περὶ τοῦ μὴ τὴν γυναῖκα ἡγεμόνα γίνεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ἀνδρός)'.<sup>161</sup> He does not explain that Origen adds ἀπλῶς ἀλλ' to his quotation of the verse, before οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, showing that Origen sees two distinct prohibitions. Also, Payne is wrong to claim that Origen is describing 1 Tim 2.12 with the expression μὴ τὴν γυναῖκα ἡγεμόνα γίνεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ἀνδρός. As shown above, this expression relates mainly or entirely to the prohibition of 1 Cor 14.35 against a woman speaking in the assembly.

Not only is it inadmissible to view this expression of Origen's as referring back to 1 Timothy 2.12 alone, it should also be observed that the idea which is expressed is by no means the same as the single idea which Payne claims to be the meaning of 1 Timothy 2.12. For Origen, 'not to become leader of a man in speech' means not to speak in the assembly at all, whereas Payne sees only a limitation on a woman assuming for herself an authority to teach men. Payne argues that Origen's use of the word γίνεσθαι ('to become') 'may suggest a woman assuming this authority for herself'.<sup>162</sup> But if a woman is appointed as a teacher by the governing elders of the church, rather than by self-appointment, she has still become a teacher, and has thus become a leader of men in speech. Payne believes that 1 Timothy 2.12 permits this; Origen does not.

Payne claims that Origen 'in this context affirms' Priscilla and Maximilla, the two leading women of the Montanists.<sup>163</sup> In fact, Origen in effect condemns them, referring to 'disciples of the women,

161 Payne, οὐδέ, 246.

162 Payne, οὐδέ, 246.

163 Payne, οὐδέ, 246.

who had become pupils of Priscilla and Maximilla, not of Christ the bridegroom' (οἱ τῶν γυναικῶν μαθηταί, οἱ μαθητευθέντες Πρισκίλλη καὶ Μαξιμίλλη, οὐ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἀνδρός τῆς νύμφης.)<sup>164</sup>

## F. 'Positive' and 'negative' concepts

In a study of the syntax of 1 Tim 2.12, Andreas Kostenberger proposed a novel thesis about the usage of οὐδέ in koiné Greek literature that, if accepted, would help to determine the sense of αὐθεντεῖν in the verse. He claimed to find a pattern that οὐδέ is used either to link two activities or concepts that are 'viewed positively in and of themselves' by the writer or speaker, or to link two activities or concepts that are 'viewed negatively' by the writer or speaker.<sup>165</sup> He proceeded to argue that since Paul viewed teaching (διδάσκειν) in itself as a 'positive' activity, he must also so view αὐθεντεῖν, which must therefore be translated as 'to have authority' or 'to exercise authority'. His position is thus in conflict with that of Payne, who also sees teaching as 'positive', but views αὐθεντεῖν (or αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός) as negative.

In response, Payne denies that there is any 'grammatical or syntactical rule that keeps οὐδέ from conjoining a positive activity with a negative activity.'<sup>166</sup> Remarkably, he cites in support the statement in BDF §445.3 that the 'correlation of negative and positive members is, of course, admissible'. But this is to confuse two separate meanings of 'negative' and 'positive'. Kostenberger is using the words to indicate whether terms are viewed favourably or unfavorably by the writer or speaker. BDF is saying something entirely different and unrelated: namely that the grammatically positive conjunctions καί and τε may be paired with the negative οὔτε in correlative expressions. As has been shown above, this has nothing to do with οὐδέ, which is not a correlative.

Nevertheless, it may be agreed with Payne that it is impossible that there could exist a grammatical or syntactical constraint on the joining of negative terms according to the subjective valuation placed upon them by the writer or author. Compare the statement 'I like running and swimming; she does not run or swim', with 'I like running but hate swimming; she does not run or swim'. It cannot be that αὐτή οὐ κολυμβᾷ οὐδὲ τρέχει ('she does not run or swim') would be correct in the first case but not in the second, simply because of my personal preferences regarding sporting activities.

Payne re-examines the texts that Kostenberger studied, and points out a number of instances where οὐδέ appears to join one activity or concept that may be viewed as positive 'in itself', with one that seems to be negative. Two examples will suffice to bring to light some of the issues involved:

LXX Sir 18.5 -6	κράτος μεγαλωσύνης αὐτοῦ τίς ἐξαριθμήσεται; καὶ τίς προσθήσει ἐκδιηγῆσασθαι τὰ ἐλέη αὐτοῦ; (6) οὐκ ἔστιν ἐλαττώσαι οὐδέ προσθεῖναι, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξιχνιάσαι τὰ θαυμάσια τοῦ Κυρίου·	The power of his greatness who will enumerate? And who will add to recount his mercies? (6) It is <i>impossible</i> to diminish <i>or</i> to increase them, and it is impossible to search out the wonders of the Lord. <sup>167</sup> [NETS]
--------------------------	--	--

164 J. L. Kovacs, *1 Corinthians: Interpreted by Early Christian Commentators* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005) 239-240.

165 Köstenberger, *A Complex Sentence*, 57.

166 Payne, *οὐδέ*, 250-1.

167 A note in the NETS translation points out that 'them' is not in the Greek. Brenton, in his translation, takes the object of 'diminish' and 'increase' as the 'wondrous works' of 18.6b.

Kostenberger considers both 'diminish' and 'increase' to be positive 'in and of themselves', while Payne observes that to diminish God's mercies should be considered as negative, and to increase them as positive. In his rejoinder to Payne, Kostenberger seems to depart from his former opinion, saying that the writer does not look favourably on either diminution or increase, since 'the only proper approach is to represent God's mercies accurately'.<sup>168</sup> This may be accepted as a possibility, but clearly Kostenberger does not succeed in defending his earlier claim. In fact, one could hardly take either a positive or a negative view of increase or diminution 'in themselves': any subjective valuation must depend on what it is that is being increased or decreased.

Plu. Table Talk 711.E.2	ὥσθ' ὁ οἶνος ἡμᾶς ἀδικεῖν οὐκ ἔοικεν οὐδὲ κρατεῖν.	the wine seems not to be harming us or getting the best of us.
----------------------------	---	---

Kostenberger gives this text as an example of οὐδέ coordinating two concepts that are viewed negatively, but Payne claims that the meanings given in Liddell and Scott for κρατεῖν ('to be strong, powerful') are 'clearly positive'. In his rejoinder, Kostenberger points out that 'wine "getting the best" of someone is not viewed positively by the writer'.<sup>169</sup> He thus includes the subject (the wine) with the verb, rather than considering the concept signified by the verb 'in and of itself'. But in 1 Tim 2.12, he excludes the subject (a woman) and considers the concept of teaching 'in and of itself', giving it a positive valuation. For the sake of consistency, it would seem necessary to exclude the subject from the Plutarch text also. Ἀδικεῖν ('to do wrong') must certainly be considered to be a 'negative' concept, in and of itself. Although certain senses of κρατεῖν, such as 'conquer' and 'seize by force', can hardly be given a subjective valuation in and of themselves, Payne is surely right to designate this is a 'positive' verb, in its overall lexical range. In his original paper, Kostenberger identifies ἰσχύω ('to be strong', 'to prevail') as 'positive'. If ἰσχύω is taken as positive, then κρατέω must be also.

Remarkably, in his rejoinder to Payne, Kostenberger states that 'Contrary to Payne's understanding, however, it is not the case that verbs are "positive" or "negative" by themselves'.<sup>170</sup> He thus identifies one of the main weaknesses of his own thesis, which rests upon his claim of a pattern of οὐδέ linking two activities or concepts 'viewed positively in and of themselves'. Kostenberger identifies the verb βάλλω ('throw') as 'positive' in itself in Matt 7.6, even though it is negative in context ('do not throw your pearls before swine'). Strangely, he identifies the same verb as 'negative' in Plutarch's Roman Questions (273.E.10), even though the questioner almost certainly views the activity of throwing missiles at the enemy in a positive light. Kostenberger considers the verb διώκω ('run after, pursue') to be positive in itself in Luke 17.23, even though negative in context. But in the Roman Questions (269.D), he treats it as a negative. In the case of several other verbs, including κοπάω ('labour'), καταβαίνω ('go down'), ἀπέρχομαι ('depart'), φοβέω ('fear'), ἐκπορεύομαι ('leave'), ἀναμείγνυμι ('have intercourse with'), and κατατίθημι ('lay down'), it must be doubted whether Kostenberger's categorisation of them as positive in themselves can be considered as other than arbitrary.

Since even Kostenberger himself seems, in his rejoinder to Payne, to have abandoned the attempt to assign valuations to verbal concepts in themselves rather than in their context, he does not appear to have succeeded in establishing a rule that would enable the determination of the sense of αὐθεντεῖν in 1 Tim 2.12. Clearly, since he does not permit it, Paul views a woman teaching in a negative light,

168 A. J. Köstenberger, *The Syntax of 1 Timothy 2.12: A Rejoinder to Philip B. Payne* (<http://www.biblicalfoundations.org/wp-content/uploads/2012/01/42-The-Syntax-of-1-Timothy-2.pdf>) Retrieved 27/8/14.

169 Köstenberger, *Rejoinder*, 2.

170 Köstenberger, *Rejoinder*, 2.



and the same is true of a woman exercising authority over a man. Nevertheless, there is no doubt an element of truth in Kostenberger's thesis. One would expect the two elements joined by οὐδέ to be in harmony with one another. While there does not seem to be any grammatical or syntactical reason why a negative sense could not be assigned to αὐθεντεῖν, there remain exegetical considerations. It would hardly need saying that a woman should not, say, violently dominate a man. And why should women be singled out for a prohibition that would surely apply to men also? On the other hand, the meaning such as BDAG's 'to assume a stance of independent authority', may be worthy of consideration. Thus one would have, say, 'I do not allow a woman to teach, nor to act independently of a man'. The genitive could perhaps be explained as an ablative, denoting separation. Such a translation would adopt the type of meaning for αὐθεντέω that Payne prefers, without departing from the normal function and meaning of οὐδέ.

## F.1 Two final cases

During his discussion of Kostenberger's thesis, Payne contends that in two final instances οὐδέ combines two elements into a single idea. In Plutarch's Table Talk (711.E.2), cited above, he suggests that the two verbs ἀδικεῖν and κρατεῖν combine 'to convey a single idea: the harm wine causes when it gets the best of someone'.<sup>171</sup> In response, it may be observed firstly that the translation Payne offers does not support his case, as it employs the disjunctive 'or' to distinguish between the concepts of the wine harming them and of it getting the better of them. Second, a distinction between the two is quite intelligible, either in the type of effect of the wine or in its degree. It could be that ἀδικεῖν is referring to the possibility of being poisoned, and κρατεῖν to being overcome by drunkenness. Alternatively, ἀδικεῖν could refer to a degree of harm, and κρατεῖν to being overpowered, whether by poisoning or drunkenness. There is nothing here to force a special function for οὐδέ.

The second case is in Plutarch's The Reason of Beasts (711.E.2):

<p>ἡ δ' ὄσφρησις ἡμῶν πρὸ τῶν χυμῶν γνώμων οὔσα τῆς δυνάμεως ἐκάστου πολὺ τῶν βασιλικῶν προγευστῶν σκεπτικώτερον διαισθανομένη, τὸ μὲν οἰκεῖον εἴσω παρήσι τὸ δ' ἀλλότριον ἀπελαύνει καὶ οὐκ ἔῃ θιγεῖν οὐδέ λυπῆσαι τὴν γεῦσιν ἀλλὰ διαβάλλει καὶ κατηγορεῖ τὴν φαυλότητα πρὶν ἢ βλαβῆναι·</p>	<p>But our sense of smell, even before we taste, is a judge that can much more critically distinguish the quality of each article of food than any royal taster in the world. It admits what is proper, rejects what is alien, and will <i>not</i> let it touch <i>or</i> give pain to the taste, but informs on and denounces what is bad before any harm is done to us.</p>
--	---

Again, the Loeb translator employs 'or' to distinguish between 'touching' and 'giving pain' to the taste. Θιγγάνω can mean to reach as well as to touch, and λυπέω means to grieve or vex. Plutarch points out that the sense of smell gives forewarning of bad foods, preventing them even touching or reaching the mouth, and moreover preventing them vexing the taste buds. The second idea is added to the first as a development of it. The function of οὐδέ is normal, appending a new idea to a previous one, the two in this case being closely related. Certainly, bad food cannot grieve the taste unless it first touches it, and probably if it does reach the taste, it will also grieve it. It may be admitted therefore that the two ideas could perhaps merge into one in the mind of a reader. But this is a consequence of the closeness of the concepts that are added together, not to some previously unknown combining function of οὐδέ.

<sup>171</sup> Payne, *οὐδέ*, 252.

## Conclusions

Payne's thesis fails to convince. He provides no grammatical or lexical support for the meaning and force of οὐδέ that he contends for. When employed as a coordinating conjunction, οὐδέ simply connects one negative to another in an additive way. It never subtracts; that is to say that the addition of the second term never limits the extent of the first. A detailed examination of Paul's use of οὐδέ shows no departure from normal usage. Likewise, for those other texts where Payne suggests a limiting, combinatorial force for οὐδέ, careful examination shows that a good sense is yielded by giving the conjunction its normal additive function.

Payne is almost certainly correct to say that ἀνδρός is not the object of διδάσκειν in 1 Tim 2.12. He is also successful in refuting Kostenberger's attempt to establish a so-called syntactical rule that would delimit the range of possible meanings of αὐθεντεῖν to those which are 'positive' in and of themselves. There is reason to doubt that such a rule can exist, at least in the form proposed. Nevertheless, it may be agreed with Kostenberger that a meaning for αὐθεντεῖν should be preferred that gives a natural harmony and balance to the sentence.

Origen's replacement of οὐδέ by ἀλλ' οὐδέ in his citation of 1 Tim 2.12 demonstrates that he sees two distinct components to Paul's prohibition. Likewise, Chrysostom considers the first prohibition independently of the second.

Payne's attempt to draw support for his thesis from hendiadys in English lacks a sound basis in scholarly discussion of Greek hendiadys. The phenomenon, as it is generally accepted to exist, occurs with positive conjunctions, linking terms in close proximity, and so is not relevant to 1 Tim 2.12.

In conclusion, Paul gave a twofold prohibition encompassing women teaching and women exercising authority over men, both of which are contrasted with being in quietness or silence. Οὐδέ serves to connect the two infinitives in an additive way, according to its normal function as a coordinating conjunction.