

**Within the Veil: A Transformational Metaphor for the Interpretation
of 1 Timothy 2:11-15**

Author

Johnston, Kathryn Elizabeth

Published

2009

Thesis Type

Thesis (Masters)

School

School of Humanities

DOI

[10.25904/1912/385](https://doi.org/10.25904/1912/385)

Rights statement

The author owns the copyright in this thesis, unless stated otherwise.

Downloaded from

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/365514>

Griffith Research Online

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

Within The Veil: A transformational metaphor for the
interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15

Kathryn Elizabeth Johnston

BSocWk (Hons), MSW

**School of Humanities
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Griffith University**

**Submitted in fulfilment of the requirements of the degree
of Master of Philosophy**

September 2007

ABSTRACT

The Bible is permeated with rich symbolism, and the quintessence of the meaning of Biblical texts is found through examining concepts, patterns, principles, and images portrayed within the Biblical text itself. This thesis asks whether or not evidence supports an alternative reading to the traditional translation, and interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. The traditional reception of the text is that the place of a woman is to be silent, in submission, with no right to teach, as she is under the authority of a man. In recent decades the text has come under greater enquiry by women and men who argue for the liberation of women from the traditional reading. This thesis examines the paradigmatic positions of traditionalists and egalitarians. The traditionalists espouse a hierarchical Church structure, with women as the 'second class', and the thesis argues that their worldview is situated within the normative paradigm of patriarchy. Egalitarians claim that gender equality exists within the Biblical text.

The thesis undertakes an exegetical analysis of the traditional translation through the lens of the metaphor 'within the veil'. It claims that the metaphor offers new illumination of this text, and within the metaphor is an overarching Biblical principle of impartiality. Further, the thesis argues that as a result of the event of the rending of the temple veil in Jerusalem, at the time of the death of Jesus, it symbolised a new era of the New Covenant Church with: unlimited access to God through Jesus Christ; it reconciled the relationship between God and humanity after the Edenic Covenant was broken; it realigned relationships the way it was 'in the beginning'; and thereby removed all barriers that previously existed, including gender.

Evidence is presented to support the claim that it is only through the synchronisation of the OT and NT patterns, and symbols that 1 Timothy 2:11-15 can be complete in its meaning for the Church. In the OT, only the High Priest could enter 'within the veil' into the Holy of Holies to make atonement for the sins of Israel. All of this changed when Jesus, as God incarnate, came in the flesh to be the atoning sacrifice for 'all'. The OT rituals and sacrifices were thereby extinct. Jesus Christ, as the mediator between God and humanity

made a way 'within the veil' for all who choose to enter into the New Covenant agreement with God.

As part of the deconstruction, and restoration of the text the methodological strategy was chosen to implement a multi-layered analysis; including, the world 'before' the text (how the reader receives the text); the world 'behind' the text (the first century world of Ephesus); and the world 'of' the text (textual criticism). To identify principles inherent in the Biblical text the Apostle Paul's theology was also examined. Additionally, the methodology included a critique of the debates around whether or not the Apostle Paul has been misrepresented, and unfairly maligned through the historical and traditional translation. It is argued that the exegete as reader 'before' the text with access 'behind' the text becomes part of the multi-layered world of the text. This Biblical feminist interpretative approach for textual analysis is based on the scholarly work of Sandra Schneiders which involves the notion of 'window' and 'mirror'. The 'window' into the text becomes a 'mirror' as the text is engaged by the reader to create meaning in the present - the contemporary world. All of the exegetical layers were fused recreating the life of the text, thereby giving it new meaning.

The thesis challenged the preconception of men as being superior to women on the basis of the evidence gathered from the multi-layered textual analysis, and aimed to dismantle the belief that this is the 'will of God'. In addition, it argues that the traditional translation is the result of historical, socio-cultural, and religious conditioning.

The findings revealed parallels between the goddess Artemis, as 'protector' and 'provider' of the people in First Century Ephesus as translating to men in the Church, as opposed to Jesus Christ - the new *pater-familias* of God's household. The thesis concludes that the subjugation of women is a pagan practice in the Church and is akin to idolatry - a remnant of a Hellenistic, and pagan culture dating back to the First Century.

Through the restoration of the text the thesis claims that women are no longer the 'second sex', and argues that they possess ontological, spiritual, and

functional equality comparable to men. On the basis of the findings scholars are invited to reconfigure the patriarchal paradigm through new exegetical methods; secondly, the Church is challenged to engage in a process of structural renewal, and restore women to their rightful place. What emerges from the findings of the research is a new reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. The reading celebrates and proclaims unconditional gender equality, and therefore, achieves the necessary equipoise for a fully functioning New Covenant Church. The study concludes with an alternative and paraphrased reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 as:

A woman must learn quietly without causing disruption and be supportive when she is under instruction (v 11). I do not give authority for a woman to engage in false teaching and teach others that she is the originator of man, she should remain quiet (v 12). For after Adam and Eve were created; Adam was formed first, then Eve (v 13). Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived; however, that does not make Adam superior to Eve as both made mistakes and were expelled from the Garden of Eden (v 14). Apart from this, everyone has an opportunity to be saved through Jesus Christ as long as they continue in faith, love, and holiness, as is required by God, and they too should behave decently, and ordered in God's household (v 15).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	I
TABLE OF CONTENTS	IV
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	VIII
STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY	IX
ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS	X
TECHNICAL PREFACE	XII
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
<i>The Gender Debate and 1 Timothy 2:11-15</i>	2
The Need for Clarification of 1 Timothy 2:11-15	5
<i>The Ramifications of Praxis in the Church</i>	8
Personal Preamble to the Study	9
The Research Questions	12
<i>The Reception of 1 Timothy 2:11-15</i>	13
<i>The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles</i>	15
<i>The Use of the Metaphor ‘Within the Veil’</i>	19
Patterns, Principles, and the Mosaic Covenant	20
The Tabernacle Symbolised the New Covenant Order	22
The New Testament Account of the Rending of the Temple Veil	24
Scholarly Debate on the Temple Veil	26
<i>Conclusion</i>	29
CHAPTER 2	31
SITUATING THE TEXT IN THE SCHOLARLY DISCOURSE	31
<i>Feminism, Scholarship, and the Church</i>	31
The First-Wave of Feminism	33
The Second-Wave of Feminism	34
The Third-Wave of Feminism	35
Feminism and the Struggle of Women	36
<i>Patriarchy and the Church</i>	39
Patriarchy, and the Image of God	40
The Normative Paradigm	42
Changing the Normative Paradigm of Patriarchy	44
Roles of Women within the Normative Paradigm of Patriarchy	46

<i>Theological Positions on the Role of Women in the Church</i>	48
<i>The Paradigm Debate</i>	51
<i>Traditionalists versus Egalitarians</i>	53
<i>Conclusion</i>	57
CHAPTER 3	59
METHODOLOGY	59
<i>The Biblical Text as ‘Word of God’</i>	60
Authority of the Biblical Text.....	61
<i>The Transmission of the Canonical Biblical Text</i>	62
Lack of Extant Evidence for 1 Timothy 2:11-15	64
Textual Corruption of the Biblical Text.....	65
The Spiritual Element in Exegesis.....	69
<i>Foundations of the Exegesis</i>	71
Reception Theory	72
The Reader’s Relationship with the Biblical Text	74
<i>Hermeneutics and Theology of the Methodology</i>	76
Feminists and the Biblical Text.....	78
Hermeneutic of Suspicion versus a Hermeneutic of Faith	81
<i>Parameters of the Methodology</i>	84
The World of the Biblical Text	84
The Multiple Contextual Layers of the Methodology.....	87
<i>Conclusion</i>	87
CHAPTER 4	90
SITUATING THE TEXT IN ITS SOCIO-CULTURAL CONTEXT.....	90
<i>The Ancient City of Ephesus</i>	93
<i>The Temple of Artemis and Cultic Worship</i>	94
The Artemision and Eusebeia.....	94
Artemis Ephesia.....	98
<i>The Place of Women in the Ancient World</i>	100
Women in the Roman Empire	101
The Place of Jewish Women.....	103
Household Codes in the New Testament Church.....	104
<i>Conclusion</i>	108
CHAPTER 5	111
SITUATING THE TEXT IN THE PAULINE MISSION AND THEOLOGY	111
<i>The Pauline Mission</i>	112
Paul, Timothy, and the New Covenant Church in Ephesus.....	113
Paul’s First Letter to Timothy	115

<i>Pauline Theology</i>	117
Pauline Theological Motifs	117
Paul's Soteriological Message	121
Paul's Teaching On Salvation.....	122
Paul's Teaching on Faith.....	123
Paul's Position on the Law and Gospel/Grace Polemic	126
Paul's Teaching on Women Bishops, Elders and Deacons.....	128
<i>Conclusion</i>	133
CHAPTER 6	136
THE CONTENTIOUS TEXT AND TEACHING IN 1 TIMOTHY 2:12	136
Reception of the Text "I do not permit" (οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω)	140
<i>1 Timothy 2:12 and 'to teach' (διδάσκειν)</i>	144
Teaching and the Grammatical Structure of 1 Timothy 2:12	148
The Role of Teaching in the Church.....	153
The Image of Paul – Traditionalist versus Egalitarian.....	157
<i>Conclusion</i>	161
CHAPTER 7	164
THE CONTENTIOUS TEXT AND AUTHORITY IN 1 TIMOTHY 2:12.....	164
Αὐθεντέω Meaning to Have or Exercise Authority.....	164
Αὐθεντέω Meaning to have Dominion over, to Dominate	170
Αὐθεντέω Meaning Murder, Suicide, or Sacrilege.....	172
Αὐθεντέω Meaning Author, Origin or Source.....	174
<i>Conclusion</i>	177
CHAPTER 8	181
SITUATING 1 TIMOTHY 2:11-15 WITHIN ITS CONTEXT	181
<i>An Examination of Silence in 1 Timothy 2:11-12</i>	182
The Word Meaning	182
A Comparative Analysis of Silence in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and 1 Corinthians 14:33-35	184
<i>Women and Submission</i>	186
Subordination theory	187
The Meaning of Submission (ὑποταγή) in Different Contextual Settings	191
<i>Paul's Purpose for Referring to Old Testament Text</i>	195
Paul Responds to Neo-Gnostic Truths and or Heresies	199
Paul Heralds the New Covenant Church	200
<i>Salvation through Childbearing</i>	201
The Reception of the Birthing Metaphor	202
Paul and the Use of Metaphorical Language.....	205
<i>Conclusion</i>	208

CHAPTER 9	211
FINDINGS AND CONCLUSION	211
<i>The Reception of the Text within the New Covenant Church Order</i>	215
The Place of Women in Paul’s Ministry.....	217
Evidence of a Patriarchal Bias in the Traditional Translation	219
<i>The Traditional Reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15</i>	220
The Struggle for Women’s Religious Rights.....	221
<i>The New Reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15</i>	224
1 Timothy 2:11	225
1 Timothy 2:12	226
1 Timothy 2:13	228
1 Timothy 2:14	229
1 Timothy 2:15	230
Conclusion.....	232
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	236

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to express my appreciation and thanks to my principal supervisor, Dr. Anne Dawson for her guidance and support. I also extend thanks to my associate supervisor, Dr. Sue Fairley for her advice early in the research. My sincerest gratitude goes to Dr. Sarah T. (Sally) Rickson for her assistance and support in revising and finalising the thesis. Without her scholarly advice this thesis would never have been completed.

My mother Valma Jean Fleming has always been a source of inspiration for me. I thank her for her continued love, and interest in all that I do. Finally, my love and greatest appreciation goes to my husband Bill. Thank you for your encouragement, support, and understanding whilst I completed this project.

Soli Deo Gloria.

STATEMENT OF ORIGINALITY

This work has not previously been submitted for a degree or diploma in any university. To the best of my knowledge and belief, the thesis contains no material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the thesis itself.

Kathryn Elizabeth Johnston

Date.....

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

1. Reference Works

BDAG	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i> , 3 rd ed., (refer technical preface, p. xii).
LSJ	<i>A Greek-English Lexicon</i> (Liddell and Scott), (refer technical preface, p. xii).
HBD	P. J. Achtemeier (ed.), <i>Harper's Bible Dictionary</i>
DPL	G. F. Hawthorne and R. P. Martin (eds.), <i>Dictionary of Paul and His Letters</i>

II. Ancient Documents

Clement	<i>Strom.</i>	<i>Stromateis</i>
Josephus	<i>Ant.</i>	<i>Jewish Antiquities</i>

III. General

B.C.E.	Before the Common Era
CBMW	Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood
C.E.	Common Era
Cf.	<i>Confer</i> , compare
Chap., Chaps.	Chapter; Chapters
e.g.	<i>exempli gratia</i> , for example
et al	<i>et alia</i> , and others
ibid	<i>ibidem</i> , in the same place
i.e.	<i>id est</i> , that is
NT	New Testament
op. cit.	in the previous work cited
OT	Old Testament
p., pp.	Page number (single); page number (plural)
Para.	Paragraph
PE	Pastoral Epistles
v., vv.	Verse, verses
WCTU	Women's Christian Temperance Union

IV. BIBLES

AMP	Amplified Bible
ASV	Authorised Standard Version
DBY	The Darby Bible
JB	The Jerusalem Bible
KJV	King James Version
NASB	New Authorized Standard Bible
NCV	New Century Version
NEB	New English Bible
NGEINT	Greek English Interlinear New Testament
NIV	New International Version
NKJV	New King James Version
NLT	New Living Translation
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SOT	Spurrell's Old Testament
TSNT	The Source New Testament
WBS	Webster's Bible Translation
YLT	Young's Literal Translation

TECHNICAL PREFACE

Throughout this thesis, direct quotations from the Holy Bible in English are taken from the New Revised Standard Version [*The HarperCollins Study Bible: With the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books* (New York: HarperCollins Publishers, Inc., 1993)] unless otherwise indicated. Two sources were accessed for the Greek text: 1) *The New Greek-English Interlinear New Testament with the New Revised Standard Version, New Testament* (Carol Stream, Illinois: 1990); 2) *The Greek New Testament, Fourth Revised, Corrected Edition, 1994; Fourth revised edition, 1993*, Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart. Analytical Greek New Testament, version two, 1995, by Timothy and Barbara Friberg. Used by permission. Electronic Edition STEP Files, 1998, Parsons Technology, Inc. Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, Stuttgart: Germany.

A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, Third edition (BDAG), by Walter Bauer, edited and revised by Frederick William Danker, sourced from the Libronix Digital Library System, Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 2002.

A Greek-English Lexicon, Eighth edition 1897, New (ninth) edition completed 1940, New Supplement added 1996 (LSJ), by Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, Revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones, with the assistant of Roderick McKenzie and with the cooperation of many scholars, sourced from the Libronix Digital Library System, Bellingham, WA: Logos Research Systems, Inc., 2000-2006.

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

“Let a woman learn in silence with full submission. I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she is to keep silent. For Adam was formed first, then Eve; and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. Yet she will be saved through childbearing, provided they continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty” (1 Tim 2:11-15) NRSV.

This thesis is a research study of the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 using multiple methodologies for textual, contextual, and intertextual analysis to assess the possibility of an alternative reading to the traditional translation. As part of this study, it is argued, that the First Letter to Timothy, which is part of the Pastoral Epistles (PE),¹ is authored by the Apostle Paul. The letter indicates that Paul has departed Ephesus, and has left Timothy in charge of the Church; the letter is to guide and encourage him in his pastoral work. The study applies a feminist theological approach as part of an exegetical analysis with the undertaking to determine whether the traditional English reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 (shown above) is the most complete translation of the original Greek text. The research aspires to build on the work of many inspirational women who have engaged in feminist scholarship in their own inimitable style and method. The classic works of Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1815–1902) and Katharine C. Bushnell (1856–1946) are examples of feminist literature that reflect the outstanding work of these feminist scholars and reformers who studied the Biblical text (Bushnell, 2004; 1993). Their Biblical studies concentrated on liberating women from patriarchal religious ideologies that excluded women from ministry in the Church, and relegated them to a second class status in society. It could be argued, their work has not sufficiently changed the traditional patriarchal paradigm that continues to dominate much of Church function in the Twenty-first Century.

¹ The *Pastoral Epistles*, known as the *PE*, are traditionally attributed to the Apostle Paul. They are perceived as pastoral, as the letters or epistles were written to the individuals Timothy, and Titus.

The Gender Debate and 1 Timothy 2:11-15

1 Timothy 2:11-15 is at the centre of numerous theological, exegetical, and socio-rhetorical studies with one common thread: the place and status of women in the Church has not been fully resolved. Likewise, neither has the place of women in the home. The authority of the Biblical text continues to place women in subjection to men in both of these domains. There is no scholarly consensus about the translation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and as yet, no one has had the 'definitive word'. William Mounce (2000, p. 103) asserts that 1 Timothy 2:11-15 "is the most discussed passage in the *PE* today", and that "interpretations range from seeing Paul as a liberator and champion of women's rights to dismissing Paul as wrong and irrelevant in today's culture". He claims that "even though there are other passages in the *PE* more difficult to interpret, in recent years more has been written on vv 11-12 than on any other passage in the *PE*" (Mounce, 2000, p. 117). Despite this being the case, there is no agreement on its meaning. Cowles (1993, p. 34) questions how the debate is being conducted, and asks whether such a debate brings glory to God. Nevertheless, the dialogue continues and the differing theological alliances present their arguments based on the authority of the Biblical text.

Dissension about the place of women in the Church and home based on interpretations of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is evident across Evangelical, Pentecostal, Protestant, and Roman Catholic denominations, all of which have entered the debate - mostly founded on the traditionalist versus egalitarian positions. The traditionalists' position is that 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is a universal prohibition preventing women from teaching and having authority in the Church for all time. On the other hand, the egalitarians adopt the view that the prohibition was temporary, and related to a particular situation in the Church in Ephesus. The Biblical authority of egalitarianism, and the substantiation of their arguments for including women in leadership in the Church are being strongly contested by scholars in evangelical circles, particularly in the United States of America. Thomas Schreiner (Schreiner, 2005, p. 85) states that "the role of women in the Church is probably the most emotionally charged issue in American evangelicalism today". Further, Paige Patterson (Patterson, 2005, pp. 248-259)

claims that the discourse about the translation and meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is a phenomenon that has spread across the globe. James Beck and Craig Blomberg (Beck & Blomberg, 2001, p. 9) state “the relevant theological, biblical, and exegetical issues are all very much still open for examination”. They also claim that it has been “the view throughout history of most Protestants, the various Orthodox branches of the Church, and the Roman Catholic Church” that women should not hold the office of a priest, minister, or pastor (Beck & Blomberg, 2001, p. 178). The exclusion of women raises important issues about the place and authority of Scripture in the Church and society, and its value and relevance in today’s world. While some denominations have accelerated the debate allowing women to participate and teach in Church leadership, other denominations have adopted a more conservative approach; not sanctioning change with respect to this issue.

Walter Liefeld’s (1989, pp. 148-149) research identified six potential reasons or issues that are given for the Biblical interpretation, and application of 1 Timothy 2:12. These range from: 1) women were false teachers or victims of false teachers who took sexual advantage of them; 2) women were uneducated and unable to teach; 3) women were unreliable witnesses; 4) the practice of Gnosticism in the Church; 5) in the Hellenistic culture, female prophets were acceptable, female teachers were not and; 6) Jews, the teachers of Scripture were revered; based on a claim that those in earlier times who revealed the ‘Word of God’ were seen as divine – women, would not be acceptable as teachers. On the basis of these premises and the Genesis narrative, Liefeld (1989) argues that women are prohibited to teach; however, he concedes there is need for further clarification.

In recent decades, the debate about the role of women in the Church has turned to more of a socio-political standpoint, rather than a hermeneutical perspective. From a socio-political point of the view, the scholarly opinion is that the issue of the equal status of women in the Church can only be attained if simultaneously the equal status of people of different race, gender, and social status is addressed (Koester, 1997). While the socio-political agenda is a valid, and legitimate approach, it could be argued that it should not supersede a

sound hermeneutical argument to validate the meaning of the text, and the authority that Scripture has in the Church.

Robert Clouse claims that the role of women in the Church was “one of the most pressing problems facing believers in the closing years of the twentieth century” (Clouse & Clouse, 1989, p. 20). In 2000, John Dawson² (as cited in Cunningham, Hamilton, & Rogers, 2000, p. 11) called for someone to finally resolve the long standing issue of gender; imploring scholars to “show clearly and finally what the Bible says about gender”. In 2005, Andreas Köstenberger and Thomas Schreiner (2005, p. 175) stated that “the controversy over the role of women in the Church has gripped virtually every denomination in Christendom”. The controversy is focused on the translation of the Greek text, and the interpretative meaning given to the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15.

The gender debate continues even with advanced technological tools to assist in the analysis of early Christian literature and Biblical data, the discovery of ancient manuscripts, and archaeological and epigraphical findings. R.T. France (1995, p. 19) believes it is acceptable and necessary to alter our thoughts regarding a long held position, as long as we do not change the authoritative teachings of the Bible “in favour of a secular agenda”. He argues that while scholars have the capacity to “change our minds”, the traditionalists and egalitarians are intent on finding “legitimate ammunition in the Bible...to promote their cause” (France, 1995, p. 20). The dominant mode of scholarly understanding with gender roles in the Church exists within the traditionalist paradigm. It could be argued that any change from this widely accepted paradigm would require a substantial shift from the long-established notions surrounding patriarchy. Secondly, if traditionalist scholars were to change their positions, this might cause major disruption in the Church. Nevertheless, such a

² Founder of *International Reconciliation Coalition*, Adelaide, Australia, and writer of the foreward to book by: Cunningham, L., Hamilton, D., Joel, & Rogers, J. (2000). *Why Not Women: A Fresh Look at Scripture on Women in Missions, Ministry, and Leadership*. Seattle, WA: YWAM Publishers.

potential crisis should not dismiss the need for further clarification and examination of the text. Therefore, part of this research includes exploring the traditionalists' and egalitarians' scholarly theological positions to establish what gaps and weaknesses exist in their Biblical exegesis.

The Need for Clarification of 1 Timothy 2:11-15

Even though the debate about the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 has continued for centuries, it has intensified in recent decades as it is evident that there is a need for further clarification. Through scholarship of this subject, it is expected that different translations and meanings of the text will emerge, particularly given the more recent archaeological discoveries, and the use of advanced technological apparatuses. This study integrates such findings, and asks the question as to whether the common reading of the text is an authentic translation. The universal translation from the Greek to English is mostly consistent across different English translations. The Greek text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 reads:

¹¹ γυνή ἐν ἡσυχία μανθανέτω ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ· ¹² διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἄνδρος, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ. ¹³ Ἀδὰμ γὰρ πρῶτος ἐπλάσθη, εἶτα Εὐα. ¹⁴ καὶ Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἐξαπατηθεῖσα ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν· ¹⁵ σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, ἐὰν μείνωσιν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἀγιασμῷ μετὰ σωφροσύνης.

To draw attention to the interpretative issues with 1 Timothy 2:11-15, six different English translations have been selected for inclusion in this study: the Interlinear Greek-English; the Authorised King James; the New Revised Standard; the New International Version; The Message Bible; and finally, a contemporary independent translation from a Classical Greek scholar using

recently discovered papyri and inscriptions³, *The Source New Testament*. The translations follow;

The Interlinear Greek-English Translation:

“¹¹Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. ¹²But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. ¹³For Adam was first formed, then Eve. ¹⁴And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. ¹⁵Notwithstanding she shall be saved in childbearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety” (A. Marshall, 1974).

The Authorised Version of King James:

¹¹Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. ¹²But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. ¹³For Adam was first formed, then Eve. ¹⁴And Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived was in the transgression. ¹⁵Notwithstanding she shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in faith and charity and holiness with sobriety.

The New Revised Standard Version:

¹¹Let a woman learn in silence with full submission. ¹²I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she is to keep silent. ¹³For Adam was formed first, then Eve; ¹⁴and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor. ¹⁵Yet she will be saved through childbearing, provided they continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty.

³ Cf: *The Source New Testament with Extensive Notes of Greek Work Meaning*, by Dr A. Nyland, 2004, pp. 7-12. Reference is made to Moulton and Milligan's eight volumes in *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament* that had no entry for about 17 per cent of New Testament words and 800 words in the lexicon had no documentary attestation. As Nyland states "nearly every recent New Testament dictionary and concordance is based on this old work while older ones are based on work prior even to that of Moulton and Milligan" (p. 7).

The New International Version:

¹¹A woman should learn in quietness with full submission. ¹²I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent. ¹³For Adam was formed first, then Eve. ¹⁴And Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner. ¹⁵But women will be saved through childbearing - if they continue in faith, love and holiness with propriety.

The Message Version:

I don't let women take over and tell the men what to do. They should study to be quiet and obedient along with everyone else. Adam was made first, then Eve; woman was deceived first—our pioneer in sin!—with Adam right on her heels. On the other hand, her childbearing brought about salvation, reversing Eve. But this salvation only comes to those who continue in faith, love, and holiness, gathering it all into maturity. You can depend on this.

The Source New Testament:

¹¹A woman must learn and she is to learn without causing a fuss and be supportive in everything. ¹²I most certainly do not grant authority to a woman to teach that she is the originator of a man – rather she is not to cause a fuss – ¹³for Adam was formed first, then Eve. ¹⁴And Adam was not deceived, but the woman made a mistake as she was beguiled, ¹⁵and she will be saved by means of the Birth of the Child if they continue to be trustworthy, loving and holy and have good sense (Nyland, 2004, pp. 548-551).

From these selected translations the different meanings given to the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 are clear, despite the author's aim of accuracy in the translation from the Greek to English. The historical reading is the commonly accepted reception or understanding of 1 Timothy 2:11-15; however, it is argued that this reading grounded in the authority of the Biblical text and

patriarchal scholarship has amplified the voice of the text, and silenced the voice of women.

The Ramifications of Praxis in the Church

Many Christian women and men continue to accept a patriarchal interpretation of silence and subjection as an integral part of God's will and purpose in the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Such a position has directed praxis in the Church; furthermore, it could be argued that the subjugation of women is a major factor in declining Church attendance.⁴ The ramification is that as women are silenced, the manifold presence of God's wisdom may also be silenced: with the end result, a Church in decline. As Bushnell (2004, p. 139) wrote "no church can long survive the silencing of its women". She argued that the Church that silences women, will be found to silence the Holy Spirit as women were destined to have a very large share in the preaching of God's message, and in bringing souls to Christ. She then draws the reader's attention to Genesis 3:15 stating "for did not God promise, long ages ago, as regards woman, that her seed should bruise the Serpents head?" (Bushnell, 2004, p. 139). Bushnell believed that women had a role in preaching and teaching; a role that was authorised by God but withdrawn by man. Bushnell, and other women like her were human rights advocates. The point of reference for the religious rights movement for women like Bushnell and Stanton was how the Biblical text was received by Church leaders, and then communicated to the Church and the general public. How the text was translated, understood, and given meaning became Church praxis, which afterwards became the experiences of women which resonates throughout this thesis.

⁴ In Australia in May 2001, 7000 churches consisting of over 435000 church attendees took part in the *National Church Life Survey (NCLS)*. The survey showed that during 1996–2001, Church attendance declined by seven per cent across the participating denominations. Retrieved 24 September, 2008, <http://www.ncls.org.au/default.aspx?sitemapid=133>.

Personal Preamble to the Study

My experiences with the Church⁵ across a number of denominations over several decades, that affected my personal standpoint on the subject was that the leadership of the Church was male dominated. My experiences with a Christian community, and the treatment of women caused me to re-evaluate my relationship with God; God's relationship with others; and the relationship between women and men. My observation of the Church structure was that married women were given greater prominence compared to single or widowed women. There seemed to be a covert hierarchy rarely openly discussed, but obvious in its marginalisation of women. Despite some Protestant denominations ordaining women this is not consistent practice throughout the Church; for example, women cannot be ordained as priests or pastors in the Roman Catholic Church worldwide. One of the reasons attributed is that Jesus only chose male Apostles; therefore, only men are to be ordained as priests.⁶ Cowles (1993, p. 34) questions the simplicity of such an argument and asks whether this was meant to exclude women from teaching in the Church, or "were there some practical social realities that dictated such a limitation?" On the other hand, when women participate in many Protestant Churches; for example, in a teaching role, this is often under the authority and protection of a man.⁷ Women's rights to ordination in the Presbyterian Church in Australia

⁵ The general term "Church" is used to refer to the institutionalised Christian Church; the global community of believers. This is inclusive of all Christian denominations that may hold a diversity of beliefs but who believe Jesus - as revealed in the NT Christian Scriptures; is the Messiah, God incarnate, and born of the Virgin Mary. At times, Church is replaced with *ekklesia* when discussing the local Church in the First Century, meaning a smaller assembly or congregation, or when this refers to a group of people coming together to distinguish this from a global community of believers.

⁶ Cf: the Apostolic Letter ***Ordinatio Sacerdotalis***, by John Paul II, to Bishops in the Catholic Church, on Reserving Priestly Ordination to Men Alone, 22 May 1994, sourced from the Vatican website. Retrieved 26 October, 2007, http://www.vatican.va/.../apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_22051994_ordinatio_sacerdotalis_en.html.

⁷ Women in the Lutheran Church of Australia are to fulfil supporting, rather than leading roles. Refer to the statement prepared by the *Commission on Theology and Inter-Church Relations*, adopted by General Synod, 1978 Convention (edited August 2001).

were rescinded in 1991.⁸ The Lutheran Churches in Australia have debated the subject in recent years.⁹ The Baptist Church in Queensland does not ordain women, although it is permitted in other States of Australia; it is currently under review for Queensland Churches.¹⁰ In the Pentecostal Church, the Australian Christian Churches (ACC) accepts both women and men as ordained ministers.¹¹

My observation of Pentecostal Churches suggested that women were given positions of leadership through the status of their husbands, although this has changed to some extent since that time. In 1984 I was an observer when the Pentecostal Church I attended, partnered with other churches across Australia, and was successful in securing religious exemptions for women in the *Sex Discrimination Act 1984* (Cth); giving the Church the legal right to discriminate against women on religious grounds.¹² Such discrimination is evident today in

⁸ Prior to 1991 women were ordained in the Presbyterian Church in Australia. Cf: 'The Scheme of Union.' Retrieved 23 October, 2008, <http://www.presbyterian.org.au/belief.htm>.

⁹ At the 2006 Convention of Synod, a case for women's ordination was put forth, as well as a case that the Lutheran Church in Australia has no authority to ordain women. The denomination sanctions women in other roles, including elders. Retrieved 23 October, 2008, <http://www.lca.org.au/lca/synod/ordinationcover.cfm>.

¹⁰ The case for ordination of women in the Queensland Baptist Church is under review. Submissions on the subject close 24 January, 2009. The final report and recommendations to the churches will be made on 27 February, 2009, with a decision made at a Special Assembly on 22 May, 2009. Retrieved 25 September, 2008, <http://www.qb.com.au/page.aspx?id=123>.

¹¹ <http://www.aog.org.au/newsandevents/proposednewconstitution/tabid/1393/language/en-au/default.aspx> provides information about Australian Christian Churches (ACC); also known as Assemblies of God in Australia (AOG), their 2007 *United Constitution*, and the draft 2008 *United Constitution*. While ACC ordains women ministers, there are currently no women on their national board that consists of nine men. Retrieved, 25 September, 2008.

¹² Letter dated 6 December 2004 (held by the author) from Ms Pru Goward (Sex Discrimination Commissioner, Human Rights and Equal Opportunity Commission, Sydney), stated that "the religious exemptions prescribed in the SDA appears to be premised on an acceptance that religion discriminates against women; this is apparently an acceptable trade off for maintaining religious traditions if not philosophy....there appears to be little religious or political support for change".

the distinct roles of women and men in the Church; men are predominantly in leadership positions even though women outnumber men in Church congregations.¹³ I became aware of some denominations where women's roles are supervised and overseen by men. Still, many believers and Church leaders deem that only men have the divine authority to fulfil positions of leadership¹⁴ and that this is supported by Scripture.¹⁵ Leadership and teaching authority accorded to men is commonly based on a number of key Biblical verses.¹⁶ From the study of these verses and other principles drawn from the text, theological, and doctrinal positions have been determined.

My linguistic observations within the Church revealed that language is dominated by masculine pronouns; sermons or homilies are not always gender inclusive; and at times women are excluded altogether - either intentionally or unintentionally. Phyllis Bird (1997, p. 240) described it as the "pervasive socio-cultural bias of patriarchal androcentrism" in Biblical interpretation and in the Church. She draws attention to the patriarchal bias that affects the way people think, their speech, and shapes their experience and expression (Bird, 1997). My informal discourse with other women revealed an implicit acceptance of submission to the hierarchical structure of the Church. The experiential evidence was pervasive. A strong androcentric bias and patriarchal control, based on the authority of the Biblical text existed in the Church. Following

¹³ Survey data of Church attendance in Australia showed "in every denomination, in every age grouping, women outnumber men". See Kaldor et al 1999a, p. 17. The highest number of women in senior leadership in Australia is 19% in the Uniting Church; Salvation Army (16%); Anglican (8%). Retrieved 12 October, 2008, <http://www.nlcs.org.au/default.aspx?sitemapid=46>.

¹⁴ The Pentecostal Church denomination I currently attend (New Life Churches International) ordains women as ministers; however, there are leaders and people in the Church who endorse the 'male headship' principle.

¹⁵ The use of the word 'Scripture/s' refers to the Christian Writings of the OT and NT Canon (The Holy Bible), made up of 66 books; OT – 39 books and NT – 27 books. The Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books contained in *some* Bibles are not included.

¹⁶ Apart from 1 Timothy 2:11-15 arguments for the subordinate nature of women based on textual criticism refers to Genesis Chapters 1-3; 1 Cor 11:2-16, 14:33b-36; Eph 5:18-33; Col 3:18-19; 1 Pet 3:1-7.

these experiences my interest in the need for additional research into the subject of women in the Church emerged. Therefore, it was Church praxis that precipitated the research questions, and the study of the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15, and this contribution to the scholarship debates.

The Research Questions

It was the silencing of women in the Church, and their inability to function fully in Church leadership based on the authority of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 that lead to the all-encompassing research questions. How could male and female be created in the image of God, and yet women were not functionally equal to men in the Church and home? (Gen 1:27). Why were women allowed to teach in some denominations, but then under the supervision of men? Did the second person of the Godhead come to redeem humanity in order to sustain a 'class' system within the Church? Did God discriminate between people based on gender, or has the text been misunderstood? Who was reading and interpreting the text (the mind of God) on the issue of women's silence and subjugation - was it the traditionalists or the egalitarians? Was the patriarchal model a legitimate model for the Church given that it appeared to be about power, control, and male domination? What translation and meaning given to the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 has the most compelling evidence or support? What was embedded within the text when it was examined within its context, and what meanings have been endorsed by scholarship and other readers? These questions precipitated this research. Essentially the research explores a text that appears to establish a two-tiered system with women destined to be second class citizens in God's Kingdom on earth - the Church. In contrast, women's rights in the secular world have transformed more rapidly to women in the Church due to judicial changes; for example, anti-discrimination legislation.

When discussing discrimination, women in the secular world, have conceived the term breaking through the 'glass ceiling' in their pursuit of equality for women. Janeen Baxter and Erik Olin Wright (2000, p. 275) found that the "glass ceiling' is one of the most compelling metaphors for analysing inequalities between men and women in the workplace". While it should be used with caution, their study showed that in Australia the 'glass ceiling' effect

for women is more evident at the “middle of managerial hierarchies than at the top”; indicating disadvantage in women moving from the lower to middle levels of management (Baxter & Wright, 2000, pp. 289-290). In the Church, comparison is drawn to women breaking through the ‘stained glass ceiling’; but because the struggle is so great, and the debate has placed such strict limitations on women’s liberty and function in the Church, this study argues that to reach full equality it may be likened to breaking through the ‘marble ceiling’. It was the Apostle Paul in his First Letter to Timothy who states that Jesus “desires everyone to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth” (1 Tim 2:4). Has the Church come to understand the truth about the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15? This question precipitated an interest in discovering the original intended meaning, and what other truths were embedded in the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. As part of this study, it is argued that the translation, and meaning of the text equates with the social conditioning, ideologies, philosophies, and worldview held by the scholar as reader and textual interpreter.

The Reception of 1 Timothy 2:11-15

When 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is read in English, the reader receives the historical translation; that is, a woman is in a subservient role to that of a man. Within the text there is a declaration of gender inequality that the Church has accepted as the designated place of women. Mounce (2000, p. 117) claims “the historical reading of the text sees Paul limiting the scope of women’s ministry and grounding that prohibition in the creation of Adam and Eve before the curse of the Fall”. Further, he states that “if it could be proven elsewhere Paul allows women to teach overseers (i.e., [sic] men) authoritatively within the household of God (1 Tim 3:15), then it would have to be concluded that Paul is inconsistent or that vv 11-15 have been misunderstood” (Mounce, 2000, p. 117). Until that time, the historical reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 has shaped the normative paradigm for the Church, and subsequently, the experiences of women.

My experience in the Church, and reception of the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 was different from the traditional reading, and closer to the egalitarian scholarship, particularly when the text was read in the context of other Biblical

texts. For example, in Paul's First Letter to Timothy it records that there is one God, and one mediator between God and humanity: Jesus Christ who gave himself as ransom for 'all' (1 Tim 2:5-6). In my reception, the meaning I attributed to the text was that all access to God was mediated by Jesus: no one, including men, could claim they had the God-given authority to act as an intermediary to God on behalf of another; therefore, women's access to God is not mediated by men. In this respect, women's voices are not silenced, and there is no discrimination between women and men based on their relationship with God.

It is argued that in reading across the Pauline Corpus, the Apostle Paul had a very inclusive style when writing to the Church. For example, Paul in his Letter to the Galatians states that 'all' are children of God through faith, and there is no longer male or female (Gal 3:26-28). Further, he states that 'all' who believe are justified by faith in Christ, and not by the works of the law (Gal 2:16). In reading the Biblical text, Paul appeared inclusive of everyone, and did not seem to discriminate by gender. In the manuscripts Paul sent to the early Churches, his emphasis was on teaching the truth of the Gospel message, and he exhorts the Church to live a Godly and holy life. Paul wrote to the Church in Corinth and told them that 'all' believers are ambassadors for Christ (2 Cor 5:20). Again, Paul does not limit ambassadors to gender; he is inclusive of 'all' in the Church. The First Letter of Peter states that 'all' are to be built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God "through Jesus Christ" (1 Pet 2:5). The text does not say that only men are part of the new order of priesthood but that 'all' in the Church are "a chosen race, a royal priesthood and a holy nation, God's own people in order that you may proclaim the mighty acts of him who called you" (1 Pet 2:9). In this letter Peter wrote to Christians in five Roman provinces of Asia Minor; indicating this was the heritage for 'all'. If this was the inheritance of believers, why would women need to be subject to their husbands? (Eph 5:22). If 'all' in the Church were to be subject to one another (Eph 5:21), how did this translate as women being subject to men, but men not being subject to women? If women were to be silent in the Church, and subject to men without the authority to teach, where

was a woman's place in the Church? If Jesus Christ died for 'all' why were 'all' not equal before God; for example, in Church function? These questions were interconnected with the traditional and historical reception of the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. This study receives the text as Pauline; however, given that such a claim is disputed by modern scholarship this position is defended.

The Authorship of the Pastoral Epistles

The text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15, found in Paul's First Letter to Timothy, is part of the PE. Until the Nineteenth Century the PE was generally accepted as Pauline. Early in the Nineteenth Century, the German theologian Friedrich Schleiermacher (1807) (b.1768 – d.1834) placed doubt in the mind of scholars about the authorship of Timothy. Since that time, scholars have been discussing issues about authorship including: comments in the writings of Polycarp; that the PE are missing from the Marcion Canon; that Paul's movements do not match with the account outlined in the Book of Acts; and the variations in the vocabulary of other Pauline letters (Dibelius & Conzelmann, 1972; P. Johnson, 1988).

Gordon Fee (Fee, 1988, p. 1) claims that it is now generally accepted by NT scholars that a pseudepigrapher authored the PE around the turn of the First Century C.E. Mounce (2000) argues that there are three scholarly positions based on the linguistics, structure, and methodology of the PE: the Amanuensis, Fiction, and Fragment Hypotheses (pp. xcix-cxxix). Overall, he is convinced that the Amanuensis Hypothesis is more likely as it is supported by both internal and external evidence (Mounce, 2000, p. cxxix). Nonetheless, not all scholars agree. As Liefeld (1999, p. 26) maintains, there is enough evidence to support a claim that "Paul may legitimately be considered the true author" of the PE. He bases his claims on patristic writers such as Polycarp who made mention of the PE and "Justin Martyr, writing around A.D. 140" (Liefeld, 1999, p.27). Other scholars agree with Liefeld as there are a number of early witnesses that support Pauline authorship. Polycarp (ca. 69–155), Irenaeus (ca. 120/140–200/203), and Clement of Alexandria (ca. 150–211/215) were all early witnesses to Pauline authorship, and accepted them as a part of the Canon in this period (Towner, 2006). Donald Guthrie (1990, p. 19) argues that

Polycarp was the earliest witness to the use of 1 and 2 Timothy, arguing on the basis that not only did he know and use the PE “there are allusions to these letters in Justin Martyr, Heracleon, Hegesippus, Athenagoras, Theophilus, and Irenaeus, which show that they were widely known, while Theophilus definitely believed them to be inspired”. Jerome Quinn and William Wacker (2000, p. 3) state that “Polycarp almost certainly quoted the letter to Timothy in his *Phil.* 4.1, perhaps as early as 120 C.E.”. Johnson (2001) also argues that Polycarp made other references to his use of 1 and 2 Timothy around this period.

Clement of Alexandria, a Greek theologian and philosopher of the Second Century C.E., is another early external witness to the First Letter to Timothy, and its authority in the Church. Johnson (2001, p. 21) argues that Clement uses 1 and 2 Timothy in his *Stromateis*¹⁷ and is quoted as saying that “1 and 2 Timothy were rejected by some heretics”. Alexandria was one of the ancient cities well-known for Gnosticism; the blending of pagan and Christian teachings. Towner (2006) argues that the reason Tertullian of Carthage¹⁸ (ca.150/160–225 C.E.) did not mention 1 and 2 Timothy is because they were not accepted by Marcion (ca.85–160). However, Johnson (2001) calls attention to an inconsistency with Tertullian rejecting 1 and 2 Timothy given that prior to this, he used the texts extensively in his work. The problem with Marcion is that he rejected the Christian teachings, and developed his own heretical theology that became known as Gnosticism. Essentially, Marcion rejected the Hebrew Bible, the OT, and as a result of this and other unorthodox teachings he was excommunicated from the Roman Church in 144 C.E.¹⁹ As Towner (2006, p. 5) states Tertullian

¹⁷ Clement of Alexandria’s work *Stromateis* (or known as the *Miscellanies*) is one of the great trilogies he wrote in his lifetime.

¹⁸ Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus was an ecclesiastical writer in the patristic period. He was a pagan until his conversion to Christianity in 197 C.E. In 206 C.E. he joined the Montanist sect. A dissenter of the Church, he later became founder of his own sect. St Augustine was responsible for reconciling the remnants of the Tertullian sect back to the Church. Retrieved, 9 October, 2007, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/14520c.htm>.

¹⁹ Cf: http://www.earlyChurch.org.uk/article_marcion.html for more information about Marcion and his heretical teachings.

rejected the PE because “antihetical themes suggests that Marcion’s omission was intentional even if his precise reasoning for this remains obscure”. If Paul’s teachings did not align with Marcion’s heretical teachings, this may well have been the reason for Marcion’s rejection of the letters (Guthrie, 1990). Despite Marcion’s reasons, there are a number of early witnesses in the First and Second Centuries, including the Muratorian Canon that attests to the PE being of Pauline origins (Guthrie, 1990).

On the other hand, Paul Johnson (1988) argues that Ferdinand Christian Baur (b.1792–d.1860) came to the conclusion that the heretics opposed to the PE were of the same mind as Marcion; therefore, they must have been written much later than the First Century. Furthering the argument, Liefeld (1999, pp. 26-27) refutes the claim of Clement of Rome - another early witness, when he places the PE in the period of 96 C.E. on the basis that the PE were excluded from the Chester Beatty Papyrus (*P*⁴⁶) circa 211 C.E., despite the compilation being an incomplete collection. The earliest copy of the Pauline Corpus found in *P*⁴⁶ contains fragments of all but two, 1 and 2 Timothy - of Paul’s fourteen traditional letters (Holmes, 1993, p. 928).²⁰ Again, Liefeld (1999, p. 27) cites the bishop of Antioch around 211 C.E. as stating “that pseudepigraphic writings in the name of an Apostle are to be rejected”, and believes this is a reference to the Apostle Paul.

Others strongly argue against the upsurge of scholarly opinion that opposes Paul as the author of the PE. As Johnson states (2001, p. 50), “contemporary commentaries tend to assert a unanimity of opinion that is not entirely supported”. Further, “the existence of a majority opinion is far from a guarantee of the truth of that position” (L. T. Johnson, 2001, p. 55). As he explains, the common term to describe such a position without adequate evidence is a ‘presupposition’ or an ‘exegetical fallacy’. He further describes the situation as “the power of construal” - how thinking is acculturated, the power of social conditioning, and how worldviews affect perceptions and beliefs (L. T. Johnson,

²⁰Holmes must also include the Book of Hebrews when he refers to fourteen Pauline letters.

2001, p. 55). This is a mirror image of the normative paradigm of patriarchy articulated in this study. Experiences of life, what is taught, what is observed, and the process of socially expected ways to think and behave are all drawn from the social, political, and religious culture.

As the debate about authorship has intensified, scholars have turned to more sophisticated Biblical tools. On that basis, Quinn and Wacker (2000, p. 4) argue that with more computer analyses of the linguistic data from the PE, the evidence has moved away from the PE being “homogenous internally and different from the rest of the Paulines”. However, they emphasise that even when scholars access the same linguistic data and conduct similar historical-critical methods, there are striking differences in their hypotheses to explain the authorship and principles contained within the PE (Quinn & Wacker, 2000). They then refer to the ‘commentaries of Bernard, Guthrie, Spicq’, and other scholarly work finally arguing that there is sufficient evidence to support that Paul is the author of the PE (Quinn & Wacker, 2000, p.18). They state:

When an interest in gathering the Apostle’s correspondence began at the end of the first century, the PE were copied in a codex of Paul’s letters to individuals along with Philemon, a letter with considerable similarities to other Pauline texts and a few to the PE. On this construction Paul is author of the PE because they were authorized by the Apostle during his own ministry (Quinn & Wacker, 2000, pp. 18-19).

While scholars hold different views on the historical time frame of the PE, Quinn and Wacker (2000, p. 19) state that “there is a tendency to favour an origin at the turn of the first Christian century”. Following their research and taking into account all the internal and external witnesses they claim that the PE were most likely written in the period between 80–85 c.e. On the other hand, the editorial board of the *NRSV* Bible maintain that the PE were written early in the Second Century (Metzger, 1968). Others argue that “Church tradition places the writing of 1 Timothy somewhere between A.D. 62 and 63, shortly after Paul’s first Roman imprisonment” (C. Kroeger Clark & Evans, 2002, p.734; Nyland, 2004). The position of the Roman Catholic Church after taking into account all the

evidence is that the PE were written in the period between 62–66 C.E. prior to Paul's martyrdom in 67 C.E.²¹

Another factor to validate Pauline authorship is the Christological teachings central to the PE. Ellis (1993, p. 665) argues for Pauline authorship of the PE as alike Paul's other letters and teachings they also occur within a Christological centre of Jesus, who as part of the deity of the Godhead became the atoning sacrifice for the sins of humanity (1 Tim 2:4-5; 3:16). While scholarly opinion is mixed, Fee (2007, pp. 472-473) following his in-depth study of Christology in the PE states that there "is a Christology so like the earlier letters, and often so subtle and unrehearsed, that one could use these findings to argue rather strongly for Pauline authorship (as their ultimate source, whoever may have done the actually [sic] writing for him)". In addition, the early witnesses of Polycarp, and the Second Century Muratorian Canon suggest that the PE were of Pauline origin (Guthrie, 1990). Therefore, for the purpose of this research, the First Letter of Timothy is understood to be of Pauline authorship, written in the seventh decade of the First Century C.E. - just prior to Paul's death.

The Use of the Metaphor 'Within the Veil'

An explanation of the metaphor 'within the veil' used in the title of this thesis, and the principles contained within the metaphor are drawn from the Biblical account of the Mosaic Covenant found in the OT, and its association with 'Law' that was replaced with the New Covenant, revealed by Jesus Christ, and its association with 'Grace'. Firstly, the metaphor is used to signify change or movement from the 'Old Covenant' into the 'New Covenant' Era; secondly, it has center stage as a metaphoric principle that illuminates the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15; and thirdly it heralds a new and egalitarian world for humanity within the New Covenant Church.

²¹ Cf: Catholic Encyclopedia: St. Paul, Chronology. Retrieved 25 March, 2007, <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/11567b.htm>,

An understanding of the significance of the metaphor 'within the veil' and the principles and patterns contained within the metaphor, as well as its function within this study is needed at this juncture. This includes a justification for the use of the metaphor through an explanation of the purpose and role of the Tabernacle in the Biblical account, as well as the symbolism of when the temple veil was rent in two at the death of Jesus. This study argues that within the metaphor is an overarching principle for the interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 which will be assessed in this study, and is one that has been undervalued by modern Biblical scholarship.

Patterns, Principles, and the Mosaic Covenant

The OT records the covenant God made with Moses, (commonly known as the Mosaic Covenant), and promises that the Israelites would be God's treasured possession, a priestly kingdom, and a holy nation - as long as they kept God's commandments (cf: Ex 19:5-6; Ex 24:7-8; Deut: 5:1-5; 1 Kings 8:9, 21). The Book of Exodus describes the instructions, and pattern given to Moses on Mount Sinai with specific commands for building a sanctuary for God - known as the Tabernacle (cf: Ex 25:8-9; 29:43-46). The significance of the Tabernacle cannot be underestimated, as strict requirements were placed on Moses to build it according to the pattern as dictated by God (Ex 25:40), because it symbolised the New Covenant order (cf: Jer 31:31-32; Jn 1:17; Rom 5:12-14; 9:4-5; 11:26-27).

As part of the Covenant, Moses was given specific laws, ordinances, and statutes, and these were written on tablets of stone by God (Ex 24:12). When Moses returned from Mt Sinai, and saw the people engaged in idol worship, he was so angry he threw the tablets to the ground breaking them (Ex 32:4, 5, 19). God's Covenant was renewed with the Israelites after Moses made intercession on behalf of the people (Ex 32:11-14). He was asked to cut two more tablets of stone and God wrote the same words on these that were on the former tablets (cf: Ex Chap. 34). Apart from the Decalogue, or Ten Commandments given to Moses, there were other commands and regulations concerning worship, slaves, violence, property, restitution, social and religious laws, the sabbatical year and Sabbath, and the annual festivals (Ex Chaps. 20-23). The first

commandment of the Decalogue was that the people were to have no other god, nor make the form of anything to worship (Ex 20:3-4). This is a consistent motif throughout the OT Scriptures - Israel was not to participate in the idol worship of other gods. Israel was required to keep and diligently observe all the laws, ordinances, and statutes to achieve success and prosperity (Deut 5:29-33; 6:1-3). There were fierce consequences if they did not observe the laws. If they worshipped other gods, God's anger was kindled against them (cf: Deut 4:25; 6:15; 7:4; 29:20). In the first century, Josephus a Jewish historian, records the same events about the Mosaic Covenant, even though these happened approximately 1500 years earlier.²²

The writings of Josephus describe the OT Scriptural narrative outlining the Ten Commandments, and verify that the pattern for the Tabernacle was given to Moses on Mount Sinai when Moses was absent from the people for forty days (cf: Ex 34:28) (Josephus, 1987).²³ Moses' absence caused disquiet amongst the people as they thought he had perished, the consequences being they would be without a 'governor' and 'protector'.²⁴ Josephus' manuscripts also confirm that there were laws additional to the Decalogue, after these were requested by the Hebrew people (Israelites), so they would know how to act in all situations.²⁵ There were consequences for disobeying the laws, for example, a rebellious son was to be stoned.²⁶ It was only through obeying the laws that the Israelites would be happy and fulfilled; consequently, everyone was to be educated, and trained in the law before all else.²⁷ Everyone was required to listen to the law when it was read; women, men, children, and servants and the laws were to be "engraven in their souls, and preserved in their memories".²⁸ Such was the significance of learning God's commandments for the Israelites.

²² Josephus *Antiquities*, trans. Whiston 3.5. § 75-99

²³ *Ibid.*, *Ant.* 3.5.5. § 91-101.

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, *Ant.* 3.6.7. § 98.

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, *Ant.* 3.5.6. § 94.

²⁶ *Op. cit.*, *Ant.* 16.11.2. § 363-366

²⁷ *Op. cit.*, *Ant.* 4.8.12. § 211.

²⁸ *Op. cit.*, *Ant.* 4.8.12. § 210.

However, as the people were unable to keep the commandments, the place and role of the Tabernacle became the means and method for the Israelites to be reconciled into a 'right' relationship with God. At the same time as part of God's unfolding plan to redeem all of humanity, the Tabernacle was symbolic of Jesus Christ's coming.

The Tabernacle Symbolised the New Covenant Order

The pattern found in the Tabernacle symbolised the New Covenant Order within three divisions: the Outer Court entered by a gate, the Holy Place, and the Holy of Holies (cf: Ex Chs. 25-40). The Holy Place was separated by a door from the Outer Court with the Holy of Holies separated from the Holy Place with a veil or curtain (Ex 26:33). Inside the Holy of Holies was the 'Ark of the Covenant' that housed the tablets on which were written the Mosaic Covenant, the agreement between God and the Israelites (Ex 25:10-21). In the days of Moses only the High Priest had access 'within the veil' to the 'most holy place' within the Tabernacle (Ex Ch. 26; Lev Ch. 16). Once a year, the High Priest would go into the Tabernacle, and enter the 'most holy place' to make atonement for the people's sins (Ex 30:9-11). The mercy seat: the place where God appeared was made of pure gold, and set above the Ark (Ex 25:17-22). Once the Tabernacle was finished it became God's dwelling place; a place where God would meet with the Israelites (Ex 25:22; 29:42-46; 30:6). Samuele Bacchiocchi (2003, p. 5) argues that the Tabernacle is representative of the heavenly sanctuary that is, "the dwelling place of God". Secondly, he states that most modern authors claim that the heavenly sanctuary as described in the Book of Hebrews is a "metaphor for the spiritual presence of God" (Bacchiocchi, 2003, p. 7). Nearly fifty chapters in the Books of Exodus, Leviticus and Numbers in the OT Scriptures are dedicated to the description of the Tabernacle, attesting to its significance.

God appeared in a cloud that covered the Tabernacle during the day, and by fire in the cloud at night where the Ark of the Covenant resided (Ex 40:34, 38). When the cloud moved, the Israelites would move. Wherever the Ark of the Covenant went, the presence of God went (Num 10:33-36). The Ark represented Israel's place of safety and protection; however, if the people

disobeyed God, his presence was removed (Nu 14:9). As the protection of God was dependent on the obedience of the people, and because they were unable to keep the law, the High Priest had to perform atonement rituals.

Until the time of Christ, Aaron, his ancestral household, and the tribe of Levi were given the responsibility to perform the duties in the Tabernacle (Nu 18:1-2). The priesthood was given to Aaron as a gift from God (Nu 18:7). It was given to him and his descendants as a covenant of perpetual ordinance (Ex 29:9; Nu 25:13). This gift could not be retracted. Each year the High Priest would go 'within the veil' or curtain to make atonement for the sins of the people with a blood offering. The High Priest would sprinkle the blood on the mercy seat as was commanded by God (Lev 16:14-15, 34). As Bacchiocchi (2003) explained, this was the pattern strictly ordained by God to make atonement for sins. His analysis of the OT rituals, including sacrifice is that the "earthly sanctuary with its daily and yearly services typifies important aspects of Christ's heavenly ministry (Bacchiocchi, 2003, pp. 9-10). He further explains that

the plan of salvation is an abstract truth. To help us conceptualize some of its vital aspects, God has provided us in the sanctuary a *pictorial representation* of the redemptive ministry of Christ. For example, the altar of burnt offering portrayed the great atoning, substitutionary death of our Lord (Bacchiocchi, 2003, p. 10).

It is in the NT Book of Hebrews that the spiritual truths of the heavenly sanctuary are made clear. As a result of his exegesis, Bacchiocchi (2003, p. 10) is convinced that the "priestly services and sacrifices of the earthly tabernacle were a "copy and shadow" of the "more excellent" ministry conducted by Christ. The significance of the redemptive work of Jesus corresponds to the 'past' (before Calvary) that is typological of services of the early sanctuary, whereas these were "fulfilled and superseded" by "heavenly intercession and mediation of Christ" (Bacchiocchi, 2003, p. 10). Bacchiocchi (2003, p. 14) argues that Christ appeared in the 'past' as a sacrifice for sins; in the 'present' he appears as the mediator before God on behalf of humanity; and in the 'future' he appears a second time "not to deal with sin but to save those who are eagerly

waiting for him". The scholarly work of Bacchiocchi analyses the symbolic nature of the Tabernacle as part of God's unfolding redemptive plan for humanity. The Tabernacle, a typology for what was to come was later replaced by a New Covenant agreement between God, and humanity, through the atoning work of Jesus Christ.

The New Testament Account of the Rending of the Temple Veil

The Greek word (καταπέλασμα) representing the rending of the Temple veil (*velum scissum*) occurs six times in the NT; three times in the Synoptic Gospels (Mt 27:51; Mk 15:38; Lk 23:45), and three times in the Book of Hebrews (Heb 6:19; 9:3; 10:20) (Gurtner, 2006, p. 111). On each occasion in the Synoptic Gospels, recognition is given to the messianic nature of Jesus, and his divinity. In the Book of Hebrews, the text relates to what was achieved for humanity through the death of Jesus as he made access 'within the veil', into the very presence of God.

Robert Plummer (2005) claims that there are two prevailing scholarly views on the rending of the temple veil. He argues that one is that believers have new access to God through Jesus Christ; the other is symbolic of the judgment of God, and the departure of God's blessing (Plummer, 2005, p. 303). In the Apostle Paul's First Letter to Timothy, he confirms that access to God is now only available through Jesus Christ (1 Tim 2:5). The veil rending could not be a departure of God's blessing as it was through Jesus' death on the cross that atonement for the sins of the world was made and blessings followed for all believers (cf: Rom 3:24, 4:7-8; Eph 1:3, 7; Col 1:14). The rending of the veil symbolised the end of the requirement for an earthly intermediary between God, and his people. Under the OT law, the priests ministered in the earthly sanctuary that was merely a shadow, or a pattern of the heavenly sanctuary, and the 'good' things to come in Jesus Christ (Heb 8:5; 10:1). The NT Book of Hebrews exemplifies the significance of the OT Tabernacle, and Jesus as the

mediator of a better covenant (cf: Heb Chs. 8-10).²⁹ No longer does God need another High Priest akin to Aaron, as Jesus fulfilled all that was required. Temple sacrifices were no longer binding as Christ offered himself once for all (Heb 7:27-28).

The Book of Hebrews reports that the veil - symbolic of the separation between God and humanity - was removed by the death of Jesus as he opened a new way through his flesh (Heb 10:19-22). The NT believer, now justified by faith was no longer subject to the rules and regulations of the law, and for those baptised into Christ, there is no division between *Jews*, *Gentiles*, *slave* or *free*, *males* or *females* - for all are one in Christ Jesus (Gal 3:23-29). The debate on gender equality now shifts to whether or not Galatians 3:28 is the interpretative grid for understanding 1 Timothy 2:11-15, as has been argued by some scholars; for example, F. F. Bruce (Bruce, 1982). Given the importance of this argument within this study, it is discussed further in Chapter Two. However, what has been established and confirmed by the intertextuality of the Biblical text is that there is now direct access to God through Jesus Christ, and the Holy Spirit dwells within the believer, which has become God's dwelling place: the

²⁹ Until the 1800s the Book of Hebrews was attributed to Paul. Since that time his authorship has been contested. Gordon Fee, in discussing Pauline Christology, argues that on the spectrum of "high" or "low" Christology, Paul fits on the "high" end as does the author of Hebrews (Fee, 2007, pp. 7-8). For the purposes of this thesis, the Book of Hebrews is deemed as Pauline. Further rationale for this position is provided forthwith. The Second Letter of Peter confirms that Paul did write to the Hebrews (2 Pet 3:15). The theology of Hebrews is similar to Paul's other messages in the PE, E.g. justification by faith, also effectively communicated in Hebrews (cf: Heb 4:2, 6:12, 10:19-22, 11:1-40). The Biblical hermeneutic that Scripture interprets itself directs the exegete to consider the total context of the canonical books of the Bible. Therefore, the principle of *analogia totius scripturae*, otherwise known as 'intertextuality' is applied in this thesis. In addition, the Biblical text in the Book of Hebrews is central to conclusively explaining the metaphor 'within the veil'. Also, in the NT, the Second Letter of Peter confirms that Paul wrote to the Hebrews (2 Pet 3:15). Again, another sign that Paul is the likely author of Hebrews is in Hebrews 13:23 where the author makes mention of his relationship with Timothy. Timothy as a co-worker of Paul's was often mentioned in the Pauline Letters (cf: Rom 16:21; Phil 1:11).

temple of God (1 Cor 3:16; 6:19). The believer, both female and male, now dwell in the 'most holy place' in God's presence, through faith and by grace, that is, God's favour (Rom 3:24-25).

Scholarly Debate on the Temple Veil

Few scholars have entered the debate about the temple veil - evident by the paucity of research on the subject. More recently, Gurtner (2006, p. 97), with reference to the rending of the veil, claimed that the "interpretations of this event have ranged from the rigidly historical to the hermeneutically fanciful". This augments the need for this study as it contributes to the articulation of the metaphor 'within the veil' and its relevance to the reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15.

Plummer (2005, p. 301) draws attention to the scarcity of scholarship on the subject as he is not aware of any work that defends the historicity of the rendering of the temple veil, apart from Theodore Zahn's in 1902 - over one hundred years ago. Scholars, such as Rudolf Bultmann (1963) do not place any significance on the events surrounding Jesus' death, including the rending of the veil. Others, including Harry Chronis (1982), disagree with Bultmann. As Chronis (1982, p. 110) argues, it was "within the *sanctus sanctorum* (Exod 33:11, 14) himself [referring to God] rips away the veil and shows his face, [and] manifests his 'presence'". Further, he argues that the rending of the veil as recorded in the Markan account (Mk 15:38) is a

potent cipher for the 'material disclosure' of the messianic secret in 15:37....because 15:38 is already a natural cipher for theophany,³⁰ the impact of its insertion here must be obvious: *it characterizes the christophany³¹ as a theophany!* Jesus' self-disclosure is an act of divine self-disclosure....Jesus manifests his true identity; and the effect, according to Mark, is equivalent to God himself showing his 'face' (Chronis, 1982, p. 110).

³⁰ A theophany refers to a divine manifestation—the appearance of God.

³¹ A christophany refers to an appearance of the incarnate Christ.

In view of that, Chronis (1982, p. 114) argues the rending of the veil was “an interpretative metaphor, phrased in cultic idiom, for both the self-sacrificial character and the self-revelatory force of Jesus’ death”. A similar approach is taken in this study as it argues that the rending of the veil is an interpretative metaphor for 1 Timothy 2:11-15.

Even though contemporary research is scarce there are external witnesses to the event from early Church writers. De Jonge (1986, p. 76) cites Hippolytus³² describing the veil rendering as “suffering with (Christ) and indicating the true heavenly high priest”. Another early Christian writer Origen³³ (as cited in de Jonge, 1986, p. 78) stated “it was fitting that these things were veiled, until the only one who could reveal them should make them manifest to those who wanted to see them, in order that those who had been liberated from death through the death of Jesus Christ who destroys the death of the believers, would be able to behold what is inside the veil”. Eusebius³⁴ - often referred to as the ‘Father of Ecclesiastical History’ offers insight into what was concealed in the Biblical text of the OT, and revealed in the NT text. Louth (1989, pp. 9-10) quotes Eusebius when he draws attention to how God communicated to humanity in patterns and symbols, and in doing this described the High Priest as an imprint of Christ.³⁵ Josephus describes the Tabernacle veil as separating

³² Hippolytus (ca.170–236 C.E.) was a prolific writer of the early Church. It is likely that Hippolytus was a disciple of Irenaeus (ca.120/140–200/203 C.E.) who was an early Church father and apologist. It is believed that Irenaeus listened to sermons of the great Bishop and martyr Polycarp of Smyrna (ca.70–150 C.E.), thereby establishing a lineage of external evidence back to the First Century.

³³ Origen (ca.185–254 C.E.) birth and death dates are still under dispute. Origen of Alexandria is considered one of the greatest early Church theologians.

³⁴ Eusebius (ca. 260–339 C.E.) was a Greek Christian writer. His writing of the first three hundred years of the Christian Church is the only surviving account of this period.

³⁵ Exodus 25:40, Leviticus: 4:5, 16; 6:22. The reference to the High Priest as anointed (in Leviticus) does not translate to Christ in English; however, in Greek, the words anointed and Christ are the same. In Hebrew ‘Messiah’ and ‘Anointed’ are one and the same. In John 1:41 ‘Messiah’ is translated as the ‘Anointed one’ (cf: *NRSV*).

the 'holy place' from the 'most holy place'; as the dwelling presence of God was concealed and not visible to those outside.³⁶ According to Josephus, the Tabernacle was an "imitation of the system of the world", representing heaven, sea and land and the boundary between heaven and earth.³⁷ Thus the symbolism of the Tabernacle is that those who entered the holy of holies were entering heaven.³⁸ Such reasoning limits the presence of God to heaven as a place and does not acknowledge the omnipresence of God. In part, this is a reasonable explanation; however, what was actually taking place in the Holy of Holies was that the High Priest, Aaron was meeting with God, not only entering His presence. In OT times, when God led the Israelites through the desert to the land of Canaan, God's presence was confined to an earthly place. In the NT Era the presence of God is within the believer. As the Apostle Paul told the Athenians "the God who made the world and everything in it, does not live in shrines made by human hands" (Acts 17:24; cf: 1 Pet 2:5). Under the Old Covenant, God re-established his relationship with humanity, and made a means for the atonement of sin through the Tabernacle rituals. The rending of the temple veil marks the end of the OT way, that is, the temple and its cultus (Chronis, 1982, p. 114). Following this Jesus made the way for the new arrangements God provided to humanity.

As part of this new beginning, when studying the Lukan account of the rending of the veil, Joel Green (1991, p. 543) argues that this symbolises an elimination of the barriers between people who were previously alienated either through status or ethnicity. He claims that it is symbolic for the status of women, a powerful metaphor and an extension of the grace of God; therefore, as a result of his exegesis, he argues that all barriers that previously existed, and were determined by the temple itself are broken (Green, 1991, p. 543). Green (1991), in recognition of the symbolism of the rending of the veil argues for

³⁶ Op. cit., *Ant.* 3.6.4. § 125.

³⁷ Op. cit., *Ant.* 3.6.4. § 123; *Ant.* 3.6.7. § 181.

³⁸ Barker, Margaret "Beyond the Veil of the Temple. The High Priestly Origin of the Apocalypses". Retrieved 14 May, 2006, <http://www.marquette.edu/magom/veil>.

gender equality from this point in time. Thus 'within the veil' becomes a transformational metaphor as humanity is reconciled with God in a new relationship, as it was in the beginning, prior to the breaking of the Edenic Covenant. Subsequently, in this context the symbolism of the rending is revelatory; gender barriers are abolished, creating a new and transformational relationship between women and men, and thereby challenging the traditional translation and meaning given to 1 Timothy 2:11-15.

Conclusion

Until the questions proposed in this study are answered to the satisfaction of scholars, the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 will continue to be understood within a patriarchal paradigm, and women in the Church will continue to face gender discrimination based on Biblical authority. It has been established in this introduction that the debate on the place and role of women in the Church is still current and problematic. Therefore, further clarification of the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is needed. The two major theological positions regarding the role of women; the traditionalists and egalitarians, continue to engage in an unsettled and dynamic polemic. Not only does the debate raise questions about the historic meaning given to 1 Timothy 2:11-15, but also about discrimination, marginalisation, oppression, and the religious rights of women in the Christian Church. The debate also provokes a further question about how the text has been, and is received and assimilated into the teachings of the Church. It is difficult to understand how a post modern woman would not question their predicament, and position in the Church, particularly if it is in contradiction to a woman's place in the secular world. The study asks why women would passively and willingly submit to patriarchal subjugation, and silencing in the Church, as in many sectors of the secular world such treatment would not be tolerated.

This study moves into the Biblical world, and asks whether this is a condition predicated on a particular reading of a text? It also asks whether a contradiction exists in the translation, interpretation, and meaning given to 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Can the traditional translation that places limitations on the role of women in the organisation of the Church be justified? This study aims to

discover new insight into the 'female quandary' in the Church. The research is based on a feminist theological methodology, and summons the interpretative metaphor 'within the veil' with the objective to determine whether the analysis supports the transformation of the historical and traditional meaning attributed to the text. It is with this purpose that 1 Timothy 2:11-15 becomes the subject and substance of this thesis.

The following chapter situates the text in the scholarly discourse of the opposing traditional and egalitarian perspectives. As a preamble to the polemic of these positions on gender equality in the Church, the study reviews the role of feminism, and the socio-cultural construction of patriarchy as a normative paradigm. In effect, Chapter Two situates 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in the scholarly discourse. The chapter reviews the literature on the subject, and evaluates the formation of patriarchy as the dominant force behind the discrimination, oppression, and marginalisation of women in the Church.

CHAPTER 2

Situating the Text in the Scholarly Discourse

Over the centuries, the majority of Biblical exegetical literature has been under the authorship of men. It could be argued, this literature has led to an androcentric focus, and an interpretative bias in explaining and understanding the Biblical text, in particular 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Thus, within that framework, androcentric scholarship has contributed to the social structure of patriarchy that accords men authority, power, and control in the Church, and in some measure the secular world. For that reason, it could be argued, that in order to counteract the male centered dominance in Church and society women became involved in human rights activism. In the late Nineteenth Century, as women sought equality in society and the Church, this action gave way to the first-wave of feminism in westernised countries. Therefore, to situate the text in the scholarly discourse it is necessary to return to this period when the feminist Biblical agenda was strengthened through feminist scholarship. It is during this period that the struggle for women comes to the forefront, and the dominance of patriarchy is critiqued. This chapter follows the early feminist tradition; it critiques the roles of women within the patriarchal paradigm that is normative for the Church; and explores the theological issues foremost in the traditional and egalitarian positions.

Feminism, Scholarship, and the Church

It is argued that the reason for women's Biblical scholarship being seen as tangential is due to the dominance of patriarchal scholarship over centuries (Schüssler Fiorenza, 1988a; Spender, 1980). This has happened even though there is a literary history of Christian female writers, and scholars. However, since the beginning of the Twentieth Century, and the rise of feminism, patriarchy's dominance has been more rigorously critiqued. For example, Kathleen Bliss (1952) in the mid Twentieth Century critically assessed the function, and status of women in the Church. In her work, Bliss uncovers the breadth of involvement of women that has been hidden and unrecognised. Now

acknowledged, the feminist contribution to Biblical literature has been identified by Mary Malone (2001, pp. 32-33) as in the “compensatory” stage; however, as she states this only became evident in the latter part of the Twentieth Century. Since that time, through contemporary publications, and the dissemination of literary works, women are finally being restored to their rightful place in history (Malone, 2000-2003; Ruether & Keller Skinner, 1981; Tucker & Liefeld, 1987).

The ‘compensatory’ stage is recognised through the acknowledgment of women’s Christian literature, and theology from the Middle Ages that has only been circulated in the last few decades; for example, Hildegard of Bingen, and Julian of Norwich (Maddocks, 2001; Magill, 2005). Although women in the Medieval Period held positions as leaders in the Church, they did not hold ecclesiastical authority similar to male leaders. This is shown in 1222 C.E. when Pope Honorius III supported the Abbess of Quedlinburg when she suspended a number of clergy, but then required the Abbot of Michelstein to provide the enforcement, and ecclesiastical censure for the offences (Raming, 1976, pp. 73-74). The abbess was not deemed to have authority equal to an abbot; therefore, when an authoritative function was necessary, it had to come from the male leader. Women functioned in the Church, but did not have authority over man, resonating from the meaning given to 1 Timothy 2:12.

In the Eighteenth Century, women in the Church, and in society questioned the right of men to have authority over women. One of the earliest works of feminist literature was by Mary Wollstonecraft (b.1759–d.1797) who wrote *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman* in 1792 (Wollstonecraft, 1992). Wollstonecraft’s platform was that women are not inferior to men, but their lack of access to education makes them appear inferior. She argued against women receiving only a domestic education, and being treated as property to be traded by men. It is around this period that there is an awakening of women’s Biblical scholarship. In the early 1820s and 1830s, in the United States of America, there was a Protestant religious revival that became known as the Second Great Awakening. By the 1860s, Phoebe Palmer and Hannah Whitall Smith known as the holiness women, taught a theology of gender equality in marriage and ministry (Chapman, 2004). Women began to question the patriarchal

stronghold in the Church and the State, and engage more directly in Biblical scholarship.

Elizabeth Cady Stanton (1815–1902) organised the Seneca Convention in July 1848 to discuss the social, civil, and religious rights of women.³⁹ Susan Anthony (b.1820–d.1906) attended the convention, and then worked with Stanton to form the National Woman's Suffrage Association (NSWA) in 1869. Katharine Bushnell (b.1856–d.1946), a Hebrew and Greek scholar, travelled the world promoting the work of the Women's Christian Temperance Union (WCTU). In America, the WCTU, involving many evangelical women in Church leadership became a leader in social reform for women in the western world. Muriel Porter (1995) claims that in Australia the WCTU is signposted around the early 1890s; its action in Australia was so successful that Australia became the first nation where women had the right to vote and concurrently the right to stand as candidates for the national parliament through the *Commonwealth Franchise Act* in 1902. Therefore, it could be argued that an interest in Biblical scholarship was accelerated by the Women's Suffragette Movement in Australia, Britain, and America. The WCTU movement paved the way for what became the first-wave of feminism in the latter part of the Nineteenth Century (Hassey, 2004).

The First-Wave of Feminism

The first-wave of feminism, as it has been labelled, saw women engaging in work and scholarship that was previously the domain of men. In the period of the first-wave of feminism Helen Spurrell's (1985) translation of the OT from the unpointed (original) Hebrew text was published in 1885.⁴⁰ Spurrell's work is given nominal recognition in patriarchal scholarship. In the same era, Stanton (1993) first wrote and published her work titled the 'Woman's Bible' in 1895. She explored the socio-religious and socio-political dimensions of the role of women in the family, Church and society, thereby, challenging traditional views

³⁹ National Women's History Project, *Living the Legacy: The Women's Rights Movement 1848–1998*. Retrieved 14 September, 2006, <http://www.legacy98.org/move-hist.html>.

⁴⁰ One hundred years later an edition of Spurrell's work was published in Great Britain in 1985.

on women in the Church. In the last twenty years of her life, she wrote about the “oppressive nature of orthodox Christianity and its interconnectedness with women’s subjection in the home, economy, state, and Church” (Stanton Cady, 1993, p. xix). Stanton’s work remains an important feminist analysis, and an historical marker in women’s Biblical scholarship. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (1988b, p. 7) emphasises the significance of the publication in that apart from Stanton’s work “no alliance between feminist biblical interpretation and historical-critical scholarship was forged in the nineteenth century”. Stanton’s work, which is essentially a Bible commentary, argues that the authority of Scripture is at the source of vetoing women’s emancipation. Women have been marginalised and oppressed, from this position of authority of the Scriptures. Consequently, this study argues that this is where the debate has to be centred. This is where Katherine Bushnell focussed her attention in 1886 after she left the WCTU, as she was intent on researching and documenting the Biblical truth of complete equality for women as contained in the Scriptures. The voices of women as Biblical scholars were beginning to be heard. As Malone (2001, p. 60) said “these first women exegetes sought to find themselves in the text...in order to counteract all the negative teaching in the texts about Eve and her sinful descendants”. Momentum was building in the women’s movement, and the quest for equal rights for women and their right to participate in Church leadership gathered impetus leading to the second-wave of feminism.

The Second-Wave of Feminism

In the 1960’s Betty Frieden’s book the *‘Feminine Mystique’* paved the way for change for women in the secular world (Friedan, 1964). Frieden’s work drew attention to the impact of industrialisation, and the inequality of women in the home, and workplace. Addressing inequality, and women’s rights to equal pay through legal amendments became the touchstone for the second-wave of feminism in the 1970s. Even though the second-wave of feminism in Australia was politically successful, many women in the Church continued to be bound, and faithful to the patriarchal tradition (Brennan, 1995). As Patricia Brennan (1995, p. 181) states, “there was a large gulf between the majority of Church women and the new feminist rhetoric”. At the same time in the United States of America, through Biblical scholarship, women were challenging the traditional

and hierarchical paradigm of the Church structure, making way for the inclusion of women through an egalitarian paradigm (Hardesty, 1971; Hardesty & Dawson Scanzoni, 1974; Hardesty, Sider Dayton, & Dayton, 1979).

Nonetheless, there was not a significant paradigmatic shift in the 1970s despite the efforts of women's scholarship; subsequently the Church, for the most part, remained within the traditional patriarchal paradigm. It appears that Australian women were bound by the dominant patriarchal paradigm through obedience to 'God's Word', resulting in a retreat from a potential paradigm shift (Brennan, 1995). It was at this time, that Paul Jewett emerged as the first male evangelical to argue from a Scriptural basis that female subordination is incompatible with creation accounts, Jesus' teaching, and the Apostle Paul's Letter to the Galatians (Jewett, 1975). Jewett's work instigated the evangelical debate about the right of women to teach in the Church. He aimed to counteract the criticism of patriarchal scholars' that the NT Scriptures were misinterpreted, and the authority of Scripture was being abandoned. The debate was unrelenting, and was still prevalent when the third-wave of feminism emerged in the 1980s.

The Third-Wave of Feminism

The third-wave of feminism embarked on addressing the issues of women's experiences more seriously, and was intent on stimulating action to achieve justice for all women (Clifford, 2001, p. 5). This action has been seen at a secular level as international treaties have paved the way for equality.⁴¹ These treaties, however, do not address religious inequality as found in the Christian Church. The third-wave of feminism was a response or backlash to the perceived failures of the second-wave of feminism. During this time, the media perpetrated a stance that the Women's Liberation Movement was responsible for many of the problems afflicting women, and society in the late 1980's

⁴¹ Australia became a signatory to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination in July 1980 (CEDAW, 2002). This became an international treaty on 3 September 1981 with around one hundred nations bound by the provisions, including Australia.

(Faludi, 1992). Scholars such as Faludi (1992) argue that this type of backlash is part of a historical trend that occurs when women appear to have made considerable gains in their endeavours to achieve equal rights. In the 1980s feminism diverged in two ways: one drew closely on French philosophy and psychology, and considered the voices of many women including “women of color, such as Audre Lorde, bell hooks, and Rosario Morales”; while the other focused on “the difference that social location makes in women’s lives”, and how this impacts on the “injustices of gender discrimination, racial prejudice and colonial oppression” (Clifford, 2001, p. 5). Because of the injustices brought about by traditional patriarchal methodologies, feminist Biblical scholars sought new methods of understanding and explaining the Biblical text. The third-wave of feminism was essentially a movement of liberation, raising the consciousness of women, and addressing inequalities that existed in society (Schneiders, 2000). Rosen (2000) identifies consciousness-raising as being accredited to Kathie Sarachild in the 1970s and argues that essentially it was a rhetorical strategy that enabled women to share their experiences of oppression, discrimination and marginalisation. Initially consciousness-raising targeted the individual; however, later it shifted to the collective struggle of women for equality.

Feminism and the Struggle of Women

Feminism was born out of the struggle of women for equal opportunity and rights. This struggle continues into the Twenty-first Century, especially for women in the Church. Almost one hundred years ago, the struggle was identified at a debate held in Great Britain in 1914, following the Pentecostal revival between 1907–1914; its purpose was to establish whether there was Biblical authority for women to function in a teaching role (Chapman, 2004). At the convention, male authority was reaffirmed and subsequently, limitations were placed on a woman’s role in the Pentecostal Church. In the same year, the Assemblies of God in America was formed. Chapman (2004, pp. 217, 241) explains that women who had been teaching in the Church until this time were now told they had “no biblical warrant for their office”. These events had far reaching consequences for women in the Church. It is argued that the restrictions for women happened as Protestant organisations moved towards

greater equality for women in the 1930s, and at the same time other parts of the Church moved to exclude them (Becker, 1996). As Hassey (2004, p. 52) argues, it was between the First and Second World Wars that there was a “conservative Protestant backlash against changing social values”, and “a more literalist view of Scripture among fundamentalists” that resulted in less support for women in ministry. Such a position increases the momentum of the struggle for women in the Church.

The struggle, whilst differing across Church denominations, is noticeable in the comments of Maryanne Confoy (1995). She states that any woman who aspires to leadership in the Church is classed as “aberrant, a deviation from the dominant male-normative approach” (Confoy et al., 1995, p.18). Others argue that equality is not about the struggle, but relates to the distortion of Paul’s view about women’s function within the Church (Lee, 1995). Subsequently, it could be argued, that as women continue to struggle for equality, patriarchy struggles to maintain the status quo. As Schüssler Fiorenza (1993b, p. 18) states “a theoretical shift from the paradigm of domination to one of radical equality” is what is at risk. She argues that the focus should be on the struggle more so than “the androcentric biblical text and its authority” (Schüssler Fiorenza, 1993b, p. 21). Rather than focus on the struggle per se, the method adopted in this study is to engage with the Biblical text as outlined in Chapter three. It is argued that more can be achieved by engaging with the text, as this is where the scholarly polemic exists. With the struggle there are two aspects: the struggle to defend the patriarchal paradigm, and the struggle to oppose or expose the disparities in the egalitarian paradigm.⁴² Rather than focusing on the struggle, Fran Ferder and John Heagle (1989) take a trajectory of concentrating on partnership, mutuality, and collaboration between the sexes; not on exclusivity that defines gender into prescribed roles. Therefore, in their analysis equality in the Church is pivotal to an individual having the gifts or

⁴² This was acutely evident in 1984 in the Southern Baptist Church in the United States of America. A resolution at its General Convention called for all members to abide by the ministry’s tradition of male leadership.

charisms to fulfil a ministry leadership role, not a specific gender (Ferder & Heagle, 1989).

Nonetheless, an egalitarian paradigm is not readily achieved. In view of the struggle, the androcentric nature of the patriarchal paradigm has been a catalyst for women rejecting the Church, as happened with Mary Daly.⁴³ Conversely, Veronica Lawson (1995, p. 149) argues it has been a catalyst that has encouraged women “to take up the challenge to restore women to their rightful place at the heart of the originating stories of the Christian tradition”. This study argues that the heart of the originating stories has to be centred in the Biblical text, not the struggle itself - this is addressed further in Chapter Three. While the struggle can be acknowledged, it needs to move into the world ‘of’ the text to discover what is embedded in the text, and such a move is central to the methodology of this study. As the study argues, if there is Biblical equality for women, it has to be found in the canonical text as Biblical authority is centred in, and has been extracted from the world of the text.

To address the marginalisation and oppression of women, feminist scholars are committed to creating new forms and methods to deconstruct the text as occurred in the methodological approach for this study. Schüssler Fiorenza (1992) has taken a narrative approach with her four dimensional framework of: a feminist hermeneutic of suspicion that takes for granted the androcentrism of Biblical texts and their interpretation; a hermeneutic of proclamation that seeks to eliminate oppressive Biblical texts for women; a hermeneutic of remembrance that seeks to recover Biblical traditions from a feminist perspective by asking new questions; and a hermeneutic of creative actualization whereby women are enabled to enter Biblical history through the historical imagination, artistic re-creation, and ritual. Schneiders 1991b, p. 86) argues that in any methodology “tradition is the essential context for the

⁴³ Mary Daly (b. 16/10/1928) is a radical feminist philosopher and theologian holding three doctorates. Ms Daly retired after thirty-three years as an Associate Professor in the Department of Theology at Boston College teaching feminist ethics.

interpretation of Scripture, but Scripture is the norm by which the true and living tradition is discerned". Even though it is the patriarchal tradition as a norm that has historically marginalised women, Biblical feminist scholars are persuaded to work within the area of theological method and norms, and not only from a perspective of criticizing existing traditions (Young Dickey, 1990). What becomes a major obstruction for women are conventional Church practices that have persisted for centuries, and which are responsible for forging the normative paradigm of patriarchy into the consciousness of the Church.

Patriarchy and the Church

The patriarchal philosophy is a hierarchical model of Church function that has been universally accepted for centuries. Patriarchy dictates the relationship between women and men in relationship to God, and to each other. Patriarchal scholars argue that the subjection of women and their place in the Church is based on the authority of the Biblical text (Grudem, 2004b; Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005; Patterson, 2005). Scholars, like Karen Torjesen (1993, p. 5) argue that the Church must "extricate the essential teachings of the Christian Gospel from the patriarchal gender system in which it is embedded...and restore women to equal partnership in the leadership of the Church and participation in Christian life". On the other hand, the task is not only extricating the essence of the Gospel message, but providing authoritative evidence that Biblical equality for women and men exists within the text. Until this happens, patriarchy holds the contemporary Church in a cultural 'time warp'.

It is patriarchy with its hierarchy of domination, power, and control that places men at the centre, and women on the periphery (Becker, 1996, p. 50). There is empirical evidence to support this claim of marginalisation, even though some denominations now ordain women as priests or pastors. In Australia, Church leadership in Protestant congregations consists of ninety-three per cent men even though men contribute to only thirty-nine per cent of the congregations

(Kaldor, Dixon, & Powell, 1999a, pp. 16, 19).⁴⁴ Conversely, due to a vocational crisis in the Roman Catholic Church in the United States of America, male priests are no longer leading Church congregations. No longer on the periphery, women are central to the sustainability of the Church as eighty-two per cent of Churches in the United States of America find themselves under the leadership of women, including both lay and religious (Cozzens, 2002, p. 72). Unofficially women are no longer marginalised in the leadership of the Roman Catholic Church; officially there is still an androcentric bias that is evidenced in Church teaching; for example, in their portrayal of the image of God, and the hierarchical structure of the Magisterium (the male leaders).

Patriarchy, and the Image of God

The patriarchal Church presents an image of God as masculine, with women and men being socialised into a belief system that ascribes superiority to males. Such a belief system concludes that as Jesus Christ was male, God is male; therefore, men are superior. Schüssler Fiorenza (1995) argues that the acceptance and image of a male God is based on a socio-cultural construction of sex and gender. In Catholicism, this socio-cultural construction states that as Christ was a man, and Head of the Church - only a male priest can 'in persona Christi', that is, be a representative of the Body of Christ – 'the Church'.⁴⁵ The image of a male God has legitimised the unjust social structures that oppress women even though theological tradition has never assigned gender to God (Schneiders, 1986). Judy Brown (2004, p. 289) explains that the phenomena of a male God occurred as the Church ascribed sexuality to God. It

⁴⁴ This is supported by data from the *National Church Life Survey, Australia*, when 7000 congregations were analysed. For further information cf: <http://www.ncls.org.au>.

⁴⁵ Cf: the "Apostolic Letter ***Mulieris Dignitatem*** of the Supreme Pontiff John Paul II on the Dignity and Vocation of women," dated 15 August 1988 that explains the role of priest is reserved exclusively for men. Arguments are based on the Roman Catholic Church doctrine, including the symbolism of the Bridegroom as masculine, and only men having the authority to perform the Eucharistic Sacrament as only a man can act "in *persona Christi*." Retrieved 20 September, 2008, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/john_paul_ii/apost_letters/documents/hf_jp-ii_apl_15081988_mulieris-dignitatem_en.html.

could be argued that this occurred as a consequence of God being relegated to the created order whereby an 'error of gender' emerged.

The male image of God materialised even with the Bible narratives rich with metaphors that view God in both the masculine, and feminine (Schneiders, 1986). As the male image of God dominated the Christian tradition to the exclusion of women, feminist theologians have sought new images that liberate women from patriarchy, and a male dominated Godhead (Wainwright, 1997). On the other hand, it is argued that if gender equality is found in the Biblical text, then the accepted image of God as masculine has to change. Even so, there is no scriptural evidence to support the concept of God as exclusively male, even though Jesus was male (Schneiders, 1986). God is no more masculine than feminine, as God is Spirit (Jn 4:24). Wainwright (1997, p. 160) argues that the patriarchal mindset is "embedded within patriarchal familial or imperial structures of the first century". Again, other scholars argue that for women to be free from patriarchy the imaging of God has to become a critical factor as part of a cultural revolution in the Church (Ruether, 1993). Women who engage in such a change process are identified as reformers - women who believe in their giftedness and their right to function fully in the Church (Becker, 2000).

Since the late 1980s women confronted with the patriarchal paradigm in the Roman Catholic Church have become more socio-politically aware, and whilst many have left the Church, others have reorganised themselves around the principle of 'WomenChurch', inspired by the theology of Schüssler Fiorenza (Schüssler Fiorenza, 1988a). Even so, it is still the Magisterium that retains the authority, power, and control. In an interview with Rosalind Hinton, Ruether, a Roman Catholic theologian, describes the predicament of women since the early 1990s as the Magisterium robustly prevented women from taking their place in the Church, and the academy (Hinton, 2002, pp. 33-34). Further, Ruether explained that this happened in a number of ways, including replacing progressive bishops with reactionary conservatives, and undermining women and liberation theologians in teaching institutions. Ruether is pessimistic about the Church recognising women in the same class as men, at least in her

lifetime. Subsequently, on the basis of gender, women are confined to a second-class status; women are culturally and socially trapped within patriarchy, the normative paradigm for the Church.

The Normative Paradigm

The normative paradigm is a set of belief systems, ideologies, philosophies, methodologies, and experiences that together create a worldview (Kuhn, 1962). Thomas Kuhn (1962) derived the concept of the 'normative paradigm' from within the physical sciences; however, the concept can readily be transferred to the area of patriarchal Biblical scholarship, which is governed by shared paradigmatic theoretical, methodological, and theological beliefs that contain certain presuppositions sourced in patriarchy. As Kuhn (1962, pp. 40-42) argued, so intertwined are the shared paradigms that they tell the individual "what both the world and his science are like". For patriarchal scholars, the Church consists of a hierarchical structure with men superior to women. In a patriarchal worldview, the socio-political, and religious world is understood in relation to the agenda set by men who hold the authority, power, and control. Scholars who continue to argue for a traditionalist worldview are collaborators within the normative paradigm of patriarchy. This paradigm sets the standards for a theological treatise on the role of women and excludes information that does not readily fit.

Scholars who share the normative paradigm of patriarchy argue that the traditionalist view - even though there may be minor variations within the paradigm is the only theologically sound method to explain the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. This is attributed to the Apostle Paul who, in the First Century, set the standard for the treatment of women, and their place in the Church when he wrote his First Letter to Timothy. A literal reading of the text without further examination would hold Paul culpable for the prohibitions against women in the Church. Such a reading identifies four injunctions against women: women are to be silent; in submission; are unable to teach; or, have authority over a man (1 Tim 2:11-12). A theological position requiring women to be submissive to men is part of the normative paradigm for patriarchal scholars. Men are to be the

leaders in the Church and home, and there is no choice as it is divinely ordained.

Within the normative paradigm of patriarchy, functions are performed within a hierarchy. The paradigm can be compared to a jigsaw puzzle whereby the pieces interlock to create an acceptable picture (Kuhn, 1962). Implicit in the normative paradigm of patriarchy is that all the facts about the role and function of women in the Church and home do not need to be fully rationalised. The primary objective is to retain the homeostasis of the normative paradigm, and this can only be achieved when all the facts are integrated, more so than any other alternative paradigm (Doughty, 1994). Any new or 'revealing facts' that would fundamentally challenge or extend the paradigm, but do not fit into the prevailing picture are rejected. For traditionalists, the burden of proof appears to be on the egalitarians - those outside the normative paradigm, to present new information; however, when any new information is offered it is dismissed as irrelevant because it does not 'fit' into the paradigm. This is the major challenge for women, and men who want to revolutionise the place of women in the Church.

The paradigm has been described as so pervasive that women are not only the victims, but at times actively work to reinforce it (Lee, 1995). Alan Padgett (2005) accuses male scholars who contribute to sustaining this paradigm as being biased against women's leadership. He states that "these men have absorbed the patriarchal, worldly presuppositions of traditional Western culture" (Padgett, 2005, p. 24). While Padgett does not recognise the operation of the normative paradigm of patriarchy as such, in reviewing the phenomenon within his work he articulates how the paradigm functions. For example, Padgett (2005) draws attention to the research work of Daniel Doriani (1995) on the history of the interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 whereby he disregards the influential and significant works of Nineteenth Century feminist scholars Elizabeth Cady Stanton and Phoebe Palmer. Such an example suggests that patriarchal scholars manipulate data to promote their own normative paradigm, and ignore information that does not accommodate their approach.

In relation to 1 Timothy 2:11-15, it is argued that due to the domination of the normative paradigm of patriarchy, traditionalists and egalitarians intersect within the dominant paradigm; traditionalists remain within the paradigm, and the egalitarians, as outsiders, venture into the paradigm to neutralise the traditionalists' power. Therefore, in the engagement of the text, the inter-relationship between reader, and text, becomes fundamental to the intersections of these two paradigms. It is the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 where the authority to discriminate against women in the Church originated, and it is in the world of the Biblical text where the struggle for equality will be won or lost.

Changing the Normative Paradigm of Patriarchy

Like Kuhn's normative paradigm, the normative paradigm of patriarchy resists any attempt to change. As Kuhn (1962) explains, it is only the cumulative weight of anomalies that will finally force the paradigm to collapse. It is argued that the theological paradigm placing women as inferior to men dates back to the patriarchal belief system intrinsic to the culture of the Roman Empire in the First Century, based on *patria potestas*. This was a social system whereby absolute, and unaccountable power over wives, concubines, children, servants, slaves, animals, and property owned by the *pater-familias* remained with the father who was the head of the family, tribe, or clan (Schneiders, 1986). As Schneiders (1986, p. 11) argues that in Greco-Roman times, "insubordinate wives or slaves could be sold or killed". She explains that the authority of the *pater-familias* was "considered as divinely established, and the patriarchal system was unalterable and rebellion against the father was rebellion against God" (Schneiders, 1986, p.12). Subsequently, with the influence of *patria potestas* the patriarchalisation of Christianity was almost complete in the early Second Century (Malone, 2001, p. 79). Due to the concretization of patriarchy, Schneiders (1986, pp. 11-12) argues that "patriarchy is the basic principle of all major relational systems in the western world".

In other words, it could be argued that patriarchy has been frozen into human consciousness, and is the normative paradigm in society and the Church. Consequently, there is no equality in women's function in the Church, and

women's rights are suppressed in the 'name of God'. Notwithstanding this there are some women who believe that it is the 'will of God' for them to be in submission, and support a hierarchical structure of authority in the Church. This study argues that such conscientization has its roots in the Greco-Roman culture of the First Century. As a result, women feel 'safe' within the normative paradigm of patriarchy. To go outside the paradigm creates distress as this would signify moving outside the 'will of God'. These women believe they have equality within the divine pattern of patriarchy and do not have the right to question God. Schneiders (1991a) draws attention to the distinction between rights and equality, and argues that these differences are at the basis of divisions between feminists and non-feminists. She argues that the division is on two levels: between women and men, and between women and women (Schneiders, 1991a). Subsequently, the legacy of patriarchy is a class system in the Church. To manage its anomalies, Schneiders' (1991a) argues that women should think of themselves as belonging to every class rather than the oppressed class. Without this type of thinking, she argues that women place themselves in a position where they are competing as the oppressed (woman) to enjoy the equal rights of the oppressor (man) (Schneiders, 1991a). She encourages women to redefine equal rights "in terms of equity rather than identity", but then concedes that equal rights will only be achieved if this is part of a judicial process (Schneiders, 1991a, p. 14).

Marie Tulip, and Kathleen Mc Phillips (1998) argue that it is the gender distinction in Australia in both the Church and State that is one of the reasons for "the domination of secularism in Australia and the devaluation of all things religious in the public sphere" (Tulip & McPhillips, 1998, p. 265). This thesis also argues that the marginalisation of women within the Church, and religious exemptions in legislation have contributed to the domination of secularism in Australia. This dominance becomes evident in the absence of young adults in Church congregations, ageing congregations, and one in six clergy experiencing 'burnout' and considering leaving the ministry (Kaldor et al., 1999a, pp. 129-139). The trend that has increased is Church attendees whose orientation is towards the Bible with more who view Scripture as the 'Word of God'; one reason given for this is that those who do not hold this view of

Scripture have left the Church (Kaldor et al., 1999a, p. 133). Also, religion is devalued through the exclusion of women, and many women respond by leaving a patriarchal Church structure. Tulip and McPhillips (1998) place the responsibility of the devaluing of religion with the historians, sociologists, and social theorists, both feminist and non-feminist, who have not mapped the gender feature of religious organisations, and their belief systems. On the other hand, it is argued that such a situation could be projected as a condition of the domination of patriarchal rule in Church and society.

The challenge then is to address the supremacy of patriarchy and inequalities within the system in order to gain liberation for women in the Church. To attain this, Schneiders (1991a, p. 15) has called for a new social order where she says “both women and men enjoy the conditions necessary for the exercise of full human personhood”. However, it is argued that for women and men to enjoy full human personhood this requires men and women to take joint responsibility to achieve such transformational change; in effect, the normative paradigm of patriarchy would have to change.

Roles of Women within the Normative Paradigm of Patriarchy

The normative paradigm of patriarchy has had the powerful effect of taming women and effectively socialised women into accepting their place as submissive within the Church hierarchy. The normative paradigm of patriarchy is dominant, and it is from this paradigm that other paradigms such as the egalitarian paradigm emerge. Becker (1996) identifies women functioning in the Church in either the roles of traditionalist, catalyst, or reformer. It is argued that all of these women function within the dominant paradigm and each position is a response to it.

Traditionalists believe in women being in subordination to men in the Church with married women accepting the authority and headship of their husbands. Unmarried women who hold this position would accept the authority of a male figure, such as a priest or pastor, to guide them through life. Becker (1996, p. 72) quotes a traditionalist who stated “God said women should remain silent in the Church and yes, he said it in that culture, but we believe it applies to all

cultures....I'm very comfortable with that". Such women who live within the normative paradigm of patriarchy genuinely believe they are living out the 'will of God'. A fine example of a woman within the normative paradigm of patriarchy and a traditionalist is Dorothy Patterson (2005, p. 140)⁴⁶ who believes that the role of women is set for all time through the passage of 1 Timothy 2:11-15, and other supporting passages; for example Genesis Chapters One to Three. For her, the passage in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is part of the divine order and "is predicated on God's timeless design for male-female relationships" (Patterson, 2005, p. 172). Her rationale is that God sets the order of creation as men were formed first and "the man was assigned the task of providing, protecting and leading, and the woman was created to be a helper suitable to assist the man in his vast responsibilities in dominion" (Patterson, 2005, p. 172). Lee (1995) argues that it is women like Patterson who are not only the victims of patriarchy but at times they actively work to reinforce it. Patterson (2005, p. 152) living and working under the normative paradigm of patriarchy places emphasis on 'Church order' and ignores the command in 1 Corinthians 14:26, 33, 40 that 'all' are encouraged to bring a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation - premised on the basis of being obedient to Scripture. Further, she states that a wise woman would suppress her giftedness and remain silent, so as not to speak out and cause confusion or division in the Church. She argues that women can teach but this has to be woman-to-woman teaching (Patterson, 2005, p. 155). However, Patterson is not entirely secure in her position in the normative paradigm of patriarchy as she demonstrates uncertainty about the gender passages when she states that

the challenge is to fit all the passages together and identify the diverse factors in each so that when jointly understood this word from God is consistent, free from confusion, and adequate to supply principles needed for faith and practice (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005, p. 162).

⁴⁶ In 2005 Dorothy Kelley Patterson held the position of Professor of New Testament and Greek, and director of PhD/ThM studies at Southeastern Baptist Theological Seminary, Wake Forest, North Carolina.

For Patterson, the issue of women in leadership does not seem to have been fully resolved. Yet, her faith and practice corresponds with the traditionalist view situated in the normative paradigm of patriarchy. Any facts or new information that do not fit into the paradigm only create confusion for women like Patterson; and therefore, these have to be rejected.

Another role of women identified by Becker (1996) is that of catalyst. These women work diligently inside the normative paradigm of patriarchy and such a woman is not outspoken about the constraints placed on the role of a woman, but silently work to demonstrate her ability, and the capacity of women to participate in the Church. The third role Becker (1996) identifies is that of reformer. This is a woman who wants to see change, who believes in her giftedness, and her right to function fully in the Church. However, it is in the implementation of this giftedness that the reformer confronts the prevailing paradigm.

The role of women within the patriarchal paradigm, and the issues surrounding the interpretation of the Biblical text has been an issue for twenty centuries. Lawson (1995) argues that women supporting the patriarchal paradigm are the major challenge for feminist Biblical hermeneutics. This is why reformers, such as Biblical feminists have developed alternative methodologies and hermeneutics to analyse the Biblical text.

Theological Positions on the Role of Women in the Church

Theological positions on the role of women are so divided that this has posed problem to Church unity. Even though many denominations have given women opportunities to function equal to men, many men and women within them, and other denominations believe that such a position is not a reliable, and/or valid theological position.

In exploring differing positions on the role of women in the Church David Diehl (1990, pp. 25-50) identifies five distinct theological scholarly positions: 1) radical or revolutionary feminism; 2) mainstream or reformist feminism; 3) evangelical

feminism; 4) a moderated view of evangelical feminism; and 5) traditionalists. While Diehl does not categorise these positions into either a traditionalist (patriarchal), or egalitarian paradigm, he does draw attention to the diversity of theological positions within the debate on the place of women in the Church. At one end of Diehl's continuum are the traditionalists, and at the other, revolutionary feminists.

It is argued there are scholars who would identify with one of Diehl's positions whilst others would be pluralist. In my examination of scholars' theological positions, Schüssler Fiorenza is at one end of the continuum as a revolutionary or liberationist feminist theologian (position one); Robert D. Culver, Andreas Köstenberger and Wayne Grudem hold a traditionalist view (position five; Rosemary Ruether can be described as a reformist feminist theologian (position two) and also as a revolutionary feminist (position one); Craig Blomberg has a moderated view of egalitarianism (position four); and other scholars, such as Craig Keener, Gilbert Bilezikian, Paul Jewett, Linda Belleville, Catherine and Richard Kroeger, all support an egalitarian view of the Scriptures (position three). Scholars who hold egalitarian perspectives are in the 'reformer' category, and through their theological methods aim to revolutionise the normative paradigm of patriarchy.

Of the five positions identified by Diehl, generally those that believe in the inspiration of the Scriptures, though there may be some individual variations, are the evangelicals (position 3), moderate evangelicals (position 4) and the traditionalists (position 5). It is argued that the belief in the Scriptures is a critical factor as without the authority contained in the locus of Scriptures through inspiration, Biblical feminists are unable to establish that equality exists within the Biblical text. Traditionalists and egalitarians, on the whole, hold a belief in the inspiration of the Scriptures, and it is these two theological positions that are discussed in this thesis. It is argued as part of this work that the traditionalist theological position is found in the normative paradigm of patriarchy. Within Biblical scholarship, new methodological approaches have been utilised, and together with the discovery of archaeological and ancient manuscript evidence, a new egalitarian paradigm has been formed and

accepted as a legitimate position in the debate on women in the Church. Even so, the egalitarian paradigm has not been accepted by many traditionalists who differ on theological interpretation of Biblical text. In the Church the polemic on whether equality exists within the text is primarily between these two positions. It is proposed that complementarian theology has been introduced to make the normative paradigm of patriarchy more acceptable in a secular world that values equality; while the Church still maintains there is divine sanction for religious inequality.

The official statistics clearly support the pervasiveness of patriarchy in the Church. In a study conducted in 1988 in North America women represented 7.9 per cent of the ordained clergy, increasing only by 4 per cent in the period between 1978 to 1988 (Beker, 1980, p. 58). Studies in the mid 1990s showed that the percentage of female clergy had decreased, and was not competing with the number of men entering the ministry (Beker, 1980, p. 58). In 1995 the number of women in leadership in the Church decreased in Australia when the ordination of women in the Presbyterian Church in Sydney was rescinded (Caine, 1998, p. 267). It is argued that at this time the Church was realigning itself with the normative paradigm. In comparison, on 15 June, 2006, the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America elected a woman moderator of the 217th General Assembly.⁴⁷ A new egalitarian paradigm is evident in the cultural milieu of the Presbyterian Church in the USA; one which is absent in the Australian context as was earlier discussed in Chapter One.

Both traditionalists and egalitarians claim there is adequate Biblical evidence in the Scriptural text to support their theological position although there are wide-ranging theological differences, and interpretations of the text. Elaine Storkey (2000, pp. 80-81) states that “we always bring to the biblical text our own minds, our own perspectives, ideas, attitudes, location, history, culture, nuances and concerns which are all, themselves, extra-scriptural”. Anne Clifford (2001)

⁴⁷ At the time the Rev Joan Gray had responsibility for the 2.3 million member denomination, Retrieved 20 August, 2006, <http://www.pcusa.org/ga217/newsandphotos/ga06015.htm>.

reaches the same conclusion that cultural preconditioning is grounded in life experiences rather than in theology or Scriptural interpretation and are thereby brought into the gender debate. Therefore, the warrant for feminist Biblical scholarship is to balance the debate through removing the extra-scriptural features that are contained in both the traditionalist and egalitarian paradigms.

The Paradigm Debate

The contemporary paradigm debate of gender equality with reference to 1 Timothy 2:11-15 emerged from secular feminism of the 1970s and it has been gathering momentum ever since (Pierce, Groothuis, & Fee, 2004). The traditionalist and egalitarian paradigms are both supported by a theological perspective. From a traditionalist perspective, in relation to the authority of the Biblical text as the 'Word of God', Wayne Grudem (2004b) believes that some egalitarians are denying the authority of Scripture, and he perceives the rise of evangelical feminism as a new pathway to theological liberalism. He is so disturbed by egalitarianism that he has written extensively on the 'warning signs' to discredit the egalitarian argument (Grudem, 1979, 2004a, 2004b). Janette Hassey (2004, p. 43) rejects such a notion and argues that evangelicals have a long history of commitment to the authority of Scripture, as well as the egalitarian position. In support, Ronald Pierce (2004, p. 75) asserts that "a high view of Scripture had been an explicit part of evangelical egalitarian theology from the beginning".

Therefore, it can be argued that the differentiation between the traditionalists and egalitarians is in the translation and meaning given to the text rather than the authority of the Scriptures that is in question (Pierce et al., 2004). That is, it is more about how the text is received and filtered through the reader's Biblical analysis and extra-scriptural frameworks. On one hand, egalitarians receive the text from a number of perspectives, including how Jesus treated women as recorded in the NT; examples of women leaders in OT and NT times; the need to move from tradition to Biblical principles; and the misreading, or mistranslation of the text. On the other hand, the traditionalists argue that there are patterns and principles contained in the Scriptures that designate gender

relationships. The differences between the traditionalists' and egalitarians' paradigms are discussed in more detail in Chapters Six, Seven, and Eight.

Within the traditionalist paradigm, 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is received as a universal prohibition of divine sanction: one that cannot be reversed. Ferder and Heagle (1989, p.110) state that since the early Church, the traditionalist paradigm has been "the predominant understanding and practice of ministry in the Catholic Church". Such a position is sustained despite growing evidence that women were leaders and priests in the early Church prior to Constantine the Great (ca. 272–337). Therefore, the egalitarian position rejects the theological standpoint that any office, ministry, or opportunity should be denied to women on the grounds of gender alone (Pierce et al., 2004). Both the Kroegers (1992) and Torjesen (1993) argue that there is substantial evidence to support women functioning equal to men in the Church. Torjesen (1993, p. 6; 156-157) argues that a change occurred between the Second and Fourth Century as the Church became institutionalised; women were gradually disenfranchised from a leadership role as the Church adopted a patriarchal and hierarchical structure that was absent in the early Church (Torjesen, 1993). Consequently, while the Church continues to function within a hierarchy, women are treated as the 'second sex'.

To mitigate the consequences for women in the Church, the traditionalists have diverted their argument somewhat to a complementarian position, avoiding the negative nuances of patriarchy inherent in the traditional perspective. Beck and Blomberg (2001, p. 17) draw attention to one of the concerns from the traditionalists in that the perspective "can sound authoritarian rather than merely authoritative". It is argued here that a hybrid 'traditionalist' position has developed stating women are equal before God but function within a hierarchical organisational structure. For example, Ann Bowman (2001), whilst having a complementarian or hybrid traditionalist position believes that the only prohibition on women is that of a Senior Pastor role. However, such a view is still based on an 'authority' model as a woman always has to be in submission to men at some level. This is where there is some variance within the traditional perspective.

One of the major disparities, between the traditionalists and egalitarians, when it comes to the gender debate regarding equality relates to Galatians 3:28. F.F Bruce (1982, p. 190) argues in support of the egalitarian position and believes that any restrictions on women's ministry in the Church should be read in the context of Galatians 3:28. He argues that Paul states "there is no longer Jew or Greek, there is no longer slave or free, there is no longer male and female; for all of you are one in Christ Jesus" - gender is no longer a factor for Paul; therefore, Galatians 3:28 is the interpretative grid for all other gender passages. The traditionalists on the other hand disagree. Schreiner (2001, p. 181) argues that one gender text cannot be more fundamental than another, and both deserve to be interpreted within their context. This is why this current study stresses the importance of the intertextuality of the Biblical text when engaging in exegesis, rather than isolating a text, such as 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Accordingly, another approach with these two key texts (1 Tim 2:11-15; Gal 3:28) is a conflation of the two as an interpretative grid. This is the approach taken in this study, however more than this, other exegetical methods are introduced in order to examine the validity of the traditional translation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 as discussed in Chapters Four and Five.

Traditionalists versus Egalitarians

Scholars have written extensively about the Apostle Paul, his position on women, and whether he was a traditionalist or an egalitarian. Some scholars claim that when the Biblical text is examined through the historical interpretation, he seems to preserve aspects of the patriarchal culture. Craig Blomberg (2001, pp. 330-331) argues that Paul "was neither a classic hierarchicalist nor a full-fledged egalitarian" and he "discerned no tension between preserving certain elements of his patriarchal culture and adopting countercultural, liberationist strands of thought within that larger framework". However, the trajectory in this study examines Paul's theology across his writings to discover whether or not he articulated the middle ground.

Taking the argument further, Grudem (2004b, p. 517) maintains that "egalitarianism is heading toward an androgynous Adam who is neither male nor female, and a Jesus whose manhood is not important". In one sense,

Grudem is correct as 'Adam' is the Hebrew term for 'humankind'; Adam was formed first and then Eve, but *both* were created simultaneously in God's own image and God blessed *them* (Gen 1:27-28). Jesus may have been male, but he was born of a woman; therefore, it is argued that egalitarianism is not moving towards androgyny but towards equality. As Stanton (Stanton Cady, 1993, p. 14) argues referring to Genesis 1:26, 27, and 28 "it is evident from the language that there was consultation in the Godhead, and that the masculine and feminine elements were equally represented....exactly equal and balancing each other, are as essential, to the maintenance of the equilibrium of the universe as positive and negative electricity". The notion around the masculinity of God, both within the traditional and egalitarian position have misleading arguments that are not based on the truth found in the Biblical text. Traditional translations emphasise paternal images, terms, and metaphors and ignore the maternal. Such differences and presuppositions to these images are situated within theological methods and frameworks, and whether the emphasis is on Old Covenant and or New Covenant texts as a basis for their argumentation.

It is argued for the purpose of this study that Old Covenant theology is based on the traditions of the OT, while New Covenant theology relates to the traditions of the OT through the works of Jesus and his teachings recorded in the NT. Paul explains this in his First Letter to the Corinthians when he wrote about believers being part of a 'new creation' or New Covenant order (cf: 2 Cor 5:17; cf: Gal 6:10-12, 14-16; 2 Cor 5:16-18). However, Old Covenant theology is evident in the Biblical exegesis of many traditionalists including Patterson with her dependence on the creation story as a 'first principle' (Patterson, 2005, pp. 152-153). Her view is that the place of women was firmly established in the Garden of Eden, whereas Torjesen (1993) argues on the basis of a New Covenant theology based on NT principles and supported by external witnesses of ancient inscriptional evidence. Further, Torjesen (1993, p. 18) produces evidence showing that in the early Church women were included in the leadership of the Church, for example; as an elder. Fee (2004a) also argues for the 'new creation' or 'new humanity' theology, and he finds this embedded in the Pauline text. He is adamant that "to give continuing *significance* to a male-authority

viewpoint for men and women, whether at home or in the Church, is to reject the new creation in favour of the norms of a fallen world” (Fee, 2004a, p. 185).

It is argued that New Covenant theology heralded by the redemptive act of Jesus was emblematic of moving from one covenant to another. The transition took place as Jesus made it possible for all to go ‘within the veil’ as part of the New Covenant, which signalled a new agreement between God and humanity. The New Covenant order was transformational as the Church moved into a new era of ‘grace’. Nevertheless, in the space of a few centuries the barrier, corresponding to the veil in the Tabernacle was replaced, and women were restricted from rightful entry and prohibited from using their gifts in the Church - OT theology sought pre-eminence.

A characteristic example of Old Covenant theology is found in the Council on Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (CBMW). This organisation exemplifies a modern day *patria potestas* system with the *pater-familias* (male) as head of the family, and is an anti-feminist group based in the United States of America promoting a traditional model of leadership for the Church. Ruether (2002) states that it is the CBMW view, held by men and women that is damaging the Church by claiming that evangelical feminism distorts God’s plan for humanity. CBMW produced the “Danvers Statement”⁴⁸ in the late 1980s. CBMW is disturbed by the emerging roles of women; the threat to Biblical authority; the uncertainty about complementary differences between the sexes; the promotion given to feminist egalitarianism and other issues relating to Biblical authenticity; sexuality and the role of women in the home. The argument of CBMW is based on the normative paradigm of patriarchy, and concerns held about the demise of family values, since the women’s movement began in the 1960s. As Nancy Duff (1997) states, the core of family life is seen to be at risk if men do not take leadership and assume the role of ‘protector’ and ‘provider’ to their wives and

⁴⁸ Cf: <http://www.cbmw.org/danvers>: *The Danvers Statement* (1988) published by the CBMW. The objective of CBMW is to promote the traditionalist perspective. Men are the leaders in the Church and home and women should be respected in their complementarian role to the male.

family. Hence, this socio-cultural conditioning of the populace continues to have a strong influence on the Christian Church both in the United States of America, Australia, and other parts of the world in the Twenty-first Century.

Another example of Old Testament theology is in Susan Foh's (1989, pp. 69-105) argument as she deems that any position of teaching or ruling for women in the Church is forbidden. She can be classified as a complementarian or hybrid traditionalist as she argues that a woman is functionally subordinate to her husband (Foh, 1989, p. 73). Her justification is that there are three principles operational before Eve and Adam ate from the tree after God commanded them not to (Foh, 1989, pp. 72-76). The first is that man and woman are equal in being, and while woman is functionally subordinate to her husband, she is not inferior (Gen 1:27). The second is that man was created first to establish his headship, the woman was created after (1 Tim 2:13), and for the sake of the man, to help him (Gen 2:21-23; 1 Cor 11:8-9). The third principle is that the husband and wife are one flesh (Gen 2:24). She argues that the principles worked harmoniously together until Adam and Eve's act of disobedience. Consequently, Foh (1989) argues that women are prohibited from teaching as a direct result of Eve being deceived. In addition, she maintains that the prohibition given in 1 Timothy 2:13 was because man was created first and therefore, women have a subordinate role in the Church and in marriage (cf: 1 Cor 11:3; 14:34; 1 Tim 2:11; Eph 5:22-24). Further, she accepts that there is only one valid view against women's ordination, and this is a Scriptural prohibition (Foh, 1989). Arguing on the basis of 'old creation' theology, Foh like many others has not made the transition to 'new creation' theology, or a New Covenant Church paradigm.

In the New Covenant Church, a different picture emerges. Very early in the Christian community, women were included in the ministry of Jesus: women travelled with Jesus in his ministry, and supported him out of their own means (Lk 8:3). Bowman (2001) argues that it was Jesus who first set the cultural standard for the Church as recorded in the Gospel accounts when he went against cultural norms by involving women in his ministry. Conversely, Belleville (2001, p. 81) claims it was Judaism that set the parameters to include

a “wide range of female ministry roles” in the early Church. It appears, however, that it was not so much Judaism but more the counter revolutionary action of Jesus whose attitude and ministry were inclusive of women. It is argued that it was Jesus who first set the parameters for the New Covenant Church in the First Century and this continued with the Apostle Paul. Paul set the example for the egalitarian model as part of Church praxis working alongside women, referring to women as his co-workers, and acknowledging them in their leadership roles.

Conclusion

This chapter situated the scholarly debate of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in literature, and identified the foremost issues in the debate about equality for women in the Church. The discussion illustrates the currency that still exists in the debate and it identifies the key elements in the polemic signifying that equality for women in the Church is far from being given scholarly sanction. Beck and Blomberg (2001, p. 12) claim that the “current debate, when conducted with integrity, is healthy for the Church and necessary for her [sic] witness in the twenty-first century”.

The traditional and egalitarian positions presented by scholars are both judged to be flawed; however, in general terms, the debate is about human and religious rights: about men sharing authority, power, and control. The traditional perspective is linked with privilege and power, and has the potential to end in tyranny and submission (Douglass Dempsey & Kay, 1997). On the other hand, the egalitarian position shares the privileges, the power and rule. Douglass and Kay (1997, p. 78) state that it is the traditional perspective or paradigm that accentuates differences, while egalitarianism has been described as “the ways we are alike without taking responsibility for the ways we are different”. In view of this, the challenge of Biblical exegesis is to discover what the context reveals about the text without being too premature in taking a position.

To situate this work in its scholarly discourse, this research returned to the roots of feminism, and its influence on the Church. The domination of patriarchal scholarship and its role in shaping the lives of women in the Church were

discussed in the context of how the Church has presented images of God. This study argues that due to its patriarchal history, the Church has formed a normative paradigm of understanding that explains the role of women in the Church, and restricts women from functioning fully within it. The chapter also discussed women's struggle within patriarchy, the integration of the normative paradigm into their lives, and how women form distinct roles to accommodate the paradigm. Concurrently, there are scholars whose work is shifting the axis of the traditional patriarchal to an egalitarian paradigm and work in this chapter contrasted the feasibility of these conclusions as a model for Church function. The argumentation of each paradigmatic position will form the basis of discussions in later chapters.

The next chapter discusses the methodological approach, and the measures taken in analysing the differences in interpretation and meaning given to the subject text. The chapter builds on scholarly feminist methodological approaches, whilst simultaneously delineating a distinctive feminist methodology. The intention of the multi-layered methodological construction is to enhance the prospect of determining new pathways of understanding the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15.

CHAPTER 3

Methodology

An historical interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 through the normative paradigm of patriarchy has contributed to women's subordination in the Church and family (Belleville, 2004; Cowles, 1993; Daly, 1985; Mickelsen, 1989; Schneiders, 1982; Scholer, 1984; Schüssler Fiorenza, 1996c, 2001). The principles of translation, and exegetical interpretation held by patriarchal scholars, such as Wayne Grudem, Andreas Köstenberger, and Thomas Schreiner are established through their theology, and a patriarchal perspective of the Scriptures (Grudem, 2004b; Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005). Patriarchal scholars, including the Magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church support the traditionalist perspective due to a hierarchical understanding of the place of women and men in the ecclesiastical, and domestic sphere. For the most part, they base their interpretation on the Biblical principles found in the Pauline Corpus: including the masculinity of Christ, the Apostles all being male, the theology of creation, and/or one based on the theology of the Godhead, that is, the Doctrine of the Trinity. Their position on women is justified from this diagrammatic framework because it is judged to be divinely ordained, and accordingly, it is for the benefit of the human race and women in particular. Subsequently, the theology of the traditionalist position, expressed through the normative paradigm of patriarchy sanctions the type of hierarchical relationship that ensue between women and men.

If God ordained a hierarchical relationship between women and men with women in a subordinate position, this needs to be supported by Biblical text, including principles and patterns found within the text. In addition the text cannot be fully understood without being placed in its context. As Mickelsen (1989, p. 177) argues, a text without its context is at risk of becoming a pretext. How the reader receives the text, that is, the reader's interaction with it also becomes part of the interpretative process. Accordingly, it is argued that a methodology for an exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 has to be a multi-layered, and utilise an integrated approach in order to accurately interpret the text. 1

Timothy 2:11-15 is a contentious text as there is no overall scholarly consensus on its meaning. Vern Poythress'(1979, pp. 319-331) proposition is that there are multiple meanings in the Biblical text as he argues for three types of projected synchronic analyses including the speaker, discourse, and audience (situation). He draws attention to the complexity of Biblical analysis, the interlocking formations, and theological constructions for competently judging the intended original meaning. In the case of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 it appears that scholars have polarized views of the intended meaning, even though they are competent in Biblical interpretation. Subsequently, it is argued that the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 has been corralled by patriarchal scholars in order to sustain the subservient nature of women promoted by the traditionalist perspective.

The methodological approach in this thesis has been developed from these concerns, to diminish the current polarisation reflected by scholars; and to neutralise the normative paradigm of patriarchy by way of introducing balance into the debate through analysing the traditionalist and egalitarian arguments. Within this process, and a methodological framework the intention is to retain the integrity of the Biblical text. A discussion on the Biblical text as the 'Word of God' explains the authoritative position it is given in this study. Hereafter, the chapter discusses the problems with the traditional translation due to transmission issues, and then outlines the foundations, hermeneutics, and theology of the exegetical methodology employed for this study.

The Biblical Text as 'Word of God'

Stendahl (1984) drew attention to the bifurcation of the Holy Bible as being both a literary classic, and the 'Word of God' or 'Holy Scriptures'; even with the recognition and canonisation of the text, he saw both aspects as part of the normative dimension of Biblical literature (Stendahl, 1984). Schneiders (1991b) maintains that for the believer, the Bible is more than a literary classic; it is recognised as the revelatory 'Word of God'; God's communication to humanity. Despite Schneiders' claim, the Biblical text as the 'Word of God', and the authority it holds in the Church continues to be debated by scholars.

Authority of the Biblical Text

Gerhard Maier (1994, p. 177) argues that the authority of Scripture is only achieved through Biblical revelation. He states that arguments as to the authority of the Biblical text by scholars vary widely. They include: the attributes of Scripture; its powerful redemptive effect; the Church as the origin of Scripture; Christian experience; the material content (*Sachgehalt*); or its divine initiator (Maier, 1994, pp. 169-173). Further, he states that “Biblical revelation’s unique authority consists in its normative transmission of the word of the triune God. In any case, that is the claim that revelation itself makes. No other document, occurrence, or authority can occupy a position at its side” (Maier, 1994, p. 176). In addition, the work of Bengel (as cited in Thompson, 2004, p. 84) shows that there is evidence for the authority of Scripture due to Jesus’ use of Scripture (Mt 4:1-11) as it “declares that He is the Destined One who should fulfil Scripture; and at the same time shows the high authority of Scripture itself, irrefragable even to Satan”. As Thompson (2004, p. 77) states “Bengel equates Scripture with God’s written word, and asserts that both in part and in whole, the writings of Scripture are perfect and without defect”. He refers to Bengel when discussing important tasks in textual criticism when aiming to “separate the later errors to copyists from what is likely to represent ‘the original autographs’ so as to better study and master ‘the Sacred Volume’” (Thompson, 2004, p. 80). Subsequently, the methodology was developed to counteract such errors, and the potential for corruption of the Biblical text is discussed later in this chapter.

The claim that the Biblical text is the authoritative ‘Word of God’ traverses centuries. In evangelical circles, it is argued that it is the canonical books of Scripture that are affirmed as the final authority, rather than human criticism as they are inspired by the Holy Spirit (Bridges, 2003, p. 26). However, because of its status as an authoritative text, and the meaning given to the text, women’s role and function in the Church has been restricted. On the other hand, it is not the authoritative text that is at the root of the problem but the meaning given to the text. On that basis, it could be argued that patriarchal scholarship has constructed and modelled a woman’s role in the Church by exploiting the text, particularly if evidence shows it has a different meaning. Based on the traditional translation and interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 women have been

told they cannot teach nor have authority over a man, and they must be silent. However, the Biblical text, testifies differently - women have not been silent, and they have had a notable place in history with the Scriptures as the OT bears witness in the life of Huldah the prophetess (2 Kings 22:8-20). As Claudia Camp (2000, p. 96) explains Huldah held a significant role in Biblical history as she “authorizes what will become the core of Scripture for Judaism and Christianity”. She heralds the text as the ‘Word of God’ and establishes it as “authoritative, or canonical” (Camp, 2000, p. 96). This was well before the birth of Jesus testifying that even in the OT period women had a significant role in bringing about the purposes of God. While the debate on the creditability of the Biblical text as the ‘Word of God’ continues, there is sufficient evidence from scholars to uphold the Biblical text as authoritative. It is with this framework that the exegesis is conducted.

Thus as an authoritative text, the answer to the struggle for women’s equality in the Church must be found in the primary source of the Canon - the world of the text. This is due to the authority of the text sustaining the self-interest of men, and their position of patriarchal power in its interpretation (Schüssler Fiorenza, 1994). A hundred years earlier, Stanton⁴⁹ (1993) had a similar argument in that the authority of Scripture had been used against women preventing their emancipation and condoning their submission and silencing them. Inherent to this study is a query though radical, as to whether equality in the Church is embedded in the text but has furtively gone astray in the transmission, and through a myriad of translations.

The Transmission of the Canonical Biblical Text

McDonald (2006, p. 542) claims that the Scriptures were firstly identified by Irenaeus at the end of the Second Century when he documented them as consisting of two parts - the OT and NT Biblical texts. Later, in 367 C.E.

⁴⁹ Stanton's book *The Woman's Bible* was first published in 1895. Stanton, along with other religious reformers spent twenty years researching and lecturing about the oppressive nature of orthodox Christianity that taught the subjection of women in the home, economy, State, and Church (cf: page xix foreword).

Athanasius, the Bishop of Alexandria was the first person to identify the twenty-seven books of the New Testament Canon (Hastings, 1909, p. 123).⁵⁰ It took until the Fourth Century C.E. when Eusebius, a Church historian listed all recognised books; excluded from his list of the twenty-seven books recognised today were Hebrews, James, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Jude and Revelation due to his concern about their authenticity.⁵¹ The question of what books should be included in the Canon was finalised by the Roman Catholic Church at the Council of Trent in 1546; forty-five books of the OT and twenty-seven books of the NT (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 87). The Canon for the Protestant Church today consists of sixty-six books: thirty-nine OT books and twenty-seven NT books, whilst Roman Catholics add the *Apocryphal* and *Deuterocanonical Books*. Prior to the innovation of the Gutenberg printing press in the Fifteenth Century the Books of the Bible were heard rather than read. It is argued that oral transmission increased the potential for misunderstanding of the text, and manual translation by scribes increased the possibility of error and corruption.

In the Greco-Roman Period it was common for authors to give their written works to friends who would copy them (Gamble, 1995). Paul quite probably followed this same practice. Therefore this practice of copying the text would have seen multiple copies of Paul's letters circulating across the Churches. Luke Johnson (2001) argues that it is this early mode of communication that led to a range of textual variants. Further, he states these textual variants are "yet to be fully exploited" (L. T. Johnson, 2001, p. 19).

It is argued that these textual variants would concern Paul as the truth of the Gospel was paramount for him. In his First Letter to Timothy he identifies himself as a teacher of the truth (1 Tim 2:7); the Church as the bulwark of the truth (1 Tim 3:15); and he is concerned about those who are bereft of the truth

⁵⁰ Athanasius included some of the Apocrypha in a separate list of 'good reading', including Esther. Other parts of the *Apocrypha* were included as part of the Old Testament books (*Epistle of Jeremiah and Baruch*).

⁵¹ Cf: *Eusebius, History of the Church*, 3.24.15; 6.25.10.

(1 Tim 6:5). Therefore, to address the possible corruption of the text requires an appropriate range of interpretative tools to substantiate textual meaning, and to uncover the truth contained within the text, even though primary source documentation for 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is rare.

Lack of Extant Evidence for 1 Timothy 2:11-15

One of the major difficulties with 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is the absence of *extant papyrus* (ancient manuscripts), to verify an accurate translation of the text. There are portions of *papyri* for the entire Pauline corpus (**P**⁴⁶) except for 1 Timothy and 2 Timothy (Dibelius & Conzelmann, 1972; Hawthorne, Martin, & Reid, 1993, p. 928). There is a patristic citation of the text dated at the middle of the Second Century with Tertullian using the Old Latin to cite 1 and 2 Timothy (L. T. Johnson, 2001, p. 18). The complete Letters to Timothy are found “in the uncial Codex Sinaiticus (Fourth Century), followed by Codex Alexandrinus (Fifth Century)” (Towner, 2006, p. 8). The text is also found in the Peshitta version or Syriac Vulgate of the NT, written around the beginning of the Fifth Century (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005, p. 98). In addition, the PE as a collection is also found in the Ninth Century text, Codex Augiensis or Codex Boernerianus (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005, pp. 74-75). Given the lack of primary source *papyri* Towner (2006, p. 9) when referring to the PE states that “these three letters to co-workers are more in evidence in the writings of the early Fathers...than in the *papyri*”.

Scholars, Bruce Metzger, and Bart Ehrman (2005, p. 98) state that around three hundred and fifty manuscripts of the Peshitta NT - several dating from the Fifth and Sixth centuries “have been transmitted with remarkable fidelity, so that very few significant variants exist among the witnesses”. This makes it one of the more reliable texts available from the Fifth Century Period. This is the foremost dilemma facing all exegetes when deconstructing, and reconstructing textual meaning from the PE. As Holmes (1993, p. 929) states “any reconstruction of the transmission history of the Pauline letters involves a high degree of conjecture and hypothesis”. To address such conjecture, this study includes an intertextual approach; an examination of word usage within other early Christian

literature; and the identification of Biblical principles existing in the text; including the Pauline Corpus.

Textual Corruption of the Biblical Text

This study argues that due to the transmission of the sacred manuscripts over many centuries, and inherent within the ancient method of scribes' handwritten replicates of the texts there is the potential for widespread corruption of the primary Biblical texts; the derivative today is that the English text may not be a complete, and reliable translation. These problems are demonstrated by a brief overview of the transmission of the sacred texts beginning with the Septuagint translation of the Torah.

The Septuagint translation of the Torah has its origins in the period of the Third Century B.C.E. in Alexandria, Egypt, and was translated from Hebrew to Greek for Greek-speaking Jews (Charlesworth, 1985, p. 735). *The Catholic Encyclopedia* states that the Septuagint Version "while giving exactly as to the form and substance the true sense of the Sacred Books, differs nevertheless considerably from our present Hebrew text" (*Catholic Encyclopedia: Septuagint Version*, Section IV., para. 1). In this statement the Roman Catholic Church acknowledges textual changes as a result of the transmission of the OT text. The oldest and most complete Biblical manuscript held today by the Roman Catholic Church is the Codex Vaticanus (Fourth Century). Similar to other ancient manuscripts, there is no word separation (known as *scriptio continua*), and very little punctuation. Also the Codex Vaticanus is known to have a certain amount of textual corruption due to corrections, additions, and omissions.⁵² Another early codex, the Codex Leningrad written around 1010 C.E. is one of the best illustrations of the surviving Masoretic text, and the oldest complete

⁵² Cf: The *Codex Vaticanus (B or 03) mid fourth (Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Ms. Vat. Gr 1209)* includes a fragment of the OT and NT text. There have been corrections in the text, the tracing over of faded letters with fresh ink, and occasionally, letters were omitted as they were considered erroneous to the particular text being worked on. Other amendments include the addition of accents, and breathing marks. Retrieved 15 December, 2006, http://www.earlham.edu/~seidti/iam/tc_codexv.html.

Hebrew Bible today has been recognised as having the same potential for corruption.⁵³

The potential for corruption with the Masoretic text happened as the Masoretes, with the intention to preserve the original meaning of the Hebrew text, added a system of dots and dashes to the consonants to form the vowel sounds (Salters, 1990, p. 429). The Masoretes not only added vowels, but accents that act as both punctuation, and as a musical notation in the text, and symbols in the margins for unusual words that needed to remain as written. These additions and changes increased the potential for corruption of the text. The first Bible based on the Leningrad Codex was Rudolf Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica* (BHK 1937). Further editions have been produced and BHS (regarded as the fourth version of the *Biblia Hebraica*), is a revision of the third edition of the *Biblia Hebraica*. Today, scholars believe the best representation of the Hebrew text is to be found in the *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia* [BHS]; but this should not be thought of as the original Hebrew text (Salters, 1990, p. 429). It was the BHS (1977, ed. Sec. emendate, 1983) that was used in the OT and the *Greek New Testament* for the NT of the *RSV* Bible revision, culminating in the *NRSV* (Meeks, Bassler, Lemke, Niditch, & Schuller, 1993, xxvii). Also available to the revision committee was information from the forthcoming fourth edition of the BHS that is in common use, and highly regarded by scholars as a reliable edition of the Hebrew and Aramaic Scriptures. However, as Sanders (2005, para. 6) argues, the fourth edition of BHS while offering a less subjective apparatus and a collation of the *masorah magna* was "published too early to take advantage of the full impact of study of the Judean Desert Scrolls upon the art of textual criticism of the Hebrew Bible".

In 2004, the *Biblia Hebraica Quinta: Fascicle 18: General Introduction and Megilloth*, was published. This fifth edition of BHQ, though still based on the Leningrad Codex is without the bias first introduced by Martin Luther called *Res*

⁵³ Cf: The West Semitic Research Project, who examined the Codex. Retrieved 8 May, 2006, http://www.usc.edu/dept/LAS/wsrp/educational_site/biblical_manuscripts?LeningradCodex.html.

et Argumentum, or the “hermeneutic of textual criticism” whereby only the textual consonants were seen as authentic (Sanders, 2005). Others would not call this a bias, but a more reliable study as it is conducted from the original and unpointed Hebrew text. A translation using the same method was first published in 1885 by Helen Spurrell (1985), the first woman to translate the OT from the unpointed text (without vowels) using Boothroyd’s *Biblia Hebraica* (1813) as her reference point for her study. Benjamin Boothroyd was another scholar who was convinced that the accepted Hebrew text of the day had numerous errors. The subject of error and corruption in the text, and challenging textual authenticity is not a matter that has been rigorously debated by scholars, as generally they accept the Masoretic text as their primary source document. This is with the exception of Rabbis and Jewish students of the biblical text who favour the old Koran edition of the Bomberg Bible (ca. 1516–1517) (Sanders, 2005).

The most significant translation that has influenced understanding of the Christian Scriptures is the Latin Vulgate. The OT and NT text was in Latin until Wycliffe produced an English translation of the Latin New Testament that was completed after his death in 1384 (G. L. Jones, 1990, P. 704). William Tyndale’s New Testament was printed in 1525 C.E., followed by Myles Coverdale’s Bible which was the first complete Bible printed in English in 1535 C.E. Apart from some translations by individuals, the *KJV* (ca. 1611) remained relatively uncontested until 1881 when Westcott and Hort produced a critical edition of the Greek NT (Wallace, 2001). More recent scholarly research has shown that “the 47 scholars who worked on the *KJV* knew Latin better than they knew Greek or Hebrew” (Wallace, 2001, p.6). The Greek text used for the *KJV* was the Stephanus text of 1550 (third edition), which relied on Erasmus’ third edition of 1522 (Wallace, 2001). Westcott and Hort accepted that the NT text could be divided into three groups of witnesses, the Syrian text, the Western text, and the Neutral text (Birdsall, 1990, pp. 681-684). Based on the works of patristic writers, Westcott and Hort concluded that the witnesses in the Second Century supported the Western text. However, since that time the Western Text has been criticised as being well outside the western parts of the Roman Empire (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005). Even so, the Western Text can be traced to

the Second Century as it was used by Irenaeus, Marcion, and Tertullian (Ehrman, 1994). As a result, the Codex Bezae is one of the most significant witnesses of the Western text (Burton, 2000).

Despite some scholars recognising the significance of the Western text, its acceptance as a reliable witness is still being debated by scholars today (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005). Included in the debate is that there were alterations to the text in order to minimise the role of women in the early Church, due to an anti-feminist bias (Witherington, 1984). Metzger and Ehrman (2005) argue that there is also evidence of corruption due to the doctrinal differences of the scribes, apart from the unintentional errors or problems with eyesight, hearing, judgment, spelling, and grammar mistakes. They raise the critical importance and implications of the textual variants in the NT when assessing the marginalisation and oppression of women (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005). Consequently, this is an area of scholarship that requires further critique to discover what this may mean for the place of women in the Church.

Therefore, it can be argued, that the textual variants and the corruption of the text in its transmission have bearing on the translation, interpretative meaning and reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. A small alteration of the text could change its complete meaning. It appears that alterations of the text have happened on two levels; changes due to doctrines that were unacceptable, and introducing 'proof text' additions to support a favourite theological belief or practice (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005, p, 265-268). When Ambrosiaster, a Fourth Century Roman commentator on the Pauline Epistles found variants between the Greek and Latin manuscripts, he accused the Greeks of being underhanded in bringing in corrupt texts (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005, p. 266). More recently Dominika Kurek-Chomycz (2006, p. 108) has shown through an examination of some text-critical variants of NT text concerning Prisca and Aquila, that scribes may have "tendentiously corrected the text of Pauline epistles and Acts of the Apostles so as to diminish the role of Prisca". She argues that this is one of the most legendary indications of a 'Western' and 'Byzantine' textual tradition to diminish the prominence of women (Kurek-Chomycz, 2006). Such textual contamination not only diminishes the role of Prisca but potentially influences

contemporary praxis regarding the role of women in the Church. Further, some Biblical translations “were prepared by persons who had an imperfect command of Greek” and to compound this “certain features of Greek syntax and vocabulary cannot be conveyed in a translation” (Metzger & Ehrman, 2005, p. 95).

Notwithstanding the potential for textual variants, it is envisaged that a range of methodological tools will assist in extricating the original and intended meaning from the text. This is the approach taken in this study, and the reasons behind the multiple layered methodology. It is argued that within these layers of Biblical exegesis, there is another hidden layer and that is the Spiritual element. The significance of the Spiritual aspect in this study is now discussed.

The Spiritual Element in Exegesis

This study acknowledges the Biblical text as the ‘Word of God’, and it draws on Fee’s (2001) work that within the believing community all exegesis contains a Spiritual element. He claims that an “exegesis of the biblical texts belongs primarily in the context of the believing community who are the true heirs of these texts” (Fee, 2001, p. 276). Over a long scholarly career, Fee (2001, p. 279) came to understand that historical-critical analysis of the Biblical text included a Spiritual element while still conducting a “carefully articulated biblical theology”. He argues that the role of exegesis is to facilitate an understanding of the meaning intended by the author; however, the ‘real intent’ of engaging with the Biblical texts is a Spiritual one (Fee, 2001, p. 279). This study argues that it is the merging or synthesis of these two aspects; that it, the exegetical and spiritual, that provides the essence of the text completing the circle. Other scholars; for example, Herman Hanko (1991) argue that if the Scriptures are inspired by the Holy Spirit, then the spiritual element must be drawn into a grammatico-historical methodology. Therefore, it is argued that typically for a believing scholar in the pursuit of finding meaning in the text it has a Spiritual dimension. In this study, the Spiritual dimension for the reader becomes an important reference point for the interpretation of the text in this multi-layered approach. Such is the claim of this methodology as the Spiritual is fused into the horizons of the methodology. For example, the chapter in this study on Pauline

Theology is a doorway to Paul's spirituality as it reveals his passion for God's people, and the purpose of Kingdom living. Accordingly, as an interpreter of the Scriptures, Fee (2000, p. 14) is convinced that to hear from God the interpreter must listen to the text and "come to the text with an absolute conviction that it is God's word...here God speaks and we listen".

As a reader listening to the text, Schneiders (1991b, p. 28) states that "we cannot say that God literally speaks". However, if the Scriptures are to be believed by the faith community as the 'Word of God', the Scriptures do speak to the reader in the contemporary world through the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, the Scriptures state that there were occasions when God did 'speak'. God spoke to Adam in the garden (Gen 3: 9-13); the Lord appeared to and had a conversation with Moses (Ex 4:1-5); and God spoke to Samuel (1 Sam 3:1-15). The Scriptures state that in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth and "the Word" was with God, and "the Word" was God (Gen 1:1; Jn 1:1-4). Jesus Christ, who is also known as 'the Word', and part of the Godhead became flesh and lived on earth (Jn 1:14). As recorded in the OT, God spoke through the prophets, but in the last days God spoke through the Son, Jesus Christ (Heb 1:1-4). Throughout the Scriptures the 'Word of God' is referred to as a living entity (Heb 4:12), and the wisdom of God penetrates through the 'Word of God' which is alive and active - transforming the life of believers (cf: 1 Pet 1:23).

Therefore, a Biblical exegesis is different from that of conducting an explanation of other literary works because the final aim of Biblical exegesis is a Spiritual one. One of the hermeneutic principles identified by Paul is that no one comprehends the thoughts of God except the Spirit of God (1 Cor 2:11). As Walter Kaiser and Moisés Silva (1994, p. 24) argue the principle of the need for the indwelling of the Holy Spirit is emphasised in 1 John 2:26-27b. Therefore, the engagement of the text - the 'Word of God' - by the believer is through the Holy Spirit. As with Paul, the Holy Spirit testified and spoke to him (cf: Acts 20:23; Rom 9:1). Paul when he wrote to the Thessalonians states that the message of the Gospel "came not in word only, but also in power and in the Holy Spirit with full conviction" (1 Thess 1:5). It is within this context that the

Biblical text, that is, the 'Word of God' is received and given divine sanction in this study as an authoritative text for the Church. Therefore, as an authoritative text the debate surrounding 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is not situated in the polemic of its authority but the text is recognised and endorsed as the 'Word of God', and foundational to the exegesis.

Foundations of the Exegesis

The interpretation of Biblical texts is complex and there are a range of theories and frameworks that can be used for this purpose. F.P.A. Demeterio (2001) identifies three different layers of meanings and concerns that are relevant to the exegetical task namely theory, methodology and praxis. He argues that these relate to the epistemological validity and prospect of interpretation, the formulation of dependable systems of interpretation, and the definitive process of interpreting specific texts (Demeterio, 2001). Epistemological validity of an exegesis is dependent on an unambiguous methodology to allow for good integration of the data. Without this, the influence of the findings to change praxis in the Church will be diminished.

A major foundation to the thesis is that the methodology employs a feminist schema as one which expands the space for exploring the egalitarian perspective. Such a position is in accordance with the belief that God who upholds justice would not choose to discriminate against women keeping them silent, and in submission to men based on their gender (cf: Deut 16:18-20; 1 Kings 3:28; Ezra 7:25; Rom 3:25, 26; Heb 11:33). Even in the OT Era the Israelites were not to distort justice, nor show partiality. It is argued that a feminist schema, whether the researcher is female or male is necessary for an exegesis of a controversial text, such as 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Schüssler Fiorenza (1996b, p. 335) states that "feminist scholars are in danger of collaborating with the continuing patri-kyriarchal silencing and marginalizing of feminist theoretical accomplishments" without feminist hermeneutics in Biblical exegesis. The paradox here is that it is not the 'means' or the hermeneutics, which is the danger for feminist scholars; it is when the 'ends' or accomplishments of women scholars are disregarded by the wider Biblical scholarly guild. This study argues that when this happens it is a product of the

normative paradigm of patriarchy. For Schüssler Fiorenza (2001, p. 146) feminist hermeneutics become the primary method for addressing the dominant paradigm, and the subsequent struggle for women, placing women “into the centre of the historical narrative”. The methodological approach in this study allows for alternative perspectives, and if evidence is forthcoming it would support the notion of women as being oppressed and marginalised over the centuries through a patriarchal interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. It also endorses a Biblical feminist theological position, and supports the struggle of women in the Church through an analysis of the text within its context.

How the reader engages with the text is critical to an exegesis and thereby forms an important part of the methodology. In this thesis, Reception Theory provides the basis for understanding how the text is received, and how the reader engages and interacts with the text. The Theory of Reception, therefore, underpins all the work of the exegesis and is a critical component in the foundation of the exegesis.

Reception Theory

The reception of the Biblical text and how the reader engages with the text has an effect on its meaning. If a first reading is a contemporary reading from the English text, the reader engages with this text. This is why the reader needs to situate the text within its original socio-cultural setting to establish the likely meaning the text had to its first readers. Further investigation of the text in its original language, and the specific circumstances that were behind the First Letter of Paul to Timothy is required. Consideration also has to be given to textual transmission errors over time, and an androcentric position that has been concretised by patriarchy. Other problems are encountered in the translation of Biblical text from one language to another. Firstly, this happened with the translation of the text from Greek to English, compounded by the fact that there are not always satisfactory English equivalents. J.B. Phillips (1974, p. ii) explains the art of translation as

not only the transferring of words from one language to another but also the accurate transmission of thought, feeling, atmosphere and even of style....bear in mind that you cannot always either give an English equivalent for a Greek word of expression, or even always render the same Greek word by the same English one.

Translation problems are also evident in other languages, for example, with the Biblical idiom 'hardening of the heart': interpreted as a negative in the English language, is different in the African Fulani language. In this language 'hardening of the heart' is not a negative term but a positive; meaning "someone who is courageous" (de Waard & Nida, 1986, p. 34). To capture the intended meaning of the text in the translation to the Fulani language requires a meaningful equivalent. Therefore, to effectively give meaning to 1 Timothy 2:11-15, close attention must be paid to historical, lexical, syntactical, and rhetorical elements.

The methodological approach used in this thesis incorporates and draws on aspects of Reception Theology that Ormond Rush (1996) developed in his work. He concluded that the reader interacts with the text, and becomes the thread connecting events (Rush, 1996). It is the reader - the receptor of the text who is the thread that connects with the Biblical text in its contemporary setting, who goes back in time to its original setting, and back again to the current period. As Rush (1996, p. 31) explains, "through this engagement a synthesis happens as the text is examined within its original setting and how it was received in a particular time of history (*the text within history*); how it was received by individuals and communities across history (*the text throughout history*); and how it is received in its socio-historical context can also have a determining impact on the wider general history (*the text and history*)". Therefore, in any Biblical exegesis it is how the recipient or reader receives the text (*Holy Scripture*); how the text relates to the historical time it was written (*historical setting*); the influence it has had on Christianity throughout the ages (*experiences of individuals and communities*); and how it has impacted on society in general (*theology, tradition, and doctrine*). All of these factors influence textual meaning and need to be integrated for a reliable reception and

authentic reading of the text. It is in the reading and the reader's interaction with the text that meaning is ultimately established.

The Reader's Relationship with the Biblical Text

It is argued in this framework that it is in the reader's engagement with the Biblical text that meaning is given. Secondly, the reader's relationship with the text is directed by hermeneutics, and this establishes the process of engagement with the Biblical text, in particular the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. The level of engagement with the text is at the intersection between the Spiritual preconditioning of the reader, the presuppositions held by the reader - the socio-cultural biases of the reader, all of which influence how the text is received and subsequently given meaning. This is over and above translation issues.

While the text is central to the methodology of the thesis, the starting point is the set of questions asked of the text to determine its meaning. As Hans Gadamer (1979) explains, it is the reader's views held within their paradigm of understanding that questions are formed that reshape the text. According to Sandra Schneiders there are two ways that the Biblical texts are approached in terms of its history either 'through time' (diachronic), or an approach that relates with the text as it stands in some particular 'point in time' (synchronic) (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 112). Both the 'diachronic' and 'synchronic' methods are part of this methodology. The world of the interpreter is multi-dimensional and the methodology in this thesis adopts Schneiders' interpretative approach of examining the world 'behind' the text, the world 'of' the text and the world 'before' the text (Schneiders, 1991b).

Examining the text on multiple levels enables the reader to engage with layers of understanding or horizons, and it is the blending of these that creates the meaning of the text. Gadamer (1982) in his classic work refers to such a process as a 'fusion of horizons'. This means that when a Biblical text is explained it is not as a result of the interpreter's perspective, or only from the socio-historical context of the text, but how the differing perspectives are fused together creating an alternative similar to a multi-voiced discourse (Gadamer,

1982). Paul Ricoeur (1981) argues that the Biblical meaning is not frozen in the text but made or found in the encounter between the reader and the text. In developing his theory, Ricoeur built on Gadamer's hermeneutical theory and subsequently viewed the Biblical text as metaphorical. He regarded interpretation as occurring in front of or 'before' the text rather than 'behind' the text (Ricoeur, 1991). Both Gadamer and Ricoeur describe the factor of 'distanciation' that is inherent in Biblical hermeneutics as the distance between what the authors intended and what is presently read. Their method to address the existence of 'distanciation' was through a hermeneutic of suspicion. They believed that the text had to be approached with suspicion to reduce tendencies for self-deception. For Ricoeur (1981), by engaging with the text the reader separates it from the author's original intended meaning as it completes or creates new meaning. This is similar to the 'reader-response' approach of Wolfgang Iser (1978) who leans towards the view that it is the reader who completes the text. Köstenberger (1994) on the other hand argues that there would be more agreement amongst scholars if the principle of 'first horizon' was followed, that is, what the text meant to its original recipients. He believes that subjectivity in our interpretation gives legitimacy to feminist, liberation, and African-American hermeneutics and there should be a return to the original reading and meaning prior to a contemporary reading (Köstenberger, 1994). Returning to the original meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is difficult because of the lack of reliable extant manuscripts. At the same time there is always an element of subjectivity that is borne out of the hermeneutics and methodological approach. This is why this methodology is multi-dimensional to increase the transparency of the methodology and the sources, to reduce subjectivity, and subsequently provides an interpretative translation that reflects the most probable original meaning.

Therefore, the reader, when engaging with the text in exegesis needs to declare their theological and hermeneutical biases, as occurred in this research study. The reader as the thread within the socio-cultural and theological milieu fuses all the parts together, and creates the fabric of textual meaning. In the process of discovering the meaning of the text, the hermeneutics become important as they corroborate epistemological validity.

Hermeneutics and Theology of the Methodology

It is argued in this study that the Biblical hermeneutics of evangelical or Biblical feminism is not well understood by some scholars who conduct Biblical exegesis from the position of the normative paradigm of patriarchy; for example, Paul Felix (2003) and Wayne Grudem (2004b). Felix (2003) states that evangelical feminism overlooks the grammatico-historical perspective. One of his major criticisms with the text in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and evangelical feminism is on the basis that

Any attempt to establish one passage as the interpretive grid for all other passages is inconsistent with two standard tenets of the grammatico-historical method of interpretation: (1) the plenary inspiration of Scripture; and (2) the necessary harmonization of texts. The principle of the analogy of faith is valid, but not when it is brought into the interpretation process too early, as evangelical feminists tend to do (Felix, 2003, p.42).

On the other hand, Grudem (2004b, p. 505) finds disturbing warning signs in evangelical feminism, and believes this is a new pathway to liberalism that will either “deny the complete truthfulness of Scripture or else deny the full authority of Scripture as the Word of God”.

As a consequence, the methodological approach in this study responds to these criticisms through the clarification of the Biblical hermeneutics that are integral to the exegesis. The methodology is consistent with the belief that the Scriptures are the inspired ‘Word of God’. The harmonisation of the texts occurs through the hermeneutic of *analogia totius scripturae* - the principle is encountered in the methodology of this thesis as 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is interpreted in light of other Scripture. In this methodology the ‘analogy of faith’ is countered by the *analogia totius scripturae* hermeneutic and is identified as part of the hermeneutic spiral of the exegetical process. Given that this methodology is part of a hermeneutical spiral, the ‘analogy of faith’ does not and cannot have a clearly defined entry point. Even describing exegesis as being circular is dangerous according to Grant Osborne (2006). He argues that in

Biblical exegesis a “spiral is a better metaphor because it is not a closed circle but rather an open-ended movement from the horizon of the text to the horizon of the reader” (Osborne, 2006, p. 23). Harmonization of the texts occurs through the hermeneutics and the faith discourse with all its nuances. At the same time, the methodology recognises that when interpreting a text, careful attention must be given to exegetical, historical, and presuppositional fallacies (Carson, 1996).

Hermeneutical and theological biases are evident in all scholarly work, at least in some capacity. The exegetical work of evangelical feminists has been critiqued as being weakened by their failure to use the *‘sola scriptura’* hermeneutic (Grudem, 2004a). However, in this study as an evangelical or Biblical feminist the *‘sola scriptura’* hermeneutic is a core part of the exegesis. The *‘sola scriptura’* hermeneutic emerged from the Reformation Churches who opposed “the principle of tradition of Tridentine Catholicism” when the Council of Trent agreed to treat Scripture and Church tradition as equal (Maier, 1994, p. 184). Today the principle of *‘sola scriptura’* is used most commonly by Protestant scholars (Maier, 1994). Bengel (as cited in Thompson, 2004) argued that “Scripture interprets Scripture and that the individual parts should be read in light of the whole” (Thompson, 2004, p.86). Saint Augustine (1958, p. 38) held the same view when he claimed that an accurate understanding of the text may involve the comparison of Scriptural texts. While not all scholars agree with the hermeneutic of *‘sola scriptura’* it has been an accepted hermeneutic as part of Biblical scholarship since the Fourth Century.

Again, there is often more than one Biblical hermeneutic that guides an exegesis. France insists that engagement with the broader context of the Scriptures is a critical part of the hermeneutical process (France, 1995). Vernon Robbins (1992) identifies the engagement of other Scriptures as the principle of *‘intertextuality’* as part of his socio-rhetorical approach to Biblical interpretation. This approach engages in the process of comparative analysis of other texts to find or recover the original meaning of the text; the specific concentration in the socio-rhetorical approach is interaction between the history, cultures, and social situations of the background of the Bible that forms the fabric of the text (Robbins, 1996). The theological approach in this methodology

employs the principle of 'intertextuality' otherwise known as the '*sola scriptura*' principle to uncover the intended meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15.

The methodology in this study also incorporates a socio-rhetorical approach; including historical criticism that engages philology, the socio-cultural, and religious milieu of First Century Ephesus. As part of this interrogation of the text, supporting evidence also comes from archaeological and epigraphical evidence. The methodological framework in this study stands firm in the face of criticism from scholars such as Felix (2003) and Grudem (2004b) as it upholds the inspiration of Scripture and its authority in the Church, and it harmonizes the text through its Biblical hermeneutics; for example '*sola scriptura*' or 'intertextuality'. Another area that is also open to scholarly critique is feminists' treatment of the Biblical text and the 'faith' hermeneutic that are now discussed.

Feminists and the Biblical Text

Feminists in their critique of the Biblical text form a cohesive alliance through their standpoint of patriarchal oppression, and marginalisation of women in the Church. Feminist scholars Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza and Sandra Schneiders both acknowledge women's individual oppression, structural oppression, and marginalisation (Schneiders, 1991a; Schüssler Fiorenza, 1989).

The extensive work of Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (1984) has conscientized a Biblical feminist methodology to replace the traditional and patriarchal approach. In *Bread Not Stone*, she has argued for a deconstruction of the dominant paradigms used in Biblical interpretation (Schüssler Fiorenza, 1984). In a later work *Discipleship of Equals: a Critical Feminist Ekklesia-logy of Liberation*, Schüssler Fiorenza (1993a) calls for a shift from the patriarchal paradigm to that of recasting Biblical exegesis within a discipleship of gender equality. She identified three criteria for feminist theology as part of recasting Biblical exegesis in order for it to achieve a radical democratic religious vision, these are: 1) women regardless of denomination, class, or race need to recognise the systemic nature of their oppression under patriarchy; 2) she urges women not to engage in feminist approaches that position women as

exclusively oppositional; and 3) she encourages a common vision in order to inspire diverse groups of women to attain liberation (Schüssler Fiorenza, 1993a). On the other hand, Schneiders (1991a, p. 14) argues for a feminist theology that is

a comprehensive ideology which is rooted in women's experience of sexual oppression, engages in a critique of patriarchy as an essential dysfunctional system, embraces an alternative vision for humanity and the earth, and actively seeks to bring this vision to realization.

Like Schüssler Fiorenza, Schneiders seeks a new feminist theological paradigm to liberate women. Both of these scholars argue that the dominant patriarchal paradigm is the source of women's oppression. The common ground for both scholars is firstly their quest to redress the ongoing legacy of patriarchy, and secondly, the disenfranchisement of women in the Church, and the second class status it confers.

Ruether (1985a) takes feminist theology to another level to rectify patriarchal oppression, and the domination of women. She argues that feminist theology must move from a preconceived theological obligation to build on a Scriptural foundation and build on a "primal re-encounter with divine reality" (Ruether, 1985a, p. 710). She calls for new texts, a new canon, a new theology, and a new community of 'WomenChurch' where women reject the notion that patriarchy is God's will (Ruether, 1985a). This is where this study complements Ruether in that it questions the legitimacy of the authority of patriarchy, and whether it is God's will to discriminate against women. Ruether (1985a) argues that only when women form a new community of believers will they be empowered and have the ability to take centre stage in the Church. However, the task is greater than rejecting the notion that patriarchy is God's will and the formation of 'WomenChurch'. It is argued that this would only achieve a segregation of believers, similar to the current patriarchal segregation of women and men in the Church. Therefore, the theological task for Biblical exegesis is to prove that the dominance of patriarchy in the Church is outside the 'will of God'.

Other feminists have responded to the subjugation of women brought about by patriarchy in other ways; for example, Ada María Isasi-Díaz has produced a new feminist paradigm identified as *Mujerista* theology (Isasi-Díaz, 1996). The objective of the theology is to offset the oppression of Hispanic women who have been marginalised by dominant patriarchal structures. *Mujerista* theology includes “both ethics and systematic theology”, and as a liberative praxis its main goal is the liberation of women (Isasi-Díaz, 1996, p. 62). The corollary of oppression for Hispanic women is that they no longer have a voice in the Church. The women’s right to be heard has been lost, only to be reflected in one familiar rhetorical statement of “aquí las mujeres no tienen nada que decir (here the women have nothing to say)” (Isasi-Díaz, 1996, pp. 111-112). Hispanic women do not reject the Bible but accept its authority only insofar as it contributes to their struggle for liberation (Isasi-Díaz, 1996, p. 150).

As part of the struggle for gender equality in the Church, some feminists; for example, Letty Russell, have rejected Scripture as the only authority for Christian theology. Russell (1985, p. 141) relies on women’s experience and tradition claiming that “Scripture cannot be the only authority for Christian community or Christian theology”. In discarding the Biblical text as the primary method, the axis has shifted to a critical understanding of language to empower women. Schüssler Fiorenza (1999a, p. 60) advocates for this stance rather than a reliance on the Biblical text to realise full gender equality. For women like Schüssler Fiorenza, Radford Ruether, Russell, and Isasi-Díaz an androcentric bias in mainstream Biblical interpretation has produced a suspicion of the Biblical text; the aspiration of feminist scholars then becomes one of making sense of the Biblical text through an emerging feminist theological paradigm. In this study, approaching the Biblical text through an exegetical analysis of ‘behind’, ‘of’, and ‘before’ the text, it claims that this is a reliable method to free the text from its patriarchal bondage.

Nevertheless, not all women are satisfied with radical feminist hermeneutics as this can shift the centre of the argument from the Biblical text. Within this context, Mary Ann Tolbert (1983) claims that there are many Biblical feminists

who want to stay within the Christian tradition. Feminist scholars have a different centre of foci in their work, for example; Sandra Schneiders (1986) and Mary Ann Tolbert (1983) focus on the literary aspect of the Biblical text; Schüssler Fiorenza's (1989, 1996c, 1999b) is on the liberation of women in the reconstruction of women's history behind the text. The task of these scholars is to seek equality for women by applying a method of re-reading the NT text (Lawson, 1995). Within this myriad of scholarly and differing Biblical hermeneutics, the common ground is an agreement that the text is embedded in patriarchy; consequently, values, and beliefs held about the text becomes a critical dynamic in the hermeneutical process of Biblical interpretation. Therefore, feminist hermeneutics, and theology does not represent a standardised approach to Biblical exegesis. If an exegete approaches the Biblical text as the authoritative 'Word of God' they are more likely to approach the text with a hermeneutic of faith; conversely, if the text is not recognised as having God's authority the text will be more likely approached with suspicion (R. Kroeger Clark & Kroeger Clark, 1992).

Hermeneutic of Suspicion versus a Hermeneutic of Faith

Scholars Elizabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Rosemary Ruether, Letty Russell, and Ada María Isasi-Díaz approach the Biblical text with a hermeneutic of suspicion, not recognising it as the authoritative 'Word of God'. The Biblical text is judged more as a witness of socio-cultural conditions, religious, and political interests based on patriarchy. Schüssler Fiorenza (2001) conducts her exegesis through a hermeneutic of suspicion. This is evident when she states

Biblical readers are generally not aware that biblical histories are neither reports of events nor transcripts of facts but rather rhetorical constructions that have shaped the information available to their authors in light of their religious or political interests (Schüssler Fiorenza, 2001, p. 146).

Schüssler Fiorenza, and other feminist theologians regard this approach as a reflective and meaningful critique as part of a Biblical methodology. On the other hand, Lawson (1995, p. 155) argues that this hermeneutic of suspicion

addresses not only 'what is in the text', but also 'what is not in the text'. Due to the androcentric nature of Biblical interpretation, Schüssler Fiorenza (1999a) draws attention to the silences within the text, arguing that within the context of the textual world they contribute to determining textual meaning. It is argued in this study that it is the amplification of the context 'behind' and 'before' the text that gives the text its meaning. The hermeneutic of suspicion, and the hermeneutic of faith diverge at the point of divine inspiration of the Scriptures. Engaging with the Biblical text through a hermeneutic of suspicion is to regard the Bible as a literary classic, whereas engaging with the Biblical text through a hermeneutic of faith is to be open to the influence of the Holy Spirit whose purpose is to illuminate the text, and guide the exegete.

Suspicion within this methodology argues that a faith hermeneutic relates to suspicion of the androcentric interpretation of the text 'in the present', not necessarily the way the text was originally written by the author of the text 'in the past'. Erin White (1995, p. 143) claims that a "finely tuned feminist hermeneutic will move between past, present and future, between trust, suspicion, and hope"; a finely tuned hermeneutic in Whites analysis will include the element of faith. Schneiders (1991b, p. 13) concurs with this position when she states that Biblical criticism "can be incorporated into a faith-filled and faith-enhancing reading of the New Testament". The Biblical text when approached with a hermeneutic of faith regards God as faithful, a God who does not discriminate based on gender and therefore is inclusive of women in the functioning of the Church (cf: 1 Cor 1:9).

Schneiders (1991b) argues that if faith is understood as part of a belief in God, and if God is revealed in the text, then faith is required for an interpretation of the Biblical text. She claims that the Biblical text is for information and transformation; similarly Ricoeur (1981) claims the text requires readers to open themselves to become new selves; both draw attention to the transforming power of the Biblical text. The hermeneutic of faith becomes the defining difference as faith invites transformation whereas the person without faith engages with the text solely for information, and or historical literary critical inquiry. Schneiders' (1991b) critiques the faith element between believing and

non-believing scholars. Her critique includes a qualification that even among believing scholars there are those who do not associate the relationship between faith and the Bible as having “any practical bearing on the scholarly task of exegeting the text” (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 12). Nonetheless as she explains “there are other believing scholars who think that their faith and that of the Church must play an integral role in valid interpretation and that this in no way prejudices the scholarly objectivity of their work” (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 12). Between these two perspectives there are varying degrees of whether or not the Biblical text is inspired by God. Schneiders (1991b, p. 12) claims that at a fundamental level most readers, apart from whether or not they hold a faith hermeneutic, are attentive to the “importance of historical and literary contexts in determining the literal meaning of any text”. While the main objective is the translation and interpretation of any given text, it is argued that a scholar’s view can be influenced by their faith perspective; hermeneutical approach; theological biases; denominational position; acceptance of the role of doctrine; and understanding of tradition in the life of the Church.

When the Biblical text is examined faith is a prerequisite for a believer and central to the Gospel message (cf: 2 Cor 5:7, 8:7; Eph 3:12, 17; 1 Tim 1:2, 4, 5; 3:13; 4:1; 5:8). The Apostle Paul had a mission to proclaim the Gospel message, and faith in Jesus Christ is central to the Pauline message. Paul in his First Letter to Timothy refers to Timothy as his “loyal child in the faith” (1 Tim 1:2). Paul speaks frequently about the importance of faith (1 Tim 4:6; 5:8; 6:11), and how this can be eroded (1 Tim 1:19; 4:1; 6:10). Further, Paul writes to the Ephesians and urges them to “fight the good fight of the faith” (1 Tim 6:12). Therefore, as faith is central to Pauline theology and the Christian experience it is a legitimate hermeneutic. Gadamer (as cited in Grondin, 2002, pp. 136-137) argues for the “specificity of the question of faith” as a central hermeneutic. In this context he claims that the “notion that one is moved by the question of God, or faith, cannot be universalized, it is specific, and even crucial, for theological hermeneutics” (Grondin, 2002, pp. 136-137).

Parameters of the Methodology

The overall aim of the exegesis in this thesis is to establish whether the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15, as read, understood, and received by the Church today mirrors the intended meaning as written by the Apostle Paul in the First Century C.E. Given the uncertainty within scholarship about the PE being an authentic Pauline writing, the issue of authorship was addressed in Chapter One to assist credibility, reliability, and in order to sustain a valid theological argument in this study. The methodology in this thesis acknowledges that the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 cannot be segregated from other texts, and its socio-historical background. Included in the methodology is the merging of a spiritual element within the exegetical process that acknowledges the influence of the Holy Spirit in the interpretation of the Scriptures. In addition, the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is examined in the course of the exegesis by means of the theological principles present in the Pauline Corpus. The text throughout history includes an appraisal of textual transmission, an investigation of word usage in 1 Timothy 2:11-15, and a textual analysis by situating the text in its socio-cultural, political, and religious period. The text is also examined through the filtering system of the normative paradigm of patriarchy as this interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 has placed women on the periphery in the Church, and produced a history and culture of social, and religious conditioning. The thesis claims that such social and religious conditioning, which is part of patriarchal indoctrination, is prevalent to some extent in all sectors of the Church, impacting upon the lives of women and men, while it bestows a second class status upon women. To define the discrepancies and morbidity of the place designated to women, this study invokes the principle found within the symbolism of the metaphor 'within the veil'. Integral to this study is the argument that the rending of the veil heralded a New Covenant and an inclusive community that is not evident in a patriarchal reception, translation, and explanation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15.

The World of the Biblical Text

This methodology adopts an approach similar to Schneiders' (1991b) work as it examines the world 'behind' the text (the text as window); the world 'of' the text (the text as linguistic system and mirror); and the world 'before' the text (the text

as transformative) (p. 113). However, as she states “the weight of the interest is not equal” and more attention in this thesis is given to the world ‘of’ the text and the world ‘behind’ the Biblical text to understand its meaning (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 113). She argues that it is through this course of action that an “alternative reality” is created; in this study it is to produce a new reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 through exegetical analysis (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 167).

History demonstrates that the Biblical text rarely came under critical scrutiny from within the faith community for the first sixteen centuries of the Christian Era, however, since the time of the Renaissance, the text has been subject to historical criticism (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 98). When Biblical scholars began to apply fresh critical methods to the text their discoveries were disturbing. They found “scientific error in the text; they discovered historical mistakes or deliberate falsifications; they discovered evidence that the sacred authors to whom some of the books were attributed could not possibly have authored these works; they discovered evidence of multiple authorship and of successive redactions, or interpolations and emendations in the text” (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 98). This forms part of the world ‘behind’ the text and in Schneiders’ exegetical construction, how the Church receives the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is dependent on textual criticism in history. This then configures doctrine and theological positions, and the hermeneutics that direct the interpretation of the text. Another part of the world ‘behind’ the text, additional to Schneiders’ framework in this methodology is the ethos, socio-cultural, and religious practices of First Century Ephesus. It is argued that to fully understand the Biblical text in the Twenty-first Century, the First Century world of Ephesus must be understood.

While this study approaches the Biblical text as the ‘inspired Word of God’, it refers to an uncontaminated and uncorrupted Biblical text. Due to probable distortions of the text it is necessary to employ other methods apart from textual criticism in order that the inspired and sacred text is attributed its proper meaning. With such a potential for textual corruption over the centuries it is argued that 1 Timothy 2:11-15 has been traditionally translated, interpreted, and moderated through a normative paradigm of patriarchy. Therefore, the meaning

drawn from the text cannot be readily assimilated into Church praxis without an exegesis that extensively explores and authenticates the world 'of' the text; however this requires a reliable witness, and it is here that Schneiders' asks "who can testify" (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 134). Testifying is a complex process that has to be done through a range of exegetical tools that justify the meaning given to the text. Therefore, without an array of exegetical tools, analysis is more subject to exegetical fallacies; for example, semantic anachronisms or prosthesis when analysing syntactical units (Carson, 1996, pp. 33, 77).

The world 'before' the text is how the reader interacts with the text, the experiences of the reader, and how the text is interwoven into the reader's philosophical and theological worldview. It is at this point of understanding where the research questions are formed, and the goal becomes understanding in "an epistemological sense and an ontological sense" (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 158). That is, what is understood by Paul's statement in 1 Timothy 2:11-15, whether the traditional understanding is valid, and the consequences of meaning given to the Biblical text for the Church in the here and now.

Interpretation is the process of engagement in a dialectic of explanation and understanding; of finding meaning in the text and its appropriation in the life of the Church (Schneiders, 1991b, pp. 157-179). To understand or to interpret the text due to potential corruption, the reader and interpreter of meaning will need to explain what happened to the text in the intervening history since the First Century. Once a person has come to an understanding "in the epistemological sense" they are changed ontologically, and this is where transformation takes place (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 159). Explanation "is the process of more or less methodical interrogation of the text through techniques of investigation" (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 158). It is in this process where the 'fusion of horizons' occurs and the revelatory text is given meaning. At the intersection of 'explanation' and 'understanding' comes appropriation or in Schneiders' classification 'transformative understanding' (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 158). It is by this method of explanation and understanding that the meaning of 1 Timothy

2:11-15 is liberated, and becomes a transformative text, producing a paradigm shift.

Therefore, the task in the exegesis is to recognise the text as both 'window' and 'mirror'. As Schneiders explains, the 'window' into the text becomes a 'mirror' for the reader creating a world of meaning in the present, the contemporary world (Schneiders, 1991b, p. 113). The text as 'window' looks behind the text into history, and the ancient First Century world to generate textual meaning. The reader positioned 'before' the text in the contemporary world, and with access 'behind' the text becomes part of the multi-dimensional world of the text.

The Multiple Contextual Layers of the Methodology

As part of the interpretative process there are multiple layers of context to consider as identified in this research. First is the contextual understanding of the reader and how the text is received, which is the reader 'before' the text; for example, in patriarchal scholarship this would be the normative paradigm of patriarchy (theological beliefs and value systems). The context and analysis of the ancient world describes the world 'behind' the text. The world 'of' the text includes an examination of the text, its syntax, Pauline theology, and also how the reader and the Twenty-first Century context interact within these layers to create meaning.

In the postmodern world, patriarchal scholarship has fortified the place of women in the Church as subservient and inferior. This has been created by the traditionalist perspective with scholarly claims that the traditional translation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is based on the authority of the Biblical text. The goal of Biblical feminist scholarship is to examine evidence to correct the position that women are universally, and divinely ordained to be marginalised to the male dominated centre in the Church and home.

Conclusion

The distinguishing feature in this methodology is the multi-layered approach to re-examine the textual meaning given to 1 Timothy 2:11-15. How the reader engages with the Biblical text is a critical factor in exegesis; therefore, in this

study the reader becomes the thread that connects with the text, and integrates the multi-dimensional layers of the methodology. It has also been argued, that as exegesis has a Spiritual dimension, the presence of the Holy Spirit has an effect on the reader's reflexivity in the exegetical task. The Holy Spirit becomes *Testimonium Internum Spiritu Sanctu*.⁵⁴ Such a concept, while not readily accepted by all scholars, is a conventional standard for others. Chapter Three explored this concept, and the function of the Holy Spirit in relation to the Biblical text in the manuscripts attributed to Paul.

In summary, the methodological approach is inclusive of: 1) the use of a feminist hermeneutic of faith; 2) a hermeneutic of *analogia totius scripturae* or an analogy of the total Scriptures, the Biblical hermeneutic that Scripture interprets itself; 3) a hermeneutic of celebration through the use of the principle 'sola scriptura' or 'intertextuality' as God's liberation for women is found within the Biblical text. Employing these hermeneutic principles culminates in a hermeneutic of recuperation and reconstruction of the text to discover an alternative reality.

The major contribution of this research is found in the theological framework of the exegesis through the use of the metaphor 'within the veil'. Its significance to this study is that it is simultaneously both metaphor and an important theological principle for an interpretation of the subject text. The methodology has been structured in such a way that it examines the varying factors and constraints surrounding the traditional patriarchal reading. The multi-layer approach in the methodology allows the reader to observe the text as a 'window' and 'mirror' in the deconstruction of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Concurrently, a textual reconstruction is taking place with the objective of producing a new and alternative reading to liberate women, and the contemporary Church.

⁵⁴ *Testimonium Internum Spiritu Sanctu* is the belief that the Holy Spirit who inspired Scripture also authenticates and proves its divine origin through the Scripture itself. The concept was introduced by John Calvin, a French Protestant theologian in the Sixteenth Century.

Chapter Four examines the socio-cultural conditions of First Century Ephesus going into the world behind the text, and exploring the social, religious, and political milieu of the era when the early Christian Church was being established. The First Letter to Timothy was a personal pastoral letter from the Apostle Paul to encourage Timothy in his work with the young Church in Ephesus, and to guide him in managing the pressures and conflicts of the surrounding culture.

CHAPTER 4

Situating the Text in its Socio-Cultural Context

To understand the original intended meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 it is necessary to examine and analyse the world ‘behind’ the text; its socio-cultural environment, customs, and the religious practices of the era. It is the world ‘behind’ the text - the First Century world of Ephesus that forms the unwritten part of the text. According to research conducted as part of this thesis, Paul wrote his First Letter to Timothy around 62–66 C.E. At this time, religion and politics were closely interwoven, and infiltrated all aspects of life in the Roman Empire. Therefore, a cross-cultural perspective that connects the reader’s world with the world of the text, and the world ‘behind’ the text, is critical in the formation of textual meaning. Without examining the text in its differing contexts, the receptor will reconstruct the text from their own world perspective, a world that is shaped through socialisation, education, and tradition (Bird, 1997).

Paul and his co-workers had their own cultural heritage and religious traditions as they introduced a new religious movement and structure for God’s Church based on the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles.⁵⁵ The Book of Acts relates the story of how Paul, a Jew and Roman citizen had a dramatic conversion experience and became a passionate follower of Jesus Christ (cf: Acts Ch. 9). When Paul wrote to the Church in Galatia he states that he had been commissioned by divine authority, claiming that this came from “Jesus Christ and God the Father, who raised him [Jesus] from the dead” (Gal 1:1). Further,

⁵⁵ Paul, in his Letters to Timothy, encourages him to be a good minister of Jesus Christ, and warned him about false teachers (1 Tim 1:3-7; 4:1, 6; 2 Tim 2:17-18; 3:10). He also wrote to the Church in Corinth, after sending Timothy to them to remind them of the teachings of Jesus Christ (1 Cor 4:17). In the Book of Acts Paul speaks to the Athenians and the foreigners about this new teaching in the Areopagus (Acts 17:19-34).

Paul stated that the Gospel he proclaimed was received by divine revelation, and not from any human source (Gal 1:11-12).

Both Paul and his disciple Timothy had their own cultural backgrounds and education. Paul, when addressing King Agrippa, tells him about his cultural heritage explaining that prior to becoming a believer, he grew up as a Jew; he belonged to the strictest sect of the Jewish religion; and he lived as a Pharisee (cf: Acts Chap. 26). In view of this, it is likely that Paul had in-depth knowledge of the Jewish Torah, its laws, regulations, customs, and an understanding of the religious/socio-political systems of the Pharisaic sect with their anti-Hellenic views. Paul, commissioned by God, and an Apostle of Jesus Christ, was convinced his new mission was to preach the Gospel message. In contrast, it is very probable that Timothy was educated in both the Jewish and Greek cultures as his mother was a Jewish believer, and his father was Greek (Acts 16:1) Early converts to Christianity were both Jews and Greeks, living under Roman rule (cf: Acts Ch. 14). The record in the Book of Acts testifies to a number of socio-cultural contexts blending into a new socio-religious culture. Ephesus is a good example of a city with multiple cultural characteristics; it was governed by Roman authorities, whilst its citizens had Greco-Roman and Jewish cultural backgrounds. This cultural mix of social customs, religious practices, laws, and regulations was what confronted Paul and Timothy in the establishment of the early Church. Their foremost mission was to merge these different cultural mores and customs into a new and united Christian culture.

In the ancient world it was not uncommon for cities, regions, and even nations, as part of a polytheistic culture to worship more than one god. Within this context, Paul's commission was to promote a belief in one God. In doing so, he faced opposition, including accusations by Epicurean and Stoic philosophers as "being a proclaimer of foreign divinities" (Acts 17:18). At one stage, Paul was supported in his mission by a vision from the Lord, and he was told not to be silent (Acts 18:9). Paul continued to remain faithful to his mission of proclaiming the Gospel, despite much opposition.

From Paul's First Letter to Timothy, it appears that Timothy has to address a number of issues that were current in the *ekklesia* at Ephesus. Given the

religious milieu of the city it was likely that the influences of the Hellenistic culture, other cultural conditions, and the expectation of worshipping Artemis were impacting on Timothy's ministry. Due to the socio-cultural and religious circumstances, it is argued that the primary problem for Timothy related to the Hellenistic culture in Ephesus, and the presence and pressure borne by the requirements of cultic worship. This was in direct opposition to the teachings of Jesus Christ and the Apostles. Paul in his communication to Timothy warned him to expect that in the later days or 'End Times', some would renounce the faith and be misled through deceitful spirits and the teachings of demons (1 Tim 4:1-2). As Nyland (2004, p. 541) states, the city was "well known historically as a centre for magical practices, spell casting and the conjuring of evil spirits....the New Testament links Ephesus [sic] with much demonic activity". All of this confronted Timothy as a young minister and his task was to ensure that such activity and cultic teaching did not permeate Church teachings.

Therefore, the mission of the early Church was to convince people to turn away from influences of cultic worship and demonic practices, away from the Kingdom of Satan to the Kingdom of God. The wider message of the Gospel to the early Church was to reject the worship of pagan gods, and instead, worship the one true God.⁵⁶ It is recorded in the Book of Acts that when Paul spoke to the Corinthians he told them that they were not to think of God as likened to gold, silver or stone, that is, an idol image (Acts 17:29). Through Timothy, Paul appeals to the Ephesians to turn away from all false gods and false teachings (1 Tim 4:1; 2 Tim 3:108). Paul explains that God up until the New Covenant Era had overlooked the ignorance of humanity but now was commanding everyone to repent from idol worship (Acts 17:30). He was so intent that believers should separate themselves from idol worship when writing to the Church in Corinth, Paul exhorts them to "*flee* from the worship of idols" (1 Cor 10:14).

This chapter peers through the window of the Biblical text to the First Century world of the ancient city of Ephesus. It is argued that in researching the socio-

⁵⁶ Cf: Acts 26:18; 1 Cor 8:6; Eph 4:6; 1 Thess 1:9; 1 Tim 2:5.

cultural and religious allegiance of the citizens of the city, light will be shed on the meaning of the Biblical text under inquiry. The chapter also explores the place of women in the ancient world to discover how this may have fashioned cultural expectations for women in the New Covenant Church.

The Ancient City of Ephesus

The ancient city of Ephesus was an Ionian city situated on the coast of Asia Minor (Jenott, 2004). Archaeological discoveries of coinage have revealed that Androkolos, son of Athenian, King Kodros is depicted on the coins. This would suggest that the Ephesians acknowledged Androklos as the city's founder, thus dating the city's foundation to 1000 B.C.E. with Ionian migration.⁵⁷ In the establishment of the early Church in Ephesus Paul, and Timothy were proclaiming the Gospel message to a culturally diverse community, but with mainly Hellenistic religious practices. As W. M. Ramsay (1901, p. 174) states, Ephesus was a religious centre long before it "became a political capital".

The city of Ephesus with its cultural diversity had developed over many centuries. From the Sixth Century B.C.E. when Ephesus was invaded by King Croesus of Lydia the city continued to come under foreign rule (Baugh, 2005b); however by 547 B.C.E., the city was under Persian rule (Meyers, 1985, p. 270). In 412 B.C.E., Ephesus participated in a revolt against Athens and joined with Sparta in the Second Pelponesian War, but later returned to Greek rule under Alexander the Great in 334 B.C.E. (Dean, 1999). However, this period was more accurately recognised as a time of Macedonian rule, rather than Greek, as prior to this Alexander the Great was King of Macedon (Jenott, 2004). After Alexander the Great died in 323 B.C.E., the city was captured by Lysimachos who reconstructed a new fortified city at Mt Pion. Ephesus was secured by the Seleucid kingdom just before the death of Lysimachos (d. 281 B.C.E.), but later came back under Roman rule following the Battle of Magnesia in 190 B.C.E.

⁵⁷ Professor Barbara Burrell (Cincinnati University) completed this research in 2002 whilst a Senior Research Fellow at the Australian Centre for Ancient Numismatic Studies (ACANS). Cf: Ancient History Department, Macquarie University, Sydney, NSW, *The Coinage of Ephesus*. Retrieved 15 May 2006, <http://online.mq.edu.au/pub/ACANSCAE/chapters/chapter05.htm>.

(Jenott, 2004). By 133 B.C.E. Ephesus was part of the Attalid Kingdom, and became the capital of the 'Roman Province of Asia' (Dean, 1999).

Even with centuries of foreign influence, Ephesus was seen to remain firmly "rooted in its Greek cultural heritage (language, architecture (sic), fashion)" (Jenott, 2004, para. 4). First Century Ephesus - while subject to Roman control - operated as a 'free city' having its own currency, and under the rule of its own council (Jenott, 2004). Under the reforms introduced by Augustus, Ephesus was one of the most prominent and influential cities in Asia Minor, having peace and prosperity that lasted well into the Third Century (Strelan, 1996, p. 43).

The Temple of Artemis and Cultic Worship

The cult of Artemis was similar to the Cult of Asherah,⁵⁸ who worshipped the Canaanite goddess, recorded in the OT account⁵⁹ (cf: 1 Kings 15:13, 18:19; 2 Kings 21:7). In the ancient world, it was common for nations to worship gods and goddesses. For example, the Egyptian equivalent of Artemis was the goddess Isis; the goddess Astarte in Mesopotamia; the goddess Cybele in Anatolia; and the goddess Rhea in Greece (Seval, 1986). During the time of Paul, inscriptional evidence points to the worship of Artemis, Demeter, Kore, and other gods in the *Prytaneion* (town hall) (Meyers, 1985, pp. 249-250).

The Artemision and Eusebeia

The Temple of Artemis, and its religious significance was central to the socio-economic and political functioning of Ephesus. Consequently, religious activities formed the foundation of the social structure and prosperity of the city. Strelan (1996, p. 27) states that the "statues of gods, heroes, and distinguished citizens – and there were thousands of such statues in Ephesus – were visible

⁵⁸ For a more detailed study of the Cult of Asherah see the work of Hadley, J.M. (2000). *The Cult of Asherah in Ancient Israel and Judah*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

⁵⁹ Throughout the Biblical account of the OT, the God of the Hebrews (YHWH) warned the Israelites against worshipping other gods, in order to remain in favour with YHWH (cf: Ex 20:3; Deut 8:19; 13:13; Jer 16:10-13; 25:6).

reminders of the duty of citizens and of the protection and goodness of their gods and benefactors”.

In Ephesus, there are archaeological remains, including pottery found nearby the Temple of Artemis, dating to the Fourteenth Century B.C.E. Archaeologists are now of the belief that a cult existed in Ephesus beginning in that period.⁶⁰ In more recent decades, objects found on site show that the temple was built under an Eastern influence, not Greek as was first thought by scholars.⁶¹ The original temple of Artemis was a stone building built in the Seventh Century B.C.E. (Milne, 1985, p. 66). The destruction of the temple has been dated to an invasion of Cimmerians in 660 B.C.E., and was later restored by the Lydian King, Croesus (Milne, 1985). In 356 B.C.E. the temple was burnt down by Herostratus (LiDonnici, 1992, p. 400). According to Plutarch, this tragic event happened because “it was the night of Alexander’s birth, and Artemis had travelled north to assist” (Thomas, 1995, p.99). These were the types of cultic beliefs and practices held in this Era - as Plutarch associated the loss of the Artemision to Artemis’ absence; thereby demonstrating the strong interconnectedness of politics and religion (LiDonnici, 1992, p. 402). Subsequently, the worship of gods and goddesses was assimilated into every part of daily life through mythological legends and beliefs.

The city of Ephesus, known as the ‘Gateway to Asia’, was a prosperous city, and the people wanted to build a temple to their goddess that was “larger and more beautiful than any other temple ever built before” (Seval, 1986, p.15). Gaincarlo Biguzzi (1998) draws attention to the importance and splendour of the Artemision constructed entirely of marble. The temple was a place of worship, and an international banking centre. Biguzzi (1998, p. 279) states that the Artemision was “a pillar of economic solidity for Ephesus and the whole of Asia”.

⁶⁰ Cf: Ancient History Department Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved 20 May, 2006, <http://online.mq.edu.au/pub/ACANSCAE/chapters.htm>.

⁶¹ Cf: The Temple of Artemis: One of the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World. Retrieved 12 June, 2006, <http://www.ancientroute.com./Monument/7wonders/Artemis.htm>.

In Ephesus, it was “difficult to function without being involved in polytheistic cults because such cults were woven together with most aspects of the life of the city” (Borgen, 1995, p.37).⁶² Strelan (1996, p. 53) states that

Biblical scholars have generally ignored the significance of myths and rituals when discussing the state of the Artemis cult in Ephesus. But to do so is to ignore a very complex mythical system which gave Ephesus its ‘soul’ and gave the majority of its inhabitants a strong sense of belonging and ownership.

The integration of religious and socio-political life in Ephesus was known as *Eusebeia* and “was not simply a dimension of life, it was city life....the term fundamentally meant right relationships, including those of marriage, family, and city, but also with the gods” (Strelan, 1996, p. 28). Due to *Eusebeia*, there were superstitious practices, rituals, and festivals held to guarantee the stability of life in the city and in order to appease the gods.

Even under Roman rule, Ephesus maintained its religious importance. LiDonnici (1992) explains that in the latter part of the First Century, Artemis was recognised as the warden of the people, the legitimate wife of the city of Ephesus, and trustee of the financial resources of the Artemision for the next generation; so great was her influence. As LiDonnici (1992, p. 409) states there was no one more powerful in Ephesus than Artemis, and she was recognised as the protector, provider, and guardian of the people. She held the controlling power in the city and everyone was reliant on the goddess for their safety and security.

⁶² Cf: in addition to this reference: Oster, R. (1990). Ephesus as a Religious Centre under the Principate 1: Paganism before Constantine. *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II*, 18(3), 1661-1728; Strelan, R. (1996). *Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Given that Artemis was the controlling power, honouring and worshipping the goddess in Ephesus was essential to the well-being and livelihood of the city's citizens. As well as Artemis, there were other gods, iconic statues, and imperial cults that pervaded civilization in Ephesus in the First Century. Strelan (1996, p. 3) argues that "while non-biblical scholars such as Price and Friesen have shown interest in the imperial cult in Ephesus, biblical scholars only recently have begun to look more closely at that politico-religious aspect of Ephesian society". Therefore, it is argued that the full extent of the power and control of cultic worship, and its influence on early Christianity is an area of research that requires further attention.

There were consequences for the citizens of Ephesus if they did not participate in the city's religious practices. Accordingly, those who did not participate in cultic worship were severely punished, such was the importance given to cultic practices (Schüssler Fiorenza, 1985). There was little tolerance for those who would not give Artemis the respect and homage she deserved: one inscription shows where a capital sentence was given to several dozen men when they disrupted a festival held in her honour (Horsley, 1992). On one occasion "Heraclitus, an Ephesian philosopher...had been banished from Ephesus for daring to speak against the cultic practices of those with power, and against the common will of the people" (Strelan, 1996. p. 36). As Strelan's (1996, p. 37) research showed, in the ancient world anyone who spoke out against the religious authorities were at risk, including Christian prophets spreading the Gospel of Christ particularly "if their message was made public beyond the setting of Jewish and Christian communities".

Despite the intimidation of punishment, the early Church thrived as it countered cultic practices well into the Second Century. As Pliny's writing about the Christians to Trajan in 112 C.E. revealed, the Christian faith was becoming a grave threat to regular cult worship (Koester, 1995a).⁶³ This is confirmed by the Biblical account in the Book of Acts that records there was great apprehension

⁶³ Pliny's letter and Trajan's response are the oldest extent pagan documents about Christianity.

in Ephesus at the thought that Artemis could be deprived of her majesty that caused all of Asia, and the world to worship her (Acts 19:27). Wherever the Gospel message was taken, people were required to turn away from other gods and idols to serve a living and true God (1 Thess 1:9). Christianity introduced an entirely new culture into the dominant Hellenistic religious culture; one that was deep-rooted in the commercial, political, and socio-religious life of Ephesus.

Artemis Ephesia

Artemis Ephesia was worshipped throughout the Hellenistic and Roman Empire. Biguzzi's (1998, p. 279) research illustrates the significance of Artemis in the socio-cultural life of Ephesus and the entire Mediterranean world as "the image of Artemis was reproduced an infinite number of times on coins, votive statuettes, votive offerings, house decorations, as well as in the branch temples". The Biblical account records Ephesus as the great temple warden of the goddess Artemis (cf: Acts 19:35).

It was common in the ancient world for cities to have a goddess who would be a 'protector' and 'provider' of the people (Oster, 1990, pp. 1700–1706). While the elements of 'protector' and 'provider' had always been representative of the Ephesians' reliance on Artemis, LiDonnici (1992) explains that these functions Artemis performed for the citizens "became more generalized and universalized under Roman rule" (p. 405). She argues that it was Artemis as the central icon and premium goddess of Ephesus that wove the history of the people together (LiDonnici, 1992). Therefore, life in the city was inextricably interwoven with their religious cultic icon. Further, Dowsett (2002) argues the "fertility of people, animals and crops was believed to be dependent on acceptable worship at Artemis's shrine, so that associated trade was the bedrock of the economy for miles around" (p. 621). In the ancient world it was quite common for nations to have fertility icons, for example, in Egypt, Isis was considered a goddess of fertility relating to both motherhood and crops (Padfield, 2002). Not all scholars, however, believe there is enough evidence to support the view of Artemis as a goddess of fertility (Baugh, 1999). Nonetheless, she had a powerful influence on every aspect of life despite scholarly disagreement about the extensiveness

of her role. However, as a 'protector' and 'provider' for the people, it could be argued that this would extend to the fertility of people, their animals, and crops. There were two common but different representations of the goddess Artemis likely due to socio-political changes, as this dominated religious life in the ancient world. The Hellenistic Artemis was recognised by the Greeks as Artemis Ephesia, whereas Diana was the goddess of the Romans (Baugh, 2005b, p. 24). The earliest coins in the ancient world were dated from the Third Century B.C.E., and Artemis Ephesia is represented on these as a huntress (Thomas, 1995). Statues in Greece depicted Artemis with a bow and arrow and a deer or stag, similar to the goddess Cybele. It was not until the Second Century B.C.E. that Artemis Ephesia with her necklaces, and multiple round protuberances appear on the coinage of Ephesus.

LiDonnici (1992, p. 392) claims that the image of Artemis, with her multiple protuberances, was common with other Hellenistic and Greco-Roman Anatolian religious statues as shown with a "fourth-century B.C.E. votive relief of Zeus of Labraunda". Christine Thomas (1995) claims that Artemis Ephesia with the heavily figured necklaces, multiple rounded protuberances between the necklaces and waistband, and a tightly wrapped skirt with tile-like rectangular fields filled with animal motifs was also a common feature with other Anatolian cult statues. She states that it is this image of Artemis, which is evidence of the city's Anatolian heritage that later became popular throughout the Hellenistic Period (Thomas, 1995, p.86). Such a depiction of Artemis is also attested to by archaeological discoveries through excavations of the ancient city of Ephesus.⁶⁴ Artemis' multi-breasted image was housed in the temple in Ephesus, and as part of the mythology and folklore surrounding Artemis she was reputed to have come directly from the god, Zeus (Lockyer, 1986, pp. 345-346). Robert Fleischer (1973) has catalogued the representations of Artemis Ephesia that

⁶⁴ Cf: The Ancient History Department Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved 15 May, 2006, <http://online.mq.edu.au/pub/ACANSCAE/chapters.htm>.

appeared on cistophoric coinage. By far, it was the image of Artemis with her multiple protuberances that is the most frequent on its coins.⁶⁵

There are a number of mythological stories regarding this breast-like ornamentation of Artemis who was the icon of the pagan cult. Explanations of the symbolism of the pectorals that were part of the Artemis figurine have included that they were: representative of a swarm of male bees impregnating Artemis; testicles of bulls sacrificed by the priest in the temple rituals; a sign of fertility as the goddess represented an offering of semen; or the breasts represented nurturance and motherhood (Seval, 1986). All of these theories relate to Artemis as the protector, nurturer, and provider of the people; - the benefits were received as the citizens participated in worship rituals and practices. As Clinton Arnold (1993, p. 250) explains, the city of Ephesus held Artemis Ephesia in such esteem as a 'protector' and 'provider' that this was similar to a binding agreement; and a divinely directed covenant between the goddess and the citizens of the city. Artemis' subjects in turn worshipped her through cultic rituals to continue to receive favour from the goddess. Amongst other rituals of the Artemis cult, the discovery of coins by archaeologists attests to a divination practice conducted before the image of Artemis.⁶⁶ Such were the cultic practices happening in Ephesus when Paul wrote his First Letter to Timothy. To accept the Gospel message, a significant socio-cultural, and religious paradigm shift was required by the citizens of Ephesus.

The Place of Women in the Ancient World

Inherent in the culture of the ancient world was a belief that women were different to men in nature and therefore, inferior. Such a belief dates back to

⁶⁵ Cf: The Ancient History Department Macquarie University, Sydney, Australia. Retrieved 15 May, 2006, <http://online.mq.edu.au/pub/ACANSCAE/chapters.htm>.

⁶⁶ The Ancient History Department, Macquarie University, Sydney, found that the ritual depicted two naked boys throwing knucklebones (animal vertebrae) that were used for gambling in temples for prophecy. D. G. Hogarth in his excavations of the temple of Artemis found many such knucklebones: natural bones, and ivory imitations (some with gold or amber decorations). Retrieved 15 May, 2006, <http://online.mq.edu.au/pub/ACANSCAE/chapters/chapter08.htm>.

the time of Aristotle (384–322 B.C.E.). Aristotle's view of the world included a philosophy about natural history, and he concluded that as women were inferior by nature, they were incompetent to take any position of prominence or leadership (Bristow, 1988, p. 5). In the ancient world there was a dualistic way of thinking: soul/body; heaven/earth; spiritual/earthy; master/slave; male/female; and husband/wife. The views on women in the ancient world had its foundation in the Aristotelian philosophical notion of the soul over the body (Malone, 2001). In the ancient world men were deemed to be more powerful, and by nature, rulers, and therefore, superior to women (Malone, 2001, p. 79). As women were inferior by nature, this belief over time became firmly entrenched as part of the culture, the customs, and the belief systems of the people.

Women in the Roman Empire

Even though Ephesus was very much a Hellenistic city, the Roman culture had a marked influence on everything that happened in the city (Cotter, 1994). The Roman government viewed the synagogue *synodos* (assembly) as similar to a private association or a religious club. For that reason, it could enjoy the support of its patrons as it met for religious and social reasons (Torjesen, p.17). At the same time, everyone in the Roman Empire was expected to follow Roman laws and codes of behaviour.

In the First Century, Roman society was established on a ranked order of five social classes according to wealth; - the senatorial and equestrian classes as the highest were given the privilege and position of ruling classes (Eisenstadt & Roniger, 1984). Shmuel Eisenstadt and Luis Roniger (1984, pp. 52-53) explain that there were three types of patron-client relationships: 1) between either the senatorial and equestrian classes, and another person of lower standing; 2) between either the senatorial and equestrian classes, and a foreign community who sought particular favours from the relationship, such as protection; 3) and one of *amicitia* (friendship), whereby the relationship between the patron and the client maintained more of an equal social status. Through the patronage system, women acquired many of the institutionalised forms of honour that were generally reserved for men (Torjesen, 1993). In contrast to women in Athens, and Corinth, women in Asia Minor held public and cultic offices, priesthoods,

and other positions of great honour - apart from those conferred through the patronage system (Witherington, 1988). The difference between Roman and Greek women was that even though Roman women were controlled by the *pater-familias* system they were given more freedom and were included in social events; whereas Greek women lived more secluded lives (Cotter, 1994).

Inscriptional evidence shows that Romanised women were not fully defined by their father, husband, or guardian. They did have their own individual identity; however this was restricted to the home and social events (Cotter, 1994). However, in the polis, the public and political life belonged to Roman men. Even though the stereo-type in the Greco-Roman world was for women to remain in the domestic domain, wealthy women did hold positions of leadership in the First Century. For example, there is evidence from Pliny the Younger, that Aristio's (one of the leading citizens in Ephesus), wife held a high office in the city "during the last decade of the First Century C.E. and into the next" (Strelan, 1996, p. 33). Strelan (1996, p. 120) claims that in Asia Minor twenty-eight women held the position of *prytanis* (a high ranking office involving the finances and cultic life of the city) in eight cities in the first three centuries of the Common Era; thirty-seven women held the position of *stephanephoroi* (positions of high public profile and prestige) in seventeen cities over five centuries; and eighteen women in fourteen different cities held the position of *agonothetis* (a position of responsibility for contests). Therefore, contrary to the view that women were confined to the domestic domain, there is inscriptional evidence to depict that women were also active in civic and religious life in the ancient world. Furthermore, inscriptional evidence shows there were at least fifteen women *archiereiai* (women high priests) that existed over a time span of two centuries (Barnett, 1989). Horsley claims that "women were *archiereis Asiae* in their own right as well as men" (Horsley, 1992, p. 138). Altogether, there is only one contested inscription showing that women held the function of *asiarch* (high priest) in Ephesus (Horsley, 1992).

In the face of this evidence, Baugh (2005b, p. 32) argues that for women to hold the position of high priest in an Imperial Cult is "nothing new" as "women held various priesthood from the earliest times in the Greco-Roman state cults and

particularly in earlier ruler cults honouring Hellenistic queens”. Notwithstanding this, he argues that this does not necessarily indicate a “shift of views on the familial roles for women in Asia or in Ephesus” but only that the priesthoods in various cults were held by daughters and wives of wealthy families (Baugh, 2005b, pp. 32-33). Contrary to Baugh’s (2005b) analysis, Evans (1983a, p. 39) argues that the shift in women’s roles was central to the emerging Church and that “emancipation was taking place, but was largely restricted to the wealthier classes, and even then did not go unopposed”. Even if this was the case, and women held public and religious roles in the ancient world, there were inconsequential changes to the general cultural attitudes towards women - even in the Christian Era (Fustel de Coulanges, 1955). Patriarchal cultural attitudes remained dominant and are evident today as scholars continue to engage in the polemic about the role of women in the ancient world to justify women’s place in the Church and home in the Twenty-first Century.

The Place of Jewish Women

The Jewish culture was hierarchical and men occupied the positions of greatest authority. As Bird (1997, p. 93) states, men performed “the priestly service in both sacrificial and oracular functions”. This was similar to other cults in the Ancient Near East where the priestly office was largely reserved for males. It is speculated, in the Israelite cultus, that women participated through maintenance and support roles; however, this is not well documented in Biblical accounts (Bird, 1997). Essentially, it was a division of labour that corresponded to the larger society. In Jewish culture, women were deemed to be a possession and came under the ownership and authority of men. Jewish men would give thanks to God that they were not born a woman so demeaning was the place of women. In the Jewish culture, the Tenth Commandment⁶⁷ was used as a means to subjugate women as they were considered to be a man’s possession, and thus could be stolen. The commandment was taken entirely out of context

⁶⁷ Neither shall you covet your neighbor’s wife. Neither shall you desire your neighbor’s house, or field, or male or female slave, or ox, or donkey, or anything that belongs to your neighbor (Deut 5:21).

as it was stating that no one should desire or want anything belonging to a neighbour. In fact, the objective of the Tenth Commandment was to address a wrong attitude or intent; it was not an edict that women were possessions to be coveted (Bristow, 1988). This shows the danger in isolating Biblical text to give it meaning, as did the Jews with their customs, and attitudes to women.

Notwithstanding the general treatment of Jewish women, there is evidence that they did hold leadership positions in their religious structures. The place of women in synagogue services is well attested by inscriptions, and evidence shows women were both elders and synagogue leaders in the First Century. There are three Jewish inscriptions that attest to female priests from the First Century B.C.E. to the Fourth Century C.E. (Nyland, 2004, p. 548). As well, Nyland names six women identified through inscriptional evidence that attests to there being Jewish women elders (Nyland, 2004, p. 548). Torjesen (1993, p.18) augments the argument when she states “inscriptions reveal a dimension of leadership not always conveyed in theological histories”, and that this leadership was extended to the office of elder in Christian communities. Also, there was at least one case of a woman, in the Second Century who was head of the synagogue in Smyrna (not far from Ephesus), and it is concluded from this and other inscriptional evidence that there were women leaders and elders in synagogues throughout Asia Minor (Arnold & Saucy, 2001). However, Arnold and Saucy (2001) accommodate the evidence through the normative paradigm of patriarchy, claiming that such evidence is the basis for the exclusion of women from leadership roles in the Church. While this may have occurred in the ancient world, they argue it is not part of the NT order (Arnold & Saucy, 2001).

Household Codes in the New Testament Church

The household codes in the ancient world give insight into the structures and customs of this era, and the role and place of women. According to Baugh (2005b, p. 13) there is very little scholarly research on women’s roles and function in civic and religious life in ancient Asia Minor, in particular, in Ephesus. What is known is that women in the Roman Empire were subservient and subsidiary to men. In the Greco-Roman world, the central figure in the family

was male; a woman was subject in every way to her husband, and her role was basically for reproduction and to meet the needs of her husband as part of the 'cult of the hearth' (Fustel de Coulanges, 1955, pp. 41-51). Roman women were controlled by the legality of the code of *'patria potestas'* and all women were under the *'manus'* or authority of their husband (Evans, 1983a, p. 39). The male head of the Roman household, known as the *pater-familias* had complete control and power over his wife, children, and slaves; for the woman, quietness and submission for the woman were virtues that were highly valued. It was the household code that detailed the duties and relationships within the family.

The Biblical texts of Ephesians 5:21-6:9 and Colossians 3:18-19 are commonly referred to as the 'household codes' for the Church. The system of 'household codes' was common from the time of Aristotle and is known as the *Haustafeln* (Hawthorne et al., 1993, p. 587). The household codes were introduced by all cultural groups under the governance of the Roman Empire to prevent retaliation from Roman officials. Timothy Gombis (2005, p. 317) argues that most scholars have an "apologetic trust in Ephesians, viewing it as an attempt to shield the new Christian movement from the suspicion that it might undermine contemporary social structures and ultimately threaten the stability of the Roman Empire". He argues that the *Haustafeln* is part of the 'new humanity', and Paul's "exhortations [in Ephesians 5] are radical in that they directly confront and subvert the social structures of contemporary society" (Gombis, 2005, p. 330). On the one hand, Gombis (2005) sees Paul as confronting and radical; however, he also sees Paul as supporting a hierarchical Church structure. He claims that Paul is subversive by claiming that the notion of 'headship; is for the benefit of the woman, for her protection, and nurturance in her subordinate role to her husband (Gombis, 2005, p. 326). Such a conclusion is questionable as it accepts the Biblical text on face value, and suggests that Paul would want to deceive the government by articulating a household code that would be acceptable to Roman rule. To take the argument a step further, it could be concluded that such a household code is suggestive that in the emerging Church structure the husband is taking the place of Artemis. At the same time, such an argument is problematic as it seems unlikely that Paul

would instigate a model for the Christian home similar to the ritualistic practices for the worship of Artemis, and not place Jesus Christ at the centre of Christian worship.

Further, it is argued that when the writings of Paul are closely examined they reveal that he introduces a 'new' type of household code. The code of the 'new life' required everyone was to be imitators of Christ as part of the family of God - shown in loving relationships (Eph 5:1-2). Secondly, the relationship in the family was one of mutual support (Eph 5:21) and servanthood (Mt 20:26: Mk 9:35). Paul identifies himself as a servant on a number of occasions, and refers to Tychicus as a "beloved brother, a faithful minister and a fellow servant" (cf: Rom 1:1; Eph 3:7; Col 4:7). In his First Letter to Timothy, Paul writes about deceptive spirits and after this, instructs Timothy in the requirements of a good minister (1 Tim 4:1). Paul states that "if you put these instructions before your brothers and sisters, you will be a good servant of Christ Jesus, nourished on the words of the faith and of the sound teaching you have followed" (1 Tim 4:6). He then exhorts Timothy to train himself in godliness (1 Tim 4:6-8). This study thereby argues that the Christian household code in the Pauline context consists of growing to maturity, growing in holiness, and serving one another in mutual love and support (cf: Eph 5:21-33).

There are scholars who argue against the traditional reading of the Biblical text as conforming to a hierarchical structure for the Church, as it is not consistent with a wider interpretation of the text (I. Howard Marshall, 2004b). For instance, the ambiguity of the text in Ephesians (cf: Ch. 5) is evident when other texts, and the context are examined. On one hand, Marshall (2004b, p. 188) argues that the shift in the postmodern world is from 'slavery' to 'employment' and there is emphasis on justice and fairness; however, this is not an equal relationship but a contractual relationship. He draws attention to the text in Ephesians as being a "concealed hermeneutical trap" for readers if "significant modification" is not applied to an interpretation in the Twenty-first Century (I. Howard Marshall, 2004b, p. 187). On the other hand, Marshall's analysis can be readily contradicted as employment can be seen as a contractual relationship of equals. With equality in sight Towner (2006) argues for caution given that there

is potential for those outside the Church structure to misinterpret the egalitarian household code of the new and emerging Church. He states that, in the Church an unequal gender relationship more than likely occurred as “both the social structure and the physical structures of the ancient household reflect the hierarchical system” (Towner, 2006, p. 713). When the Pauline texts are further examined, for example in 1 Corinthians 12:13 and Galatians 3:28, a range of new social customs is evident and Towner (2006, p. 714) argues that this reflects the “egalitarian promises” of the Gospel. Even then, two thousand years later, despite the ‘egalitarian promises’ these promises are not fully reflected or practiced in Church governance in the Twenty-first Century.

It is argued that the hierarchical structure and women’s submission to their husbands would have been voluntarily accepted in the First Century Greco-Roman world as it “was what their pagan society had always taught” (Davids, 2004, p. 227). It was firmly established in their customs and culture’ however, in the new and emerging Church structure, Fee (2004b, p. 375) argues that within the Ephesian text there is “a lack of explicit teaching on patriarchy as the norm in the new creation, to derive a theology of patriarchy from the Ephesians’ passage would thus seem to be a dubious form of theologizing at best.” Further, Fee (2002, p. 8) argues that the household is a type of “nucleus of the larger Christian community”. He goes on to explain that as a “basic sociological model” of patronage and production, the First Century household was based on “mutual relationships between unequals” - all for the benefit of each other (Fee, 2002, p. 6). As Fee explains, the *familia* is a Latin term for which English has no exact equivalent and it included blood relatives and others; for example, slaves (Fee, 2002). He argues that there was already a “semi-public” aspect to the home or household in the First Century that formed a new type of kinship “where Christ was now the new *paterfamilias*” (Fee, 2002, p. 6). The place of women in the new emerging Church structure: the household of God, thereby becomes transformational. The New Covenant reality heralds a new understanding of the place of women. Fee’s argument is noteworthy as it provides a new dimension to understanding the ‘headship’ principle, and the hypothetical hierarchy that places men at the apex in the post-modern world of the Church and home. Accordingly, it is argued that men are now superseded

by Jesus Christ, and women and men relate directly to him who holds the authority of the household, not men - as is commonly taught from a patriarchal reading of the Biblical text.

Conclusion

Situating the text in its socio-cultural context provides a mirror into the First Century world of the text. When the culture and customs of the First Century world are examined, it questions whether the place of women in the Church conscripted by patriarchy is visceral rather than Biblical. It is evident that while the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 was situated in an era of patriarchal domination, women did hold authoritative leadership roles in the First Century. Nonetheless, this is an area that requires further scholarly research.

It has been established that the First Century world was a polytheistic religious culture, and Ephesus was dominated by Hellenistic pagan influences as citizens worshipped and revered their goddess Artemis. The commission of Paul, Timothy and others in the early Church in Ephesus was to counteract the prevailing Hellenistic and pagan cult worship practices. As was discussed, worship practices in the city were assimilated into every facet of life and known as *Eusebeia*. Religious practices were so intermingled with life in the city that they could not be separated from the socio-economic and political life of the city. As part of an exegesis, this chapter explored the extent and impact that socio-cultural conditions had on the meaning given to the Biblical text.

In the city of Ephesus the citizens trusted in the goddess Artemis to be their 'protector' and 'provider' and in return she was revered and worshipped throughout the city. In the ancient world, the rituals in the worship of gods and goddesses was required as "the whole life and happiness of the State depended on the proper performance of these necessary duties" (Warde-Fowler 1963, p. 116). As part of worship practices, certain rituals and purification processes had to be followed, including sacrificial rituals similar to the requirements in the Tabernacle as part of the Mosaic Covenant. The power that Artemis had over the city cannot be underestimated. As Strelan (1996, p. 69)

states “the religion of the goddess permeated almost every facet and stratum of urban life during almost all the first three centuries of the Roman Empire”.

It was the impact of Artemis and Hellenistic religious practices that affected the establishment of the early Church. Rather than the responsibilities of ‘protector’ and ‘provider’ transferring to God, it appears that the early Church were still involved in pagan myths and unsound or heretical teachings other than those of the Gospel message. Paul writes his First Letter to Timothy to address such issues (1 Tim 2:3-7). To give authority to anyone other than God to be the ‘protector’ and ‘provider’ is akin to engaging in pagan worship. In effect, the person who is the ‘protector’ and ‘provider’ becomes the focus of worship and therefore, an idol. Those who participate are engaging in idolatrous practices; if men place themselves in the position of ‘protector’ and ‘provider’ they are thereby placing themselves in a position reserved only for God, and women who pay them homage are engaging in idolatry. Further, it is argued that this is inconsistent to the commands of God found in the Biblical text that state there shall be no other God before the one true God (cf: Deut 5:7; 8:19; 11:16; 28:14; 2 Kings 17:35). For a believer to place themselves in a place reserved only for God is a very precarious place to be.

There was much opposition to Paul introducing a new and counter cultural paradigm that included women in the Church structure. Ruth Edwards (Edwards, 1989, p. 77) argues that Jesus did exactly the same as he “was not interested in founding a hierarchy, but rather something more akin to a family, whose members serve one another”. Paul’s actions were therefore, counter cultural to patriarchal Jewish traditions, and the patriarchal paradigm present in the *patria potestas* Roman household code. However, as the Church becomes more politicised and institutionalised the role of women goes into decline. Torjesen (1993, p. 6) explains how over time this paradigm shift occurred. She states that the

legitimacy of women’s leadership roles was fiercely contested. In the polemical writings of this period we encounter for the first time the arguments that Jesus appointed only male disciples and therefore

women cannot be ordained; that Paul instructed women to keep silent during public discussions and thus women cannot teach; that if Jesus had wanted women to baptize, he would have been baptized by his mother, Mary. Although these arguments were rather weak in themselves, they were buttressed by the Greco-Roman world's beliefs about gender.

In the Greco-Roman world there were strong beliefs about the role of women (mainly being domesticated); however, they still functioned in some prominent roles in the public domain. It seems, however, that the transition to complete acceptance of women in public roles was never fully realised in the Christian Church. It is argued that the hierarchical form of leadership in the contemporary Church with men as the most senior in the hierarchy, is based on the OT prototype of patriarchy, and NT androcentric interpretations. In the early Church, for men to publically and fully regain their place, position, and power, authority structures had to realign with the normative paradigm of patriarchy. The patriarchal paradigm provided security, power, authority, and the customary status for men in the First Century world. Under the patriarchal paradigm men were the 'protector' and 'provider'. This is the same role, held by the goddess Artemis in the pagan and idolatrous practices in Ephesus.

The next chapter situates the text in Paul's mission and theology. This study argues that to encounter the closest meaning of what Paul intended in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is facilitated by the intertextuality of the Biblical text, in particular, the texts found within the Pauline Corpus. Secondly, without the clarification of Paul's mission and placing the text within this context is to conduct a vitiate exegesis that can end in a flawed reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15.

CHAPTER 5

Situating the Text in the Pauline Mission and Theology

Scholars generally agree that the Pastoral Epistles (PE) were a response to false teaching or Gnostic beliefs that were influencing the Christian Church, and leading people astray from the central Gospel message (L. A. Brown, 2000, p. 487). In the PE, Paul makes a distinction between prophecies and warnings about false teachers in the midst of the Church (Hort, 1895, p. 132). In Paul's First Letter to Timothy false teaching is first raised in Chapter One, and he explains this further in his Second Letter to Timothy (cf: 1 Tim 1:3-5; 2 Tim 4:1-5; 6:1-5). In particular, Paul draws attention to believers in Ephesus being lead astray through false teaching. In writing his Second Letter to Timothy he refers to an OT example of Jannes and Jambres who opposed Moses and the truth, stating that that such people had a form of 'godliness' but denied the power of God (2 Tim 3:5). Paul, through Timothy, warned the Ephesians that these people are of corrupt mind; they opposed the truth as they had a counterfeit faith (2 Tim 3:8). The standard interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:3:6 is that 'silly women' were led astray through false teachers; a theological view that is "anchored [in] the popular notion that women were flighty and easily led astray" (L. A. Brown, 2000, p. 489). While there is evidence for a translation meaning 'silly women' as supported by BDAG,⁶⁸ Nyland claims that the rare Greek word (*γυναικάριον*) actually should be translated as 'followers' as in 'followers of heretics' (Nyland, 2004, p. 569). Therefore, it is argued that in that context, Paul writes to Timothy as a corrective measure due to the infiltration of heretical teaching.

In exploring the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 this chapter situates the text within the Apostle Paul's mission, and his theology that is found in the Pauline Corpus. This will assist the assessment of evidence and conclusivity about

⁶⁸ BDAG, p. 985.

whether there has been an emendation made to the translation, and/or meaning given to 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Subsequently, this chapter is a recension of the subject text based on Paul's commission, and his theology as he communicated to the young and developing Church communities.

The Pauline Mission

Paul's primary mission as an Apostle of Jesus Christ was to establish the New Covenant Church. Ephesus is central to Paul's mission as the city was his headquarters for the expansion of Christianity in Asia Minor. As mentioned, his fundamental message of the Gospel was to turn from worshipping other gods. to worship the one true God (Acts 17:23-24; 1 Cor 10:14). The motif of a monotheistic God is first evident in the OT Biblical texts and later introduced by Jesus as recorded in the Matthean Gospel in the NT (cf: Ex 34:14; Lev 26:1; Deut; 10:20; Mt 4:10).⁶⁹ Given the Hellenistic culture and worship of pagan gods in Ephesus, worshipping a monotheistic God would have been an alien concept to the citizens of the city as was discussed in the previous chapter. The socio-cultural and religious practices of life in the city were diametrically opposed to the New Covenant Church being established by Paul, with Timothy's assistance.

Once Ephesians became 'believers' they had to change their allegiance from Artemis to the Christian God: - the corollary of this was a decline in the sale of Artemis icons and other 'goddess paraphernalia', affecting the livelihood of the artisans and silversmiths. On one occasion the impact of the downturn in sales was so great that it created a riot in the theatre of Ephesus (cf: Acts, Ch. 19). Demetrius, a silversmith, and guild leader of his craft was angry that Paul and his disciples were drawing people away from the worship of Artemis and the purchase of Artemis artefacts (cf: Acts 19:23-41). To counteract the situation, Demetrius gathered others from the trade, causing a protest that resulted in a riot. During the riot, Paul's travelling companions Gaius and Aristarchus were dragged into the theatre of Artemis, enduring the roar of the crowd for two hours

⁶⁹ Cf: HBD, Robert M. Good, p. 72.

as they shouted “Great is Artemis of the Ephesians”. Due to the disturbance and potential risk to Paul’s life, he was cautioned not to enter the theatre by some of his disciples and officials of the province. The Town Clerk was forced to take control of the crowd, citing the rules of the court, and insisting that the matter be referred to the regular assembly of the court for arbitration. This incident was symptomatic of the economic impact and disruption to everyday life as people changed their allegiance, and became worshippers of Paul’s monotheistic God, rather than Artemis.

Central to the Gospel message proclaimed by Paul was that all false and pagan deities were to be renounced. In Ephesus, the citizens were to renounce Artemis and substitute her role and responsibilities of ‘protector’ and ‘provider’ with the Christian God. Biblical texts attest to God as being a ‘protector’ and ‘provider’ (cf: Psalm 12:7, 91:14; Isa 31:5; Lk 4:10, 17:11; Gen 22:8; Jer 33:9; Ezk 34:29-31; 2 Thess 3:3; Phil 4:9). For example, when Paul spoke to the Ephesian Elders as recorded in the Book of Acts, he encouraged them to fulfil their responsibilities as God’s delegates to watch over, and protect the people of the Church (Acts 20:28-32). Paul warned the elders that some from their own group would distort the truth of the Gospel with the aim of enticing the disciples to follow them (Acts 20:30). Similarly, Paul urged Timothy to instruct certain people in the *ekklesia* at Ephesus not to teach a different doctrine opposed to the truth, and teachings of Jesus and the Apostles (1 Tim 1:3). Albeit that the dates of the Pauline Letters are accurate, Paul had earlier written to the Ephesians (ca. 60-62 C.E.) to explain the teachings of Jesus; further, he teaches the Church that the Gentiles are no longer alien from the Commonwealth of Israel but are now citizens with the Jews as part of the New Covenant arrangements (Eph 2:12-14).

Paul, Timothy, and the New Covenant Church in Ephesus

The establishment of the New Covenant Church is in fulfilment of the words spoken by the OT Prophet Jeremiah (cf: Jer 31:31-34). No longer would God write laws on tablets of stone but on their hearts (Jer 31:33). This New Covenant included the availability of personal knowledge of God; available to all, and it included the forgiveness of sins (1 Cor 1:5; 2 Cor 4:6; 1 Tim 2:4; Col

1:14). In God's divine plan, the old (Adam) was replaced with the new Adam (Christ) (1 Cor 15:22, 45). Sin came into the world through Adam; Jesus came into the world to atone for sin (cf: Rom Chap. 8). The OT law could not achieve righteousness for the people because of the weakness of the flesh; therefore God provided a life led by the Spirit that was not ruled by the standards of the flesh (Rom 8:6-13). The new arrangements included believers being led by the Spirit - they became children of God, and joint heirs with Christ (Rom 8:14, 17). As a result, the law with all its commandments and ordinances were abolished (Eph 2:15); there is good news through the Gospel (Acts 20:24; Rom 15:9; 1 Cor 15:1); the Gospel brings a message of peace (Eph 6:15); there is oneness of the Spirit (Eph 4:4-6); all believers become members of God's household (Eph 2:19); and all believers form a new spiritual building with Jesus as the cornerstone (Eph 2:20-22). Living a life in the Spirit is what Paul recommends. Paul in his Second Letter to the Corinthians states that Jesus Christ made believers ministers of a New Covenant not based on the written 'Law' but on the 'Spirit', for it is the 'Spirit' that gives life (2 Cor 3:6-8). This New Covenant life is described as a 'better' covenant in the Letter to the Hebrews (Heb 8:10, 16). Understanding this New Covenant agreement between God, and humanity is imperative as it changes relationships and illuminates the NT Biblical text.

As discussed in Chapter One, central to Paul's teaching, is that when Jesus Christ died he made reconciliation with God on behalf of humanity in order to resolve the sin of Adam - thereby is the starting point of a 'new beginning' for humanity, following the breaking of the Edenic Covenant (cf: 1 Cor 15:22, 45; Rom 5:5; Col 1:20). The rending of the veil or the curtain in the temple in Jerusalem was symbolic of what Jesus Christ achieved through his death - he was the complete atonement for sins (Heb 10:18). The temple was no longer required in its previous state. Prior to his death, Jesus had spoken figuratively about his resurrection (Jn 2:21-22). As Hays (2003, p. 221) states, it "forges a symbolic identification between the temple and Jesus' own body in Jesus' enigmatic prophecy 'destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up'". The symbolism of the movement from the temple as a building, to the temple being Jesus' body was not understood until after the resurrection once embodied in its figural form (Hays, 2003). In the New Covenant Era, God

through the Holy Spirit now dwells within the physical body of each believer, and this is now the temple of God, the place where God lives (cf: 1 Cor 3:16; 6:19; 2 Cor 6:16).

Paul's First Letter to Timothy

Scholars, such as Clyde Votaw argue that the Letters to Timothy in Ephesus, and Titus in Crete were to address two issues: firstly, false teaching, and secondly, the problem of some disciples being unworthy and unfaithful in their duties (Votaw Weber, 1896, p. 134). Other scholars, in this case Donald Guthrie, assert that the problem of false teaching is a consistent problem for Paul as he addresses this in all of his letters that form the PE (Guthrie, 1990, pp. 39-40). There is an older scholarly view that Paul's First Letter to Timothy is a 'Church manual'; however, Fee argues that the purpose relates to Church order, and that was the very reason Paul left Timothy in Ephesus (Fee, 1994, p. 757).

This study argues that when examining Paul's First Letter to Timothy, it is clear that he is left in charge of the Church in Ephesus to address the problem of false teachers⁷⁰ and with this, Paul gives ethical instructions to the Church (1 Tim 3:14-15; 4,13). Therefore, it is reasonable to argue that the source of the false teachings that were being circulated were fixed in the cultural practices of the Ephesians, prior to them becoming converts (Quinn & Wacker, 2000, p. 49). Further, it is argued that many of these practices continued when they joined New Covenant Church communities.

In Paul's First Letter to Timothy, there is a distinct comparative configuration between Chapter One and Chapter Six as Paul draws together the fabric and purpose of his Letter: Timothy is to instruct and to teach about the dangers of false teaching (1 Tim 1:3; 6:2b; 4-7a; 6:3-6); Paul explains misunderstandings about the law and godliness (1 Tim 7b-10; 6:5-6); their commission was

⁷⁰ Cf: 1 Tim 1:3, 3:7, 4:1-10, 6:3-5, 20; 2 Tim 2:14-18, 23-26; 3:1-9; 3-13; 4:3, 4; Titus 1:10-16; 3:9-11; see also 1 Tim 1:-19-20; 2 Tim 1:15.

grounded in faith (1 Tim 1:5, 19; 4:12; 6:11-15); the doxology⁷¹ (1 Tim 1:17; 6:16); Paul then repeats Timothy's commission, and reiterates that he is required to "fight the good fight of faith" (1 Tim 1:18-19); and later, Paul repeats Timothy's commission reminding him that others have gone astray through false knowledge and "missed the mark as regards the faith", that is, abandoned their beliefs (1 Tim 6:20). Towner describes a similar structure when explaining the parallels between Chapters One and Six (Towner, 2006, pp. 390-393). In addressing the issue of false teaching in his letter to Timothy Paul uses gender-inclusive pronouns (cf: 1 Tim 1:3, 6; 4:1; 6:3, 21, *NRSV*); for example, Paul refers to "certain people" (1 Tim 1:3), "some people" (1 Tim 1:6), "some" (1 Tim 4:1; 6:21), and "whoever" (1 Tim 6:3). Similar claims are made in the *KJV* translation that relate to women and men, the exception being 1 Timothy 6:3 which is interpreted as 'man'. Being cognisant of other Biblical texts that relate to the role of teaching, Paul's First Letter to Timothy is indicative of his inclusiveness as teaching includes everyone who had the gift to teach (cf: 1 Cor 14:26; Eph 4:7-13; 1 Tim 1:3; 4:13; 6:3-5).

Paul's concern about false teaching is not isolated to a particular heresy being taught by a woman in Ephesus. Paul, as an Apostle was on a mission from God, and he was to be a witness to the world bringing a soteriological message to the Church (cf: Acts 22:10, 15). He teaches that anyone who deviates from the truth of the Gospel message has fallen into error (1 Tim 1:3-4). Timothy is given clear instructions by Paul about not teaching error, different doctrines, and to ensure people refrained from occupying themselves with myths, speculations and genealogies (cf: 1 Tim Chap. 1). Towner (2006, pp. 109-100) believes that the myths and speculations Paul wrote about were closely associated with the worship of 'other gods'; as the term 'myths' was used by Plato not only to identify a story or teaching as false but also as deceptive. With the reference to genealogies that promote speculations Towner suggests that these could well have been linked with Judaism, and the birth rights associated with family

⁷¹ This is a prayer of praise, and worship to God.

genealogies. As he stated that such practices were “known to have been practiced in Jewish communities” (Towner, 2006, p. 110).

Essentially, Paul's warning to Timothy is concerned about those who desire to be teachers in the New Covenant Church but do not understand what they are doing and thereby are leading others astray; these false teachers were not “outsiders” but inside the leadership of the Church (1 Tim 1:3-11). Another internal witness that problems existed within the leadership of the Church is confirmed when Paul sends a message from Miletus to the Ephesian Elders (cf: Acts 20:17-35). Central to Paul's First Letter to Timothy is that false teaching is to be rectified, and that there be no deviation from the Gospel message taught by Paul.

Pauline Theology

For an interpretation of the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 an identification of the principles, motifs, and patterns in the Pauline Corpus is necessary for several reasons. At one level, Pauline theology sets the parameters for an understanding of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and at another level he demonstrates his theology through his pastoral praxis, that is, by the way he works with women and men in the *ekklesia*. Paul's theological praxis provides a window into his world and thereby, more exactitude about women's participation in the mission of the early Church. In the New Covenant Church in Ephesus, Paul is establishing a 'new creation' culture to replace the Hellenistic and pagan culture. Therefore, Pauline theology, the principles, motifs, and patterns found in the Pauline Corpus are foundational to understanding the intended and original meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15.

Pauline Theological Motifs

There were two ways Paul taught the Church; through oral presentation as part of his missionary journeys, and by means of his letters. The written Pauline Corpus identifies Christological truths, and generates a number of theological motifs or themes that give a window of understanding into the text, and subsequent to this, principles and practices for the Church in the NT Age.

It is the motifs and principles in the Pauline Corpus, found in the world of the text, and combined with Biblical textual analysis supported by other ancient writings, that give the reader a more reliable understanding of the text. A literal reading of the text; for example, in an English version today does not always convey to the reader the original intended meaning of the text. This is evident by the varying translations and interpretations that have stimulated the ongoing debate regarding the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. The debate is intensified when there is a patriarchal bias in the interpretation; - the objective is then two-fold. One is to separate the text from the patriarchal paradigm, and secondly, to determine what is temporal and what is universal in the Biblical text, and how this changes a contemporary reading. An example of a temporal versus universal discourse is demonstrated by Paul's Letter to the Ephesians. The notion surrounding this letter is that it originated as a general letter for all of the *ecclesial* groups as part of the early Church, not just the Ephesians (Meeks et al., 1993, p. 2192). Paul writes about the mystery of God, now revealed to the Apostles and prophets through the Spirit, and how everyone can share in the promise of Christ Jesus through the Gospel (Eph 3:1-20). He establishes the parameters for the formation of the New Covenant Church, and describes how social and cultural transformation is to take place in the life of the believer in the context of the Church community. The Letter to the Ephesians is both temporal and universal, that is, it was specifically for the First Century Church in Ephesus but then had universal application for all Churches in the First Century, and now the believers in the Twenty-first Century. This is a similar argument in relation to 1 Timothy 2:11-15 where scholars argue that the Pauline prohibitions for women while temporal (First Century situation) now have universal application in the Church.

In examining the Pauline Corpus, the Apostle Paul is primarily concerned about the growth and maturity of the Church. Maturity is important to Paul as he recognises that it will prevent believers from being deceived, for example, by false teachers (Eph 4:14-15). Paul exhorts the Church to grow in the unity of the faith, and in the knowledge of Jesus Christ, and he teaches that it is the *charisms* (gifts) that underpin the maturing of the Church (Eph 4:7-13). This motif of maturity, and knowledge of the truth, appears in his First Letter to

Timothy, and also in his Letters to the Ephesians, Corinthians, Philippians and Colossians (1 Cor 1:5, 2:6; Eph: 4:13, 15; Phil 1:9, 3:15; Col 1:9-10, 2:2-3, 3:10, 4:12). Knowledge of the truth, maturity that leads to godliness, and imitation of the character of God is Paul's desire for believers (Titus 1:1). These form the foundation of Paul's theological motifs that he wants Timothy to include in his teaching praxis. It will be through Timothy's instruction that the Church will be equipped to differentiate between true and false teachers; he is urged to follow Paul's instructions as it is only through this method that the Church will retain their faith (1 Tim 1:18-19). Therefore, scholars argue it is through Paul's beliefs contained in the PE that theological principles and practices for the Church can be identified.

Jouette Bassler (1996) and Frances Margaret Young (1994) hold to the view that the PE need to be understood and interpreted through Paul's beliefs and customs evident in his writings, and the Pauline tradition referred to as *Paulustradition* (Bassler, 1996; Young, 1994). At a fundamental level this is correct, however, to understand the Biblical text is to identify the divine principles or theological truths that are contained within the complete Pauline Corpus. It is through an examination of Paul's theology that the principles embedded in the Pauline Corpus provide the exegete further insight into what Paul meant in the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Therefore, the principles become a critical element of the exegesis as part of a reductionist approach. Given the lack of extant manuscripts of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 that date back to the First Century there is no prospect of analysing the original Greek text from the primary source. In the task of interpreting the text, other methodological tools are required as part of the methodological process in order to establish the original or closest probable meaning of the text.

At the centre of Pauline theology is Paul's Christological emphasis on Jesus as Messiah: Fee draws attention to the Christology in Paul's First Letter to Timothy emerging as part of the "larger soteriological issues that are constantly present for Paul" (Fee, 2007, p. 420). Fee states that evident in the PE is the Pauline claim that Christ offered himself as a ransom for all sinners (1 Tim 1:15; 2:6). In doing this, Paul shifts the ground from "ascetic requirement to gracious

acceptance” (Fee, 2007, p. 421). Further, Fee claims that “Christ came as a genuine incarnation, thereby himself affirming the goodness of creation” (Fee, 2007, p. 421). Furthermore, all four of the major Christological moments in Paul’s First Letter to Timothy refer to “Christ’s humanity”, and “the first and third also reflect/emphasize the incarnation” (1 Tim 15; 2:4-6; 3:16; 6:12-13) (Fee, 2007, p. 421). At the same time, “three of them, either directly or indirectly, have soteriological implications” (Fee, 2007, p. 421).

In Pauline theology there is an ‘oneness’ as part of an inclusive awareness as Paul teaches the Church the way ‘within the veil’; particularly evident in Paul’s Letter to the Ephesians (Eph 4:1-16). He does not make a gender distinction as he declares that Christ gives gifts; for example, the gift of teaching gift to believers. Some scholars, for example, Cynthia Briggs Kittredge (1998) and Sandra Hack Polaski (1999) argue that Paul is hierarchical, authoritarian, and exploits his apostolic position in order to restrict empowerment for women (Briggs Kittredge, 1998; Hack Polaski, 1999). The blame is placed on Paul rather than a patriarchal translation and interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 for women’s subservient place in the Church and home. To understand Paul’s teachings about women requires a more holistic view of the PE and the Pauline Corpus.

Johan Christiaan Beker (1980) presents an apocalyptic eschatological framework as the only workable method in which to explain Paul’s letters to the Church. He states that the “traditional apocalyptic thinking in terms of the two ages and their strict temporary dualism is only peripherally present in Paul because the old age has run its course already: ‘the end of the ages has come’ upon us” (Beker, 1980, p. 146). He refers to statements in the Pauline Corpus that suggest the end of the ages had come, and this had happened at the right time with the birth of Christ through a woman (cf: 1 Cor 10:11; Gal 4:4) (Beker, 1980, p. 146). Further, he draws attention to the transformational changes for humanity, beginning with Jesus Christ when he states, “the resurrection of Christ marks the beginning of the process of transformation, and its historical reality is therefore crucial to Paul because it marks the appearance of the end in history and not simply the end of history” (Beker, 1980, p. 149). Beker (1980)

draws attention to the end of the Old Covenant Period as Jesus heralds the New Covenant Age. Therefore, to understand Pauline theology and what this means for the Holy Spirit inspired teachings of the Apostle Paul, is to situate 1 Timothy 2:11-15 within an eschatological framework, and a context that is firmly embedded in the Gospel message (Gal 2:5, 14; Eph 1:13; Col 1:5). Inside the eschatological framework is the Christological aspect found in the PE, which is similar to Paul's other letters that point to a relationship with God through Christ - independent of gender. A relationship, it is argued, that dismantles the 'old' hierarchical structure and replaces this with the 'new' horizontal structure. Therefore, every believer, woman and man, are equal before God, and relate to God without any earthly intermediary.

As part of this study it is argued that the elements of Pauline theology that are most germane to the interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 are based on five Pauline teaching foundations; 1) the soteriological message; 2) salvation in Christ; 3) the message of faith; 4) the distinction between Law and Gospel/Grace; and 4) instruction on false teachings/heresy that would undermine the Gospel message.

Paul's Soteriological Message

As Paul teaches the soteriological message the Biblical record accounts that Paul is filled with the Holy Spirit; therefore, the Gospel message he proclaims does not only come from the spoken word, but from the power and conviction of the Holy Spirit (cf: Acts 13:9; Rom 9:1, 14:17; 1 Cor 6:19, 12:3; Eph 1:13; 1 Thess 1:5; 2 Thess 2:13). He explains the role of the Spirit in his First Letter to the Corinthians when he distinguishes between the wisdom of the world and God's wisdom (cf: 1.Cor 2:6-16). As Fee (2000, p. 36) states, Paul "sets out in the starkest form possible the absolute contrast between believers and non-believers, those who have gone the way of God's wisdom and those who have not". God's people are "led by the Spirit" and therefore, Paul was also "led by the Spirit of God" (Gal 5:16-18). Further, he states that "to be 'spiritual' from Paul's point of view; it means to be a Spirit person, one whose whole life is full of, and lived out by, the power of the Spirit" (Fee, 2000, p. 39). Therefore, a Biblical exegesis for the believer is an academic task with a Spiritual element,

as “without the presence and power of the Holy Spirit, all else is mere exercise” (Fee, 2000, p.7).

For that reason, an understanding of the Spiritual aspect in exegesis cannot be ignored. Paul, directed by the Holy Spirit is epitomizing the person of Jesus Christ; it is his intention through his letters to exhort, admonish, and encourage, so that all can reach a place of maturity and be imitators of Jesus (cf: 1 Cor 4:16-17; Eph 4:13; Phil 3:15; Col 1:23).

Paul's Teaching On Salvation

In Paul's First Letter to Timothy he writes that the reason Jesus came into the world was to save sinners (1 Tim 1:15). Not ashamed of the Gospel message of Jesus Christ he proclaims this is for everyone (Rom 1:16; 1 Cor 1:21). It is the Gospel, the word of truth that Paul announces will bring salvation (Eph 1:13). In Paul's Second Letter to Timothy, he explains he is prepared to endure suffering so that others may gain salvation (2 Tim 2:10). In his Letter to the Corinthians he writes that 'today' is the acceptable time, the day of salvation (2 Cor 6:2). When he writes to the Ephesians Paul refers to salvation and the 'Word of God' as armour for the believer; - the helmet being a metaphor for 'salvation', and the sword a metaphor for the 'Word of God', - the divine communication revealed to humanity through the Scriptures (Eph 6:17). It is God's salvation, and God's Word that gives protection to the believer; not Artemis or any other god. Paul wants everyone to share in this 'free gift' of salvation, and to receive an abundance of grace – God's unmerited favour (Rom 5:15-17). With God's protection comes God's provision, and favour. Paul's explains to the Romans that the wages, or the provision that comes from sin is death; the provision that comes from salvation, is eternal life (Rom 6:23). Paul emphasises that God's salvific plan is for everyone, and made possible through the redemptive act of Jesus Christ (1 Tim 2:4-6).

Central to salvation is faith as Paul reminds Timothy that it is his knowledge of the sacred writings, - the Scriptures - that enables him to give instruction for salvation through his faith in Christ Jesus (2 Tim 3:15). Paul explains in his Letter to the Colossians how believers go through a renewal in knowledge that

comes through the 'new self' as part of the 'new creation' that is being renewed in the image of God its creator (Col 3:10). Paul explains that in the renewal process there is no longer a distinction between people. In his Letter to the Colossians, Paul does not specifically give the example of male or female as he does in Galatians 3:28 but states "Christ is all and in all" (Col 3:11). In his First Letter to the Corinthians he confirms that all believers are part of the one Spirit (1 Cor 12:13). Whereas when he writes to the Churches in Galatia, he specifically mentions there is no longer "male" or "female" as "all are one in Christ Jesus" (Gal 3:28). Paul does this because he is astonished that the believers are moving away from the truth, into another Gospel, whereby the Galatians are discriminating between male and female. The truth that Paul teaches is that the division between genders no longer exists in the body of Christ. As Howard Kee (1992, p. 230) states "in ancient literature – pagan, Jewish, and Christian – there is no statement about the place of women more radical than Paul's declaration in Galatians that 'in Christ' [his term for the new Christian community] there is no place for the ethnic, social and sexual difference the wider society maintains". Consequently, it is argued that in the First Century world there was a measure of cultural bias that lead to a misinterpretation of what Paul said about women (Bristow, 1988). In his message of salvation it is 'grace' - available for all, and without discrimination that becomes the trademark for the New Covenant life.

Paul's Teaching on Faith

Paul in his teachings to the Church, places emphasis on justification by faith, as opposed to justification by the works of the law (Rom 3:28; Rom 5:1; Gal 2:16; 3:11, 24). He teaches that a person cannot be justified by keeping the law, or by doing 'good works' as salvation is through faith not works, although works follow a faith filled life (Rom 4:5; Gal 3:12). Faith for Paul is essential for the Christian life as salvation only becomes effective through faith (2 Cor 5:7; Rom 3:25). Paul in his Letter to the Romans explains that justification comes by grace as a gift through the redemption of Jesus Christ (Rom 3:24) - everyone is justified, made acceptable before God through believing in the redemptive Jesus: the Son of God. Paul explains that part of being justified by faith, the gift of salvation includes receiving the righteousness of God (Rom 4:11, 24; 5:13).

John Calvin's discourse on justification by faith explains that through faith a person is accepted and receives God's favour; consisting of forgiveness of sins, and the imputation of righteousness through the redemptive work of Jesus Christ (Calvin, 1863, Chap. 11).

The importance of faith as part of the 'new creation' or 'new humanity' is emphasised by Paul as he engages in the discourse of faith in one hundred and twenty-three Biblical verses. These occasions represent fifty-four per cent of the verses where 'faith' is mentioned in the NT. Paul in his Letter to the Romans explains that faith comes from hearing the word of God (Rom 10:17), and he exhorts believers to walk by faith, and not by sight (2 Cor 5:7). Faith increases through hearing the 'Word of God', and Paul's commission is to make the 'Word of God' fully known (Col 1:25). Paul in writing his First Letter to Timothy is fulfilling that commission as he explains that the believers are to develop, and grow to maturity by following God's plans, that is, God's teachings which are only known through faith (1 Tim 1:4b).

According to Krister Stendahl (1976, pp. 23-39), Paul's justification of faith is born out of defending the rights of Gentiles to be full heirs - the same as the Jews. It is argued that what Stendahl proposes is a misrepresentation of Paul's writings, and teachings to the Church on the role of faith; he is not defending the rights of the Gentiles to be treated the same. Rather, Paul is acknowledging God's omniscience, and the teaching about God's universal plan to make the Gospel available to 'all' who had faith (cf: Rom Chapters 10-11; Gal 2:15-16; Eph 2:15-20).

One of the limitations with some scholarly endeavours and Pauline theology is to classify or create divisions of Paul's theological teachings to certain books, rather than an integrated, and seamless theology across his writings. Many of the letters Paul wrote were circular; intended for all the churches in a particular area; while others were written to specific churches or individuals to address specific issues, such as the Letters to Timothy in Ephesus. When looking to identify a centre for Pauline theology, scholars see this differently, ranging from an apocalyptic eschatology (Beker, 1980); reconciliation (Martin, 1983); the new

age and the new life in Christ (Hickling, 1978); and justification by faith (Käsemann, 1982). All of these centres of Pauline theology can be rationalised for different reasons: for Käsemann (1982) faith is central to salvation; faith is a foundational truth and it is through faith that the 'free gift' of salvation is received with God given righteousness; and it is 'faith' that forms the centre for understanding Romans Chapter Four, for understanding Pauline theology, and subsequently forms Paul's Biblical faith hermeneutic.

On the other hand, Albert Schweitzer (1968) relegates justification by faith to a subsidiary part of Paul's teaching. An analysis of faith in the Pauline writings, however, shows that 'faith' is central to the Gospel message taught by Paul and is a consistent thread in the fabric of Pauline theology. Throughout Chapter Four of Paul's Letter to the Romans he explains the role of faith, giving the example of Abraham who through believing God, and having faith, it was imputed to him as righteousness (Rom 4:3, 22). Similarly, it is imputed to all who believe in him who raised Jesus from the dead (Rom 4:23). Paul compares Adam and Christ as sin came through Adam; grace came through Christ for those who believe and who are justified by faith (cf: Rom Chap. 5).

In Paul's Letter to the Galatians he writes that if justification comes through the law, then Christ died for nothing (Gal 2:21). Augustine had a similar message, and he was accused by Pelagius of undermining the law by preaching this 'grace' message (Meeks, 1972 p. 216). Paul teaches that the law was the disciplinarian only until Christ came and now all who believe are justified by faith (Gal 3:24). He quotes Habakkuk 2:4 "but the righteous live by their faith" when he states that no one is justified before God by the law (Gal 3:11). Living under the law is living under the 'old order' as found in the OT Covenants. The foregoing argument validates Paul's position as he made a shift from the Old Covenant to the New Covenant arrangements; teaching and reinforcing the New Covenant order – its Church structure, and expectations of believers. Further, he responded to ethical issues that confronted Church function; for example, the place of women.

Paul's Position on the Law and Gospel/Grace Polemic

Understanding Paul's position on the Law and Gospel/Grace polemic is significant in the argument within this thesis as 'Law' and 'Grace' are not synonymous, but very distinctive parts of the divine redemptive plan. The significance is in the progressive and yet definitive shift in the terms of agreement between God and humanity. In the New Covenant Church 'Grace' is the unparalleled condition or state provided by God in order that humanity can retain 'right' relationship with God their Creator. In his Letters to the Church, Paul's discourse on the 'Law' argues that the believer is not "under the power of the Law" but under 'Grace', which is Christ's law, or in other words, the way of Christ (cf: Rom 6:14-15; 7:4; 1 Cor 9:21-22; Gal 6:2). Christ became the end of the 'Law' so that righteousness might prevail for all who believe (Rom 10:4). The Biblical texts through Paul's teachings confirm that the 'Law' is substituted by 'Grace', just as 'Christ' was substituted for 'Adam' (Rom 6:14; 1 Cor 15:22; Gal 2:21); nonetheless, scholars are still divided into a number of differing positions about Paul's teachings on 'Law' and 'Grace'.

In his Letter to the Romans Paul states that the law in its entirety, its commandments and ordinances have been abolished - it is no longer valid as a legal requirement, it is only valid through the grace of God. (Rom 6:15). Grace, as Paul discusses does not give licence for sin, but it brings the believer into a new quality or newness of life (Rom 6:1-4). Karl Barth (1936) argued for the notion of the 'new man' as he saw Paul's 'Doctrine of Grace' laying the foundation for an entirely new humanism – fulfilled through the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Once anyone is in Christ they are part of the new creation or the new humanity, as an individual, and corporately as part of the Body of Christ (cf: 2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15; Eph 2:15). As L. J. Kreitzer (1993, p. 253) explaining the eschatology of Paul states "it is the resurrection of Jesus Christ, above all, which conditions and determines Paul's eschatological teaching for it is in the resurrection that the inauguration of the eschaton has truly taken place, the new order has begun". As Paul states "it is Christ Jesus, who died, yes, who was raised, who is at the right hand of God, who indeed intercedes for us" (Rom 8:34). As part of this transformation of the created order, Paul in his Letter to the Ephesians, describes the mystery of God's divine

plan that was predestined with Christ as redeemer, and was revealed in the fullness of time (Eph 1:7-10). Again Paul writes to the Church in Corinth that the 'old' has passed away and the 'new' has arrived (2 Cor 5:17).

There are scholars who believe that the 'Law' is relevant for believers (Cranfield, 1975; Ladd, 1974), and there are those who argue that it is obsolete (Käsemann, 1982; Schoeps, 1967; Schweitzer, 1968). Most scholarly debate about Law and Gospel/Grace is confined to Romans and Galatians as this is the part of the Pauline Corpus where Paul explains its relevance. In explaining the Law/Grace position, Walter C. Kaiser Jr confines his discussion to the 'chair passage', or what he sees as the central text in Romans 9:30-10:13. Kaiser (1999, p. 198) argues against the abandonment of the 'Law' in all its parts because in his view, Christ fulfilled only the ceremonial part of the law. However, not all scholars agree with his argument of dividing the law into the moral, ceremonial, and civil parts. Schreiner (1993) argues that there is no distinction between the various parts of the law, and that righteousness comes through grace, not through obeying the law. Kaiser is unable to reconcile a removal of the entire 'Law' and its replacement with 'Grace'. On the other hand, Douglas Moo (1999, p. 223) claims it is the fundamental moral requirements of the Mosaic Law, not the commandments themselves that are written on the heart. The place of the 'Law', and its role in the New Covenant Age is where scholars differ, similarly to the place of women and their role in the New Covenant Church.

Moo (1999, pp. 320-321) explains an approach to the Law/Grace argument which he identifies as a "modified form of the traditional Lutheran perspective". He refers to what he calls "historical periodization" to explain salvation as part of periods of time as documented by Biblical writers. Further, he explains that Christ is at the centre of a period which consists of two eras and he (Christ) forges a separation between these, and introduces the new era. Moo (1999) argues that this is consistent with NT writers consigning the Mosaic Law within God's salvific-historical plan to the era before Christ. He states "the New Testament teaching about the law is first, and most basically, teaching about the *Mosaic law*" (D. J. Moo, 1999, p. 321). In the NT "Law and 'Gospel'

primarily denote, not two constant aspects of God's word to us, but two successive eras in salvation history" (D. J. Moo, 1999, p. 322). His explanation of the Law and Gospel/Grace polemic is the most coherent argument as it aligns with the Pauline teachings as discussed earlier. Paul argues decisively about this in his Letters to the Romans and Galatians, and as Moo (1999, p. 333) rightfully points out "Paul views God's work of redemption in Christ as the answer to the problem posed by the negative effects of the law (Rom 3:21-26; 7:4-6; 8:2-4; Gal 3:13-14; 4:7)". The 'Law' was essentially a guide for Israel until the coming of the Messiah (Jesus Christ), and with the advent of Christ, and a new life in faith the 'Law' is obsolete (Gal 2:21; 3:24). As Moo (1999, p. 357) argues Christ became the fulfilment of the 'Law' and it is replaced with love as was evident through the ministry and teaching of Jesus. The Biblical texts preserve the notion that under Christ's law 'love' is the centrifugal force and demonstrated by the redemptive act of God, through Jesus Christ (cf: Rom 5:8; 8:35-39; 2 Cor 5:18-21; Gal 5:14).

The importance of the Law/Grace polemic to this thesis is that there is a separation point in history as a consequence of the atoning work of Jesus Christ, his death and resurrection. This new relationship with God is signalled at the rending of the veil of the temple at the time of Jesus' death; - the OT Covenant of the 'Law' is superseded, and all believers can proceed 'within the veil'. Therefore, this thesis maintains that on that basis, under the New Covenant arrangements of 'Grace', women are in the same relationship to God as men. This then places women and men equal at this juncture, and subsequently, the next step is to analyse the teachings of Paul, and the roles and function of women and men in the New Covenant Church. Even with establishing equality between women and men in their relationship to God, taking this a step further in regards to roles in the Church is not without its complexities.

Paul's Teaching on Women Bishops, Elders and Deacons

The historical translation in the PE of 1 Timothy 3:1-7 and Titus 1:6-7 refers to an elder or bishop as being of male gender. The organisation of the New Covenant Church and the structure for women and men to develop and operate

their spiritual and natural gifts is outlined by Paul in his Letters to the early Church (cf: 1 Cor 12:1-10; 1 Cor 12:28-31; Rom 12:4-8; Eph 4:11-16). Paul in the PE, gives instructions to Timothy and Titus about the qualifications of bishops and the appointment of elders (cf: 1 Tim 3:1-13; Titus 1:5-9). He also outlines the qualifications of deacons, addressing characteristics that are required for both men and women (1 Tim 3:8-13). For the most part, patriarchal praxis in the contemporary Church has followed the historical translation that the role of bishop and elder is exclusively reserved for men; women are relegated to the more subservient role of deaconess.

Torjesen (1993, p. 18) argues on the basis of inscriptional evidence that this “shows that Christian women also held the office of elder in their communities”. In her research of the early Church, she argues that it was due to the polytheism of the Greek and Roman religions that Christians avoided using the pagan term ‘priest’ (*hieros*) for their clergy (Torjesen, 1993, p. 5). In its place the early Church used “a variety of terms taken from secular life: *diakonos* (minister), *apostolos* (missionary), *presbyteros* (elder), *episcopos* (overseer), prophet, and teacher. Eventually the titles of bishop (*episcopos*), priest (*presbyteros*), and deacon (*diakonos*) came to be identified with the principal offices of the Christian church” (Torjesen, 1993, p.5). Over time translators tended to minimise the office of a minister when referring to women, translating this as deaconess instead (Torjesen, 1993, p. 5). Nyland (2004, pp. 573-574), in her NT translation referring to 1 Timothy 3:1-13, and Titus 1:5-9, claims that Paul is non-specific about gender. In addition, nowhere in the early Church when they adopted the “Jewish model of governance by elders” were women excluded (Torjesen, 1993, p. 18). Therefore, given this practice, and the fact that 1 Timothy 3:1-7 is a non-gender specific text the role of bishop is inclusive of women. It is argued that the role of elder and bishop have always been open to women but constrained by Church tradition and flawed Biblical translations.

Further, it is argued that consideration of the intertextuality between 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and 1 Timothy 3:1-7 is needed to shed light on the former. In establishing the relationship between the texts the chapter marker of Chapter

Three has to be removed and the text read as it was originally written; in one continuous flow. In scholarly discourse the subject text is usually understood to relate to women's silence, submission, and their inability to teach or hold authority in the Church, whereas 1 Timothy 3:1-7 is either referred to as an office, role, or responsibility of a bishop. There are three issues that need examination: one relates to the 'office' of the bishop; another, the interpretation of *episkopos* (ἐπίσκοπος) - meaning one who watches over, a guardian, commonly interpreted as a bishop; and finally whether the only functional place for women is as a deaconess.

The translation of 1 Timothy 3:1 in the *NRSV* states "whoever aspires to the *office* of bishop". The *NKJV* translates the same passage as "if a man desires the *position* of a bishop." In the *TSNT* *episkopos* is neither referred to as an office or position, but a role. A translation from the English to the Greek in a patriarchal paradigm has placed more emphasis on the 'position' or 'office' rather than the 'role' or the 'responsibilities'. Leifeld (2004, p. 278) argues that the only place 'office' occurs is in the Jewish priesthood, otherwise it does not occur at all in the Greek. He states that the translation of 'office' which can be traced back to the *KJV* gives the impression that it is in the text (Liefeld, 2004, p. 278).

Immediately after 1 Timothy 2:11-12 Paul makes his qualifying statements in vv 13-15, he then enters into a discourse on the criteria of a 'bishop' for 'whoever' aspires to such a position (1 Tim 3:1 or 1 Tim 2:16). It is argued that there is a high likelihood that Paul in his First Letter to Timothy was responding to a situation in Ephesus whereby a woman in the *ekklesia* was aspiring to be a 'bishop'. In the letter Paul describes the type of behaviour he expects from men and women (1 Tim 1: 8-10); he addresses the situation with a particular woman (vv 11-15); and then he states "the saying is sure: whoever aspires to the office of bishop desires a noble task" (1 Tim 3:1). He then details the criteria for *anyone* aspiring to be a bishop; including being an apt or skilled teacher (1 Tim 3:2). It is argued that vv 8-10 are essentially forerunners to Paul's requirements for a bishop (1 Tim 3:1). Consequently, it is reasonable to conclude that if

someone was teaching heresy, such as the unnamed woman Paul refers to in v 12, she could not be appointed to such an important role.

The Greek word commonly translated as bishop in 1 Timothy 3:1 (alternatively 1 Timothy 2:16) was used by Homer to classify someone who was a watcher, or guardian, and he used it to describe those who were responsible for watching over covenants with other gods (Nyland, 2004, pp. 505, 552). It is similar to the role held by officials in Ephesus who would punish citizens if they broke the covenant with Artemis. Similarly it is argued that in the New Covenant Church the overseer or guardian, woman or man, had the responsibility of ensuring that believers receive skilled teaching and are not deceived by false teachers. Gilkes (1990, p. 237) claims that overseer, usually translated as bishop was used in the early Church for both men and women leaders in the organisational structure. Biblical translations which deduce that *episkopos* (ἐπίσκοπος) means bishop is anachronistic as the Greek word was not interpreted as bishop until the time of St Ignatius in the early Second Century (Nyland, 2004, p. 505). Similarly, *episkopos* is found in 1 Peter 2:25 when the English translation refers to believers going astray like sheep, but then returning to the shepherd, or guardian (referring to Jesus). This allegory shows the purpose of the role, that is, to watch over, and ensure no harm comes to the Church. Similarly, the role of what is commonly understood as 'office' of a 'bishop', in reference to 1 Timothy 3:1, is in effect a 'role' with its responsibilities as 'overseer' or 'guardian' to care for the Church.

The responsibilities of the guardian have wide-ranging interpretations. The *NRSV* translates this as "he must manage his own household well, keeping his children submissive and respectful in every way" (1 Tim 3:4). The traditional translation and emphasis is on the male to either rule, to manage, or provide for his household; for example, the *NKJV* states the person is to 'rule'; the *NRSV* states to 'manage'; and in the *TSNT* the emphasis shifts to 'provide'. The historical application of the text has been that it is a 'male' bishop (guardian) who has the right, role and responsibility to rule, manage, and provide for his household. As Nyland (2004, pp. 397, 553) states "the term is used in the papyri in the context of one who is a leader or patron, supervisor, and director"

who cares for and “gives aid” to others (cf: 1 Tim 3:4,5; 5:17; Rom 12:8. It is the very same term “used for the pagan goddess Artemis of Ephesos [sic] in her capacity as patron of the city” (Nyland, 2004, p. 397). In its Biblical setting the meaning of the Greek “carries the sense of presiding over activities in an official capacity” (Nyland, 2004, p. 397). Consequently, the guardian has the official responsibilities to care for a group of people in the Church, and ensure that they have the support they need. There is no clear evidence that such a position is reserved solely for men; therefore, it is argued that the role and responsibilities of an overseer or guardian can be held by either women or men. Such a claim is further supported by the text of 1 Timothy 5:8.

In common translations, the text is received as the role of ‘man’ is to provide for his household, and if he does not do this he is worse than an infidel and has denied the faith (1 Tim 5:8, *KJV*). The translation has been changed in the *NRSV* to have a more non-gender specific meaning - “whoever does not provide for their relatives, and especially for family members, has denied the faith, and is worse than an unbeliever” (1 Tim 5:8 *NRSV*). Here, Paul is referring to the importance of everyone providing for others, but especially their own family. Even though more recent Biblical translations interpret 1 Timothy 5:8 to be gender inclusive; for example, the *NRSV*, the traditional values and reception of the text as referring only to men has remained within the consciousness of the Church. Thus the role of ruling and/or authority, managing and/or providing for their household is understood to be the role and responsibility of a man. Over time understanding of this function in the Christian Church conferred men to superior positions of authority; for example, elders and bishops, whilst placing women in more subservient positions based on the authority of the text. In Ephesians Chapter Four, Paul exhorts believers to live a holy life, through the gifts given by Christ to equip people for the ministry, that is the *diakonos* (διάκονος) (cf: Eph 4:7-12). Nyland (2004, pp. 406, 497) explains that the Greek word διάκονος initially meant a servant, attendant, or official in a pagan temple, and later the term was incorporated into Christianity and translated as “minister or deacon”. Nyland, (2004, p. 406) quoting a range of inscriptional evidence from the First and Second Century states “that there is

ample evidence that women were deacons in precisely the same role as male deacons". As Ferder and Heagle (1989, p. 108), argue it was in the Second Century when "there is a further step in centralizing the offices of ministry in the classic tri-partite role of bishop, priest and deacon" and the role of the bishop emerges as the unifying symbol of the Christian Church. This thesis argues at this juncture four distinct events happened. One was that the guardian (bishop) was given ecclesiastical authority, secondly, it was classified as a position of superiority instead of responsibility, thirdly as a consequence segregated to a male function and fourthly, English translations came from the patriarchal paradigm.

When an androcentric bias is removed from the equation, the text reveals that both women and men can adopt the role of overseer/guardian if they meet the criteria. The only caution that Paul gives to Timothy about roles; for example, elders, is that he is not to ordain anyone hastily, nor on the basis of partiality (1 Tim 5:21-22). It is argued that the Biblical text was misinterpreted on two levels: in relation to the role and gender of the overseer, and in relation to the role of men in the household. What eventuated over time was that the role of overseer/guardian (bishop) went from being available to 'all' in the early Church to being solely the domain of men. Whereas the only qualification for the role, apart from character, is Spiritual gifts, not gender (Gilkes Townsend, 1990, p. 231).

Conclusion

The Chapter argued an understanding of Paul's mission, and theology, is fundamental in determining the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Further, it is through the identification of Pauline principles and praxis that the text is validated and given meaning. Subsequently, it is through this process that the meaning embedded in the text is amplified.

There are a number of motifs within Paul's Christological message; central to this Paul's transformational Gospel message. All those who receive the salvation message through faith become part of the New Covenant Church. Through the use of the metaphor 'within the veil' there is a claim that women

are accepted as equals and full members of the Church, as all are being transformed into the image of God. Paul instructs in the transformational requirements for the early Church, and demonstrates a praxis of inclusiveness as he works with and alongside women.

The symbolism found in the OT and NT text, and between the Mosaic Covenant and the New Covenant is explained. Jesus Christ becomes the fulfilment of the Mosaic Covenant and in the New Covenant Period, the relationship changes between humanity and God, and between women and men. Women and men are re-established in their relationship with God through the atoning work of Jesus Christ.

In the establishment of the early Church, Paul and Timothy are confronted with false teaching, and it is this that Paul addresses in his First Letter to Timothy. The city of Ephesus was enslaved to Artemis who was the 'protector' and 'provider' for the people; Paul wants believers to leave behind their Hellenistic ways and worship God who will replace Artemis.

Examining the text on the role and function of elders, bishops, and gender gives a different reading and is inclusive of women. Paul's misogynist reputation does not reveal itself when the Pauline principles are extracted from the text. Within the text there is inclusiveness as no woman is excluded from the role of elder or bishop as long as she meets the requirements. There is an inclusiveness evident after the context is examined that does not resonate in a reading of the English text in most modern Bible translations.

Paul's teachings across the Churches are constant as he warns against false teachers. In Ephesus, they were teaching outside the confines of the Gospel and were influenced by local cultural factors that related to Hellenistic and pagan practices. The Pauline Apostolic message is that under the New Covenant life in the Spirit, all believers live under Grace, and are no longer under the Law. As part of this new life there are free gifts given by Christ to 'all' so that the Church can fully function without restrictions placed by gender.

The next chapter examines the role of teaching in 1 Timothy 2:12, and places the text within the socio-cultural context of the early Church. Further, it explores the Apostle Paul's view on teaching, his attitude to women, and whether or not he places restrictions on teaching as an authoritative function in the Church based on gender.

CHAPTER 6

The Contentious Text and Teaching in 1 Timothy 2:12

The most prominent and controversial Biblical text in 1 Timothy 2:11-15, is v 12 “I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man, she is to keep silent”. The text of v 12 is generally received as Paul’s prohibition regarding the place and role of women; however, there is scholarly contention about the translation, and the meaning given to the text for Church praxis. Another contentious characteristic of v 12 is whether it has a temporary or universal application. The two verses that follow vv 13-15 are generally understood as the Apostle Paul’s reasoning, or explanation in support of his earlier statements. It is v 12 where the gender debate lies and women’s place in the Church is centred; identifying this text as the most contentious and critical text within the pericope of 1 Timothy 2:11-15.

The place and role of women in regards to teaching in the Church seems to have its roots firmly planted in the First Century. In Greco-Roman times, it was acceptable that ‘moral philosophers’ should give guidance to men on managing their wives, and other members of their household (Hawthorne et al., 1993). Josephus⁷² writes an apologetic to Apion where he records a woman as being inferior to her husband in ‘all things’ (Josephus, 1987, pp. 773-812).⁷³ In the First Century, it was socially and politically accepted that a hierarchy existed in the relationship between women and men; further, the woman had to obey her husband as he was her superior, and this could not be reversed as it was divinely ordained and sanctioned.⁷⁴ Such a view of women as inferior was firmly embedded in the Jewish consciousness as is also evident in the Hebrew

⁷² The writings of Josephus are acknowledged as one of the most significant extra-Biblical writings of the First Century.

⁷³ Cf: *Josephus, Apion*, trans. Whiston 2:25. § 201. At the same time this did not give the husband the right, or authority to be abusive towards his wife.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

Scriptures through the OT patriarchs. By the latter part of the Second Century, Tertullian, in line with the patriarchal view, instructed the Church that women were not to speak in the Church, nor teach, nor to baptise, nor claim authority to function in positions available to a man, least of all in the sacerdotal office.⁷⁵

By the Fourth Century a similar belief and value system with reference to women is found in the teaching homilies in one of the early Church fathers, St John Chrysostom (ca. 347-407). Chrysostom viewed men as natural leaders; they were superior in every way to women; subsequently, women were marginalised, having no voice on either worldly or spiritual matters.⁷⁶ Similar views were by Epiphanius, Bishop of Salamis, (as cited in Torjesen, 1993, p. 44) when she stated in the Fourth Century:

Women among them [the Christian believers] are bishops, presbyters, and the rest, as if there were no difference of nature. For in Christ there is neither male nor female. Even if women among them are ordained to the episcopacy and presbyterate because of Eve, they hear the Lord saying: your orientation will be toward your husband and he will rule over you. The apostolic saying escaped their notice, namely that: "I do not allow a woman to speak or have authority over a man. And again: Man is not from woman but woman from man; and Adam was not deceived, but Eve was first deceived into transgression. Oh, the multifaceted error this world!

Even though Epiphanius' rebuke and condemnation of women was given to the Montanists of Phrygia, he attests to the existence of women priests. Whilst the Montanists were a breakaway sect from the Orthodox Church, there is also other evidence from the end of the Fifth Century in the epistle of Pope Gelasius

⁷⁵ Cf: Pearse, R. The Tertullian Project, "*On the Veiling of Virgins*," 9.1: (translated by Rev S. Thelwall). Retrieved 22 October, 2006, <http://www.tertullian.org/anf/anf04/anf04-09.htm>.

⁷⁶ Cf: St John Chrysostom, *Homily IX, 1 Timothy ii. 11-15*. Retrieved 15 May, 2007, <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/shaff/npnf113.v.iii.x.html>.

1, as he struggled to restore order and power to the papacy, that women priests were being ordained (Rossi, 1991). This is not something that had just developed, as Firmilian of Caesarea in the Third Century (ca. 235 C.E.), in an epistle to Cyprian condemns a woman who was fulfilling all the functions of the priesthood including the sacerdotal ministry (Rossi, 1991). There are two factors present; one is that women were participating in the leadership of the Church; and secondly, a patriarchal perspective was evident. As is shown in the beliefs, attitudes, and interpretations of Scripture by these male leaders women's participation in the Church was not sanctioned. By the Fourth Century, the Church had adopted many of the imperial structures, and under Constantine, and Theodosius, Christianity took on a 'civic ethos' shifting the meaning and focus of religion onto cultic worship (Ferder & Heagle, 1989, p. 108). Subsequently, Christian ministry "moved further away from a vision of partnership by returning to the Levitical model of priesthood as its theological paradigm" (Ferder & Heagle, 1989, p. 108). It seems that the OT model of patriarchy became firmly embedded into the socio-cultural consciousness, and oral learning of the early Church apologists, and after that it became the experience of those in the Church.

Accordingly, a patriarchal reading is evident in translations read today. The focus of this study is to determine whether this reading adequately reflects the original intention of the author who wrote in Greek. As part of this study, twelve translations were selected to draw attention to the variance in contemporary translations. These are:

- I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man, she is to keep silent (*NRSV*)
- And I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to be in silence (*NKJV*)
- I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent (*NIV*)
- But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over a man, but to be in quietness (*ASV*)

- But I do not allow a woman to teach or to have authority over a man, but to listen quietly (*NCV*)
- I do not let women teach men or have authority over them. Let them listen quietly (*NLT*)
- I allow no woman to teach or to have authority over men; she is to remain in quietness *and* keep silence [in religious assemblies] (*AMP*)
- But I do not allow a woman to teach or exercise authority over a man, but to remain quiet (*NASB*)
- And a woman I do not suffer to teach, nor to rule a husband, but to be in quietness (*YLT*)
- I most certainly do not grant authority to a woman to teach that she is the originator of a man (*TSNT*)
- I do not permit a woman to be a teacher, nor must woman domineer over man (*NEB*, 1961)
- But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, she is to keep silent (*KJV*)

Eleven out of the twelve translations quoted here support the prohibition that women are not to teach or have authority over a man in the Church. The only discrepancy is with the *TSNT* where there is still a prohibition but this is referring to preventing a woman from engaging in false teaching, or that which would be considered heresy. Andreas Köstenberger (2005, p. 54) who has conducted exhaustive exegesis on v 12 translates the first part of the verse as “I do not permit a woman to teach or have authority over a man”.

What is evident from all but one of the above translations is that limitations are placed on a woman’s role in the Church; however, a more recent, Twenty-first Century translation differs significantly from the other translations, suggesting there are grounds to examine scholarly justifications for the other translations. Accordingly, the process warrants a search behind and within the text to discover the reasons as to the variants in Nyland’s translation. As Nyland (2004, p. 8) states “the dictionary work we see in today’s Bible translations is based on a centuries-old view of word meaning, following Tyndale’s translation of 1534

and the *King James Version* of 1611". Nyland argues that translations available to believers in contemporary society "do not sufficiently regard the abundant evidence from the *papyri* and inscriptions and thus in many cases present a far from accurate translation of the New Testament" (Nyland, 2004, p. 12). One argument for giving a different meaning to 1 Timothy 2:12 is that this part of the Biblical text is not divinely inspired, and the Apostle Paul introduces the prohibition that women are not to teach due to his humanity (Jewett, 1975). Such an argument, while supporting an egalitarian paradigm is methodologically unsound as it firstly has to prove what parts of Scripture are divinely inspired. In the Twenty-first Century, the position of most Church denominational leaders is that that the entire Biblical text, the OT and NT canon are divinely inspired, even if there are differing positions held by scholars about the doctrine of inspiration.

This chapter explores the realm of teaching as germane to the Pauline Corpus for the New Covenant Church, and specifically how this contributes to an ecclesiastical understanding of v 12. It is argued that such an approach will provide further material to assist the conclusivity of a woman's place in regards to teaching in the Church. As part of determining whether the patriarchal reading is an accurate translation of 1 Timothy 2:12, this chapter explores the reception of the text in relation to the alleged prohibition "I do not permit" (οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω), the context with the word 'to teach' (διδάσκειν), and the grammatical structure of v 12. Further, it examines the role of teaching in the Church, and whether the Apostle Paul was a traditionalist or egalitarian, in order to discover whether a patriarchal translation and reading of the text is legitimate and theologically valid.

Reception of the Text "I do not permit" (οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω)

The debate regarding the meaning of "I do not permit" (οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω) has centred on whether or not Paul made reference to a temporary or universal prohibition. Marshall and Towner (2004, p. 441) argue that as Paul's aim was to achieve order in the Church assembly, the prohibition is a temporary one, and only for the specific group of believers in Ephesus. Bilezikian (1985, p.

180), Fee (1988, pp. 72-76), and Liefeld (1999, p. 113) also support this claim, as they maintain that ἐπιτρέπω indicates only a temporary prohibition

The argument is focused on the present tense and therefore it is translated as 'now'; accordingly, once women had sat quietly and learnt from experienced teachers, they could then teach (Bilezikian, 1985). Bilezikian (1985, p. 181) explains that it was Paul's intention to "protect the teaching ministry and the exercise-of-authority functions from incompetent persons"; therefore, Paul was not giving a universal prohibition for women not to teach. Liefeld (1999, p. 98) argues that as Paul used the present tense the phrase can be paraphrased as "I am not now permitting" and argues on the basis of the syntactical structure of v 12 that this indicates a temporary injunction. Further, he argues that if Paul was giving a command he would have used the indicative form rather than the imperative, and he is of the view that the Holy Spirit would have guided Paul to use the imperative construction, particularly if it was meant to be "permanently binding" in the Church (Liefeld, 1999, p. 98). Similarly, Aida Spencer (1989, p. 85) agrees with the "present tense" argument translating v 12 as "I am not presently allowing a woman to teach". Other scholars, such as Belleville (2001, p. 123) also argue on the grounds that the present indicative signifies a temporary restriction, and has a similar reading to Liefeld and Spencer of "I am not permitting at this time". Belleville (2001, p. 123), critiques the traditionalists' stance on the assumption that Paul is restricting a teaching office, arguing that teaching itself was not an office but an activity, and "it was something *every believer* was called to do, not merely church leaders (Heb. 5:12; Col. 3:16)". It is argued that Paul was concerned first and foremost about the content of the teaching as this theme is found throughout Paul's First Letter to Timothy (cf: 1 Tim 1:3; 4:16; 6:3).

To confound the argument, scholars argue for a universal application also on the basis of the present tense. Mounce (2000, p. 122) in his research of 1 Timothy 2:12 argues that due to the use of the generic γυνή, ('woman'), with ἐπιτρέπω (I do not permit) a universal truth is evident. Further, he states that there are other present tense situations in the PE that can be identified as

authoritative demands “bordering on the legal” (Mounce, 2000, p. 121). Mounce (2000, p. 100) argues that to appeal to the form of the word as a temporary prohibition is to “transcend the evidence”, and a hypothesis cannot be established on such grounds. Fee (1988, pp. 72-73), presents a counter argument due to the association between ‘teaching’ (v 12) and ‘learning’ (v 11); he is convinced that there is more support for a present indicative, and argues that it was false teaching that caused the prohibition in v 12 due to a situational problem. Further, he argues that Paul cannot be giving a universal injunction against women teaching as in his Letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor 14:26) it is clear that women “probably give a teaching from time to time” (Fee, 1988, p. 73). Nonetheless, the scholarly polemic continues as Knight (1992, p. 140) argues for the universal application based on Paul’s first person singular present indicative in other texts (cf: Rom 12:1, 3; 1 Cor 4:16; 2 Cor 5:20; Gal 5:2, 3; Eph 4:1; 1 Thess 4:1; 5:14; 2 Thess 3:6; 1 Tim 2:1, 8). However, when such a claim by Knight is examined in BDAG, other references using ἐπιτρέπω (I do not permit) all have a temporary application (cf: Mt 8:21; 19:8; Mk 10:4; Lk 8:32a; 9:59, 61; Acts 21:39; 27:3).⁷⁷ Therefore, a closer examination is required of other texts in the Pauline Corpus to resolve the ambiguity.

In examining the Biblical texts more broadly, Moo (1981, pp. 198-222) identifies twelve verses in the PE where the present active indicative first singular is used to support a universal application. Likewise, Schreiner (2005, p.100) agrees with Moo and identifies eighteen instances where the present active indicative first singular is present, namely Romans 15:30; 16:17; 1 Corinthians 1:10; 4:16; 7:10; 2 Cor 10:1; Ephesians 4:1; Philippians 4:2; 1 Thessalonians 4:1, 10; 5:14; 2 Thessalonians 3:6, 12; 1 Timothy 2:1, 8; 5:14; 2 Timothy 1:6; and Titus 3:8 to support his hypothesis that Paul gives a universal command in v 12. On closer examination of the work of these scholars, Schreiner identified seven verses in common with Moo (1 Cor 4:16, Eph 4:1, 1 Thess 4:1, 5:14, 2 Thess 3:6, 1 Tim 2:1, 8).

⁷⁷ BDAG, p. 385.

Of the eighteen verses quoted by Schreiner, six of these are to “urge” or “encourage” (Rom 16:17, Phil 4:2, 1 Thess 4:1, 1 Thess 4:10, 1 Thess 5:14, 1 Tim 2:1); four are to “appeal” (Rom 15:30; 1 Cor 1:110, 1 Cor 4:16, 2 Cor 10:1); three are “commands” (1 Cor 7:10, 2 Thess 3:6, 2 Thess 3:12); two are “desire” (1 Tim 2:8, Tit 3:8); one “beg” (Eph 4:1); one “remind” (2 Tim 1:6); and one “would have” (1 Tim 5:14). The debate between universal versus temporary injunctions can be viewed in two ways. One is to look at the verses quoted by Schreiner that are actual commands in the NT and secondly, to examine the verses in the NT that make appeals. There are more “appeals” than “commands” in the verses quoted by Schreiner. This does not demonstrate a sound argument for Paul giving a universal command. According to Osborne (1977, p. 347), “I do not permit” is not a command but an opinion that can or cannot be followed. If Paul was giving his opinion, then it would be to Timothy’s discretion to make the decision. However, Paul as an Apostle was not in the habit of giving his opinion; he was giving clear instructions as part of his commission to the early Church, and this was to teach no other doctrine but the Gospel of Jesus Christ.

Nyland argues from a different perspective stating that “I do not permit” (*ἐπιτρέπω*) is a temporary injunction relating to a specific situation in Ephesus with a universal application. Nyland (2004, pp. 548-549) translates “I do not permit” as “I most certainly do not grant authority” and explains that the use of *ἐπιτρέπω* corresponds with its use in Acts 28:16 when Paul was allowed to live by himself with a soldier to guard him. That is, authority was “turned over to”, “transferred to”, or “granted to” Paul, which is a more accurate meaning of *ἐπιτρέπω*, rather than “permit”. Nyland (2004, p. 365) provides ancient Greek literature through Homer’s use of the word to support her claim that this is the most competent translation.

While there are arguments for and against a temporary and/or universal application of “I do not permit” (*ἐπιτρέπω*), there is substantial evidence that supports the notion that Paul may have been giving a temporary command not

to teach heresy, rather than a straightforward prohibition for a woman not to teach. In the context of 1 Timothy 2:12, the situation relates only to women. If Paul is not permitting women to teach heresy, it is argued that this firstly has a temporary application to the woman in the situation at Ephesus, and secondly, that it has universal application as Paul requires that no one in the Church should teach outside the confines of the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles.

1 Timothy 2:12 and 'to teach' (διδάσκειν)

An examination of the word 'teach' and the syntax of the verse are required to illustrate whether the evidence leads to the trajectory of Paul addressing false teaching, or Paul giving a universal prohibition preventing women from teaching men. The Greek word διδάσκειν found in 1 Timothy 2:12 is translated as 'to teach'. The text in v 12 then reads "I permit no woman to teach" or "I do not permit a woman to teach". The Greek word διδάσκειν denotes 'teaching' or 'instructing' and this is commonly attested as far back as time of Homer (Nyland, 2004, p. 135).⁷⁸

This same Greek word διδάσκειν (to teach) is found in a number of other passages in the NT; examining these provides further understanding of the textual meaning in v 12. In the Acts of the Apostles, διδάσκειν (to teach) is found in four verses⁷⁹ in the context of teaching others. In Acts 5:28, the Apostles were given strict orders not to teach (διδάσκειν). BDAG differentiates the act of teaching (1 Tim 4:13, 16) from being skilful in teaching (1 Tim 3:2; 2 Tim 2:24) and/or teaching as an official role within the Christian assembly (Acts 13:1; 1 Cor 12:28; 2 Tim 1:11).⁸⁰ There is no notation or reference to διδάσκειν (to teach) in BDAG associating this with 1 Timothy 2:12, even though it records other textual occurrences of the word.⁸¹ In the NT, there are a number of times where Jesus is engaged in authoritative teaching; for example, in Matthew 11:1

⁷⁸ BDAG, p. 240.

⁷⁹ Acts 1:1; 4:2, 18; 5:28.

⁸⁰ BDAG, p. 240.

⁸¹ BDAG, pp. 237-248.

when Jesus had finished instructing his twelve disciples, he moved on from this situation 'to teach' (διδάσκειν). Other Gospel narratives also use a similar Greek word for 'to teach' (cf: Mk 4:1; 6:2; 8:31). Similarly, 'to teach' (διδάσκειν) as found in 1 Timothy 2:12 is also found in Matthew 4:23 when Jesus proclaimed the Gospel throughout Galilee. It is argued that the role of teaching was "one of the most prominent functions of Jesus in His [sic] public ministry" (Rengstorf, 1985, p. 139). As Jesus taught with 'authority' it is argued that the function of 'to teach' in 1 Timothy 2:12 is to do so in an authoritative manner.⁸² As H.F. Weiss (1990, p. 318) argues, only once does the Markan narrative show the use of the Greek 'to teach' (διδάσκειν) with reference to the disciples (Mk 6:30), and fifteen times with reference to Jesus. Subsequently, he argues that 1 Timothy 2:12 indicates a teaching activity of Church leaders, or those 'faithful' people commissioned by them to teach (Weiss, 1990, p. 319).

Ann Bowman argues that studies of "διδάσκειν" (to teach) substantiate that when used, it relates "almost exclusively to public instruction or teaching of groups" (A. Bowman, 1992, p. 200). Therefore, it is argued that the text of 1 Timothy 2:12 refers to a woman engaged in public instruction, rather than individual instruction. Paul Barth (as cited in Kittell & Friedrich, 1985) argues that when 'to teach' (διδάσκειν) is used "the aim is the highest possible development of the talents of the pupil, but always in such a way that the personal aspect is both maintained and indeed strengthened" (cf: Rengstorf, 1985, p. 135). This indicates that the teaching Paul refers to in the text is authoritative teaching as part of public instruction. On examining the Biblical texts and teaching in Paul's First Letter to Timothy, teaching as part of the New Covenant arrangements in the Church involves giving instruction that guards the truth of the Gospel that has been entrusted to the Church (cf: 1 Tim 1:11; 2:7; 3:15; 6:20). Therefore, this confirms the authoritative nature of the task. Further, Robert Saucy (1994, p. 88) draws attention to Paul's emphasis on the

⁸² Refer to Nyland, *TSNT*, pp. 25-26 who quotes evidence from ancient Greek literature to support her claim that Jesus was providing 'skilled instruction'.

importance of teaching in the PE and states that “considerable authority is attached to this ministry in the pastoral letters”. In addition, Homer Kent (1986, p. 106) claims that the authoritative role of the teacher extends across the entire NT.

One scholarly argument to reject women teaching is based on the hypothesis that the only false teachers named at Ephesus are men; *Hymenaeus and Alexander* (1 Tim 1:19-20); and *Hymenaeus and Philetus* (2 Tim 2:17-18). Given the influence of patriarchy in Biblical translation, it is not improbable to conceive that those named by Paul have since been portrayed as men; however, there are problems surrounding the etymology of Hymenaeus. Hymen or Hymenaeus is the name given to the Greek god of marriage and means ‘wedding song’. In Greek mythology, Hymenaeus is thought to be the son of Apollo by one of the Muses, perhaps Calliope Urania or Terpsichore.⁸³ The god of marriage in Roman literature is referred to interchangeably as Hymenaeus or Hymen, and there is other information that Hymen was a son of Aphrodite (Hornblower, 1996, p. 735). Hymenaeus is represented as a beautiful youth carrying a bridal torch and wearing a veil indicating that the god was feminine.⁸⁴ Cybele and Hestia - female gods, were known to wear veils, which were bridal headdresses in reality. It is alleged that Roman heroes could also be depicted with heads veiled, such is the claim for Aeneas⁸⁵ a male Roman Trojan hero; however, on exploring this claim there are no images of Aeneas with a veil.⁸⁶ In Hellenistic Studies at Harvard University, one translation identifies a person called Hymenaeus as female.⁸⁷ While the

⁸³ Retrieved 21 October, 2006, <http://www.theoi.com/Ouranios/ErosHymenaios.html>.

⁸⁴ Retrieved 21 October, 2006, <http://www.cc.columbia.edu/cu/cup/>, ref: Sixth Edition, 2003, Columbia University Press.

⁸⁵ Cf: Roxman, Suzanna, *List of Emblems of Classical Deities in Ancient and Modern Pictorial Arts*. Retrieved, 24 October, 2006, <http://www.maicar.cim/GML/003Signed/SREmblems.html>.

⁸⁶ Retrieved 21 October, 2006, <http://imagesonline.bl.uk/britishlibrary/controller>.

⁸⁷ Cf: a translation by E. Kosmetatou that reads “AB 50 (VIII 13-18) A dark cloud came upon this city, when Eetion placed his daughter below this marker and mourned her, calling upon his child Hedeia; Hymenaeus knocked at the door not of her marriage chamber, but of this tomb....but let

depiction of Hymenaeus, the god of marriage, is commonly understood to be a man, there are no images readily available to confirm this. This evidence questions the reliability of the name Hymenaeus solely referring to a male as Hymenaeus can also be the name for a woman. Subsequently, Paul, when referring to the false teacher Hymenaeus, the general scholarly view is that the person is male; however, given this evidence the person may have been a woman (2 Tim 2:17).

The earlier discussion established that Paul is addressing a situation of teaching in Ephesus. The circumstances involved a woman, and there is evidence from scholars that this was being conducted with authority in a public domain. Following this, the debate shifts to whether or not the woman was engaged in false teaching, and the polemic is largely centred on the Greek word ἕτεροδιδασκαλεῖν (to teach differently). Köstenberger (2005, p.62) argues that if Paul wanted to restrict false teaching in v 12 instead of using διδάσκειν (to teach) he would have used the Greek word ἕτεροδιδασκαλεῖν (to teach differently) as he did in 1 Timothy 1:3-4 when he asks Timothy to instruct the people not to teach a different doctrine. Further, his argument takes the trajectory that while Paul does not use ἕτεροδιδασκαλεῖν (to teach differently) in 1 Timothy 2:12 and Titus 1:9-14, there is ample contextual information in Titus to argue that Paul is forbidding false teaching (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005, pp. 61-62). Similarly, Schreiner (2005, p. 104) argues that Paul would have used ἕτεροδιδασκαλεῖν (to teach differently) if he wanted to restrict false teaching; however, he argues on the grounds that as Paul chose this same word in 1 Timothy 1:3 and 6:3 he would have “given some other clear contextual clue (such as an object clause or an adverb) to indicate that the teaching in view is false teaching” in 1 Timothy 2:12. It is argued in this study that the contextual clue is found in vv 13-15, as the context is located in the specific philosophical notion behind the false teaching of the woman that Paul then corrects. The rationale from Paul in the text of vv 13-15 is discussed in

the tears and lamentations of those citizens suffice”. Retrieved 21 October, 2006, http://www.chs.harvard.edu/publications/sec/classics/ssp/translations_en_-_epitymbia.

more detail in Chapter Eight. Further, to understand 1 Timothy 2:12 in its context, a first reading of the English text does not provide the same clarity as does a first reading of Titus 1:9-14. This is further demonstrated by comparing both texts. In both contexts Paul requires ‘silence’; however, he uses quite distinct Greek words in 1 Timothy 2:12 and in Titus 1:9-14. Nonetheless, the context relates to the notion of silence, as in Titus 1:9-14 Paul insists that ‘false teachers’ who are rebelling against the truth must be silenced. Again, in 1 Timothy 2:11-12 a woman who is engaged in false teaching must be silenced. In effect, it is argued that on the basis of the context in both situations, Paul is silencing false teachers. The reason for this is that he is intent on preventing everyone, women and men from unorthodox teaching. Essentially, Paul was concerned about false teaching in the Church, not the gender of the teacher (Hamilton, 2000, pp. 204, 214).

If Paul had meant only for men to be teachers it is argued that he would have made this patently clear. The only criteria for the role of teaching is that it be entrusted to those who were faithful people, those who were skilled in instruction, who were mature and could refute false teaching or heresy. Therefore, it is argued that Paul is not restricting women from authoritative teaching but from teaching others “false knowledge” or heresies that cause others to turn away from the central truth of the Gospel message.

Teaching and the Grammatical Structure of 1 Timothy 2:12

In the Greek and the English there are distinctly different sentence constructions, and rules of grammar. Therefore, to translate the Greek into English and fully retain the meaning of the sentence structure is not without its complexities.

The Greek in 1 Timothy 2:12 reads: διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ’ εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ. A literal translation states “to teach a woman I do not allow nor to have authority of (over) a man, but to be in silence” (NGEINT). There are scholarly positions that maintain the Biblical text in itself does not hold any new information for a different translation (Holmes, 2000).

However, Nyland (2004, pp. 8-12), when examining the NT text, found translations to be defective. For example, with J. H. Moulton's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, the *Syntax* volume was the responsibility of N. Turner; according to Nyland it is this volume that is "seriously deficient" (Nyland, 2004, p. 9). Others agree with Nyland, as Turner's work generally overlooked modern developments in research (Kilpatrick, 1990).

The major difficulty in analysing the grammatical structure of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is the reliance on lexicon tools, for example Mayser, Moulton and Milligan are not inclusive of recent *papyri*, and inscriptional evidence; and, all the lexicons that have relied on the Tyndale's translation of the *KJV* of 1611 are problematic (Nyland, 2004). For instance, it was the *KJV* that "changed the female names Junia and Nympha to masculine names, reversed the order of 'mothers and brothers', reversed the order of Priscilla (woman) and Aquila (man) when the couple was presented in a teaching context, and added the words 'a man' to a sentence about a woman being in a position of responsibility" (Nyland, 2004, p. 11). Other scholars argue that it is not the text that is defective nor its translation but the interpretation of the text based on its syntactical structure. Köstenberger (2005), is one scholar who has conducted a comprehensive study on the syntactical structure of 1 Timothy 2:12; including an in-depth examination of the Greek word 'οὐδέ' usually translated as 'nor', and its connective status in the structure of the text. He explains the sentence structure as consisting of: "(1) a negated finite verb + (2) infinitive + (3) οὐδέ + infinitive + (4) ἀλλά + infinitive" (Köstenberger, Schreiner, & Baldwin, 1995, p. 55).

Köstenberger (2005, p.56) refutes other scholarly claims that οὐδέ is subordinate to διδάσκειν (to teach) and for that reason the translation of the sentence transmits one coherent meaning. At the basis of his argument is that 'teaching' and 'to have or exercise authority' are two terms that are closely related and yet distinct (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005, p. 56). He supports this with Matthew 6:20 "where thieves neither break in nor steal" (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005, p. 56). Köstenberger (2005, p. 56) claims that 'breaking in' and 'stealing' are essentially one event of burglary; however, "they are not so

closely related as to lose their own distinctness”. To further support his exegetical analysis, he examines οὐδέ in the context of syntactical parallels for 1 Timothy 2:12 in the NT, and in extra-Biblical literature. He found only “one close syntactical parallel to 1 Timothy 2:12 in the New Testament, Acts 16:21, where the same construction, a negated finite verb + infinitive + οὐδέ + infinitive, is found” (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005, p. 57).

Given the limitations of this, Köstenberger (2005) identified fifty-two other verses that allowed for verbal forms rather than infinitives to be linked by nor (οὐδέ). In his analysis he categorized two patterns:

Pattern 1: two activities or concepts are viewed positively in and of themselves, but their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied due to circumstances or conditions adduced in the context.

Pattern 2: two activities or concepts are viewed negatively, and consequently their exercise is prohibited or their existence is denied or they are to be avoided (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005, p. 57).

He concludes that “in both patterns, the conjunction οὐδέ coordinates activities of the same order, that is, activities that are both viewed either positively or negatively by the writer or speaker” (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005, p. 57).

After examining the syntactical parallels for 1 Timothy 2:12 and uniting these with their context Köstenberger concludes that both ‘teaching’ and ‘to have or exercise authority’ are positive. Therefore, his argument is that as διδάσκειν (to teach) is used “absolutely in the New Testament for an activity that is viewed positively in and of itself, and since οὐδέ coordinates terms that are both viewed either positively or negatively αὐθεντεῖν should be seen as denoting an activity that is viewed positively in and of itself as well” (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005, p. 62). With the combination of the matching pairs in 1 Timothy 2:11 and 12 of “learning/teaching” and “full submission/having authority”, Köstenberger

(2005, p. 62) renders 1 Timothy 2:12 as “I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man”.

To discover whether the pattern usage of ‘nor’ (οὐδέ) matched his findings of NT syntactical parallels, Köstenberger (2005, p. 63) examined forty-eight syntactical parallels for 1 Timothy 2:12 in extra-Biblical literature. Using the IBYCUS system, a computer program with capability of searching all related extant ancient Greek literature, he found the same two patterns existed in extra-Biblical literature. As a result of examining this Köstenberger (2005, p. 74) states that 1 Timothy 2:12 can be read in two ways: “I do not permit a woman to teach [error] or to usurp a man’s authority” or “I do not permit a woman to teach or to have (or exercise) authority over a man”. A key question raised by him in his analysis is the role of ‘nor’ (οὐδέ), and whether it is a coordinating or subordinating conjunction. He claims that due to the syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12, and extra-Biblical parallels, that ‘teaching’ and ‘authority’ linked by ‘nor’ (οὐδέ) cannot be merged into one concept (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005, p. 62). Further, he concludes that the first activity ‘I do not permit’ joined by the coordinating conjunction with ‘a woman to teach’ states that the text “should be rendered ‘to have (or exercise) authority,’ and not ‘to flout the authority of’ or ‘to domineer’” (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005, p. 74). This demonstrates the complexity of the exegetical exercise to determine meaning.

BDAG identifies the conjunction οὐδέ (nor) in itself as a negative, being the combination of οὐ and δέ; therefore, it joins other negative words or clauses to others of the same kind.⁸⁸ Belleville (2001, p. 126) describes οὐδέ as a coordinating conjunction, however, explains this as having connecting “elements of equal *grammatical* rank but not necessarily related activities”. As she explains in her argument, the use of ‘neither – nor’ happens with synonyms, closely related ideas or antonyms, and “they function to move from the general to the particular” (Belleville, 2001, p. 126). In her reading she treats οὐδέ as a

⁸⁸ BDAG, p. 734.

negative coordinating conjunction and therefore, claims 1 Timothy 2:12 reads “I do not permit a woman to teach a man in a dominating way but to have a quiet demeanor [sic]” (Belleville, 2001, p. 127). Alternatively, “I do not, however, permit her to teach with the intent to dominate a man. She must be gentle in her demeanor [sic]” (1 Tim 2:11-12) (Belleville, 2001, p. 128). The emphasis then is on either restricting what is being taught, or the manner in which the teaching is being conducted.

The Kroegers’ (1992, p. 103) extend the argument as they place more emphasis on the context, and claim this relates to teaching incorrect doctrine, that is, false teaching. They rely on the verb that forbids teaching incorrect doctrine as Paul states in 1 Timothy 1:3-4 and Titus 1:9-14. However, on the basis of the Kroegers’ argument, further attention needs to be given to the text and context when Paul writes to Timothy, and asks him to instruct certain people not to teach any different doctrine (*ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*) (cf: 1 Tim 1:3). Köstenberger (2005, p. 62) argues that if Paul wanted to stop false teaching, he would have used the same Greek word *ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν* (to teach differently) in 1 Timothy 2:12 that he did in his Letter to Titus. As part of this study it is argued that it was likely that Paul did not use the term (*ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν*) due to the contextual situation. Earlier in Paul’s First Letter to Timothy, he is addressing false teaching propagated by a number of people, not an individual (1 Tim 1:3-4). Similarly, in his Letter to Titus he addresses a situation where a number of people were engaged in teaching for dishonest personal profit (Rogers & Rogers, 1998, p. 509). From the context, it appears that Titus was in Crete, and Paul wants him to prevent a number of the Cretans from false teaching. Paul recognises that these false teachers profess to know God but he rejects this on the basis of their actions (cf: Titus 1:16). As stated, with the situation at Ephesus, Paul is concerned about preventing a woman from teaching a particular heresy. Nyland (2004, p. 549) argues that the translation of 1 Timothy 2:12 supports a position that Paul’s concern was about one particular matter; in the analysis, a woman was teaching a heresy claiming that she was the originator of a man.

Even those in the academy who are expert scholars in Greek are unable to agree on the interpretation of the text, based on its sentence structure alone. Another reason that makes it even more difficult to understand the meaning of the 1 Timothy 2:12 is that there is no other usage of the same syntactical structure in Paul's other letters (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005). Therefore, the syntactical structure of the sentence is only one approach in a range of methodological stratum that is needed for an accurate interpretation of the text.

The Role of Teaching in the Church

In the historical reading of 1 Timothy 2:12, a woman does not have an authoritative teaching role in the Church. There are a number of scholars who claim that authoritative teaching in the Church is part of an office; for example, an elder (cf: Foh, 1989; Grudem, 2004; Hurley, 1981; Powers, 1996). On the other hand, scholars such as R. White Fowler (2001) argue that teaching, having authority, or ruling are separate functions. In relation to 1 Timothy 2:12, Foh (1979) claims the text refers to one function, and Paul's statement in v 12 is about a distinction between authoritative and non-authoritative teaching. Subsequently, it is appears that it is this distinction that formed the basis of the argument that women can teach but only in certain settings, or under the authority of a man (cf: Patterson, 2005, p. 155).

When Paul writes to the churches about the role of teaching in the Church, he does not make distinctions between women and men (1 Cor 12:28; Eph 4:11; Rom 12:6). When the NT texts are examined, the highest rank or authority given by Paul is to the Apostle and Prophet (1 Cor 12:29). The teaching role is third in the ranking, and subsequently, of less importance in the Church's structure. Foy (1989, p. 79) supports her argument for limitations on the teaching role of women to other women and children by arguing that there are "no examples of females Apostles" in the NT. On the basis that "Scripture does not contradict Scripture; Scripture interprets Scripture" she neglects key Biblical evidence that supports women in roles exceedingly more important than teaching (Foh, 1989, p. 70). In contrast to Foh's position, Junia was identified by Paul as being prominent among the Apostles (cf: Rom 16:7). While some scholars have argued that Junia was male, dating back to the Thirteenth

Century, Junia as feminine is attested to by “more than 250 times in inscriptions found in Rome alone” (Nyland, 2004, p. 408). Women Apostles are also attested to by Chrysostom (as cited in Spencer, 2004) with reference to Andronicus and Junia. As part of his *Epistle to the Romans (Homily xxxi, Rom xvi 5)* Chrysostom stated:

Indeed to be Apostles at all is a great thing. But to be even amongst these of note, just consider what a great encomium this is! But they were of note owing to their works, to their achievements. Oh! How great is the devotion of this woman, that she should be even counted worthy of the appellation of Apostle! (Spencer, 2004, p. 126).

Further, another woman, Mary of Magdala played a significant role in the ministry of Jesus; she was the first to see Jesus after his resurrection, and to give testimony to this event (Mk 16:9). As the first witness to the resurrection of Jesus, scholars have identified Mary as an “Apostle to the Apostles” (C. Kroeger Clark & Evans, 2002, p.571).

Another part of the polemic on teaching is that there is no connection between teaching and authority in the NT (Liefeld, 2004). Liefeld (2004, p. 265) argues that the term ‘teaching authority’ suggests authority in the teacher, rather than in what is taught and therefore, “is an anachronism when...discussing teaching/teachers in the New Testament”. Given the view towards Greek and Jewish women in the ancient world, Liefeld (2004, p. 265) argues that it would not have been unusual to restrict teaching to men. He draws further support from the fact that Paul did not mention women as witnesses to the resurrection because in the First Century, women were seen as unreliable witnesses (Liefeld, 2004, p. 266).

Patterson (2005) argues that the teaching of Apollos - undertaken as part of group instruction - is not the same as the teaching given by Priscilla and Aquila (cf: Acts 18:24-28). She explains that because their teaching was not in the sense of public teaching as in group instruction, she concludes that Priscilla was not teaching with authority. While there is some basis for Patterson’s

argument, the context needs to be considered to capture the full meaning of the text. Craig Keener (2001, pp. 40-44), once held a similar position; however, he could not sustain this as there are other contradicting texts, and events concerning women, including Priscilla (cf: Acts:18:25-27; Rom 16:3). In its examination the text discloses that Apollos was well versed in the Scriptures and eloquent, and yet his teaching needed adjustment, and this was provided by Priscilla and Aquila. While Priscilla and Aquila were not providing group instruction, their teaching of Apollos is significant as they had the responsibility to ensure that Apollos was sufficiently equipped to conduct further group instruction (cf: Acts 18:28). It can be deduced that Priscilla and Aquila also taught group instruction, given their operation of the *charism*. Further, Priscilla and Aquila were active ministers of the Gospel with a home Church, and worked alongside Paul as his co-workers; teaching as Paul taught. Given this information it is reasonable to claim that Priscilla would have spoken publicly alongside the men.

In the OT there is no law forbidding women to engage in public speaking as the daughter of Zelophehad addressed the priest, the leaders, and the entire congregation (Num 27:1-7) (Bushnell, 2004). In the NT there is no record of Jesus rebuking women for speaking in public (Lk 8:47; 11:27; 13:13) (Bushnell, 2004). Furthermore, if Jesus was setting the cultural parameters for women in his ministry, this did not include a prohibition on women speaking in public. Even though there is a difference between speaking in public and public speaking, Jesus encouraged women to be part of his ministry (Mk 15:40-41; Lk 8:2-3). When Jesus commissioned the seventy disciples to spread his teachings there is no mention that this excluded women (Lk 10:1). There is no mention that these disciples were only men. There are named and unnamed female followers of Jesus; they travelled with him and 'the twelve' and provided for the group out of their own resources (Lk 8:1-3).

The Biblical record of women participating as followers, or disciples is in direct contrast to accepted social practices in the First Century (C. Kroeger Clark & Evans, 2002, p. 571). The lack of identification of women was not an indication that the function of women in the Church was restricted, but that women were

being respected. As was stated by Pericles when he declared “the greatest honor [sic] belonged to the woman whose name was never mentioned outside her home, whether for good or evil” (C. Kroeger Clark & Evans, 2002, p.571).⁸⁹ However, it seems that the First Century practice of honouring women by not mentioning their name outside the home has worked to the disadvantage of women in the Twenty-first Century. Rather than scholars recognising that this was a social custom of the era, they have taken this as a sign that it limits women’s role to the domestic sphere; consequently, this has accentuated the role of men in public teaching, and displaced women.

The Scriptures portray teaching as a function that is open to those who have the *charism* or ‘gift’ to teach; teaching is open to all members who are part of the body of Christ (cf: Rom 12:4-7; 1 Cor 12:27-28; 1 Cor 14:26; Eph 4:11). Ferder and Heagle (1989, pp. 97, 98) in their study of the *charisms* or the *charismata*, state that though the gifts vary greatly “they are fundamentally equal and non-hierarchical”. As part of the ‘gift’ of teaching there is additional responsibility as teachers will be held to account for what they teach (cf: James 3:1). Teaching is not an exclusive role available only to men, although this view is commonly held by traditionalists working out of the normative paradigm of patriarchy. When the Scriptures are examined, they reveal that women were allowed to teach as long as they had the *charism* for teaching.

If there was a consistent motif around teaching only being the role of men, then surely Paul would have made this clear on a number of occasions. There are two threads of understanding coming through the Scriptural text in regard to teaching: those who teach have received a ‘gift’, and secondly, such a gift is entrusted to ‘faithful’ people who will be able to teach others (2 Tim 2:2). Paul acknowledges Timothy as ‘faithful’, and he entrusted him to teach others (cf: 1

⁸⁹ In some circles of modern scholarship, the social practice of not naming women publicly in the ancient world has led to the assertion that Priscilla is possibly the author of Hebrews. Ruth Hoppin argues that there is enough information to give strong indications to support such an argument for authorship being attributed to Priscilla (Hoppin, 1969).

Cor 4:17); he refers to Tychicus and Epaphras as faithful ministers (cf: Eph 6:21; Col 1:7); he claims that Jesus judged him 'faithful', and he was appointed to Christ's service and equipped with *charisms* to do his work (1 Tim 1:12). Other English Bibles (cf: *AMP, NKJV, NIV*) translate 'faithful people' as 'faithful men', and this has contributed to the patriarchal prejudice that only men can teach. Paul is not placing restrictions on women in a teaching role; his paramount concern is that it be entrusted to 'faithful' people, and those who have the *charism*, and meet the criteria for the role. The older women, those who are elders,⁹⁰ are to teach what is good (Titus 2:3). Teachers have the dual role of both teaching, and being able to contradict those who would refute sound teaching (Titus 1:9). Jesus or Paul did not make a distinction between genders; the evidence in the Gospel narratives is that there was acceptance of women in the ministry of the New Covenant community beginning with Jesus and continuing with Paul (cf: Lk 8:3-4; Rom 16:1, 3).

The Image of Paul – Traditionalist versus Egalitarian

The Apostle Paul is historically seen as a traditionalist who discriminates against women, arguably as a direct result of Biblical translations that favour an androcentric text. However, there is a shift in the thinking of scholars and Jean Guarino (1992, p. 75) states that "many biblical scholars believe that the historical Paul has been unfairly maligned as being a male chauvinist". Guarino quotes Francis X. Cleary as saying "Paul is early Christianity's greatest champion – second only to Jesus himself – in proclaiming full equality of the sexes in marriage and in the Church" (Guarino, 1992, p. 75). Even though Guarino argues that Paul was proclaiming full equality for women, and this is consistent with Pauline theology in the context of the 'new creation' as was argued in Chapter Five, it has not been fully translated to women's experience in the contemporary world. Even today there is a predilection from traditionalists who argue that Paul is prohibiting women from any type of public speaking (Belleville, 2001).

⁹⁰ Cf: Nyland, *TSNT*, p. 74, where the translation refers to 'male' and 'female' elders in Titus 2:-3.

This section evaluates three scholarly arguments to determine whether or not Paul was a chauvinist, or a champion for women. One argument presented by Towner (2006, p. 200) is that Paul placed the prohibition on women to return 'public respectability' to the Church. Another argument proposed by Winter (2003, p. 122) is that the Pauline teaching prohibition existed to moderate the behaviour of women in early Christian communities paralleling laws that had been introduced by the Emperor Augustus (b. 63 B.C.E.–d. 14 C.E.) to counter the behaviour of *avant-garde* women in Rome who challenged traditional roles. Thirdly, Grudem (2004b, p. 277) maintains that only men can teach the Gospel message, and he draws additional support for his argument from Paul's Second Letter to Timothy, where Paul states that Timothy should "proclaim the message" (2 Tim 4:2). His argument is based on Paul using singular imperative verbs in the text; similarly, as was discussed in Chapter Three the Magisterium of the Roman Catholic Church maintain that priestly ordination is reserved for men alone as Christ chose only men as his Apostles. His Holiness Pope Benedict XVI honours and acknowledges the role of women in the organisational structure of the Church; however, based on the Sacrament of Order that governs the Church, the priestly ministry is reserved solely for men (Pope Benedict XVI, 2006).

Firstly, Towner (2006, p. 200) argues that Paul introduces the prohibitions because women were damaging the image of the Church with their style of dress, and their participation in false teaching; additionally Paul is not only preventing wealthy women from teaching what is a heresy but what he claims is a type of experiment in the *ekklesia* at Ephesus (cf: 1 Tim 2:9-15). Further, he argues that under different circumstances women may have been allowed to fulfil more roles in the Church if not for "the combined detrimental effects of the heresy and the emerging controversial trend among wealthy women" (Towner, 2006, p. 200). While the 'public respectability' of the Church would be important to Paul, it is argued that he would not disqualify women from teaching unless he was prescribing a hierarchal model for the Church. Also, as Paul's mission was to preach the Gospel message as part of the New Covenant Church it seems unlikely that he is correcting women's behaviour by paralleling Augustus, as

argued by Winter, and discussed in the previous paragraph. This study claims that this argument loses impetus as it is anachronistic given that the laws of Augustus, the first Roman Emperor, may have changed considerably by Paul's time, given that the current Emperor Nero was the fifth Roman Emperor. Secondly, it is a contradiction to Paul's other teachings. In the New Covenant Church structure, Paul was an advocate of women being functionally equal with men. The third argument, that Paul uses the singular imperative verbs cannot be contextually sustained, as in this particular statement Paul is encouraging Timothy in his ministry. At this juncture in the Biblical text, he is not specifically addressing the issue of who should teach in the Church. To adequately critique the Pauline prohibitions, and the type of language Paul used is to return to the world of the Biblical text.

Paul in his Letter to the Ephesians asks 'all' to render service as God shows no partiality (Eph 6:9); he writes to the entire Church in Ephesus, and it is clear that he wants everyone to be ready to proclaim the Gospel - not only the men (Eph 6:15). The Roman Catholic century-old position is that women cannot be ordained to the priesthood on the basis that Christ initially chose men disciples only men can be priests; however, the argument loses its veracity given that all were Jews, and to be consistent in the contemporary world, if priests are limited to males they also need to be limited to Jews.

The Biblical text itself can provide clarity about issues of gender and highlight translation problems. For example, it was not uncommon in early Christian literature for the writer to use the Greek word ἀδελφοὶ to mean brothers and sisters, in whatever order the writer chose.⁹¹ An examination of the Pauline use of this Greek word illustrates Paul's attitude to women as Paul, when writing to the Church in Corinth, he states that he heard from Chloe's people that there was quarrelling "among you, my brothers and sisters" (ἀδελφοί) (cf: 1 Cor 1:10-11). Paul is inclusive in his language, as he appeals to everyone to be in agreement. Another example of ἀδελφοὶ is when Paul explains about the

⁹¹ BADG, p. 18.

requirement for Church meetings in Corinth (cf: 1 Cor 14:26-39); on this occasion, the *NRSV* translates this as 'friends'. Paul refers to both women and men as active participants in assembly gatherings; - the contradiction in sustaining the Pauline prohibitions is why did Paul tell everyone, including women to be "eager to prophesy" (cf: 1 Cor 14:39) when he had just asked women to keep silent? (cf: 1 Cor 14:35) (Marlowe, 2004). Subsequently, there is no scientific linguistic argument for the use of the Greek word ἀδελφοὶ being translated as a gender exclusive term (Marlowe, 2004).

In the larger context of the Pauline Corpus, the teachings, instructions and corrections are for the benefit of the entire Church, that is, all of the people; female, male, young people, and children. For example, Paul, in his opening salutation to the Corinthians writes to the 'Church': those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus (1 Cor 1:2). Paul thanks God because of the grace that has been given to the Church. He wrote in v 26 that when the Church comes together 'all' have a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue, or an interpretation. There is a parallel between 1 Corinthians 14:26-33 and 1 Timothy 2:11-15; Paul wants 'all' in the Corinthian church to participate, his major concern is orderly conduct, and this requires 'some' to be silent on occasions - referring to both women and men. For this reason, the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is to be understood in light of the context, and the Pauline Corpus as a whole.

Again, Paul is inclusive when he writes to the Churches; for example, Galatia, Corinth, Colossae, and Ephesus. In his Letter to the Philippians, Paul writes to the "saints in Christ Jesus" in Philippi (Phil 1:1). Paul writes to all the believers: women and men. In his Letter to the Philippians, Paul addresses the believers (ἀδελφοὶ): both women and men, and asks them to "stand firm in the Lord" (Phil 4:1). This gender-inclusive translation for ἀδελφοὶ fits with the redemptive trajectory in Scripture and therefore, women and men are one in Christ Jesus (Ian Howard Marshall, 2004a). As well as this, there is some evidence from ancient sources that the masculine plural forms of the noun could in some

contexts have a gender-neutral sense (Marlowe, 2004, para. 5). It also has the expanded meaning in BDAG of *close associates*.⁹² Paul appeals to everyone ἀδελφοὶ when he writes “present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God”, and then goes on to write to the Romans to be transformed through the “renewing of their minds” (Rom 12:1-2). Paul, as part of requirements for the New Covenant community wants everyone as close associates in the Church, to be transformed so they can reflect the image of God (Gen 1:27). It is argued, therefore, that Paul has unfairly been maligned as chauvinistic.

The intertextuality of the NT text reinforces an argument for Paul being a champion of women in the period of the First Century. The Matthean narrative strengthens the textual meaning of ἀδελφοὶ as a gender inclusive word (cf: Mt 12:48). The reference to those becoming teachers in James 3:1 is ἀδελφοί. This suggests that teachers are not of any specific gender and therefore, can be either female or male. The linguistic interpretative argument that ἀδελφοὶ refers to the male gender is less compelling when the context is examined. Paul addresses women and men in his letters to the Churches. The example of ἀδελφοὶ shows that a word study - while not complete on its own - assists in finding a more accurate interpretation of the text, particularly if this is combined with a contextual understanding.

Conclusion

The Church when it was institutionalised in the Fourth Century shows a synchronisation with the socio-political and cultural structures of the patriarchal environment. It was around this time that functional equality for women was eroded, ushering the return to patriarchal rule. As Christianity entered the public sphere “male leaders began to demand the same subjugation of women in the churches as prevailed in Greco-Roman society at large” (Torjesen, 1993, p. 38). What erupted in the New Covenant Church around this time was hostility

⁹² BDAG, p. 18.

between “the social conventions about women’s place and women’s actual long-standing roles as house church leaders, prophets, evangelists, and even bishops” and this precipitated extensive controversy in the Church (Torjesen, 1993, pp. 37-38). The fact that women were in leadership in the First Century Church was evident in the arguments in this chapter. Further, it is argued that the Apostle Paul has been misrepresented for centuries, and in particular with the translation and meaning attributed to v 12.

This chapter argues the significance of *papyri* and inscriptions in recent decades has not been factored into a Twenty-first Century translation of 1 Timothy 2:12: one that potentially will change the historical place given to women in the Church. The English and traditional translation has been at the nucleus of a contemporary understanding of women’s role and place. When examining v 12 it is evident that Paul is addressing a situation in Ephesus with the aim to prevent a particular heresy from occurring. Based on the syntax, and intertextuality of NT text there appears to be adequate evidence from scholars and this study to support Paul giving a temporary injunction.

Through an analysis of the evidence, this chapter suggests that teaching is an authoritative task, and in the state of affairs in Ephesus a woman was teaching with authority, and was engaged in group instruction; even though an aspect of her teaching was false. It is argued that while it may not have been unusual to restrict teaching to men in the cultural setting of the First Century, what is evident in the Pauline Corpus is a paradigm shift to include women in teaching. Scholars, such as Craig Keener (2001) argue that in the key text of 1 Timothy 2:12 there is a specific prohibition to one early Church congregation; a logical conclusion given that her teaching was ‘out of order’. He explains that Paul’s affirmation of women in the most prominent positions in the early Church in his other letters contradicts the exclusion of women from teaching (Keener, 2001, pp. 40-70). If Paul had intended to prohibit women from teaching and functioning in the Church as a universal principle, this was not reflected in how the early Church interpreted the text in his First Letter to Timothy. This is powerfully attested from the commentary of Epiphanius in the Fourth Century, and confirmed in his writings that women were participating as equals with men

in the Church. Further, the Pauline Corpus and the intertextuality of the NT text all confirm that teaching in the New Covenant Church is open to all who have the *charism*, and are proven as being faithful and trusted in the role.

On the basis of Paul's inclusive language with the Pauline Corpus, to infer Paul is a male chauvinist is not only to misrepresent Paul but to do him a great injustice. He was responsible for shifting the Church into the New Covenant paradigm from the OT patriarchal paradigm. It appears that in the translation of the Biblical text from Greek to English, the full extent of the Pauline letter, and in particular 1 Timothy 2:11-15, has not been captured in most contemporary translations. Neither is the context reflected with a modern reading. It is argued that Paul envisaged a New Covenant Church; one that was gender inclusive. Further, that he has been unfairly represented in scholarship, as when the Pauline text is analysed in its context it shows he does not discriminate against women. Nevertheless, history shows that a gender inclusive Church was not sustained. There is evidence of the tension the inclusion of women produced as the patriarchal paradigm was disputed, and Paul's egalitarian model falls into disrepute.

The following chapter examines the Greek word *αὐθεντέω* in 1 Timothy 2:12 to discover whether the traditional translation of the text 'to have or exercise authority' that has segregated women from participating fully and equally in the Church is an accurate translation. Over time, a plethora of meanings have been given to *αὐθεντέω* all of which have implications for the treatment and place of women in the Church. An analysis of these different meanings are centered in the scholarly debate on the subject and examined in the context of the Pauline Corpus and the intertextuality of the NT texts.

CHAPTER 7

The Contentious Text and Authority in 1 Timothy 2:12

The Greek word ἀυθεντέω, is without doubt the most contentious word of the most contentious verse in the text of Paul's First Letter to Timothy, and has been translated with a range of different meanings. At the basis of all argumentation for an accurate translation is one principal aim, that is, to prove conclusively Paul's intended meaning for ἀυθεντέω, and explain 1 Timothy 2:12, and how this relates to the place of women in the Church and home. Subsequently, the word meaning for ἀυθεντέω has gained the attention of scholars more than any other word Paul's First Letter to Timothy. The historical translation and meaning given to v 12 on the basis of ἀυθεντέω is that women do not have divine sanction 'to have or exercise authority over a man'. If the historical translation is correct, and a universal Biblical principle exists within the text, then women are destined to be subservient to men for all time. Until now, the historical translation, and in particular the Greek word ἀυθεντεῖν chosen by the Apostle Paul, has marginalised and oppressed women in the Church, creating a hierarchical culture with men in the superior position. Given the repercussions for women in the Church, due to the translation of ἀυθεντέω, what follows in this chapter is an examination of its meaning to determine the validity of the traditional translation.

Αυθεντέω Meaning to Have or Exercise Authority

1 Timothy 2:12 has been historically translated by traditionalists as "I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man, she is to keep silent". In this verse Paul uses ἀυθεντέω, a verb, that does not appear anywhere else in the Pauline Letters (Belleville, 2001). In the Twenty-first Century, for the most part, ἀυθεντέω is generally translated by scholars to mean "to have or exercise authority over". Other meanings given to ἀυθεντέω include: 'usurp authority'; 'have dominion'; or 'not to rule'. Out of twelve translations 'have authority' is found six times (*AMP; NRSV; NKJV; NLT; NIV; RSV*); 'exercise authority' is

found twice (*NASB; DBY*); ‘usurp authority’ is found twice (*KJV; WBS*); ‘have dominion’ is found once (*ASV*); and ‘or to rule’ is found once (*YLT*). In The Jerusalem Bible *αὐθεντέω* is translated as ‘tell a man what to do’. Even though there are differences in translations, the common denominator is ‘authority’ as it relates to ‘power’. However, an initial caution is that to interpret *αὐθεντέω* outside of its context is potentially problematic given that it is a *hapax legomenon*, and therefore, represents a unique challenge in establishing its word meaning in Biblical exegesis.

Elements of Koine Greek appeared as early as the Fifth Century B.C.E., with its dominant period between 322 B.C.E., and 600 C.E. (Valleskey, 1995). As there were different meanings for *αὐθεντέω* throughout that period, extra-Biblical texts, and the context of the text assist in confirming the word meaning in the First Century C.E. When referring to the use of *αὐθεντέω*, Valleskey (1995, para. 21) emphasises the importance of establishing a translation in the correct period when he states “each verb usage is significant since only 10 of the 165 significant usages of *αυθεντ-* from BC VI through AD III is, as was St. Paul’s usage in 1 Timothy 2:12, of the verb or participial form”. One of the most significant usages of the word in relation to the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is that of Ptolemy (2 C.E.) whose usage within six citations depict five as adjectival and refer to “the birth of a child under a certain sign of the heavens’ [that signifies that the newborn will be] the one who exercises authority (*αυθεντουντα*) over all” (*Tetr.* III.13.38) (Valleskey, 1995, para. 22). This evidence is critical in understanding Paul’s intended meaning - it indicates that he was not referring to a woman as not having or exercising authority - he was referring to Jesus as the one who would exercise authority over all.

Since the Seventeenth Century the *KJV* has traditionally translated *αὐθεντέω* as ‘usurp authority’ over a man. This has been replaced in the more recent edition of the *NKJV* by ‘have authority’. At one point in their research of this Greek word the Kroegers (1992) agreed with the meaning of ‘usurp authority’. As they

later discovered, ἀϋθεντέω did not mean ‘to bear rule’ or ‘to usurp authority’ until the third or Fourth Century C.E.⁹³ Consequently, when closely examined through extra-Biblical literature this meaning is outside of the First Century time period when Paul used the word. It was in the Fourth Century C.E., during the time of Chrysostom that the verb was recognised as meaning ‘usurp authority’, and even later in the Ninth Century C.E. when this translation became predominant (Wallace, 2001). The potential changes that can occur in the word meaning of words such as ἀϋθεντέω over a number of decades and/or century’s draws attention to the importance of placing the word in its correct time in history, otherwise it is given a meaning other than the one originally intended. Therefore, to understand the intended textual meaning, external evidence for the word usage has to be examined in light of the First Century Period.

Henry Scott Baldwin (2005, pp. 39-51) in his examination of the meaning of ἀϋθεντέω provided a summary of claims from nine modern lexicographers. In their conclusions, the lexicographers give eighteen possible meanings for ἀϋθεντέω including: “Sophocles: to be in power; to have authority over; to be the originator of anything; to compel; mid: to be in force; Preisigke: beherrschen (to rule, control, dominate); verfügbungsberechtigt sein (to have legitimate authority to dispose of something); Herr sein, fest auftreten (to be master; to act confidently); Lampe: hold sovereign authority, act with authority; possess authority over; assume authority, act on one’s own authority; be primarily responsible for, instigate, authorize; Moulton and Milligan: from the word ‘master, autocrat’; LSJ: to have full power or authority over; to commit murder; Mayser: Herr sein, fest auftreten (to be master, to act confidently); BDAG: to assume a stance of independent authority;⁹⁴ Louw and Nida: to control in a domineering manner – ‘to control, to domineer’; DGE: tener autoridad sobre Andros [como algo prohibido a la mujer] (to have authority over a male [as

⁹³ Cf: Kroeger Clark , C. *Ancient Heresies and a Strange Greek Verb*. Retrieved 20 February, 2006, <http://www.godstowomen.org/print.asp>.

⁹⁴ See also BDAG, p. 150 identifying ἀϋθεντέω as “to assume a stance of independent authority, give orders to, dictate to”.

something prohibited for a woman])” (Baldwin, 2005, p. 41). Five of these lexicographers (Moulton and Milligan; Mayser; BDAG; Louw and Nida; and *DGE*) identified only one meaning for the word; LSJ suggested two meanings; Preisigke three meanings while Sophocles and Lampe had four possible meanings (Baldwin, 2005). For the purpose of understanding Baldwin’s work, the eighteen possible meanings for ἀθεντέω have been categorised under 1) power or authority; 2) to be the originator; 3) to compel, control, dominate, force; 4) to be a master/act confidently; and 5) to murder.

Category 1 – Power/authority (9 references)

Category 2 – Originator (1 reference)

Category 3 – Compel/control/dominate/force (4 references)

Category 4 – Master/act confidently (3 references)

Category 5 – To murder (1 reference)

The overwhelming evidence from these lexicographers is that in general the word means to have power or authority (Category 1).

Baldwin’s (2005, pp. 49-50) analysis involved eighty-five known occurrences of the verb ἀθεντέω and he provides a summary of his analysis under four definitions with seven subsets. In addition, Baldwin examines the use of ἀθεντέω over fourteen centuries, and finds conclusive support for his earlier claim that the meaning of the he reaches a number of conclusions about the possible meanings for ἀθεντέω, his conclusions (as detailed in bold), and how these relate to his earlier findings are incorporated into Baldwin’s earlier research summary (Baldwin, 2005. pp. 45, 51):

1. To rule, to reign sovereignly
2. To control, to dominate (**entirely possible**)
 - a. to compel, to influence someone/something (**entirely possible**)
 - b. middle voice: to be in effect, to have legal standing
 - c. hyperbolically: to domineer/play the tyrant (**least possible**)
 - d. to grant authorization (**does not make sense**)

3. To act independently (**intransitive, not possible**)
 - a. to assume authority over (**could be appropriate**)
 - b. to exercise one's own jurisdiction (**intransitive, not possible**)
 - c. to flout the authority of (**could be possible**)
4. To be primarily responsible for, to do or to instigate something (**same as 2d; does not see how this could make sense in the context**)

In summation of Baldwin's work, he claims that: 2 - 'to control, to dominate', and 2a - 'to compel, to influence someone/something', are entirely possible; 3a - 'to assume authority over' could be appropriate; and 3c - 'to flout the authority of' could be a possible meaning for ἀϋθεντέω. However, he cannot claim with any certainty without further syntactical and contextual studies that these are accurate meanings for the word. The word study only allows him to conclude that "the root meaning involves the concept of authority"; which is not a decisive conclusion for its overall meaning (Baldwin, 2005, p. 51).

The major difficulty with an interpretation of ἀϋθεντέω as meaning "have or exercise authority" is that this was not the common understanding of the word in the First Century. It was not until the period of the Greek Patristic writers that ἀϋθεντέω meant to 'exercise authority' (Wilshire, 1988, pp. 120-121). Baldwin (2005) also supports such a claim that ἀϋθεντέω took on that meaning much later than the First Century, only becoming firmly established by the time of the Greek patristic writers. If the PE were written in the Period 80–85 C.E. they were written fifteen–twenty years before the turn of the First Century. If they were written earlier around 62–63 C.E., which this research claims, then the identification of the word meaning has to be situated closer to the middle of the First Century. Therefore, scholarly arguments that claim ἀϋθεντέω means to "have or exercise authority" cannot be substantiated chronologically as ἀϋθεντέω did not have this meaning until somewhere between the Second and Fifth centuries.

To bring attention to issues experienced in translating the Greek to English, two comparative texts are examined where the English is translated as 'have authority', namely 1 Corinthians 7:4 (ἐξουσιάζω), and Revelations 11:6 (ἐξουσία). The English version of 'have authority' is translated from the Greek texts in both of these examples even though the Greek is very different to what Paul used in 1 Timothy 2:12 (αὐθεντέω). The Greek word in these two texts has more nuances with the concept of 'power' even though this is translated into the English as 'have authority'.⁹⁵ In 1 Corinthians 7:4 the context relates to a wife or husband not having the only authority over either of their bodies; that is, they are not given the sole authority over their own body, someone else is also granted that authority. The context is one of mutuality; both husband and wife have the *same* authority in the relationship; therefore, the emphasis is on equality. For a complete understanding of 1 Timothy 2:12, it is argued that the exegete should not dismiss Paul's overall teaching of mutuality or reciprocity (cf: 1 Cor 7:4; Eph 5:21; Gal 3:28). Further support for this position is found in Paul's letter to the *ekklesia* in Colossae (cf: Col 3:18-20). Shirley A. Decker-Lucke (2002, pp. 720-721) argues that within this pericope of Scripture there are three pairs of reciprocal obligations, that is, between wives/husbands; children/fathers; slaves/masters, all their acts are to be done in the name of the Lord. She highlights that Paul could have chosen ὑπακούω meaning 'obey', which is used in his instruction to children and slaves but he did not do this as the relationship between husbands and wife is one of mutuality, and this is why children are to be obedient, but wives supportive (Decker-Lucke, 2002). If mutuality is not evident in the reading, then it is argued that the complete meaning of the text has been lost in the translation; for example, in 1 Timothy 2:12, if Paul meant that the woman should not have authority over a man, with the nuance of 'power', then it seems more likely he would have chosen the same word as he did when he wrote his First Letter to the Corinthians.

⁹⁵ Cf: Strong's 1849.

In examining the verb and noun forms of ἀυθεντέω it appears there is some merit in separating these. A precedent for this was set by Hesychius of Alexandria in the Fifth Century (Baldwin, 2005, p. 45). Hesychius gives a rare definition of the verb form of ἀυθεντεῖν claiming that it means ‘to exercise authority over’ (ἐξουσιαζειν) and listed 1 Timothy 2:12 as his reference (Valleskey, 1995, para. 19). As illustrated in the previous discussion, there is an association between ἀυθεντεῖν and ἐξουσιαζειν, given the parallel of 1 Timothy 2:12 (have authority) and 1 Corinthians 7:4 “for the wife does not *have authority* over her own body; but the husband does; likewise the husband does not *have authority* over his own body, but the wife does”; in that it transmits a sense of ‘power’ as part of ‘authority’ in its meaning. Therefore, evidence exists that seems to indicate there was the nuance of authority involved in the meaning of ἀυθεντέω. Following the pattern of the same word usage and application employed by Hesychius, the meaning of ἀυθεντέω within the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 correlates with a person having ‘power’, that is, someone who is in a position of ‘authority’ or ‘responsibility’.

In the second Biblical example in Revelations 11:6, ‘have authority’ is translated in the context of having ‘authority’ to “shut up the sky” and “to turn them [the waters] into blood” and “strike the earth with every kind of plague as often as they desire”. This example better equates with the concept of ‘power’. If Paul wanted to restrict women’s ‘power’ or ‘authority’ over men, it is more likely that he would have chosen ἐξουσία as this has connotations of power and dominance lacking in ἀυθεντέω; particularly in the period of the First Century. Therefore, the context, and the period of word usage becomes an important component for translators to understand the proper meaning of the Greek Biblical text.

Αυθεντέω Meaning to have Dominion over, to Dominate

Marven R. Vincent (1998) who extensively studied word meanings of the Biblical text claims that to ‘usurp authority’ is an imprecise interpretation, and a more accurate meaning of the Greek word ἀυθεντέω is ‘to have’ or ‘exercise dominion over’. Others agree with Vincent, and “if a verb is more fitting then

dominare is the most neutral term available and therefore the most accurate” (Wallace, 2001, para. 27). Nevertheless, if Paul was discouraging women from being domineering, the motif of his addressing women’s undesirable behaviour correlates with the advice he also gives to men in his letter (Davies, 1996, p. 18). As an Apostle, Paul was to ensure that believers rejected false teaching, and lived a life that reflected godliness, righteousness, faith, love, endurance, and gentleness as he requested of Timothy (1 Tim 6:11). The conduct of believers was a fundamental teaching for Paul, and he was intent on ensuring they received sound teaching.

When Schreiner (2005, p. 104) examines the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 as part of a dialogue with scholarship, he concludes that the meaning ‘exercise authority’ is constrained by the context, and when examining the word within the context his preference is to interpret it as ‘domineer’ or ‘play the tyrant’. He is convinced that the egalitarian position is untenable, and in his retort of egalitarian scholars he concludes that there are two injunctions contained in 1 Timothy 2:12: the first being that women are prohibited from teaching, and secondly, from exercising authority; due to the creation order (Schreiner, 2005, pp. 85-120). Belleville (2001, p. 126) draws a similar conclusion in her examination of ἀυθεντέω when she argues that it means ‘to dominate’ or ‘to gain the upper hand’, but again, within the context. Belleville (2001, pp. 126-127) situates her argument within the period of the Fourth Century Latin Vulgate; concluding that an acceptable translation would read “I do not permit a woman to teach a man in a dominating way but to have a quiet demeanor”. The difficulty with such a translation is the dependence on a Fourth Century text. This is considerably later than the period when Paul wrote to Timothy. A determination of the meaning of ἀυθεντέω based on a manuscript from the Fourth Century diminishes the credibility of the translation; notwithstanding, the potential for textual corruption over the centuries, thus it weakens the integrity of this textual meaning for ἀυθεντέω.

Another similar word meaning for ἀυθεντέω is to ‘have dominion’ over or ‘dominate’ or to ‘master’. Albert Wolters (2004, pp. 145-175) in his study of

αὐθεντέω and its cognates concludes that αὐθεντέω means ‘master’ as it was similar to all other Hellenistic derivatives of the word for that period. In part, Belleville agrees; however, she argues that ‘to have or exercise authority over’ needs to be understood “in the sense of holding sway or mastery over another” on the grounds that this is supported by the grammar of the verse (Belleville, 2001, pp. 125-126). She argues that if Paul had ‘exercise of authority’ in mind as the meaning for αὐθεντέω, then he would have placed αὐθεντέω first to be followed by διδάσκειν as a specific example in 1 Timothy 2:12 (Belleville, 2001, p. 126).

In *Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance*, the meaning of αὐθεντέω is shown as meaning ‘dominate’ or ‘usurp authority over’ (Strong, 1996).⁹⁶ If the meaning of 1 Timothy 2:12 is ‘not to dominate’, the context and the nuance of the words surrounding the meaning is critical in understanding the text. Again, the importance of the context is based in the potential for a Biblical principle that no gender is to dominate another, particularly as a parallel to Ephesians 5:21 and its emphasis on mutual support.

Αὐθεντέω Meaning Murder, Suicide, or Sacrilege

In addition to other meanings for αὐθεντέω scholarly exegesis has shown that αὐθεντέω can also mean murder, suicide or sacrilege. Leland Edward Wilshire using the computer database of *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (TLG) examined three hundred citations in relation to αὐθεντέω, and he found that the overwhelming evidence was that αὐθεντέω was connected with murder and suicide (Wilshire, 1988). There are differing views on the conclusions reached by Wilshire in his study of the literary citations of αὐθεντέω, as Baldwin claims that Wilshire was unclear in his conclusion with the definitions of αὐθεντέω (Baldwin, 2005). In a later study, Wilshire (1993) claims that sometime during the spread of Koine αὐθεντέω went beyond the predominant Attic meaning connecting it with murder and suicide, and claimed it related more to the

⁹⁶ Strong’s 831.

broader concept of criminal behaviour. Belleville (2001, p. 125) points out that the predominant usage of ἀυθεντέω up until the Second Century C.E. “is the committing of a crime of act of violence (such as murder, suicide, or sacrilege); she draws attention to first and Second Century B.C.E. historians Diodorus and Polybius who used the noun to refer to those ‘who perpetrated a foul deed’. If such a meaning was given to ἀυθεντέω, then a reading of v 12 would indicate that Paul meant that a woman was not to teach something that is sacrilege, meaning to violate a truth of the Gospel teachings - if she did she would be engaged in false teaching; and therefore, propagating a heresy.

Stephen Valleskey (1995) in his research of ἀυθεντέω, analysed the word usage in the period from Homer until 323 B.C.E., and discovered that it consistently meant to “kill by one’s own hand/murder/suicide.” Valleskey examined the linguistic problem with ἀυθεντέω, and in his study of the etymology from extra-Biblical literature found two unrelated meanings, namely ‘to murder’ and ‘to exercise authority’. He explained that the

second century AD Atticist lexicographers and grammarians argued that the noun αυθεντης should not be used for *despot*, one in authority, because it is a Hellenistic word, but for *one who acts by his own hand* (αυιοχειρ), particularly *murderer*, which they saw as the true Attic sense” (Valleskey, 1995, para. 5).

Nyland agrees with Valleskey’s position but claims its meaning is ‘murderer’ - citing twelve classical Greek authors and references that use ἀυθεντέω twenty-seven times; furthermore, that “it does not take on the meaning ‘master’, ‘mastery over’ until later centuries” (Nyland, 2004, p. 549). Vigilant exegesis will include placing the text in its correct period, and in this case, the context of the First Century world for a precise translation.

In examining ἀυθεντεῖν in Koine, Valleskey (1995, para. 21) found that the meaning “those in authority” in its verb form was used extensively by Philodemus in the First Century B.C.E. In studying the root form of the word, in

one hundred and sixty-five instances, he found only ten from between the Sixth Century B.C.E. and the Third Century C.E. were the same as Paul used in 1 Timothy 2:12, that is with the verb, or the participial form (Valleskey, 1995, para. 21). Further, Valleskey's (1995, para. 23) research shows that Clement of Alexandria was the only patristic writer to use ἀυθεντεῖν in the sense of murder/murderer/suicide, and he used this on three occasions for 'murderer/self-murderer', four times, he used the adjectival form; and twice used ἀυθεντεια when referring to "the *authority* of the Lord" or "*full authority*" as defined by 'omnipotent'. He concludes that given the period that Paul wrote to Timothy, and his use of ἀυθεντεῖν that it means "murder" or "suicide", but adds that with any study of Greek literature the traditional interpretation of 'exercise authority' should not be hastily abandoned (Valleskey, 1995, para. 30-40). However, given the limited number of verb citations in ancient literature, Valleskey (1995, para. 40) states that "the interpreter is still heavily dependent on Scriptural context for the correct understanding of the text of 1 Timothy 2:12".

Αυθεντέω **Meaning Author, Origin or Source**

Catherine and Richard Clark Kroeger (1986, pp. 231-232) have presented a number of different interpretations of 1 Timothy 2:12 based on different methodological approaches, and over time, have introduced new material from archaeological discoveries, for example, inscriptional evidence. In 1986, Catherine Kroeger (C. Kroeger Clark, 1986) argued that the text in 1 Timothy 2:12 read "to proclaim oneself the author or originator of something" interpreting ἀυθεντέω as meaning 'originator' or 'source'. Six years later, the Kroegers (1992, p. 103) continued to argue for this meaning but with more focus on 'author', proposing the text be read as "proclaim oneself author of man". In support of this translation, they argue that there was a heresy that Eve was the creator of Adam being taught in Ephesus. Given the Kroegers' conclusion, it could be argued that the heresy was applicable to a woman teaching that she was the 'author' or 'originator' of man. The Kroegers (1992, p. 103) state that if this was so then it could be alleged that the text means that the woman was "primarily responsible for, to do or to instigate" something. Accordingly,

following the Kroegers' line of argument, if the interpretation of ἀθεντέω means to 'instigate or start a heresy', Paul's prohibition was in the context of preventing an insurrection in the *ekklesia* at Ephesus – suggesting that the woman teacher was rebelling against the established authority of the teachings of Jesus and the Apostles. In this case, Paul would have no choice but to write to Timothy, and prohibit the teaching as he was wholly opposed to incorrect and unsound teaching (cf: 1 Tim 6:1-5).

In support of the nuance with 'author', Valleskey (1995) draws attention to the Peshitta⁹⁷ and a reading for ἀθεντεῖν, (*rê'shîth*), which is usually translated as "to have primacy, authority, power". Valleskey (1995, para. 27), with the assistance of Dr Jaral Fossum, examined the Old Syriac and Coptic translations of the Greek NT, whereby they found that in the Coptic versions ἀθεντεῖν was inserted directly into the text without it being translated. It was discovered that "the lack of any variant readings in his [Dr Fossum] critical apparatus gave him a 'high certainty' that the Peshitta reading....translated *rê'shîth*, is the same in the Old Syriac Sinaitic and Curetonian texts" (Valleskey, 1995, para. 29). The conclusion was that *rê'shîth* should be translated as to have primacy, authority, and/or power. The same word appears in the "first verse of the Hebrew Bible, *bêrê'shîth*", and therefore this would seem to mean it has the same connotations as ἀθεντεῖν in the sense of 'author', 'origin', and/or 'beginning' (Valleskey, 1995, para. 29). Further, supporting evidence comes from Nyland as she argues that ἀθεντέω also appears in the *papyri* over twenty times with the meaning of 'original', or 'originator of' (Nyland, 2004, pp. 549-550). Therefore, she argues that 1 Timothy 2:12 would read "I most certainly do not grant authority to a woman to teach she is the originator of a man" (Nyland, 2004, pp. 548-549). Such an interpretation harmonizes with the following text in 1 Timothy 2:13. In v 13, Paul explains by reference to Genesis 1:27 that the reason a woman is not the originator of man is because Adam was formed first, then Eve - where both male and female are formed in the image of God. In

⁹⁷ Refers to the Syriac version of the Bible; written circa Fourth Century.

most English translations of Genesis 3:20, Eve is referred to as “the mother of all (the) living” (cf: *NRSV, NIV, KJV, AMP*). In Helen Spurrell’s OT translation (first written in 1885); and based on the unpointed Hebrew Genesis 3:20 reads “then Adam proclaimed his wife’s name Eve, for she was to be the source of all life” (Spurrell, 1985, p. 3). That is, women would be the ‘source’ for bearing children; therefore, within this context it is argued that a woman is not saved by bearing children, but only through the Birth of the Child, Jesus. It is argued that this provides the context for Paul’s response in his First Letter to Timothy regarding the woman in Ephesus who was teaching that a woman was the originator of creation; in this case humanity (male and female), rather than acknowledging God as the source, and creator of life (Gen 1:27-28). Nonetheless, scholars argue against ‘source’ as this has other connotations that relate to ‘head’; subsequently, this has formed a consolidated basis of argumentation against an egalitarian Church structure.

In twelve versions of the Bible; *TJB, ASV, NESV, DNT, ISV, KJV, NCV, TNIV, NKJV, NLT, TLB* and the *AMP* all of these versions translate κεφαλή as ‘head’. The traditional interpretation given to κεφαλή is that it means ‘authority over’, such as ‘ruler’, ‘head’, or ‘leader’ - not ‘origin’ or ‘source’, which is supported by many Biblical scholars. Grudem is an advocate of the interpretation being ‘head’ and not ‘source’. However, the *Greek-English Lexicon* (LSJ) a major Biblical tool, interprets the word as ‘source’. In *Strong’s Hebrew and Greek Dictionaries*, and *Thayer’s Greek-English Lexicon* κεφαλή is given a meaning of ‘head’ either literally or figuratively. An examination of the Old Testament translation from the Hebrew to the Greek shows that the use of κεφαλή meaning ‘ruler’ or ‘leader’ is only used five per cent of the time (Cunningham, Hamilton, & Rogers, 2000). For traditionalists the interpretation of κεφαλή as ‘head’ has held supporting evidence for a hierarchical structure in the Church based on Ephesians 5:23-25; however, there are counter arguments, Nyland (2004, p. 500) translates ‘head’ as ‘source’, explaining that the man is the source of the woman just as Christ is the source of the New Covenant Church. This is paralleled with Ephesians 1:22, and the Pauline claim that Jesus Christ is the ‘source’, that is, the access point to God for the Church.

Further evidence that rejects a hierarchical Church structure is drawn from the intertextuality of the Pauline Corpus, and strengthens the argument that women and men are both equally dependent on each other (cf: 1 Cor 11:8-12). In further support, Holmes (2000, p. 315) argues that in the previous verse in Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians (v 10) it means that a woman has her own authority; she is not under the authority of a man. On this basis, Paul is teaching the inter-dependence between women and men. It is argued that the source, or the formation of woman, originally came from man (1 Cor 11:8; cf: Gen 2:21-23), and now the source of man, is through a woman (1 Cor 11:11-12). The only detection of superiority in vv 11-12 is given to God who is in a superior position to all of humanity. In the culmination of his statements, Paul states that "all things come from God" (1 Cor 11:12), or in another form it could be stated that "all things are sourced from God" with reference to Genesis, Chapter One.

Conclusion

In the Twenty-first Century, the major difficulty in translation of the Biblical text is reliance on conventional reference tools. The problem being that most reference material (e.g. lexicons, concordances, and dictionaries) used in theological and Biblical educational institutions need to be re-examined in light of *papyri*, and inscriptional discoveries in more recent decades. For example, Nyland (2004, p. 8) draws attention to the fact that in the last two decades "four thousand inscriptions have been found at Ephesus [sic] alone". This is why other methods, additional to the use of standard exegetical reference tools have to be included in exegesis. As late as 2005, Köstenberger states that "a precise consensus as to the meaning of the word has not been achieved among well-known lexicographers" (Köstenberger & Schreiner, 2005, p. 40). Therefore, there is ongoing contention in the scholarly polemic about a dependable methodology to establish a reliable translation of the word *αὐθεντέω*, and its meaning in the context of its syntax and its First Century setting.

The historical translation of *αὐθεντέω* is 'to have or exercise authority'. In this chapter, attention is drawn to the problems with this historical translation. Further, there are significant complexities when translating *αὐθεντέω*, and

therefore, careful consideration has to be given to the context to establish the probable meaning. Arguments predominantly centre on the use of the word, and its relationship with 'authority'. Attention was brought to the importance of situating Paul's use of ἀυθεντέω in the First Century to enable scholars to settle on its most accurate meaning. Koine speech was spoken throughout the Roman Empire in the First Century, and when Paul wrote his First Letter to Timothy it was Koine, not Latin, that was in common usage; therefore, it is argued he would have associated ἀυθεντεῖν with its common and accepted meaning at the time. Consequently, it was argued that ἀυθεντέω has to be positioned in its appropriate time in history. Subsequently, as part of the methodology in this study it is argued that consideration has to be given to the time period of word usage; how the meaning complements the syntactical structure; plus external witnesses.

An examination of ἀυθεντέω revealed that there are a range of diverse interpretations for the word. There is evidence that ἀυθεντέω is related to authority but how this is accommodated within the overall syntax needs to be taken into consideration. This chapter established that a translation of ἀυθεντέω was not as straightforward as stating the text ought to be translated as 'to have or exercise authority'. To use such a translation is anachronistic. It was argued that if Paul was prohibiting a woman from exercising authority over a man, then he more than likely would have used ἐξουσιάζω as this relates to the context.

The parallel between 1 Timothy 2:12 and 1 Corinthians 7:4 configures a new way of understanding ἀυθεντέω, and it was argued that the Pauline Corpus teaches a message of mutuality and reciprocity that is missing from the historical translation of 1 Timothy 2:12. It was shown that while ἀυθεντέω could potentially be translated as 'master' with an overtone of 'domination'; however, Belleville (2001) argued that this relates more to 'mastery over another'. To add to the complexity, the word usage of ἀυθεντέω in the First Century also had connotations with murder and suicide; however, until the Second Century this was more relevant to someone who did the wrong thing, or who perpetrated an

injustice. It was argued that the injustice was associated with a woman teaching outside the standard teachings required by Paul.

What is evident is that there is a dimension of 'authority' in an accurate translation; however, it has more relevance to authority as it relates to teaching. There was a situation in Ephesus whereby a woman was engaged in erroneous teaching and this was associated with taking the OT Biblical truth out of context. The woman was claiming that she was the 'author' or 'originator' of creation, and this necessitated Paul's explanation in vv 13-15 to discredit the heterodoxy being taught in the Church in Ephesus. It is argued that to translate *αὐθεντέω* as a directive, and claim it is a universal prohibition to prevent women from having authority to teach is flawed. It was argued that Paul taught interdependence between women and men, and therefore, to translate 1 Timothy 2:12 as 'to have or exercise authority over' is a contradiction to Paul's other teachings. It is argued that Paul never taught that one gender was superior to another as part of a hierarchy, and this is proven by the intertextuality of the text, and through examining the entirety of the Pauline Corpus.

In concluding this discussion, Ptolemy's use of *αὐθεντέω* when he refers to the birth of a child under a certain sign of the heavens is critically important as it redirects the translation of 1 Timothy 2:12, and changes the common and historical version of events and meaning given to the text. Such a meaning should not be overlooked as it is situated within the correct period, that is, the First Century. Also it draws attention to 'childbearing' found in v 15, and connects it with the 'exercise of authority' to the birth of the child, Jesus who will be the one to exercise authority over all. To argue for another translation for *αὐθεντέω* contradicts Pauline theology, principles, and the fundamental nature of the Gospel message taught by Paul, and shared across the early churches. Jesus' example in his teaching was 'not' to 'exercise authority' over everyone else. Jesus Christ himself came as a servant, not to have authority over others,

and did this as an example for humanity (Mk 10:42-45)⁹⁸ (Cunningham et al., 2000, p. 222). Jesus' example and exhortation to his disciples was to do all things with the mind and heart of a servant (cf: Mt 12:18; 20:26; 23:11; Jn 12:26).

The next chapter examines how Paul's use of 'silence' in vv 11-12 has influenced scholarly opinion and argumentation about teaching in the Church, and the traditional prohibition that restricts women from this role. Further, it explores the nuances behind Paul's rationale for vv 13-15, which scholars traditionally argue are Paul's justifications for the prohibitions placed on women.

⁹⁸ Other passages confirming the Markan view are found in Mt 20:25-28, and Lk 22:25-27.

CHAPTER 8

Situating 1 Timothy 2:11-15 within its Context

The text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is a dynamic passage, it has been the subject of extensive scholarly interest, and generated a field of research in the last couple of decades. Of the research undertaken in this period, there are two divergent streams: to liberate women from a patriarchal translation of the Biblical text; for example, by feminist scholars Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, Rosemary Ruether, and Sandra Schneiders; the other, is the defence of the traditional patriarchal translation and interpretation of the text, particularly by evangelicals in the United States of America. The Roman Catholic Church, it could be argued, do not engage in wide-ranging and robust defence of their patriarchal position, they proclaim it; for example, through regular written communication, such as Apostolic Letters.

The historical translation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 has implied that women are not to speak in the Church. Silence is seen to be a virtue that is reinforced for all Christian women; however, in recent decades, in some parts of the Church, women have been permitted to be ordained, to speak, and to preach. On the other hand, if the Biblical text does require women to be silent, and they are not compliant - they are disobeying God. Again, if the text has been mistranslated then women have unlawfully been oppressed as a consequence. Chapters Six and Seven concentrated on specific features of the English translation of 1 Timothy 2:12 as this relates to 'teaching' and 'authority'. This chapter continues from these two important features contained in a traditional patriarchal translation and places the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 within its textual context. In particular, it concentrates on examining the relationship between silence in vv 11-12; an examination of the historical translation that has placed women in submission; and lastly Paul's explanation, and justification for the prohibitions which are found in vv 13-15. As the authority of the Bible is paramount, in many parts of the Church throughout the world, women have subjected themselves to align their lives with the apparent truth found in the Biblical text. Is silence for

women one of these truths? This chapter begins by exploring this subject matter.

An Examination of Silence in 1 Timothy 2:11-12

Throughout this thesis, it is argued that the intertextuality of the text, and the context is critical in exegetical analysis in order to determine whether the historical translation that women are to be silent in the Church is accurate. The historical translation has had significant consequences for women; evident in the acceptance of a hierarchical Church structure, and the subjugation of women in the Church and home.

The Word Meaning

The Greek word ἡσυχία commonly translated as 'silence' in English Bibles is found twice in the text under analysis, once in v 11 and once in v 12. Mounce (2000, p. 18) has identified that the noun ἡσυχία occurs four times in the NT, and these occurrences are found in Luke 14:4; Acts 11:18; 21:14; and 22:2. After examining the context, he concludes that the word group generally means silence. However, both Mounce (2000) and Schreiner (2005) argue that in some settings ἡσυχία can also indicate a 'quiet demeanour', and such a translation can be attributed to texts such as 1 Timothy 2:11-12, Luke 14:4, and Acts 22:2. On further examination, Mounce (2000, p. 118) identifies four occasions where the word group means to have a 'quiet demeanor': 1 Thessalonians 4:11 (ἡσυχάζειν), 2 Thessalonians 3:12 (ἡσυχίας), 1 Peter 3:4 (ἡσυχίον), and 1 Timothy 2:2 (ἡσυχίον). Given the close relationship between silence and quietness, incorporating the context becomes a compulsory part of the exegetical process, rather than optional. The overall aim is to determine the most appropriate translation when interpreting any given Greek text.

To demonstrate the importance of the context, two of the texts identified by Mounce are examined, that is, Acts 22:2 (translated as silence), and 2 Thessalonians 3:12 (translated as quiet demeanour). The importance of the context is highlighted in the example in Acts 22:2, and the associated text of Acts 21:40. In Acts 21:40, Paul stands on the steps and motions the people for

silence (σιγή), after they heard him speak they became even quieter (ἡσυχίαν) (Acts 2:22). Even though two completely different Greek words appear in the text, the context dictates that Paul wants the people to be quiet as he is about to give a public address. Even though the root word ἡσυχία in Acts 22:2 means silence, this can change due to the context (Vincent, 1998). In 2 Thessalonians 3:12 (ἡσυχίας), Mounce (2000) argues for a ‘quiet demeanour’ as in this setting the people were being encouraged by Paul to ‘get on with their work’, that is, to work quietly. It does not mean they were required to be silent. Such examples identify the importance of the contextual setting given that the aim in Biblical exegesis is to acquire the most likely translation, and interpretation of the Greek text. The exegetical exercise itself also brings attention to the broad range of nuances when translating any Greek word into English.

The nuances regarding quietness are even more observable in the context of 1 Timothy 2:11-12 (ἡσυχία), as the word can also mean being “peaceable” (Vincent, 1998). The context in Paul’s First Letter to Timothy applies to Paul addressing the behaviour of women in religious assemblies, and therefore, it is argued that Paul required the women to be quiet in the sense of being peaceable, not complete silence. Nyland (2004, p. 549) also argues for such a translation and states that Paul is not making reference to ‘verbal silence’ otherwise he would have used the term “ἡ σιγή, ἡσιωπή”. Further evidence in BDAG validates the claim that the text should be translated as a person saying nothing or very little (ἡσυχία)⁹⁹; they are being quiet, and there is no disturbance, rather than complete silence. Such a translation in vv 11-12 also complements the context earlier in Paul’s First Letter to Timothy as he urged everyone in the *ekklesia* to lead a quiet (ἡσυχίον) and peaceful life (1 Tim 2:2).

This research into the meaning of the word found that there are five occurrences in the NT where the word could mean silence. These are the four

⁹⁹ BDAG, p. 440 refers to ἡσυχία as the “state of saying nothing or very little”.

verses identified by Mounce (2000) with the addition of Luke 23:56 (ἡσυχασαν) where the women rested on the Sabbath. Again, in this setting in the Lukan narrative, the women were not required to be silent, but quiet. Further evidence is forthcoming from Strong¹⁰⁰ as ἡσυχία can be translated as meaning either silence or quietness; however, his analysis of the word shows this can also mean ‘undisturbing’ - similar to a learning situation that does not have too much disruption. The only parallel verses outside of 1 Timothy 2:11-12 identified by Strong (1996) as having a similar meaning are two that were identified by Mounce (2000): Acts 22:2 and 2 Thessalonians 3:12. Therefore, given the scholarly evidence and the analysis undertaken as part of this study, it is argued that there are sufficient grounds for 1 Timothy 2:11 to be translated as – ‘the woman must learn quietly, that is, without being disruptive’.

A Comparative Analysis of Silence in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and 1 Corinthians 14:33-35

Today, most scholars agree that the reference to ‘silence’ in v 11 does not actually mean silence, but refers to “a quiet demeanor [sic] and spirit that is peaceable instead of argumentative” (Schreiner, 2005, p. 98). Quinn and Wacker (2000, pp. 221-223) also argue for a similar translation. Furthermore, they argue within a contextual situation, and claim that Paul refers to married women (v 12) and therefore, it is wives who are to be silent, and subsequently, excluded from teaching: referring to 1 Corinthians 14:33-35 to support their position (Quinn & Wacker, 2000, p. 223). Conversely, other scholars argue that this could not refer to the context of marriage as there is no requirement in the OT for women to submit to their husbands (Cunningham et al., 2000, p. 200).

Other scholars, such as Fee (1987) and Payne (1998) argue that the instruction in 1 Corinthians 14 for women to be silent in churches is a non-Pauline interpolation that is a later addition to the letter. Niccum (1997) and Miller

¹⁰⁰ The translation is supported by *Strong’s Exhaustive Concordance* cf: 2271, 2272.

(2003) have opposed the exegetical analysis and findings of Fee and Payne centring their argument on the “bar-umlauts” that appear in Codex Vaticanus. The polemic is quite intense as scholars formulate arguments for and against based on internal and external witnesses to support a hypothesis that 1 Corinthians 14:33-35 did or did not appear in the original manuscript. Payne (2004, p. 109) rejects scholarly opposition to his research arguing strongly that it is the placement of the bar-umlauts in Vaticanus that supports the interpolation pattern. Further, Payne (2004, p. 111), provides critical evidence to support his interpolation theory when he states “Bishop Victor of Capua writes at the end of Codex Fuldensis that he read the manuscript through twice, giving the exact month, day and year in which his editorial revisions were completed”. The significance of Bishop Victor’s instructions recorded in Codex Fuldensis (546 C.E.) is that firstly, it was believed to be the first dated manuscript in history, and secondly, the instructions given by the Bishop to the scribe (at the end of the manuscript) were to rewrite vv 36-40 immediately after v 33 (Payne, 2004, p. 111). Essentially, the Bishop was reproducing a text without 1 Corinthians 14:34-35, and scholars, including Payne argue that it was inserted in later manuscripts to harmonize with the translation of 1 Timothy 2:11-12.¹⁰¹ This is a significant discovery as historically, 1 Corinthians 14:35 has been the companion text to 1 Timothy 2:11-12, and a key internal witness that women are to be silent in the Church. Of further significance in this text is the reason given for the requirement of women’s silence in that the law requires it (cf: 1 Cor 14:35). This study argues that Paul did not write 1 Corinthians 14:34-35 as part of the text as Paul was no longer a proponent of Jewish or OT law. As discussed in Chapter Five, Paul taught that the ‘Law’, part of the Old Covenant has been abolished, and therefore when placing the text in its context it cannot be Pauline. Otherwise, it is argued, that Paul would be contradicting his own New Covenant teachings as this is where his teaching focus resided.

Further, this thesis argues that earlier in 1 Timothy 2, there is a principle of the type of living that is acceptable to God, and that this should be quiet and

¹⁰¹ Cf: The Harper Collins Study Bible, *NRSV*, 1989, p. 2160.

peaceable (cf: 1 Tim 2:2-3). There are times when both women and men are required to be silent (σιγήτω) (cf: 1 Cor 14:28). Similarly, in 1 Timothy 2, Paul requires everyone to be quiet, and peaceable, and orderly, as this is what is acceptable to God. It is argued that while Paul selects a different Greek word in 1 Corinthians 14:28 and 1 Timothy 2:3, and the context is different, the principle remains constant. The principle is one of 'order and decency' in the church, as this is what is acceptable to God (cf: 1 Cor 14:40). John Kleinig (2005, p. 15) explains, this involves "stillness and harmony, receptivity and teachability, respectful listening and readiness to receive direction". Paul is not limiting the principle to be applicable only to the marriage relationship - the principle is for the wider Church community (France, 1995). It is also important to recognise that in the First Century context, teachers made use of the Socratic dialogical approach and silence was not required (Belleville, 2001, p. 122). Therefore, Paul is not referring to verbal silence but more to being quiet - not being disruptive. This meaning is reflected by Nyland (2004, p. 548) when she argues for a textual translation of v 11 as "a woman must learn and she is to learn without causing a fuss". Therefore, this study argues that women and men are required to be quiet when under instruction, and peaceable in such a setting. The analysis in this section has presented evidence - using a comparative analysis of a Biblical text - and argued that a translation of vv 11-12 claiming that women are to be silent is debatable given the context and the potential for textual corruption in the Twenty-first Century reading. Consequently, the common translation of submission (v 12) as this relates to women, and their place in ecclesiastical and domestic spheres must be further explored.

Women and Submission

Submission is the common translation given to the Greek word ὑποταγή that appears in 1 Timothy 2:11. It is argued that this word has been used in scholarship as a filter for an interpretation and application of the text in 1 Timothy 2:12. In English Biblical translations of v 11, submission is used interchangeably with subjection (for example the *NKJV* uses subjection; whilst the *NRSV* uses submission). Inherent in both translations is an unequal relationship between genders that has been perpetuated over the centuries as a result of the translation of the text. While submission or subjection is the most

common translation, the Greek word is also translated as meaning “subordination of oneself” (Rogers & Rogers, 1998, pp. 444-445). BDAG identifies submission (ὑποταγή) as a woman “subordinating herself in every respect” but that it can also mean within another context of “keeping children under control”.¹⁰² Given these differences in translation, an examination of the theologically accepted theory of subordination by traditionalists and the meaning of submission in other contextual settings will provide evidence for the most appropriate translation.

Subordination theory

Generally, scholars agree that both women and men are equal ‘spiritually’, but a wife must be subordinate to her husband as part of God’s overall purpose for humanity (H. O. J. Brown, 1984). It was argued earlier in the thesis that when Jesus was born the culture had very restrictive roles for women. It is well known that “to some early Jewish teachers, women were inherently evil....Josephus claimed that the Law prescribed their subordination for their own good” (Hawthorne et al., 1993, p. 583).

Subordination theory is based on the ‘Doctrine of the Trinity’ and the relationship within the Godhead, that is, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. Subordination theory is one of the universally accepted doctrinal positions for women’s subjugation. In scholarship there are two major theological positions that explain the Godhead; the Immanent Trinity (God is one in essence), and the Economic Trinity (God in relation to the world). The Immanent Trinity and Economic Trinity are archetypal examples of how, over the centuries, humanity has interpreted Scripture to explain, and understand God. For example, the concept of subordination has developed around the acceptance of a hierarchy in the Godhead, which translates to a hierarchy in the relationship between women and men in the Church and home.

¹⁰² BDAG, p. 1040.

The argument based on subordination theory has its roots in the Fourth Century through divisive teaching on the Godhead by Arius, a Christian priest in Alexandria, Egypt. Arius' teachings were opposed by Bishop Athanasius, and his response culminated in the First Council of Nicea (ca. 325 C.E.). Athanasius' intention was to put an end to divisive teachings by officially establishing the relationship of the Son to the Father. Athanasius¹⁰³ argued that the Son was subordinate to the Father but only in the incarnation. The Arians held to a form of subordinationism as they denied Jesus was fully God, but still held to the theory that the Godhead was eternal. When Arius realised co-eternity represented equality, and was incompatible with his subordination theory, he abandoned his position on co-eternity (Chester, 2005). Early Church fathers Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Origen all had a predisposition to some form of subordinationist views (La Due, 2003). Chester (2005, p. 89) explains, that while the Son "does the will of him who sent him", the Son is not subordinate to him "in his being". Such was the view in the early Church as it was heretical to describe Jesus as subordinate 'in his being' to the Father. Consequently, this study asks the question, if God intended an egalitarian structure for the Church; is it also heretical to describe women as subordinate to men?

In more recent times, Knight (1977) spearheaded a debate that has been given momentum by contemporary evangelicals supporting subordinationism through the Trinity. At the centre of Knight's theological argument is that the 'Doctrine of the Trinity' and 'Creation Theology' predicated the permanent subordination of women. On the other hand, Bilezikian (1993) argues that anyone who advocates subordinationism in the Godhead is teaching heresy. Bilezikian (1993, p. 5) draws attention to St Augustine who rescinded subordinationist theories in the Fifth Century and with the position that as the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit are co-eternal, interdependent, and one in substance there is no "hierarchy, order or ranking". To counter subordinationist theories, Kevin Giles (2006), an Australian Anglican priest, quotes a number of contemporary

¹⁰³ The Athanasian Creed has always been attributed to St Athanasius (ca. 297–373 C.E.) but the author has not been evidenced. Amongst others, St. Ambrose is a possibility.

theologians who have moved away from a 'hierarchical' to a 'communal' model of the Trinity in the Twenty-first Century.¹⁰⁴ He argues against subordinationism, and described the *Australian Anglican Church 1999 Doctrine Commission Report* as both orthodox and heretical (Giles, 2002). Further, he states that "in the 1999 Sydney Doctrine Commission Report, women's permanent subordination is indissolubly linked with the Son's subordination in the eternal Trinity".¹⁰⁵ In 2004, the Primate, Archbishop Peter Carnley censured the Sydney archdiocese for effectively committing heresy, and following the error of 'Arianism'. As a consequence, Carnley was forced to call for the doctrine's re-examination.¹⁰⁶ Upon examination he determined that the subordinationist's argument is theologically precarious, and in view of that, the relationship between women and men gravitates away from a hierarchical model as this is not consistent with an explanation of the Godhead.

An additional example to depict that the subordination argument is unsound is found in the text of 1 Corinthians 15:28 where Jesus is referred to as being subject to the Father. In this context, the word 'subject' refers to a time when all will be in agreement, and there will be no discord between God and humanity. It is argued that this does not mean that all will be subject, but that all things will be realigned; all will be reconnected once the last enemy of death is rendered inoperative (cf: 1 Cor 15:12-28) (Nyland, 2004, pp. 444-445). As Bushnell (2004, p. 142) argues, the Godhead is in complete harmony, there is no subjection, only support; therefore, there are no levels of inferiority in the Church.

¹⁰⁴ Cf: Giles, K. (2002), p.20: *The Trinity and Subordination: The Doctrine of God and the Contemporary Gender Debate*. Giles quotes the following authors who support anti-subordinationist theories on the Trinity: Peters, Ted. (1993). *Trinity: Relationality and Temporality in Divine Life*; Erickson, Millard. (1995). *God in Three Persons*; Cunningham, David. (1998) *These Three Are One: The Practice of Trinitarian Theology*; and Torrance, Thomas F. (1996). *The Christian Doctrine of God: One Being Three Persons*.

¹⁰⁵ Cf: Giles, K., Sydney Morning Herald, 28 May, 2004, *Trinity at the center of a divide*.

¹⁰⁶ *Ibid*.

When examining other Pauline text, it can be seen that Paul writes to the Colossian Church and explains the fullness of life found in Christ (cf: Col 2:9-10). He explains that in Christ the whole fullness of the Godhead continues to dwell in bodily form, and (female and male) have come to fullness of life in Christ being filled with the Godhead, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It is contradictory to argue that a woman can be filled with the fullness of the Godhead, and then be in submission to a man. Consequently, when investigated further the internal witness of the text validates that Jesus Christ lived a complete human life, and at the same time he continued as the second person of the Godhead (cf: Jn 1:14; Jn 10:30; Jn 17:21-22). In Jesus' mission on earth he did not embrace a hierarchy of believers but he called all believers to be servants; both male and female to be subject to each other (Clouse & Glouse, 1989). Therefore, to assert that there is a hierarchal order in the Godhead is heretical as there has always been equality. To claim that the Son (the Word) is in subordination to the father is mistaken as the text stands in distinct opposition to such thinking (Pierce et al., 2004). To be theologically consistent is to see God the Father as the source of Christ, and man as the source of woman (C. Kroeger Clark & Evans, 2002). All people regardless of gender have equal rights within the household of God.

This study argues that apart from the Pauline texts that are translated as excluding women or placing them in submission to men,¹⁰⁷ other textual evidence is in distinct opposition to a claim that a gender hierarchy exists in the text. In contradistinction, other texts reveal a different characteristic in Paul, a man who worked alongside women, and a man who was inclusive of women in the early Church (cf: Rom 16:1, 3, 6, 7; Phil 4:2; Col 4:15; 1 Cor 1:11; 16:19; Philem 2). It is argued that if Paul was advocating a subordination model as a basis for Church function he would have made this clear in his communications; however, he did not do this. For that reason, and to further clarify Paul's position on women - submission is examined within other contextual settings.

¹⁰⁷ Cf: 1 Timothy 2:1-15, Ephesians 5:22, 1 Corinthians 11:3-16; 4:34-35 and Col 1:18-19.

The Meaning of Submission (ὑποταγή) in Different Contextual Settings

As discussed previously, given the inconsistencies in Greek to English translations, an exegetical study requires a wide-ranging analysis. Accordingly, throughout this study it is argued that for an accurate translation of any Greek word, in this case an examination of the noun ὑποταγή, commonly translated as submission; its contextual setting is crucial. Also without a broader contextual examination of ὑποταγή, the same translation will be given each time and consequently, the same mistake occurs (Towner, 2006). In addition, it is argued that within the Pauline Corpus there exists principles that can strengthen any new claims associated with a translation and application of ὑποταγή as it relates to 1 Timothy 2:11-12. Notwithstanding the translation of the text and its subsequent reception, is complex due to transmission errors and patriarchal bias in commonly accepted translations. Therefore, the process of analysis has to be multifaceted in any textual deconstruction and restoration of the text.

Submission or subjection in the context of 1 Timothy 2:11 according to Schreiner (2005, p. 99) means that “women were to learn with entire submissiveness from the men who had authority in the Church and manifested that authority through their teaching”. In 1 Timothy Chapter 2 he identifies a strong relationship between v 11 “let a woman learn in silence with full submission”, and v 12 “I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man, she is to keep silent” (Schreiner, 2005). Further, he claims that v 11 (γυνή ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μαθησέτω ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ) gives v 12 (διδάσκειν δὲ γυναῖκί οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ’ εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ) its meaning and clarification particularly with δὲ (v 12) as this mild adversative provides the clarification for the command “let a woman learn in silence with full submission” (v 11) (Schreiner, 2005, p. 99). Notwithstanding Schreiner’s argument, there is evidence within the Pauline Corpus that the translation of ὑποταγή as submission may be disputed.

Other scholarly analysis of the Biblical text contradicts Schreiner’s translation and interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-12. Nyland (2004) argues against the traditional translation of Romans 13:1 “let every person be *subject* to the

governing authorities” (*NRSV*). She argues that ὑποτάσσω commonly translated as ‘subject’ in this text means ‘support’. As Nyland (2004, p. 399) states “the passive [it] means ‘to be attached to’, ‘to be in support of’ (cf: Luc. *Paras.* 49) and was used of attached/appended (supporting) documents in the postal system”. Her argument is based on other key verses in the Biblical text that have been translated as ‘submit’ or ‘subject’ when this should be ‘support’, such as James 4:7 and 1 Peter 5:5 (Nyland, 2004, p. 624). As part of her argument Nyland (2004, p. 399), provides additional evidence for such a claim when she states “the English word ‘submit’ is properly translated by ὑπέικω, *hupheiko*, with dative ‘submit to’, cf. Heb 13:17. See also Soph. *Aj.*231, *O.T.* 625; Aesch. *Ag.* 1362; Eur. *I.A.* 139”. She argues that an in-depth analysis of ὑποταγή and its cognates demonstrates that the semantic range means ‘support’, not what is commonly translated as ‘submit’ (Nyland, 2004, p. 463). Therefore, it is argued that Biblical text, and in particularly those relating to women translated as ‘submit’ should in most instances be translated as ‘support’. An example of this is when Paul writes to the Romans (cf: Rom 13:1). A more suitable translation rather than saying that the people should ‘submit’ to God’s laws is that Paul is requesting that the people ‘support’ these as well as the governing authorities (Nyland, 2004, pp. 386, 399). The nuance is both subtle and significant as it changes the overall emphasis on what is required of believers.

An important example of the translation of ὑποταγή (submission) is found in Ephesians 5:22 where the English translation states “wives be subject to your husbands as you are to the Lord. For the husband is the head of the wife just as Christ is the head of the church, the body of which he is the Savior [sic]” (*NRSV*). This follows the earlier verse translated as “be subject to one another” (Eph 5:21). It appears that Paul’s edict for mutual submission (v 21) is contradicted in view of (v 22) “wives, be subject to your husbands”. These contradictions in the text are not adequately explained by traditionalists. Further, to confound the traditionalists’ argument there is evidence of Biblical corruption given that the Greek word for submission or subject with reference to Ephesians

5:21, 22, and 24 does not exist in some manuscripts.¹⁰⁸ For example, in the 1550 Stephanus New Testament (TR1550) and the 1894 Scrivener New Testament (TR1894) ὑποταγή exists in the text, however it is missing in the 1881 Westcott-Hort New Testament (WHNU).¹⁰⁹ Again, it is missing in the Greek text of the Biblon 2000 Project and the Tyndale translation.¹¹⁰ Nyland (2004, p. 500) states that

ὑποτάσσω, *hupotasso*, support....the oft-quoted verse, ‘wives, submit to your husbands’ does not occur in any known Greek text, yet for some reason has made its way into nearly every Bible version. The word, erroneously appearing as an imperative (in verse 22 where no verb appears, is in fact a participle and is in verse 21: ‘supporting one another’.

Further, usually not factored into an examination of Ephesians 5:21-24 is the earlier text in the chapter (cf: vv 18-21) when Paul exhorts believers to renounce pagan ways. Within this context, Gombis (2005, p. 323) argues that Ephesians 5:22 must also be read as an expansion of Paul’s command in Ephesians 5:18-21, and that believers were “to ‘be filled with the Spirit’ – which is a call to embody and actualize the identity of the New Humanity as the dwelling place of God in Christ”. Even if ὑποτάσσω was included in the text, Nyland (2004, p. 399) argues that it means support, not submission. A reading of Ephesians 5:21-23 would then reflect a supportive and reciprocal relationship, not one of gender domination. Therefore, it is argued that firstly, the text has been tampered with, and secondly, when ὑποτάσσω does legitimately appear in the text it should be translated as ‘support’ not ‘submission’. Accordingly, a translation of Ephesians 5:21, in its context and

¹⁰⁸Retrieved 15 May, 2006, <http://www.tyndale.cam.ac.uk/biblon/msstgentest.html>;
<http://www.biblegateway.com/passage/index>;
http://www.ccel.org/w/westcott/gnt/ephesians/ephesians_5.htm;

¹⁰⁹ This relates to Ephesians 5:22. Retrieved 11 May, 2006, <http://www.thebibletool.com>.

¹¹⁰ Retrieved 11 May, 2006, <http://www.tyndale.cam.ac.uk/biblon/ksstgentest.html>.

translated without any emendations would then read “be filled with the Spirit while you are supporting one another”. Such a translation diminishes the validity of the traditionalists’ argument that relies on Ephesians 5:21-24 as corroborating evidence for women’s submission in 1 Timothy 2:11-12.

Further, it is argued that placing the text in its cultural context an exegete is more likely to establish its closest probable meaning; in doing so scholars have discovered important contextual data that can influence the translation. For example, there is evidence of a Jewish community in Ephesus since the Seleucid Period.¹¹¹ It is known that Jews, as Roman citizens were given the freedom to practice their religious traditions, and laws, as well as being exempt from the military because of their religious customs.¹¹² Given this cultural context, it is argued that the Jewish understanding of ὑποτάσσω was more than likely in a non-military context. In a non-military setting it means: - a voluntary attitude of giving in, cooperating, assuming responsibility and carrying a burden.¹¹³ Conversely, in a Greek military context, ὑποτάσσω means to obey or be subject. To place the word in a military setting instead of a non-military one is to take the word out of its contextual, and cultural setting, placing it at the centre of a problematic translation. It is argued that given Paul’s Jewish background, the translation of ὑποτάσσω should be situated in the context of a non-military setting, - and therefore, it means support. There is also lexicographic evidence from the First Century B.C.E. that ὑποταγή is more appropriately translated as meaning “self-assured, firm conduct” (Dibelius & Conzelmann, 1972, p. 47). Other evidence that showed that the meaning is ‘support’ rather than ‘submit’ was conducted by Bushnell in the early Twentieth Century. Bushnell (2004) quotes *Schleusner’s Greek-Latin Lexicon* to the Septuagint where the verb does not always express a meaning of submission or subjection. She uses the example of two men in a business partnership; to be

¹¹¹ Cf: DPL, C.E. Arnold, p. 251.

¹¹² Cf: Josephus *Antiquities*, trans. Whiston. *Ant.* 14.10.11-12; 14.10.25.

¹¹³ Retrieved, 19 May, 2006, http://www.blueletterbible.org/tmp_dir/words/5/1145323941-862.html.

successful in their joint venture they will need to yield to the others' preference, that is, to harmonize their views (Bushnell, 2004, p. 141). Further, she draws attention to the Scriptural principle of mutual care and preferring or honouring others above self (cf: Rom 12:10; Eph 5:21). As Bushnell and other scholars have shown, to agree on an accurate meaning of the text, the context, the principles within the text and the etymological process have to unite to provide a more precise meaning.

To exclude features of an exegetical process; for example, the context and principles found within the text - produces a problematic translation. It is argued that if a translation stated that a woman was in submission to her husband, he would be taking responsibility for her behaviour; for example, as a parent does with a child. Mary Evans (1983b) argues that the principle evident in the Biblical text is a voluntary attitude of giving and co-operating, not one of subjection. Evans (1983b, p. 66) claims that "only God is ever seen as subjecting others, whether he subjects them to himself, to another, or to futility" (cf: 1 Cor 15:24-28; Rom 8:20; Phil 3:21; Eph 1:21-22). Thus, a translation of 1 Timothy 2:11-12 that defines women as being in submission to men is questionable. As Evans explains, Paul appears to make a clear distinction between submission as required from a wife to her husband, and obedience as required from a child to their parents or from a slave to his master. She argues that Paul "never uses the word for obedience in a husband/wife context" (Evans, 1983b, p. 66); therefore, this thesis argues on the grounds of lexicographic evidence, word analysis, and other contextual settings that there is sufficient proof that the translation of *ὑποτάσσω* as submission or subjection is incorrect as it relates to a voluntary attitude of support.

Paul's Purpose for Referring to Old Testament Text

The reason for Paul referring to the OT text in 1 Timothy 2:13-15 continues to be debated by scholars. The main reason given by traditionalists or patriarchal scholars, such as Grudem (2004b) is that the Pauline comments in vv 13-15 referring to an OT text is evidence that Paul is supportive of a hierarchal or patriarchal organisation for the Church. As discussed in previous chapters, Grudem (cf: 2004b, pp. 66-74), like many other traditionalists, argues on the

basis of the Genesis story of Adam being formed first, then Eve, and this sets a hierarchical pattern, making women subject to men. Mounce (2000, p. 130) supports Grudem's claims and argues that the women in Ephesus are trying "to reverse the created order by being in authority over men". The underlying principle existing in the text for traditionalists are that Paul refers to the OT text to support his earlier corrective statements to women in vv 11-12, and to reinforce that the created order is one of a hierarchy.

The creation argument consists of Adam being placed in the garden first and then Eve who was created as a 'helper'. Mounce (2000, p. 130) argues that Paul, in v 13 describes why men have authority over women as "God created Eve from Adam's rib", and this was for the sole purpose of being his 'helper' (Gen 2:21-23). Donald Bloesch (1982) has a similar view, as he claims the wife is obliged to serve and support her husband as a 'helpmate'. It is argued, however, that there is a major flaw in aligning Eve as a 'helper' in this regard, as it equates with subordination. This cannot be correct as God is referred to as a 'helper', and this does not place God in a subordinate position to mankind; women or men (cf. Gen 49:25; Ex 18:4; Deut 33:7; Ps 54:4, 72:12). The role of 'helper' is a relational phrase, someone who assists, it does not stipulate position or rank (Freedman, 1983). Richard Hess (2004, p. 86) provides some clarity when he states that God created the woman from his side, from the rib and this is "a part of the body that is neither above nor below him". He explains that the Hebrew word referring to 'rib' represents a "basic building pattern that can be drawn from the man and used to create a second person like the first" (Hess, 2004, p. 87). In addition he states that the verb 'made' in Genesis 2:22 (where God made the woman and brought her to the man) is '*bannah*' meaning 'to build'. Hess (2004, p. 87) then draws attention to the term for 'rib' as the exact term "used for the sides of the ark and of the tabernacle" when God gave the pattern to Moses for the Tabernacle. It is argued that because God built or formed the man and woman in sequence after he created them is not a prescription for inferiority or subordination of the woman. What is noticeable in this argument is that 'helper' and 'rib' are prime examples of how a text can be misrepresented in translation from one language to another and one culture to another. Hess (2004, p. 94) argues that in his analysis of creation that "both

unity and gender diversity are clear themes in the creation accounts” apart from their sin and ensuing judgments.

The creation narrative describes the event in the Garden of Eden where Eve was deceived by the serpent and Adam was disobedient (cf: Gen Chap. 3). In patriarchal scholarship, there seems to be more emphasis on Eve’s deception rather than Adam’s disobedience. It is argued that the prohibition not to eat of the tree was given to Adam; therefore, this should make him more culpable (Guthrie, 1990). This is the view of the Apostle Paul as it is recorded in his Letter to the Romans (cf: Rom 5:12). Mounce (2000, pp. 136-137) argues that the creation narrative as it relates to 1 Timothy 2:14 is more applicable to the nature of women than anything else. He argues that as Eve was deceived (1 Tim 2:13) women are more readily open to being deceived. Albeit, there is an inherent weakness in Mounce’s argument, as to follow his line of argumentation this would then mean that men are more readily open to being disobedient to God in comparison to women.

It is argued that the social conditioning of women’s place in the Church dates back to the early Church. Chrysostom, describes men as having superior status and pre-eminence in every way because it was the man who was formed first.¹¹⁴ What Chrysostom did not consider when he wrote his homily is that the animals were created before humanity, and Adam and Eve were given dominion over them. The animals were not given superiority or pre-eminence over humankind. The order of creation does not specify superiority. Accordingly, Chrysostom’s argument that men were superior as they were formed before women can be readily refuted (Guthrie, 1990). Chrysostom also explains in the same Homily (IX) that it was not Adam who was deceived and therefore, he did not sin. His perception of the event in the Garden of Eden is that the woman incorrectly taught the man once, and this destroyed her opportunity to teach for all time (Saint Chrysostom, ca. 349–ca. 407). What

¹¹⁴ Cf: St John Chrysostom. (c. 349 - ca. 407). *Homily IX: 1 Timothy 2:11-15*. Retrieved 15 May, 2007, <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf113.v.iii.x.html>.

becomes evident are the contradictions in his Homily. He begins with stating women had equality before 'the fall' but this changed due to Eve's disobedience. However, if women and men had equality prior to Eve's deception, then Adam was not superior in the beginning. Humankind were made in the image of God and God gave "them" dominion over the earth and every living thing (Gen 1:27-28). What is critical here is that even if gender equality was damaged by 'the fall' it is argued that full equality was reinstated by Jesus when he redeemed humanity.

Further, in examining the creation narrative, it is argued that Adam and Eve had freedom of choice with the option of following God's command or disobeying God. Both Adam and Eve shared the authority over the earth as humans, made in the image of God, and both were punished for their sin when they were expelled from the garden; therefore, both were accountable (Gen 3:14-24) (Davies, 1996). Again, while both Adam and Eve were punished, it was Adam who was charged with the responsibility of breaking the Edenic Covenant - the responsibility was Adam's as the Covenant was made with him, not Eve (Gen 2:16-17). Further, Fee (2007, pp. 303-304) argues that God's redemptive plan is found in the creation language of the Pauline letters, and how humanity is restored through Jesus Christ, the new Adam. Jesus became the second Adam to make reconciliation, and restore the relationship between God and between women and men as it was 'in the beginning' when both were equal.

In summary, Paul, in order to explain his statements found in vv 11-12, refers to the creation account to emphasise the results when women and men do not support one another, and secondly, to refute the heretical teaching of the woman in Ephesus. Again, the intertextuality of the Biblical text shows that there is evidence that women and men should be supportive of each other. Paul's consistent teaching is that within the Church, women and men should work in peace and harmony, there should be no division, and they should be united in mind and purpose for mutual upbuilding (cf: Rom 14:19, 15:5, 1 Cor 1:10, 7:15, 14:33; Col 3:14). This did not occur with Adam and Eve; subsequently, it provided an avenue for Satan, the Edenic Covenant was broken, and it had ramifications for humanity until the second Adam, Jesus Christ.

Paul Responds to Neo-Gnostic Truths and or Heresies

As first discussed in Chapter Five, given Paul's view of unsound and heretical teaching, it is to be expected that Paul would immediately respond to correct the Ephesian heresy. Regarding the woman teaching in Ephesus, it is entirely reasonable to argue that Paul would want to amend this situation and explain to the Church his reasons behind this. On this particular situation he explains his reasons for the correction by quoting OT Scriptural examples: "Adam was first formed, then Eve" (v 13). Here, it is argued that Paul is explaining that Eve was not the source of Adam, but Adam was the source of Eve. It was after Eve was formed she became the "source of all life" through her capacity for child bearing (Gen 3:20). Neo-Gnostic teachers taught that Eve was the original human, the earth-mother and source of the mother-goddess cults who gave life to Adam (R. Kroeger Clark & Kroeger Clark, 1992). Paul responds to correct this heretical teaching that had crept into the Church, and he repeats the Genesis story in response to it having been misrepresented in Ephesus (Towner, 2006, p. 231). Nonetheless, Towner (2006, p. 232) adopts a different trajectory as he argues Paul's response is due to averting a role reversal of women as they take on a public role, and began to exert authority over men. This study argues against such a trajectory as proposed by Towner as it appears more likely that in responding to the heresy, Paul refers to the Genesis story to support his earlier statements in vv 11-12. It is argued that Paul's aim is to prevent the heresy in Ephesus from continuing as others would be deceived and this is what Paul wanted the *ekklesia* to avoid at all cost (cf: 2 Tim 3:5).

Paul had already attended to the issues associated with Hymenaeus and Alexander who were victims of false teaching (1 Tim 1:20). Paul wants sound teaching in the Church. It is argued that the false teaching Paul is correcting is more neo-Gnostic or Judaistic, rather than full blown Gnosticism as this was not introduced until the Second Century by Marcion. What Paul and the early Church were facing was the counter mission of Judaising, neo-gnostic, and

Hellenistic influences affecting the entire Church, not only the *ekklesia* in Ephesus.¹¹⁵

Paul Heralds the New Covenant Church

Paul primary mission was to establish the New Covenant Church on the truth of the teachings of Jesus Christ. This was discussed in Chapter Five. Paul introduces a transformational Gospel message based on a 'new life' in Christ Jesus (Eph 4:17-32). He explains that this 'new life' is to replace the 'old life' and it requires a shift or a moving away from the old paradigmatic way contained in the law (Rom 7:6). Therefore an interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 needs to be given meaning within the new paradigm - the New Covenant Church. It is argued that if the text is not realigned to the new paradigm, the old will contaminate the new, and with this comes a hierarchical and patriarchal Church structure.

In this study it is argued, and witnessed within the Biblical text that Adam was a 'type' or 'pattern' of the "one who was to come", meaning 'Jesus' (Rom 5:14). It was Adam who "was the pattern for Christ insofar as he stood at the head of the old creation, as Christ stands at the head of the new" (Gal 6:14-15) (Meeks et al., 1993, pp. 2122-2123). A New Covenant was established through Jesus Christ: God was reconciled to humanity through Jesus Christ who passed the responsibility of reconciliation to the Church (2 Cor 5:18-19). There is a new order, and men and women are reconciled to a relationship with God and others as God intended. Paul, in his ministry in Ephesus had established the New Covenant Church, and he left Timothy in charge to ensure its perpetuity in receiving correct and sound teaching.

In opposition to a traditionalist Church structure, an egalitarian Church structure exists of shared justice, power, and authority (cf: Rom 3:25-26). As Simone de Beauvoir, in an interview with John Gerassi (1976) explained, it is the patriarchal values, and the unwillingness of men to share their power that is the

¹¹⁵ Cf: 2 Tim 1:15-18; 2:16-17; 3:6-9, 4:10; Titus 1:5, 10-11; 3:6-9; 4:10; Titus 1:5, 10-11; 3:9-14.

problem - the same way as the ruling class will not voluntarily give up their power. Similarly, it is argued, there is evidence of a gender and class struggle existing in the contemporary Church since the First Century. At the core of the struggle is the patriarchal interpretation of the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. The traditionalists, with their acceptance of patriarchal textual translations, and a hierarchal structure have created another class in the Church. In an egalitarian interpretation of the text, there is justice for women, and power and authority are a mutual commodity.

Salvation through Childbearing

The Pauline purpose for referring to Adam and Eve and childbearing has not been fully resolved by scholars. The text is generally received as; a woman “will be saved through childbearing, provided they continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty” (1 Tim 2:15). This is the literal English reading and Waters (2004) claims that such a translation dates back as far as the Second Century.¹¹⁶ In the Fourth Century Augustine of Hippo (354–450 C.E.) argued that v 15 should not be taken literally but understood “figuratively and mystically” (Waters, 2004, p. 733). Waters (2004) argues for the same treatment of the text regarding a woman having her head veiled in Paul’s First Letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor 11:5-6). He claims that the veil metaphor should have a ‘figurative’ and ‘mystical’ meaning rather than a literal one that requires a woman to wear a veil on her head (Waters, 2004, p. 733). It was not unusual for Paul to write in metaphorical language; therefore, there is a strong likelihood that Paul did the same in v 15. Consequently, there are two positions that explain the meaning of the text of 1 Timothy 2:15. The first position is that the text should be read, and explained from a literal reading of the traditional English translation, and the second position is the text should be read as metaphorical, including the existence of theological or spiritual connotations. The latter position suggests that there is a sub-text in the text needing to be

¹¹⁶ Waters, K. (2004), pp. 731–734, refers to Clement of Alexandria (150–215 C.E.); Gregory of Nyssa (330–395 C.E.); Theodore of Mopsuestia (350–428 C.E.), Ambrosiaster (ca. 370 C.E.) and Pelagius (ca. 415 C.E.) who all support a literal understanding, and yet have different nuances about how they reach their position.

examined as part of the process of determining the immediate contextual meaning.

The Reception of the Birthing Metaphor

A literal interpretation of the text as women giving birth in v 15 has been the position held by traditionalists as they consider this relates to a woman's main role in life. In the selection of terms in his letter, Paul in v 15 employs another *hapax legomenon* in 'childbearing' (τεκνογονία), making a total of two *hapax legomena* in 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Given that τεκνογονία is a rare word, v 15 necessitates further analysis rather than an acceptance of a literal reading of an English translation.

Meeks (1972, p. 137) claims that the Greek will not support a translation of "saved by means of the Birth of the Child" even though Genesis 3:15 is understood as a prediction of Christ's birth. Other scholars support this position and argue that if Paul had been referring to Jesus Christ he would have specifically stated this (Davies, 1996). Stanley Porter (1993, p. 102) is another scholar who receives the text literally from the position that women who continue in faith, love, and holiness, will gain their salvation through child bearing. Again, Grudem (2004b, p. 73) claims that the birthing metaphor, or the phrase 'childbearing', is to be understood as women having responsibility of bearing and raising children, not teaching or governing in the Church. He argues that women are to be obedient to God and to "work out the results of her salvation...that is, through being obedient to God in the various tasks and roles that He calls her to, rather than attempting to teach or govern the Church, a role God has not called women to" (Grudem, 2004b, p. 74). Even in the midst of this argument, Grudem (2004, p. 74) does concede that Paul could have been referring to 'childbearing' as the birth of Jesus coming from a descendent of Eve. Another interpretation of the English reading has suggested that the meaning of the text (v 15) is based in the socio-cultural setting of the Hellenistic world where empires were gained and retained by military force. Subsequently, Davies (1996, p. 19) argues that it was essential for women to bear male children "who could defend the empire in the next generation". It was believed

that not only the women, but the entire Empire would be saved through women bearing children as this would increase the country's defence capabilities. However, it is argued that Paul's focus was not on defending the Empire, but on defending the Gospel message; therefore, such an argument quickly loses its veracity. However, there are a number of scholars, including Nyland (2004) and Waters (2004) who maintain Paul uses the term 'childbearing' (τεκνογονία) as a metaphor, and the text should not be understood as having a literal meaning of women giving birth.

Spencer (1974, p. 220) argues from a metaphorical position stating that if Paul was defending the Gospel message of salvation, then it is possible that he was saying "a woman would be saved through the birth of the child" or "a woman will be saved through her (meaning Mary) bearing the child (with reference to Jesus)". Mounce (2000) also argues from a metaphorical position stating that v 15 has a "spiritual" meaning based on v 14. He argues that Paul refers to Eve being enticed into sin (v 14), and this is followed by a qualification in v 15 with the meaning that regardless of Eve's sin, salvation is still possible for women (Mounce, 2000, p. 144). Bushnell (2004) argues for a similar metaphorical meaning, but her explanation has an argument more attuned to Spencer's position. She explains the translation from the Greek as "*she [woman] shall be saved by the childbearing,*" – that is, by the birth of a Redeemer into the world" (Bushnell, 2004, p. 169). Oden (1989, pp. 100-101) argues that "saved through childbearing" relates to Genesis 3:15, and Jesus as being the "offspring of Eve", and he claims that it is accepted by scholars as referring to the coming of Christ "who would crush the serpent's head". Nyland (2004, p. 551) in her exegesis argues along the same lines as Oden (1989) in that the 'they' refers to Adam and Eve and this is a referent back to the OT text of Genesis 3:15 "where God said that Eve's offspring would be the downfall of Adversary". Following a detailed analysis of the Greek, Nyland (2004, p. 551) argues that the most likely translation is "and she will be saved by means of the Birth of the Child". Waters (2004, pp. 703-706) supports the position of Nyland; however, he describes 'childbearing' as an allegorical metaphor bringing attention to the context rather than a relationship between women and men. He employs the term 'allegory' in the "sense of an extended metaphor, that is, in the sense of language, imagery,

and structure drawn from an ancient narrative and applied to a contemporary circumstance” similar to the types of allegorical patterns used by Philo (20 B.C.E.–50 C.E.) (Waters, 2004, pp. 703-704, 706).

On the basis of the Biblical text and the teachings of Paul, as earlier discussed in Chapter Five, it is argued that salvation is gained through faith and by believing in Jesus Christ (cf: Acts 4:12; Rom 1:16; Gal 2:16; 2 Tim 3:15). It is through God’s grace that salvation is universally made available to all who would believe (cf: Acts 16:31; Rom 10:9; 1 Cor 15:2; Titus 2:11). There is no place in the Biblical text that indicates that salvation comes one way for men and another for women, or that women will find their salvation through the virtues of ‘childbearing’ and “faith, love and holiness”. Therefore, to interpret the text of v 15 in its literal form, “they will only be saved through childbearing and as long as they continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty” is incorrect: theologically and soteriologically.

On the contrary, a translation of being saved by the “birth of the child” is not a new concept as such a translation and interpretation of v 15 has been accepted by scholars since the Nineteenth Century.¹¹⁷ Therefore, it is argued that Paul was referring to Eve as the prototype for all women as all were to be offered salvation through the birth of the child, Jesus. This is the sub-text, or the spiritual significance of the text. It is argued that it is a soteriological statement embedded within a ‘birthing’ metaphor as Paul explains the situation concerning the woman at Ephesus when the Biblical text is translated accurately.

¹¹⁷ Cf: Nyland, *TSNT*, p. 551. Nyland quotes other authors who support the same translation of the Greek including K.C. Bushnell, *Word to Women*, 1919; C.J. Ellicott, *The Pastoral Epistles of St. Paul*, 1864; H.P. Liddon, *Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul’s First Epistle to Timothy*, 1897; T.A. Oden, *First and Second Timothy and Titus*, 1989; G.W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles*, 1992.

Paul and the Use of Metaphorical Language

In Ephesus in the First Century, it would not have been unusual for birthing imagery to be present in language as this was a cultural feature of the Cult of Artemis, and its association with fertility. Waters (2004, p. 725) states this feature is also illustrated with Apuleius (ca. 120 B.C.E.–60 C.E.) who identifies the Egyptian goddess Isis with Artemis, saying “at another time you are Phoebus’ sister; by applying to birth soothing remedies you relieve the pain of childbirth, and have brought teeming numbers to birth; now you are worshipped in the famed shrines of Ephesus”. The use of metaphorical imagery would be understood in the social culture of Ephesus. Waters (2004, p. 726) in his analysis, draws attention to Socrates (ca. 469–399 B.C.E.) who “describes himself as a midwife...and his vocation is to help men ‘give birth to the manifold good things found within them’”. As Waters (2004, p. 726) explains, Socrates used child birthing language metaphorically and refers to men who associate with him as being “like women in childbirth, suffering the pains of labor [sic]”. Child birthing imagery had application to both women and men in the ancient world. Given the influence of philosophers, such as Socrates, and goddess cults in the ancient world it is understandable that birthing imagery was reflected in early Christianity through the use of “natalistic” language in the Gospels, and in the letters of Paul, James and Peter (Waters, 2004).¹¹⁸ Therefore, it is argued as was common to the era, Paul uses the same natalistic, and metaphorical language that people in the ancient world would have understood.

An examination of the Pauline Corpus shows that it was common for Paul to use metaphorical language. For example, in his Letter to the Colossians he wrote metaphorically about ‘bearing fruit’ (cf: Col 1:6). Paul required the believers to ‘bear fruit’ for God as part of a ‘new life’ in the Spirit not through living a life in the flesh, which is associated with the law (cf: Rom 7:4-6; Gal 5:22). For Paul being ‘unfruitful’ is found in works of darkness (Eph 5:8, 11), and to be fruitful means to continue on in “all that is good, right and true” (Eph 5:9) - the point that Paul makes in v 15. To assist people in the Church

¹¹⁸ Cf: Lk 7:35; Jn 3:3-7; 1 Cor 15:8; Jam 1:15, 18; 1 Pet 1:3.

understand what he is talking about, Paul uses a range of agricultural, and gynaecological reproductive imagery; for example, the whole creation groans in labour pains (cf: Rom 8:22-23). Paul also describes himself as being in the “pain of childbirth” until Christ is formed in them (referring to the Galatians) (cf: Gal 4:19). He uses the birthing metaphor to describe a situation where there is no escape (cf: 1 Thess 5:3). Therefore, the fact that Paul uses another metaphor in 1 Timothy 2:15 is not unexpected.

In the use of metaphorical language Paul’s statement that a woman will be saved by ‘childbearing’ could also have been a response to the ‘false teachers’ who denounce marriage. The Jerusalem Bible refers to the rejection of marriage as one of the hallmarks of Gnosticism (A. Jones, 1966, p. 361). Towner (2006, p. 232) supports such a position when he states there are “strong indications that certain features of the traditional role of women (marriage and childbearing) were being set aside on the basis of the false teaching”. The Kroegers (1992) argue that false teachers of proto-Gnostics held views that sex was permissible but for this to culminate in childbirth should be avoided, and that women could lose their salvation if they had children. Proto-Gnostic views likely commenced early in the Christian Church through a misinterpretation of Paul’s comments in his Letter to the Corinthians with reference to marriage (1 Cor 7:38). Any heretical teaching would have been of great concern to Paul. However, it was far too early for Gnostic views to be fully developed as these came through the teachings of Marcion closer to the middle of the Second Century (Mead, 1931, pp. 241-249). If heretical teachings were being taught in Ephesus, for example, the rejection of marriage or that a woman could lose her salvation through childbearing, Paul’s response would be to correct the false teaching immediately. It seems more likely that Paul was responding to false teaching through a birthing metaphor. The corrective was that the only way salvation is gained was through the ‘birth of the child’, meaning Jesus. The truth of the Gospel message that Paul taught was that salvation comes through Jesus Christ, not on the basis of whether or not a woman gave birth (cf: 2 Cor 6:2; 1 Thess 5:9; 2 Tim 2:10; 3:15). Thus, Paul would not have stated that ‘childbearing’ is a means of salvation for women, and it is argued that there is stronger evidence to support that Paul used this

metaphorically. Therefore, it is argued that the dominant feature in v 15 is that Paul - through his reference to the creation account - wants to quash the heresy in Ephesus. It is argued that to sustain a literal interpretation of the v 15 is theologically unsound.

Further, the metaphorical argument is supported in another crucial example in the Biblical text when Paul explains the difference between the Old and New Covenants through the allegory of Hagar and Sarah in his Letter to the Galatians. Paul refers to Hagar and Sarah as the bond (law) and the free (grace) representing the two covenants; the old and the new (Gal 4:24-28). In his explanation, Paul moves from a patriarchal to matriarchal example to demonstrate the historical salvific events in the plan of God. While Paul does not mention Sarah specifically by name, he acknowledges the significance of the child (Isaac) that was born of Sarah, Abraham's wife. Paul contrasts the 'free woman' with the 'slave woman' to distinguish between the New Covenant through faith in Jesus Christ and the Mosaic Covenant (C. Kroeger Clark & Evans, 2002, p. 686). The relationship with God is no longer a relationship through the Mosaic Law, but a relationship through the New Covenant of 'grace' (C. Kroeger Clark & Evans, 2002, p. 687). Therefore, this study argues that women and men enter into this covenant of 'grace', through Jesus Christ, as they go 'within the veil'.

As discussed in Chapter One, the way 'within the veil' through Jesus Christ, parallels Aaron, the High Priest, going into the Holy of Holies, where he met with God. Going 'within the veil' is the culmination of the 'promise by faith' made to Abraham and Sarah, and all who believe can now fully participate in the New Covenant Church (cf: Acts 13:3; Rom 4:13, 16; Gal 2:16). Under the New Covenant love is a central theme, and Paul calls the entire Church to continue in love, faith and holiness, not just women (cf: Jn 3:11; 15:12-17; Rom 13:8; 2 Cor 7:1; Eph 4:24; 1 Thess 3:13; 4:4, 7). Similarly, Paul encourages Timothy to live this type of life; a life of "love, faith and holiness", and asked him to be an example to others (1 Tim 4:12). It is, therefore, not unusual for Paul to make reference to the requirements of this 'new life in Christ' as it confirms his general message to the Church. Finally, it is argued that Paul uses

metaphorical imagery not only to refer to what happened at creation (vv 13-14) but also to the role of Jesus Christ in the salvific plan of God, and the type of life required of the believer (v 15).

Conclusion

For a contemporary reading and understanding of the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 there are a range of factors that need consideration. Firstly, the configuration of the text as a result of textual corruption; and secondly the problem this creates is the historical and heretical teaching that it is the divine will of God that women are to be submissive in the Church, home, and society. Transmission problems; for example, through interpolations drew attention to the minimisation of the role of women through either intentional or unintentional changes to the text, sustaining the oppression, and marginalisation of women. There is strong evidence for the existence of textual variants as identified by Ambrosiaster in the Fourth Century. The potential corruption of the text, highlighted the importance of a range of interpretative tools to identify an accurate interpretation of the text; therefore, more reliance was entrusted to Biblical intertextuality, and principles within the Pauline Corpus.

An argument was presented that Paul did not require women to be silent, but like everyone else they were to be quiet and peaceable when under instruction. This style of teaching was contrary to learning settings in the ancient world; for example, the Socratic Method when it was acceptable to interrupt the teacher and dialogue was encouraged. This highlights the importance Paul placed on everyone learning the New Covenant teachings. It appears that in the New Covenant environment Paul does not want a setting where there is argumentation, and an exchange of ideas as he wants everyone to learn so that they will understand the Gospel message and not deviate from this later.

There is sufficient evidence to claim that women are not required to be in submission to men, particularly evident when other texts and the contexts were examined. It is argued that an analysis of the text that places women in submission is sourced from a patriarchal paradigm that is hierarchal, and places men in a superior position to women. It has been argued that it is the normative

paradigm of patriarchy that has sustained patriarchal translations and interpretations of the Biblical text, in particular 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Further, it is argued that the Gospel message proclaimed by Paul has an inclusive component that is not readily identified through patriarchal scholarship, or Biblical translations. Further, evidence was provided that the Pauline model for the Church was one of mutuality, it was gender inclusive, and what Paul required is a supportive and harmonious environment where everyone is equal and united.

While there were differing scholarly views proposed for vv 14-15 there was adequate evidence to support that Paul was writing metaphorically, and a literal reading and patriarchal interpretation demanded of the Biblical text is superfluous. It is argued that it was not unusual for Paul to frequently refer to the OT Biblical text to support statements in his letters to the early Church and he also does this in his First Letter to Timothy. It is argued that the reason for Paul's reference to the OT Genesis account (vv 13-15) was to correct a heresy being perpetrated by a particular female teacher in Ephesus. To elucidate his reasoning for his statements in vv 11-12, Paul uses metaphorical language to underpin the truths he is teaching the Church. It is argued that for a coherent reading of the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15, the key is to understand the Pauline metaphorical message within the text. Such an approach is supported by the Pauline corpus as a whole and the Hellenistic culture of the First Century (Baugh, 2005a; Waters, 2004).

Additionally, as this study has shown, throughout the Pauline teachings there are principles that support the New Covenant Church as restoring relational equality that had been lost when the Edenic Covenant was broken. Further, it is argued that only unsound exegesis would state that women could be saved through childbearing. The only method for salvation comes through accepting the redemptive message of the Gospel; central to this is that salvation evolves from the redemptive plan involving the birth of Jesus

The following chapter combines the findings of the study as it examines the traditional reading and amasses the evidence for a new and alternative reading

of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. The implications for Church praxis are discussed and the ramifications are that the study engages the reader in an *'aggiornamento'* - a 'bringing up to date or a process of renewing' the historical translation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. In bringing the translation 'up to date' the symbolism of the metaphor 'within the veil' becomes an exemplification of the new reading, opening up new pathways for women in the Church.

CHAPTER 9

Findings and Conclusion

The central focus of this study has been to determine if the common and historical translation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is a precise and sound translation for Church praxis, and whether or not there is evidence to support an alternative interpretation of the text. The historical translation requires women to be silent; it requires women to be in subjection to men as part of a class system in the Church; and it is a system that defines the boundaries of women's rights to teach authoritatively in the Church. Whilst there has been, to some extent, an erosion of the historical translation in some sectors of the Church; for example, due to the ordination of female priests, it is argued that this does not alter the continued dominance of the historical and patriarchal translation of the Biblical text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Until now, there has been no scholarly consensus that the traditional reading is a corrupted text resulting in an erroneous translation. In presenting the findings of this study, it is appropriate to return to the beginning of Paul's First Letter to Timothy to reflect on his instructions to Timothy.

In Paul's First Letter to Timothy he refers to Timothy as a 'loyal' child (1 Tim 1:2). According to Jewish teaching, with Timothy's father a Gentile and his mother a Jewess, his birth would be usually deemed illegitimate by Jews (Rogers & Rogers, 1998, p. 487). However, here at the beginning of the letter, Paul, a Jew, and now a believer in Jesus Christ relates to Timothy as a spiritual father, and confirms Timothy's status in the Church. In the first chapter, Paul reaffirms his confidence in Timothy, and his ability to manage the heretical teachers in Ephesus. He then urges him to instruct others not to teach any different doctrines (cf: 1 Tim 1:3). From the introduction in the letter, it appears that the foremost purpose for Paul was to encourage Timothy in the task set before him, and secondly, to urge him to be courageous, and oppose the false teaching occurring in the *ekklesia* in Ephesus. In his letter, Paul instructs Timothy in a number of other areas regarding what is expected in the New

Covenant Church. In the final chapter, Paul closes the letter with a discourse on the characteristics of the people who engage in false teaching. He encourages Timothy to live a righteous and Godly life, and it appears there is a sense of urgency for Timothy to respond to the problems in the Church (cf: 1 Tim Chap. 6). Paul's final instruction is for Timothy to avoid false knowledge as "by professing it some have missed the mark as regards the faith" (1 Tim 6:21). Therefore, it is argued that foremost in Paul's mind is for Timothy to teach sound doctrine, and, further, he has a responsibility as a teacher to instruct others to teach in alignment with the truth of the Gospel message.

The questions that precipitated this study were born out of perceived inconsistencies in the Biblical text, and experiential observations as part of Church life. Subsequently, there were a range of research questions that were asked of the Biblical text. In particular, the study questioned whether there was sufficient evidence to sustain the traditional translation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Further, given the documented discrimination, oppression, and marginalisation of women in the Church (which may be re-enforced by the traditional translation, and interpretation of the text), the study questioned whether this was part of the authoritative and Canonical Biblical text, and therefore, mirrored in NT Biblical principles. Essentially, the study conducted was similar to an archaeological excavation with the overall aim to find out whether: there were other meanings, hidden for centuries, still embedded in the Biblical text; and secondly, whether the traditional translation was accurate.

To respond to the unanswered questions about a woman's place in the Church the methodology was developed: as outlined in Chapter Three. Subsequently, the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 was analysed through a multiple layered methodological strategy, including the world 'of' the text; the world 'behind' the text; and the world 'before' the text. The analysis viewed the text as both 'window' and 'mirror', together with a grammatico-historical approach, and socio-rhetorical element that placed emphasis on the 'intertextuality' of the Biblical text. Reception Theory underpinned the study, and it was argued that how the reader engages with, and receives the Biblical text is of paramount importance. In particular, it was argued that the normative paradigm of

patriarchy was formed out of institutional, and individualistic social, and religious conditioning. In this study, it was the reader as author of the thesis that was the connective thread between the multiple layers identified in the methodology. The grammatico-historical method is referred to by Abraham (2003, pp. 6-7) as engaging in the hermeneutics of recuperation, and he argues that when examining 1 Timothy 2:11-5 through this method, it restores the text to its rightful place giving it meaning, and understanding without the disempowerment, and discrimination against women. It is argued that this thesis supports this aim. The methodology was both the approach, and process whereby the historical reading was examined, and disputed, as the text was deconstructed, and restored. The result is a new reading based on evidence presented in the thesis.

It was argued in Chapter One that if emancipation for women is embedded in the Biblical text, and this is unearthed then restoration for women will occur. However, given the current contention between traditionalism and egalitarianism this will only happen if new evidence can be accepted by patriarchal scholarship with such information becoming integrated into their paradigm; otherwise, the status quo will remain. Again, if restoration is to occur for women then the existing scholarship around the debate will need to reconsider the Biblical analysis conducted as part of this study that Jesus Christ restored the balance through the New Covenant Church, as part of the 'new order' for God's household.

In the recuperation of the text, it was the intention of this research, as expressed in Chapter One, to find out if a second class status based on gender was a divine proclamation, or a human proclamation – a patriarchal decree. The argument was conducted similarly to Pauline tradition in drawing on a metaphorical context to explain 1 Timothy 2:11-15, that is, 'within the veil'. Throughout the thesis it is argued that the metaphor 'within the veil' held redemptive, and transformational symbolism for the New Covenant Church. Similarly, Joel Green (1991) came to the same conclusion when examining the metaphor in the Lukan account, arguing that it symbolised the elimination of all barriers, including gender. Therefore, on the basis of the evidence presented in

this thesis it is argued that women, along with men have ontological, spiritual, and functional equality.

Generally, scholars agree that the symbolism of the rending of the veil grants ontological, and spiritual equality. What is disputed is whether or not women have functional equality, and this is an area that was specifically explored within the study methodology. Consequently, it is argued that there is ample evidence for a paradigmatic shift in the Church to extend full functional equality to women. Further, it is argued that when the symbolism within the Biblical text is wholly analysed and understood, the New Covenant reality is one of equality, and this is supported when examining the Pauline Corpus and the intertextuality of the Biblical text. However, for a shift towards gender equality in the patriarchal paradigm, significant changes in methodological approaches, as were undertaken in this study will need to occur. This would invite scholars to undertake fresh analysis of the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15, and centre the text within the New Covenant Church structure; secondly, to confer further on the problems with textual corruption, interpolations, and subsequent problems in the transmission of the text; thirdly, to undertake further analysis of women in the ancient world, and its relationship to Paul's First Letter to Timothy; fourthly to place the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 within its socio-cultural, and religious First Century setting; and finally, to make the connection between idolatrous practices in the First Century, and how they are mirrored in the Twenty-first Century Church through patriarchal dominance, and the male 'headship' principle, whether overt or covert. When such methods are fully integrated into Biblical exegesis on the role of women, perhaps the reception of the text will take on new meaning for the wider Church.

In presenting a summary of the findings of this study, this chapter commences with an examination of how the text changes when it is placed in the structure of the New Covenant Church, and the adaptations contemporary believers have made to accommodate the traditional reception of the text. The place of women in the Apostle Paul's ministry as evidenced in this study is reviewed, and the patriarchal bias in the translation of the text is exposed. A discussion ensues on the implications of the traditional reading, and the ongoing struggle for women

to fully appropriate gender equality given the dominance of patriarchy. On the basis of evidence presented and argued in the thesis, a new reading is presented.

The Reception of the Text within the New Covenant Church Order

This study began with the premise that the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 was Pauline, and it argued that there is sufficient evidence for such a claim, whether or not he had the assistance of an amanuensis. Further, the study argued that the reception is based on two major theological positions; the traditionalist versus the egalitarian paradigm. In the analysis it was acknowledged that both the traditionalist and egalitarian arguments are seen to have flaws, and these are debated within scholarship on the grounds of hermeneutic fallacies, and interpretative deficiencies within differing methodological approaches.

In this thesis there are multiple threads that are drawn together to explain what has occurred over the centuries regarding theological teachings on gender, and the implications this has had on praxis for women in the Church. This is over and above an analysis of the text that confronts the common misconceptions, and the traditionalist stance, as discussed in Chapter Two, that women have no authority to teach in the Church. The threads that contribute to the gender debate in the Church are: 1) the notion of male authority and headship; 2) the notion of the male as 'protector' and 'provider' within the family unit, and the Church; 3) the notion that Biblical authority exists within the text for women to be submissive to men; and 4) the notion that women are to be silent in the Church without the authority to teach. Due to the differences between the traditional reading, and secular life of women in the western world, it is argued that tensions in scholarship have surfaced on this subject. As a consequence of the dominance of patriarchy in the Church and home, women and men have had to make paradigmatic shifts to retain equipoise in their belief systems as they live out the traditional paradigm.

The paradigmatic shifts made by Christians in the Church are evident in the work of Gallagher and Smith (1999). They conducted a study of Protestant

Church attendees from six regions in the United States of America using a sample of one hundred and thirty people, two-thirds of whom identified as evangelical (Gallagher & Smith, 1999). They found that ninety per cent of respondents “combined elements of both traditionalism and egalitarianism, emphasizing men’s headship as a core family value” (Gallagher & Smith, 1999, p. 217). In reaching this conclusion Gallagher and Smith (1999, p. 217) stated that “a significant majority alluded to various New Testament passages in support of their ideals. Most frequently, respondents referred to Paul’s Letter to the Ephesians, his First and Second Letters to Timothy, and the Letter to Titus, as well as the creation story recorded in Genesis Chapter 2”. It was the characteristic of men’s assumed material responsibility as ‘provider’ that featured as the most common component in their understanding of ‘headship’. One of the areas of responsibility that respondents identified was that males have “accountability before God for the welfare of the family” (Gallagher & Smith, 1999, p. 218). What Gallagher and Smith’s research showed was that ‘headship’ is very much a concept that is included in the contours of social, religious, and economic life in the Twenty-first Century Christian Church. However, the changes in economic needs that often require two incomes per household has shifted the ground to what Gallagher and Smith identify as “symbolic traditionalism” and “pragmatic egalitarianism” (Gallagher & Smith, 1999, pp. 217-226).

Symbolic traditionalism counters the experiential changes of men and women as men have less ability to maintain their position as the ‘bread winner’, and women as the ‘good mother’. With these changes, the emphasis on the man being the ‘provider’ is decreased while the man as ‘protector’ or ‘husband as warrior’ and ‘final decision maker (husband as manager and CEO)’ are increased (Gallagher & Smith, 1999, p. 228). Men as ‘warrior’ and ‘manager/CEO’ are new post-industrial metaphors that enable believers to manage their socio-economic, and religious environments whilst still preserving the substance of the Biblical patriarchal belief system. Symbolic traditionalism, and pragmatic egalitarianism “can be seen as a bargain with patriarchy – a ‘last gasp’ patriarchy, to be sure, one that is confined to the inner corners of the family but one that continues to figure prominently in the rhetoric of evangelical

family values” (Gallagher & Smith, 1999, p. 228). Further, it could be argued, on the basis of the findings of this study, this ‘bargaining with patriarchy’ is applicable across Twenty-first Century Church denominations.

The research findings of Gallagher and Smith (1999) confirm that the ‘male headship’ principle even when part of a symbolic traditionalist paradigm still exists in the Church. This study, as discussed in Chapter Four, examined the concept of ‘male headship’, and evidence showed that it has its roots in the Greco-Roman, and Jewish family systems. It is argued that ‘male headship’ has become a firmly fixed value in contemporary Church life albeit illegitimately. The evidence shows that it is a remnant from ancient times and reinforced through a patriarchal, and pagan Biblical translation of the text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. It is argued that when the place of women is examined in Paul’s ministry, a very different paradigm emerges.

The Place of Women in Paul’s Ministry

The Apostle Paul claimed that the Gospel he taught did not emerge from a human source, but a divine one, through a revelation of Jesus Christ (Gal 1:12). Therefore, if the historical translation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is correct, then it may be argued that God discriminates against women, not Paul. However, when the Biblical text was analysed, and the text placed in its context, this study revealed that Paul has been misunderstood, and his alleged anti-feminist stance is more hypothetical than theologically sound.

This study found that within the text, there is evidence to question the common patriarchal translation that women should be subjugated to men - without authority to teach in the Church. Patriarchal constructs have dominated Christianity for centuries, and due to textual corruption there exists anti-feminist tendencies in the Western texts. Witherington’s (1984, p. 83) research shows that “there was a concerted effort by some part of the Church, perhaps as early as the late First Century or beginning of the second, to tone down texts in Luke’s second volume that indicated that women played an important and prominent part in the early days of the Christian community”. He argued that the dislike of women in prominent and public Church roles can be possibly

traced back to the First Century with the Universal and Catholic type of Christianity that reflected Roman and Western ideas (Witherington, 1984, pp. 83-84).

As discussed in Chapter Six, the dislike of women's participation in the Church was consolidated by the marginalisation of women by the early Church fathers for example; Tertullian who taught that women were not to teach. It appears that evident within the teachings of the early Church fathers, there were difficulties accepting women in leadership roles; therefore, the transition from the 'old' ways to the New Covenant Church was never fully realised. It is argued that men who were leaders, philosophers, and historians at the time of the early Church were principally indoctrinated in Greek philosophy with its disdain for women. The sacred writings were interpreted by patriarchal interpreters who

understood Paul from the viewpoint of their own culture and customs. In a sense, they read Paul's words through the eyes of Aristotle....and in so doing, they established a traditional method of viewing Paul's insights from a perspective that was Greek rather than Jewish and pagan rather than Christian (Bristow, 1988, p. 3).

Therefore, on the basis of evidence found in the Pauline Corpus, and discussed in this study, it is argued that it is not God or Paul who prohibited women from teaching in the Church but a patriarchal translation of the Pauline text. When examined closely the Church under Paul's direction and ministry, and within its broader context, does not appear anti-feminist. Paul is inclusive of women, as they worked alongside him in his work, and he was accepting of their role and gifts. Paul taught that all who were part of the body of Christ would receive gifts and they were to be used within the Church (Rom 12:5-7). The gifts are given for the Church to grow to maturity, and to the unity of the faith (Eph 4:7-13). Furthermore, the gifts are given not on the basis of gender but according to 'grace' (Rom 12:6). The only limitations for a teacher is that they do not bring the Gospel teachings into disrepute, and that these at all times should be in agreement with godliness, that is, faithfulness towards God (cf: 1 Tim 6:1-3).

Evidence of a Patriarchal Bias in the Traditional Translation

There was additional evidence presented in Chapter Six of the thesis that demonstrated a patriarchal bias in the traditional Biblical translation and interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 through the Greek word ἀδελφοί. In many instances an androcentric bias has translated this word as ‘brothers’ or ‘brethren’ rather than through the inclusive and correct term of ‘brothers and sisters’ or ‘people’. A more prominent patriarchal prejudice was evident in the examination of ‘elder’ and ‘bishop’ as discussed in Chapter Five. Paul never gives instruction that an ‘elder’ or a ‘bishop’, that is an ‘overseer’ or ‘guardian’ is restricted only to men. Epigraphical evidence attests to women being priests and bishops in the early Church. Consequently, this thesis argues that a patriarchal bias in Biblical interpretation has rendered an erroneous interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and other associated gender texts in the NT text. In addition, the study draws attention to the association between Paul’s problems with the woman in Ephesus teaching heresy, and Paul bringing attention to this, disqualifying her from becoming a bishop.

Further, Chapter Five argued that there was a plausible connection between 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and 1 Timothy 3:1-7. In vv 11-12 Paul corrects a heresy that is being taught in Ephesus giving his reasons for why he does not grant authority for a woman to engage in heretical teaching. Immediately afterwards, Paul states “if any person aspires to be a guardian [bishop] they desire a noble [fine] task” (cf: 1 Tim 2:15; 3:1). Accordingly, if the text between v 12 and 1 Timothy 3:1-2 is set aside, a paraphrase would read “I do not give authority to a woman to teach a heresy....for it is true that if anyone aspires to be a bishop they desire an excellent task and they must be beyond reproach”. Paul then lists all the requirements for a person to be a bishop. The connection is quite remarkable but it has generally been overlooked or minimised in scholarship. It is argued, that at this juncture, Paul endorses the right of women to function in the role of bishop or overseer as long as her teaching is in accordance with the truth of the Gospel message, and she sets a good example to others by meeting the criteria; for example, being hospitable, respectable, and not quarrelsome (cf: 1 Tim 3:2-3).

The role of elder or bishop is commonly understood as an office in the Church; such a proposition was questioned in this study. It was argued that the role of 'elder' or 'bishop' is related with the responsibility to oversee the work of the Church - over and above the gifts given to the Church of apostle, prophet, evangelist, pastor, and teacher (Eph 3:11). As was shown as part of this study, patriarchal scholarship neglects more recent inscriptional, and epigraphical evidence thereby continuing a history of disenfranchising women from their rightful place as Church leaders.

It is argued that the restoration of women within the Church hierarchy has been restrained by a predisposition to return to the 'old' ways, rather than the 'new' ways of equality found in the NT text. Therefore, it is argued that a patriarchal bias remains evident in the Church as the normative paradigm of patriarchy is focused on maintaining its equilibrium. It is argued that Paul struggled to move the Church into the New Covenant, the egalitarian paradigm; however, after his death this was surpassed by the early Church fathers seemingly intent on preserving patriarchal dominance. Overall, the study revealed the Apostle Paul as a counter cultural revolutionist, and reformer; he mentioned women in his letters to the Church and counted women as equals; and as his friends, and co-workers.

The Traditional Reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15

The text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 has historically been received through the dominant patriarchal paradigm. The traditional reading has been strongly defended by patriarchal scholarship; therefore, the commonly accepted text is received as follows:

Let a woman learn in silence with full submission (v 11). I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man, she is to keep silent (v 12). For Adam was formed first, then Eve (v 13), and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor (v 14). Yet she will be saved through childbearing, provided they continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty (v 15).

It is unclear when the above translation became the accepted reading of the text for the Church. However, this research has shown, as discussed in Chapter Two, that it was in the Eighteenth Century through feminist literature by Mary Wollstonecraft women began to engage in robust dialogue about their place in society, and the Church. In the latter part of the Eighteenth Century through the Protestant religious revival, women began to teach a theology of equality in the Church, and family. There was opposition from the Church hierarchy to a theology of gender equality, and little changed until the Nineteenth Century when women such as Elizabeth Cady Stanton, and Susan Anthony began to question the role of women in society, and to reclaim women's civil, and religious rights. As this study showed, the struggle for women's rights in the Church is far from over.

The Struggle for Women's Religious Rights

As discussed in Chapter Two the struggle for women's religious rights is inherent in the traditional reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. While the traditional reading is sustained, there is limited respectability for women, as they are marginalised and degraded to a second class status. To reclaim equal rights, women like Stanton, and Anthony fulfilled the role of reformer. While the struggle for full equality for women is still current in the Church, women such as Stanton have left a legacy that has enabled others to build on their Biblical scholarship. The work of Stanton and the women's feminist movement provided the momentum for women to begin to address their marginalisation, oppression, discrimination, and inequality in the Church. Nonetheless, equality for women in the Church is not reflected in contemporary Church leadership statistics, and the struggle continues. Evidence presented in Chapter Two confirmed that even though women as a cohort are over-represented in the Church, they are under-represented in Church leadership roles. The result is that women continue to be marginalised and oppressed regardless of the generalised religious rhetoric of equality in the wider Church; therefore, the multi-dimensional method was chosen for this study.

The study identified that patriarchy and a hierarchical 'old creation' theology is exploited to explain the commonly accepted translations that are found in three gender related texts: 1) the practice of speaking or teaching in public (1 Cor 14:34-35); 2) the practice of women being subject to their husband (Eph 5:21); and 3) the practice of silence, submission, and teaching (1 Tim 2:11-15). All of these are linked to social customs in the ancient world, and the analysis of the text in this study revealed that traditional interpretations are more cultural than normative. It is also argued that the New Covenant Church is an egalitarian structure based on gifting; however, as patriarchy became destabilised through a paradigm shift to egalitarianism as part of the 'new order', patriarchy as a religious organism realigned itself with its former ideological philosophies, and the patriarchal paradigm was preserved: the new egalitarian paradigm was never sustained.

The study explained how the egalitarian paradigm relapsed or was superseded by patriarchy's ascendancy. Essentially, this occurred through the teachings of the early Church fathers who were the first cohort of traditionalist scholars. Afterwards, the normative paradigm of patriarchy dominated Church praxis, and has done so since that time. In Chapter Two, in the discussion of Kuhn's (1962) framework, it was explained that change is unlikely as any new information has to exist within the prevailing paradigm. Examples of this predilection were shown in this study through an examination of other gender Biblical texts. For example, in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 the patriarchal interpretation is that man is superior to woman. When the intertextuality of the Biblical text is examined it reveals that only God is superior to humanity; women and men. Further, when the term 'head' in 1 Corinthians 11:3 is translated as 'source', the meaning of the text noticeably changes. Embedded within the text is not an authoritative voice of superiority but an explanation of a relationship of equality. The text that is received as "a symbol of authority on her head" is intrinsically a voluntary act of supporting another (Holmes, 2000. p. 315). It is argued that 'submit' should be translated as 'support'; such a position of mutual support is not something that has been integrated into the mainstream of the Christian Church due to the dominance of the patriarchal paradigm.

To shift the centre of the place of women requires a shift in patriarchal scholarship: a modal shift to begin to engage in a serious polemic that is inclusive of new *papyri* and inscriptional discoveries; that acknowledges the corruption of the Biblical texts; that will engage in rigorous scholarship outside of the patriarchal paradigm; and a willingness to invite everyone, regardless of gender to explore a new paradigm for the fully functioning Church. It is argued that when this occurs, patriarchy will awaken the underlying principles of inter-dependence, and reciprocity between women and men so evident in Biblical principles. To isolate a text and then give it legitimacy, as has happened with 1 Timothy 2:11-15, is a Scriptural fallacy as Scripture *must* interpret Scripture.

It is argued that the theology, and principles within the Pauline Corpus proclaim an inter-dependence, and reciprocity between women and men; and this extends to the wider body of the Church (cf: 1 Cor 12:20). This inter-dependence and reciprocity is ignored by the traditionalists in favour of hierarchical functionality. It was concluded, that, in part, the patriarchal disregard for functional equality appears due to a genuine belief that a hierarchical pattern for the universal function of the Church is ordained by God. In the belief that there is a hierarchy in the Church, members have been taught, and socialised to see this as God's will for the Church. The difference between the traditionalists and the egalitarians is that the latter assimilate new information into their paradigm; for example, from archaeological, epigraphical, and *papyri* discoveries to find other meaning in the text.

This study was centred within the text and demonstrated that authority for gender equality exists in the Biblical text. It appears that patriarchy is the barrier for the practice of gender equality in the Church, not the Biblical text, nor the Apostle Paul, nor the authority of God. In championing the cause for gender equality, women have developed feminist methodologies; yet, in some measure feminist methodologies have widened the gap between Biblical feminism, and traditionalist or conservative Biblical scholarship. Consequently, new feminist methodologies have been critiqued by patriarchal scholarship with a claim that Biblical feminists are responsible for diverting the truth and presiding over a new

'Biblical liberalism' (Grudem, 2004b). Consequently, Biblical feminists, as was discussed in Chapter Two, have been encouraged to move from criticising existing traditions, and embrace working within theological methods and norms (Young Dickey, 1990). This is what this study attempted to do with the addition of a feminist agenda. It was argued that sustaining a belief that the traditional reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 is a bona fide translation cannot be authenticated; subsequently, a new reading of the text has been extracted from the traditional reading.

The New Reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15

Paul was unwavering in his proclamation that only those who could teach sound doctrine should be in a teaching position. Such people must also be able to refute those who contradict sound teaching (cf: 1 Tim 1:3; Titus 1:9). Early in Paul's First Letter to Timothy he addresses a situation in Ephesus whereby there are some who desire to be teachers but who are not qualified or competent (1 Tim 1:7); furthermore, if they are allowed to teach they will teach error. It is argued that Paul is referring to women, as well as men. Paul in his letter as detailed in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 provides support and teaching to assist Timothy in his responsibility of correcting the heresy taught by a woman. If this woman is not prevented from teaching the heresy she will lead others astray as has already happened to Hymenaeus and Alexander.

Paul was careful in his choice of words, when he wrote his First Letter to Timothy about the situation in the *ekklesia* at Ephesus regarding a woman and teaching. Even with Paul's careful choice of words Bristow (1988, p. 3) draws attention to the fact that "his words have been interpreted so as to defend the very roles he challenged!" In this study, Paul's words are re-examined and a new translation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 emerged. The passage is discussed verse by verse in the following sections prior to formulating these into a new and complete reading.

1 Timothy 2:11

The traditional patriarchal reading states: *Let a woman learn in silence with full submission.* The analysis in this study showed that Paul wants everyone to learn quietly without being disruptive. Most scholars who work in this area today believe that it is not complete silence that Paul was referring to but a quiet and peaceable spirit, and not being argumentative while learning (Clark, 1980; Gritz, 1991; Holmes, 2000; Keener, 2001; Nyland, 2004; Schreiner, 2005; Witherington, 1988). Through Biblical exegesis scholars have proven that Paul wants women to be equipped in teaching the truth before they teach, the same as it would be for men (Bilezikian, 1985; Cunningham et al., 2000; Nyland, 2004; Schreiner, 2005). In the First Century it was not commonplace for women to be educated after young adulthood. Learning in the milieu of the early Church is, therefore, countercultural. The social structure introduced by Jesus, and now through Paul's ministry is a transformational Gospel message. Accordingly, women can fully participate in the New Covenant Church. More importantly, as in the days of the Israelites and the law, 'all' are to learn from the Scriptures, but are not to surpass what is written in the Scriptures (1 Cor 4:6). Thereby no one can take credit for what they teach as all the glory goes to God (1 Cor 10:31).

It was argued that the Greek word ὑποταγή (submission) v 11 is a 'filter' in the traditional reading for what follows in v 12. The traditional reading is that women cannot teach as they are in submission to men. The argument relies on textual criticism, Biblical translation of the original Greek, and in scholarship, usually the theory of subordinationism to support a hierarchical relationship between women and men. It was argued that Paul did not teach a doctrine of subordinationism, neither is it in the text. In the Fifth Century, St Augustine was definitive in his teaching that there was no hierarchy within the Godhead. It is argued that to teach otherwise is to teach heresy as was shown by the events in 2004 in the Anglican Archdiocese in Sydney.

When v 11 was examined in its context, together with the use of extra-Biblical literature, it was evident that ὑποταγή commonly translated as 'submission'

should be substituted with 'support', similarly the same is required with ὑποταγή in Ephesians 5:21-33. As the Greek word ὑποταγή is not present in the best Greek texts of Ephesians 5:22, it is argued that it should not appear in the translation in English Bibles. It is also argued that the emphasis needs to shift from submission or subjection to mutual support and cooperation in marriage, and in the Church. The notion of submission is a remnant from the First Century socio-cultural customs and does not align with the New Covenant Church where Jesus Christ is the *pater-familias*. While submission as a practice would have been accepted in Ephesus and reflected in their Hellenistic, and pagan society, paganism is not a feature of Christian society (Davids, 2004). Central to the evidence presented in this thesis is that Paul requires an egalitarian model of unity, harmony, and support for the Church. Therefore the new reading for v 11 is: *A woman must learn quietly without causing disruption and be supportive in everything.*

1 Timothy 2:12

The traditional patriarchal reading states: *I permit no woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she is to keep silent.* The debates in this passage of text are centred on whether Paul was giving a temporary or universal prohibition; whether Paul was effectively preventing women from teaching; and whether or not he was classifying women to a subservient position in relation to men. The analysis in this study firstly provided substantial evidence to claim that Paul was giving a temporary injunction to a woman. Secondly, as the scholarly debate on the topic of women and teaching is so intense, Chapter Six concentrated solely on this subject.

One of the foremost problems identified was the reliance on lexicon tools in Biblical research that have not been updated with more recent epigraphical, inscriptional, and *papyri* discoveries. Evidence was presented showing that women did teach in the early Church, and Paul was not specific about the role of teaching being the sole domain of men. An examination of the Pauline teachings revealed that the model for the New Covenant Church was one of mutuality, and women and men could teach if they had the qualifications, and

were faithful in teaching the Gospel message. Evidence was presented that revealed textual corruption: for example, through interpolations; transmission and translation problems; contradictions when examining Pauline principles, and other broader Biblical principles; and changing feminine names to masculine names, suggesting that this was for the purpose of men remaining dominant in the Church, and home. The struggle for gender dominance was evidenced when the Church was institutionalised around the Fourth Century as male leaders demanded the subjugation of women. It is argued that within the context of the Church being under the power, control, and authority of men that the patriarchal paradigm was strengthened, and gathered impetus over the centuries that followed.

As discussed in Chapter Seven, the contentious Greek word ἀυθεντέω has been a constant translational hazard for Biblical scholars. Despite the contentious polemic, it continues to be translated as ‘to have or exercise authority’. There are a number of scholars, including Baldwin (2005) who has studied ἀυθεντέω extensively, and provide evidence that the concept of authority does exist in the text. Nonetheless, other scholars, such as Wiltshire (1988) who has also extensively investigated the word usage concludes that ‘to have or exercise authority’ (ἀυθεντέω) took on the meaning of ‘authority’ much later than the First Century. It is argued that on the basis of the context, that if Paul intended to limit a woman’s ‘power’ or ‘authority’ it is likely he would have selected ἐξουσίαζω (to exercise authority over) as he did when he wrote to the Corinthian Church (1 Cor 7:4). However, that fact alone is not a sufficient argument to exclude the concept of authority from the text. On the basis of an examination of other texts, it was argued that no one is to have authority over anyone else other than God. It was argued that God is the only superior being, and to place men as superior to women is idolatry.

An argument was put forward that ἀυθεντέω was more associated with ‘author’, ‘source’ or ‘originator’ (R. Kroeger Clark & Kroeger Clark, 1992; Nyland, 2004;

Valleskey, 1995).¹¹⁹ Given that the word is a verb, an English rendering would be more associated with 'to author/source/originate' or 'to be the author/source/originator of'. It is argued, therefore, that when the meaning is attributed as author, source, or originator, this explains why Paul states Adam was formed first, then Eve. Paul was correcting what was being erroneously taught by the woman. Further, it is argued that Eve was referred to as the "source of all life" as she was to be the source for reproduction, and carried the seed of the Saviour (cf: Gen 3:20) (Spurrell, 1985, p. 3). It is argued that it was Paul who would not permit the woman to teach something that was in direct opposition to the Church teachings. It is also argued that the teaching being conducted by the woman was associated with her position in relation to the creation and formation of Adam and Eve, and this was heretical teaching. Within this context, there is a high probability that the woman was teaching that she was the originator or source of man, and this was contaminating the creation account. It is argued that the sub-text in the new reading is indicative of Paul stating that the woman needs to learn before she teaches; otherwise she will fall into error, and teach others the same, thus creating problems in the Church. Therefore, he prohibits this woman from teaching. Consequently, v 12 reads: *I do not give authority for a woman to teach that she is the source or the originator of man, she should be quiet.*

1 Timothy 2:13

The traditional patriarchal reading states: *For Adam was formed first, then Eve.* The new reading does not differ to the traditional reading; however, what is different is how the text is received. The statement does not make men superior to women, as it is argued that Paul states in his First Letter to Timothy how it was in the beginning when humanity was created. It is argued that both

¹¹⁹ There is spirited debate on this subject in scholarship. For further information on the polemic and response to the claim of the treatment of kephale as meaning 'head' and not 'source' see the article: Grudem, W. (2001). The meaning of κεφαλή ("Head"): An evaluation of new evidence, real and alleged. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 44 (1), 25-65.

women and men were created in the image of God (Gen 1:27). What Paul is referring to is that man was formed or fashioned, and this was followed by God forming woman. Some traditionalist scholars have argued on the basis of v 13 that Paul's position is that Adam is superior; therefore, all men are superior. However, as Bushnell (2004, p. 171) so poignantly argues, John the Baptist came before Jesus; however, this chronological factor did not make him superior.

Finally, it is argued as part of this study, that the intertextuality of the Biblical text provides supporting evidence for an accurate translation. Evidence was presented in this thesis that 1 Timothy 2:13 parallel's Ephesians 5:23, and 1 Corinthians 11:12. The argument is based on the man being the source of the woman as the man was formed first, and then the woman from the man. The other aspect of the argument is that Jesus Christ is the source of the New Covenant Church as he was the second Adam. Subsequently, he became the only source or access point to God, and mediator for believers. Central then, to the new reading is that no earthly man can mediate on behalf of a woman as a woman has direct access to God through Jesus Christ herself. Therefore, v 13 reads: *For Adam was formed first, then Eve.*

1 Timothy 2:14

The traditional patriarchal reading states: *and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor.* In v 14, Paul further explains what happened in the creation account, that is, it was Eve who was deceived not Adam. This thesis argued that while Eve was deceived, it was Adam who was disobedient; therefore, Adam was held responsible as the Edenic Covenant was made with him. Despite this, both Adam and Eve paid a penalty for not complying with God's command.

Some scholars argue on the basis of Paul's statement that "the woman was deceived" - meaning Eve, and since that time all women have a propensity to be deceived. It was argued, however, that this is a defective exegesis. The justification given was that if this line of argumentation was to be followed, like Adam, all men would have a propensity to be disobedient. Using such a

foundation to establish a sound exegetical argument is flawed. Further, it is argued that Paul states what happened: Eve fell into sin; however, there is an avenue available for everyone who falls into sin as he explains in v 15. The fact that Paul does not refer to Adam being disobedient in his First Letter to Timothy does not imply that he did not also transgress. In v 14 Paul explains that he is explaining the situation regarding the woman who was teaching the heresy. Essentially, Paul's reasoning was that despite her false teaching, she can still be saved from further error, and restored back to a 'right' relationship with God. It is argued that in God's redemptive plan, the Son restored humanity back into a relationship of equality as it was 'in the beginning' in the Garden of Eden. Therefore, v 14 reads: *And Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor.*

1 Timothy 2:15

The traditional patriarchal reading states: *Yet she will be saved through childbearing, provided they continue in faith and love and holiness, with modesty.* Attributing such a translation to the Biblical text in v 15 is misleading as it is argued in Chapter Eight that women have no capacity to be saved through childbearing. Patriarchal scholars argue that Paul is either referring to a woman or women who are saved through childbearing, which is a woman's rightful function. However, it is argued that Paul could not have imparted such a meaning when he wrote the letter as he taught that there is only one method of salvation, and this is through faith, and believing in Jesus Christ. There are a number of scholars, such as, Spencer (1989; 2004); the Kroegers (1992; Oden (1989); Nyland (2004); and Bushnell (2004), who argue that Paul was referring to the birth of Jesus Christ. This study argued that there is adequate evidence to claim that Paul used a metaphor when he wrote to Timothy, and selected the Greek word *τεκνογονία*, commonly translated as 'childbearing'. It was argued that to receive the text literally creates a mistranslation, and further that Paul used 'childbearing' metaphorically as it equates to the birth of the child Jesus.

Such an argument is strengthened through the meaning given by Ptolemy in the Second Century C.E. when he used *αυθεντουντα* (exercise authority). Scholars

argue that Ptolemy was referring to the birth of a child under a certain sign of the heavens - the one who will *αυθεντουντα* (exercise authority) over all. Therefore, it is argued that it is more likely Paul was referring to Jesus Christ as salvation is only available through him, and secondly, as Paul explains to the Corinthian Church, there will come a time when Jesus will exercise authority, and power over all (cf: 1 Cor 15:24). It is argued that in v 15 refers Paul either refers to the unnamed woman mentioned in v 12 or to Eve when he states 'she' will be saved; as following 'the fall' all humanity was saved through the birth of Jesus, which points back to Genesis 3:15. In addition, when referring to 'they' Paul makes a generalist statement either about 'Adam and Eve', or those in the *ekklesia* at Ephesus who may have been lead astray by the woman's teaching, as having a means of deliverance through salvation. Paul explains that once salvation is received, believers are required to live a Godly life; evidence was presented in the thesis that the foundation for this is faith, love, and holiness, or maturity. In addition, it was argued that God requires propriety, that is, order in the Church, and there was evidence to show that such a requirement was central to Paul's teachings as part of the New Covenant Church. Therefore, v 15 reads: *But she will be saved through the birth of the child if they continue in faith, love and holiness with propriety.*

Therefore a new and alternative reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15, based on the discussion of debates in the previous sections, states:

A woman must learn quietly without causing disruption and be supportive in everything (v 11). I do not give authority for a woman to teach that she is the source or the originator of man, she should be quiet (v 12). For Adam was formed first, then Eve (v 13), and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor (v 14). But she will be saved through the birth of the child if they continue in faith, love and holiness with propriety (v 15).

Applying contemporary language and incorporating the meaning that this thesis argues is embedded in the text, a paraphrased, and alternative reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 states:

A woman must learn quietly without causing disruption and be supportive when she is under instruction (v 11). I do not give authority for a woman to engage in false teaching and teach others that she is the originator of man, she should remain quiet (v 12). For after Adam and Eve were created; Adam was formed first, then Eve (v 13). Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived; however, that does not make Adam superior to Eve as both made mistakes and were expelled from the Garden of Eden (v 14). Apart from this, everyone has an opportunity to be saved through Jesus Christ as long as they continue in faith, love, and holiness, as is required by God, and they too should behave decently and ordered in God's household (v 15).

Conclusion

Finally, it is argued that the only command in 1 Timothy 2:11-15 relates to Paul reinforcing his standard for instruction in the Church, and secondly, Paul will not allow false or heretical teaching in the *ekklesia*; furthermore this is a universal injunction. Evidence was presented throughout this thesis that one of Paul's major concerns was to ensure that no heretical teachings infiltrate the Church. He was single-minded in that all teachings be in accordance with the Gospel message of Jesus Christ, and the Apostles. Therefore, it is argued that there is no prohibition for women to be silent; women are not required to be subject to their husband or men in general; and there is no barrier to women teaching in the Church as long as they have the *charism* and *character* to engage in a teaching role. It is argued that over the centuries, the dominance of a patriarchal translation of the Biblical text, textual corruption in transmission, and a social conditioning dating back to the early Church illegitimately placed women as the inferior 'second sex' in the Church. Consequently, this has created a barrier for women based on an unlawful historical and patriarchal translation.

The thesis illustrated that patriarchy has its roots in the Greco-Roman culture of *patria potestas* that is based on an ancient world system where the male head of the *pater-familias* becomes the 'protector' and 'provider' for the family or their

household. An argument was presented that identified the ambiguity of the traditionalist interpretation of Ephesians 5:21-33 claiming that this text is another foundational text for a hierarchy in the Church with women as subject to men. As discussed in Chapter Four, Fee, in his examination of the text found that there was no Biblical basis for a hierarchy and claimed that in the New Covenant Church, Jesus Christ became the new *pater-familias*. In order for men to claim that they are the 'head' of the family or the 'head' of the structure in the Church, they are essentially claiming they are the new *pater-familias*, and placing themselves in the position reserved only for Jesus Christ. Further, it was argued that as humanity is 'attached' to God through Jesus Christ - men cannot be an intermediary in place of God on behalf of another. This thesis argues that to claim this is paganism. It was shown that ὑποτάσσω (submission) has been translated incorrectly. It was argued that a more reliable translation is a voluntary act of support. The only person that humanity is to submit to is God, and the only person that Paul ascribed as superior to all of humanity was God.

There is ample evidence that the ancient city of Ephesus was a polytheistic city, and Artemis the most revered goddess in the city and across the ancient world. The thesis argued that the major struggle for the Apostle Paul, and the early Church in Ephesus was the management of the polytheistic gods in the city, and managing persecution as the new converts moved away from worshipping Artemis to worshipping God. The belief in monotheism was counter cultural to life in Ephesus, and had been this way for one thousand years before Jesus. The Hellenistic culture differed to the Jewish culture where the notion of worshipping other gods was considered an abomination. When God spoke through Moses, and gave the Israelites the Decalogue, the first commandment was to have no other gods, nor to bow down and worship them (Ex 20:1-5).

For the citizens of Ephesus to believe in God and Jesus Christ was to deny their faith in the goddess Artemis, and her protection and provision. The worship of Artemis was so ingrained in the life of the people that she was deemed to be the legitimate wife of the city. As was discussed in Chapter Four, the relationship between the citizens of Ephesus and Artemis were known as

Eusebeia, and deeply-seated in the socio-economic, and religious life of the city. The worship of the city's god was not only central, but vital to the life of the city. A breach of cultic rules could bring death as was the fate of some in the Fourth Century (Strelan, 1996, p. 100).

As discussed in Chapter Four, it was argued that a parallel existed between the sacrifices and rituals as part of the cult of Artemis, and the Mosaic Covenant when the High Priest made atonement on behalf of the people. Similar to the requirements of the Tabernacle, those who served Artemis engaged in a range of purification and sacrificial rituals as part of their pagan worship practices. Paul stipulates to the believers that there may be many gods but they are only to worship, and believe in the one God, the Lord Jesus Christ (1 Cor 8:4-6). Paul argued that the worship of other gods or idolatry could not co-exist alongside the worship of God. His central message to the early Church was that worship was to be reserved for God and the Lord Jesus alone.

One of the major contributions of this research study to this area of scholarship is the identification of the role of Artemis, and her functions as they form a parallel to the role of God in the life of a believer. The corollary of this is as men claim 'headship' of women in the Church, and home, they are substituting themselves as a demigod in place of Jesus Christ - which is idolatry. It was argued that Paul was against the worship of other gods, and idols; the claim in this thesis is that the worship of Artemis was a counterfeit spiritual function of the people, one that was probably infiltrating the young Church in Ephesus. Through the Gospel message, Paul is intent on transforming the behaviour and thinking of the Ephesians to transfer their allegiance and worship from Artemis to God, who would become their 'protector' and 'provider'. The significance of this finding for the place of women in the church is that 'protection' and 'provision' for women cannot come from a man as this comes from God: making women and men equal before God. In the natural, women and men are to work together in mutual harmony and respect to meet their earthly needs of 'protection' and 'provision', at the same time relying on God. Paul confirms that salvation is the only entry point to God's protection. No longer did believers in

First Century Ephesus, or the Twenty-first Century Church need the protection and provision of other gods similar to Artemis. Neither do women need the protection of men as for the believer all 'protection' and 'provision' comes from God with the additional provision of eternal life (cf: Rom 6:23).

Lastly, it is argued that existing within the Biblical text is evidence for an egalitarian reading of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. Chronis (1982) identifies the significance of the 'rending of the veil' claiming it is a self-sacrificing, and self-revelatory force resulting from Jesus' death. The theological significance of this is that all previous barriers are eliminated, including barriers of race, social status, and gender. When the temple veil was rent in two, this was a proclamation of ontological, spiritual, and functional equality for all humanity. With the death of Jesus came a proclamation of victory, a 'new beginning' in the relationship between God and humanity, and the relationship between women and men (cf: Rom 5:10; 2 Cor 5:18-19; Col 1:20, 22). Therefore, it is argued that all of God's people are now permitted to go 'within the veil' and partake in a new social order, a new structure - a New Covenant Church.

The study showed that patriarchy dominated around the Fourth Century, and since then women's voice has been embedded in the text, and dormant in Church praxis. Consequently, a recuperation of the text, and restoration of the place of women in the Church is long overdue. It is imperative that the Church follows the Biblical patterns, and principles found in Scripture. Subsequently, the Church must move forward, out of the *patria potestas* system and into the liberating system of Jesus Christ as the *pater-familias*: - the one and true head of the household of God. To transition completely to this new reality, this new humanity, it requires action by the Church hierarchy to ensure that their treatment of women reflects the phrase "*in necessariis unitas, in dubiis libertas, in omnibus caritas*" – in certain things unity, in uncertain things liberty; in all things charity. As this study illustrated that for all who are prepared to listen, the voice of God will be heard through the Pauline text of 1 Timothy 2:11-15: a voice that reverberates gender equality. It is a proclamation of celebration and transformation for all who enter 'within the veil'.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abraham, J. (2003). Feminist Hermeneutics and Pentecostal Spirituality: The Creation Narrative of Genesis as a Paradigm. *Asian Journal of Pentecostal Studies*, 6 (1), 3-21.
- Arnold, C. E. (1993). Letter to the Ephesians. In G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin & D. G. Reid (Eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (pp. 238-253). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Arnold, C. E., & Saucy, R. L. (2001). The Ephesian Background of Paul's Teaching on Women's Ministry. In R. L. Saucy & J. K. TenElshof (Eds.), *Women and Men in Ministry: A Complementary Perspective*. Chicago: Moody.
- Augustine Saint. (1958). *On Christian Doctrine* (D. W. Robertson, Jr, Trans.). Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Bacchiocchi, S. (2003). The Heavenly Sanctuary: Real or Symbolic? *Endtime Issues* (103), 1-21.
- Baldwin, H. S. (2005). An Important Word: ἀὐθεντέω in 1 Timothy 2:12. In A. J. Köstenberger & T. R. Schreiner (Eds.), *Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Barnett, P. (1989). Wives and Women's Ministry (1 Timothy 2:11-15). *Evangelical Quarterly*, 61(3), 227.
- Barth, K. (1936). The Doctrine of the Word of God (G. T. Thomson, Trans.). In *Church Dogmatics* (Vol. 1, Part 1). NY: Scribners.
- Bassler, J. M. (1996). *1 and 2 Timothy and Titus, Abingdon New Testament Commentary*. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Baugh, S. M. (1999). Cult Prostitution In New Testament Ephesus: A Reappraisal. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 42(3), 443-460.
- Baugh, S. M. (2005a). *The Apostle Among the Amazons: A Review Article of I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence*. Retrieved 13 December, 2005, from <http://www.cbmw.org/resources/reviews/suffernot.php>
- Baugh, S. M. (2005b). A Foreign World: Ephesus in the First Century. In A. J. Kostenberger & T. R. Schreiner (Eds.), *Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15* (2nd ed., pp. 13-38). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Baxter, J., & Wright, O., Erik. (2000). The Glass Ceiling Hypothesis: A Comparative Study of the United States, Sweden, and Australia. *Gender and Society*, 14(2, Apr), 275-294.
- Beck, J. R., & Blomberg, C. L. (Eds.). (2001). *Two Views on Women in Ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Becker, C. E. (1996). *Leading Women: How Church Women Can Avoid Leadership Traps and Negotiate the Gender Maze*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Becker, C. E. (2000). *Becoming Colleagues: Women and Men Serving Together in Faith*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Beker, J. C. (1980). *Paul the apostle: the triumph of God in life and thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

- Belleville, L. L. (2001). Women in Ministry. In J. R. Beck & C. L. Blomberg (Eds.), *Two Views on Women in Ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Belleville, L. L. (2004). Teaching and Usurping Authority. In R. W. Pierce & R. M. Groothuis (Eds.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without hierarchy* (pp. 205- 223). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Biguzzi, G. (1998). Ephesus, Its Artemision, Its Temple to the Flavian Emperors, and Idolatry in Revelation. *Novum Testamentum*, 40 (3), 276-290.
- Bilezikian, G. (1985). *Beyond Sex Roles: What the Bible Says About a Woman's Place in Church and Family*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Bird, P. A. (1997). *Missing Persons and Mistaken Identities: Women and Gender in Ancient Israel*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Birdsall, N. N. (1990). Textual Criticism (New Testament). In R. J. Coggins & J. L. Houlden (Eds.), *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (pp. 681-684). London: SCM Press.
- Bliss, K. (1952). *The Service and Status of Women in the Church*. London: SMC Press.
- Bloesch, D. G. (1982). *Is the Bible Sexist? Beyond Feminism and Patriarchalism*. Westchester, IL: Crossway Books.
- Borgen, P. (1995). 'Yes,' 'No,' 'How Far?' : The Participation of Jews and Christians in Pagan Cults. In T. E. Pedersen (Ed.), *Paul In His Hellenistic Context* (pp. 341). Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Bowman, A. (1992). Women in Ministry: An Exegetical Study of 1 Timothy 2:11-15. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 149, 193-213.
- Bowman, A. L. (2001). Women in Ministry. In J. R. Beck & C. L. Blomberg (Eds.), *Two Views on Women in Ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Brennan, P. (1995). Loosed and bound: Women's reform and the question of God. In M. Confoy, D. A. Lee & J. Nowotny (Eds.), *Freedom & Entrapment: Women Thinking Theology*. North Blackburn, Victoria: Dove.
- Bridges, J. K. (Ed.). (2003). *The Bible: The Word of God*. Springfield, MO: Gospel Publishing House.
- Briggs Kittredge, C. (1998). *Community and Authority: The Rhetoric of Obedience in the Pauline Tradition*. Harrisbury, PA: Trinity Press International.
- Bristow, J. T. (1988). *What Paul Really Said About Women*. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishers.
- Brown, H. O. J. (1984). *Heresies*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Brown, J. L. (2004). God, Gender and Biblical Metaphor. In R. W. Pierce & R. M. Groothuis (Eds.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: complementarity without hierarchy*. Downers Grove, IL: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Brown, L. A. (2000). 1 Tim 2:9-15 Women Who Profess Reverence for God. In C. Meyers, T. Craven & R. S. Kraemer (Eds.), *Women in Scripture: A Dictionary of Named and Unnamed Women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament* (pp. 592). Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Bruce, F. F. (1982). *Commentary on Galatians: New International Greek Testament Commentary*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

- Bultmann, R. (1963). *The History of the Synoptic Tradition* (J. Marsh, Trans.). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Burton, P. (2000). *The Old Latin Gospels: A study of Their Texts and Language* (*Early Christian Studies*). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bushnell, K. C. (2004). *God's Word to Women: 100 Bible Studies on Woman's Place in the Divine Economy*. Eagle Lake, TX: God's Word to Women, Inc.
- Caine, B., (General Editor). (1998). *Australian Feminism a companion*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Calvin, J. (1863). *Institutes of the Christian Religion: Book 3*. Retrieved 20 June, 2007, from <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/calvin/institutes.v.xii.html>
- Camp, C. V. (2000). Huldah. In C. L. Meyers, T. Craven & R. S. Kraemer (Eds.), *Women in Scripture: A Dictionary of Named and Unnamed Women in the Hebrew Bible, the Apocryphal/Deuterocanonical Books, and the New Testament* (pp. 592). Grand Rapids, MI / Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Carson, D. A. (1996). *Exegetical Fallacies* (Second ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Catholic Encyclopedia: Septuagint Version*. Retrieved 8 May, 2006, from <http://www.newadvent.org/cathen/13722a.htm>
- CEDAW. (2002). *Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, Reservations and Declaration, Australia*. Retrieved 25 Jan, 2005, from <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/cedaw/reservations-country.htm>
- Chapman, D. (2004). The Rise and Demise of Women's Ministry in the Origins and Early Years of Pentecostalism in Britain. *Journal of Pentecostal Theology*, 12 (2), 217-247.
- Charlesworth, J. H. (1985). Aristeeas to Philocrates. In *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament: prolegomena for the study of Christian origins*. NY: Doubleday.
- Chester, T. (2005). *Delighting in the Trinity*. Oxford, UK; Grand Rapids, MI: Monarch Books.
- Chronis, H. L. (1982). The Torn Veil: Cultus and Christology in Mark 15:37-39. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 101(1), 97-114.
- Clark, S. B. (1980). *Man and Woman in Christ: An Examination of the Roles of Men and Women in Light of Scripture and the Social Sciences*. Ann Arbor: Servant Books.
- Clifford, A. M. (2001). *Introducing Feminist Theology*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Clouse, B., & Clouse, R. G. (Eds.). (1989). *Women in Ministry: Four Views*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Clouse, B., & Glouse, R. G. (Eds.). (1989). *Women in Ministry: Four Views*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Confoy, M., Lee, D. A., & Nowotny, J. (Eds.). (1995). *Freedom & Entrapment: Women Thinking Theology*. North Blackburn, Victoria: Dove.
- Cotter, W. (1994). Women's Authority Roles in Paul's Churches: Countercultural or Conventional. *Novum Testamentum*, XXXVI(4).
- Cowles, C. S. (1993). *A Woman's Place? Leadership in the Church*. KS: Beacon Hill Press.

- Cozzens, D. (2002). *Sacred Silence: Denial and the Crisis in the Church*.
Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. (1975). *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. Edinburgh: Clark.
- Cunningham, L., Hamilton, D., Joel, & Rogers, J. (2000). *Why Not Women: A Fresh Look at Scripture on Women in Missions, Ministry, and Leadership*. Seattle, WA: YWAM Publishers.
- Daly, M. (1985). *The Church and the Second Sex*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Daids, P. H. (2004). A Silent Witness in Marriage. In R. W. Pierce, R. M. Groothius & G. D. Fee (Eds.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: complementarity without hierarchy* (pp. 224-238). Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Davies, M. (1996). *The Pastoral Epistles: 1 and 11 Timothy and Titus*. Westminster, London: Epworth Press.
- de Jonge, M. (1986). Matthew 27:51 in Early Christian Exegesis. *Harvard Theological Review*, 79 (1-3), 67-79.
- de Waard, J., & Nida, E., A. (1986). *From One Language to Another: Functional Equivalence in Bible Translating*. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Dean, M. (1999). *Ephesus*. Retrieved 13 December, 2005, from <http://www.hitit.co.uk/history.efes.html>
- Decker-Lucke, S. A. (2002). Use and Abuse of Language. In C. Kroeger Clark & M. J. Evans (Eds.), *The IVP Women's Bible Commentary* (pp. 718-721). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Demeterio, F. P. A., III. (2001). *Introduction to Hermeneutics*. Retrieved 26 November 2004, 2004, from www.geocities.com/philodept/diwatao/introduction_to_hermeneutics.htm
- Dibelius, M., & Conzelmann, H. (1972). *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (P. Buttolph & A. Yarbro, Trans.). Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Diehl, D. W. (1990). Theology and Feminism. In J. Steffensen Hagen (Ed.), *Gender Matters: Women's Studies for the Christian Community* (pp. 25-50). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Doughty, D. J. (1994). *Pauline Paradigms and Pauline Authenticity*. Retrieved 17 July, 2006, from <http://www.dept.drew.edu/jhc/doughty.html>
- Douglass Dempsey, J., & Kay, J. F. (Eds.). (1997). *Women, Gender, and Christian Community*. Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.
- Dowsett, R. M. (2002). Expectations of Women. In C. Clark Kroeger & M. J. Evans (Eds.), *The IVP Women's Bible Commentary* (pp. 621-627). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Duff, N. J. (1997). Location, Motherhood, and Marriage. In J. Dempsey Douglass & J. F. Kay (Eds.), *Women, Gender, and Christian Community*. Louisville, Kentucky: John Knox Press.
- Edwards, R. B. (1989). *The Case for Women's Ministry*. London: SPCK.
- Ehrman, B. D. (1994). Heracleon and the 'Western' Textual Tradition. *New Testament Studies*, xl, 465-486.
- Eisenstadt, S. N., & Roniger, L. (1984). *Patrons, Clients, and Friends*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

- Ellis, E. E. (1993). Pastoral Letters. In G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin & D. G. Reid (Eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (pp. 658-666). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Evans, M. J. (1983a). *Woman in the Bible: An Overview of all the Crucial Passages on Women's Roles* (Digital 2006 ed.). Carlisle, UK: Paternoster.
- Evans, M. J. (1983b). *Woman in the Bible: An Overview of All the Crucial Passages on Women's Roles*. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster.
- Faludi, S. (1992). *Backlash: The Undeclared War Against American Women* (Revised ed.). London: Chatto & Windus.
- Fee, G. D. (1988). *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, New International Biblical Commentary*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.
- Fee, G. D. (1994). *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- Fee, G. D. (2000). *Listening to the Spirit in the Text*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Fee, G. D. (2001). *To What End Exegesis? Essays Textual, Exegetical, and Theological*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Fee, G. D. (2002). The Cultural Context of Ephesians 5:18-6:9: Is there a divinely ordained hierarchy in the life of the church and home that is based on gender alone? *Priscilla Papers*, 16 (1), 3-8.
- Fee, G. D. (2004a). Male and Female in the New Creation: Galatians 3:26-29. In R. W. Pierce, R. M. Groothuis & G. D. Fee (Eds.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without hierarchy* (pp. 172-204). Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Fee, G. D. (2007). *Pauline Christology: An Exegetical-Theological Study*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- Felix, P. W., Sr. (2003). The Hermeneutics of Evangelical Feminism. *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 8, Fall(2), 35-46.
- Ferder, F., & Heagle, J., Rev. (1989). *Partnership: Women & Men in Ministry*. Notre Dame, IN: Ave Maria Press.
- Fleischer, R. (1973). *Artemis von Ephesos und verwandte Kultstatuen aus Anatolien und Syrien*. Leiden: Brill.
- Foh, S. T. (1979). *Women and the Word of God: A Response to Biblical Feminism*. Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian & Reformed.
- Foh, S. T. (1989). A Male Leadership View: The head of the woman is the man. In B. Clouse & R. G. Clouse (Eds.), *Women in Ministry: Four Views* (pp. 69-105). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- France, R. T. (1995). *Women in the Church's Ministry: A Test-Case for Biblical Hermeneutics*. Carlisle, UK: Paternoster.
- Freedman, R. D. (1983). Woman, A Power Equal to Man. *Biblical Archaeology Review*, Jan-Feb, pp. 56-58.
- Friedan, B. (1964). *The Feminine Mystique*. New York: Dell.
- Fustel de Coulanges, N. D. (1955). *The Ancient City: A Study of the Religions, Laws and Institutions of Greece and Rome*. Garden City: Doubleday.
- Gadamer, H. G. (1979). *Truth and Method*. London: Sheed and Ward.
- Gadamer, H. G. (1982). *Truth and Method: Elements of Philosophical Hermeneutics*. NY: Crossroad.

- Gallagher, S. K., & Smith, C. (1999). Symbolic Traditionalism and Pragmatic Egalitarianism: Contemporary Evangelicals, Families and Gender. *Gender and Society*, 13 (2), 211-233.
- Gamble, H. Y. (1995). *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
- Gerassi, J. (1976). *Interview with Simone de Beauvoir 1976: The second sex 25 years later*. Retrieved 18 July, 2005, from <http://marxists.org/reference?subject/ethics/de-beauvoir/1976/interview.htm>
- Giles, K. (2002). *The Trinity and Subordinationism: The Doctrine of God and the Contemporary Gender Debate*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Giles, K. (2006). *Jesus and the Father: Modern Evangelicals Reinvent the Doctrine of the Trinity*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Gilkes Townsend, C. (1990). Together in the Harness: Women's Traditions in the Sanctified Church. In M. R. Malson, E. Mudimbe-Boyi, J. F. O'Barr & M. Wyer (Eds.), *Black Women in America: Social Science Perspectives*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gombis, T. G. (2005). A Radically New Humanity: The Function of the *Haustafel* in Ephesians. *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society*, 48(2), 317-330.
- Green, J. B. (1991). The Death of Jesus and the Rending of the Temple Veil: A Window into Luke's Understanding of Jesus and the Temple. *Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers*, 30, 543-557.
- Gritz, S. (1991). *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 in Light of the Religious and Cultural Milieu of the First Century*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.
- Grondin, J. (2002). Gadamer and Bultmann. In P. Pokorný & J. Roskovec (Eds.), *Philosophical Hermeneutics and Biblical Exegesis*. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck.
- Grudem, W. (1979). The New Testament Teaching on the Role Relationship of Men and Women. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 22 (4, December), 375-376.
- Grudem, W. (2004a). Is Evangelical Feminism the New Path to Liberalism. *JBMW (Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood)*, 9, Spring (1), 35-84.
- Grudem, W. (2004b). *Evangelical Feminism & Biblical Truth: An Analysis of More Than One Hundred Disputed Questions*. Sisters, OR: Multnomah Publishers.
- Guarino, J. (1992). The Role of Women in the First Century Church. *The Catholic World*, 235 (1406), 74-77.
- Gurtner, D. M. (2006). The Veil of the Temple in History and Legend. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 49 (1), 97-114.
- Guthrie, D. (1990). *The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary*. Leicester, England: InterVarsity Press.
- Hack Polaski, S. (1999). *Paul and the Discourse of Power*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Hamilton, D. J. (2000). Do Not Permit a Woman to Teach. In L. Cunningham, D. J. Hamilton & J. Rogers (Eds.), *Why Not Women: A Fresh Look at Scripture on Women in Missions, Ministry, and Leadership* (pp. 205-216). Seattle, WA: YWAM Publishers.

- Hanko, H. C. (1991). *Issues in Hermeneutics*. Retrieved 26 Nov, 2004, from http://www.prca.org/articles/issues_in_hermeneutics.html
- Hardesty, N. (1971). Women: Second Class Citizens. *Eternity, Jan*, 14-16.
- Hardesty, N., & Dawson Scanzoni, L. (1974). *All We're Meant To Be: Biblical Feminism for Today*. Waco: Word Books.
- Hardesty, N., Sider Dayton, L., & Dayton, D. W. (1979). Women in the Holiness Movement: Feminism in the Evangelical Tradition. In R. Ruether Radford & E. McLaughlin (Eds.), *Women of Spirit*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Hassey, J. (2004). Evangelical Women in Ministry a Century Ago. In R. W. Pierce & R. M. Groothuis (Eds.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: complementarity without hierarchy*. Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Hastings, J. (Ed.). (1909). *Dictionary of the Bible*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Hawthorne, G. F., Martin, R. P., & Reid, D. G. (Eds.). (1993). *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Hays, R. B. (2003). Reading Scripture in Light of the Resurrection. In E. F. Davis & R. B. Hays (Eds.), *The Art of Reading Scripture* (pp. 216-238). Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Hess, R. S. (2004). Equality With and Without Innocence: Genesis 1-3. In R. W. Pierce, R. M. Groothuis & G. D. Fee (Eds.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: complementarity without hierarchy* (pp. 79-95). Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Hickling, C. J. A. (1978). Centre and Periphery in Paul's Thought. In E. A. Livingstone (Ed.), *Studia Biblica III. Papers on Paul and Other NT Authors*. Sheffield: Academic.
- Hinton, R. (2002). A Legacy of Inclusion: An interview with Rosemary Radford Ruether. *Cross Currents*, 52(1), 28-38.
- Holmes, J. M. (1993). Textual Criticism. In G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin & D. G. Reid (Eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters* (pp. 927-932). Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Holmes, J. M. (2000). *Text in a Whirlwind: A Critique of Four Exegetical Devices at 1 Timothy 2:9-15*. Sheffield, England: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Hoppin, R. (1969). *Priscilla, Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews*. New York: Exposition Press.
- Hornblower, S. (Ed.). (1996). *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Horsley, G. H. R. (1992). The Inscriptions of Ephesos and the New Testament. *Novum Testamentum*, XXXIV(2), 105-168.
- Hort, F. J. A. (1895). *Judiastic Christianity: A course of lectures*. Retrieved 11 June 2007, from <http://www.openlibrary.org/details/judiasticchrist00hortuoft>
- Isasi-Díaz, A. M. (1996). *Mujerista Theology: A theology for the twenty-first century*. New York: Maryknoll.
- Iser, W. (1978). *The Act of Reading: A theory of aesthetic response*. Baltimore, Md. London: Johns Hopkins University; Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Jenott, L. (2004). *Ancient Ephesus*. Retrieved 8 December, 2005, from <http://depts.washington.edu/uwch/silkroad/cities/turkey/ephesus/ephesus.html>

- Jewett, P. K. (1975). *Man as Male and Female: A Study in Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Johnson, L. T. (2001). The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A new translation with introduction and commentary. In W. F. Albright & D. N. Freedman (Eds.), *The Anchor Bible* (Vol. 35A). New York: Doubleday.
- Johnson, P. (1988). *A History of Christianity*. London: Penguin.
- Jones, A. (Ed.). (1966). *The Jerusalem Bible: New Testament*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd and Doubleday & Company, Inc.
- Jones, G. L. (1990). Translations (to the KJV). In R. J. Coggins & J. L. Houlden (Eds.), *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (pp. 704-707). London: SCM Press.
- Josephus, F. (1987). *The Works of Josephus: Complete and Unabridged* (W. Whiston, A.M., Trans. New Updated Edition ed.). Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, Inc.
- Kaiser, W. C. (1999). The Law as God's Gracious Guidance for the Promotion of Holiness. In S. Gundry, N. (Ed.), *Five Views on Law and Gospel*. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Zondervan.
- Kaiser, W. C., & Silva, M. (1994). *An Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Kaldor, P., Dixon, R., & Powell, R. (1999a). *Taking Stock: A Profile of Australian Church Attenders*. Adelaide: Openbook.
- Käsemann, E. (1982). *Commentary on Romans* (G. W. Bromiley, Trans.). London: SCM Press.
- Kee, H. C. (1992). The Changing Role of Women in the Early Christian World. *Theology Today*, 49(2), 225-238.
- Keener, C. S. (2001). Women in Ministry. In J. R. Beck & C. L. Blomberg (Eds.), *Two Views on Women in Ministry*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Kent, H. A., Jr. (1986). *The Pastoral Epistles*. Wiona Lake: BMH Books.
- Kilpatrick, G. D. (1990). *The Principles and Practice of New Testament Textual Criticism: Collected Essays of G.D. Kilpatrick*. Leuven, Belgium: Leuven University Press.
- Kittell, G., & Friedrich, G. (Eds.). (1985). *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Vol. IV). Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Kleinig, J. W. (2005). Disciples But Not Teachers: 1 Corinthians 14:33b-38 and 1 Timothy 2:11-15. *Interface*, 8 (2), 48-61.
- Knight, G. W. (1977). *New Testament Teaching on the Role Relationship of Men and Women*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Knight, G. W. (1992). *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on Greek Text, NIGTC*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Koester, H. (1995a). Ephesos in Early Christian Literature. In H. Koester (Ed.), *EPHESOS Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.
- Koester, H. (1997). *Excerpts from Dr Helmut Koester's September 13, 1997 address entitled, St Paul: His Mission to the Greek Cities & His Competitors*. Retrieved 7 Nov, 2004, from <http://www.bibletexts.com/terms/women01.htm>

- Köstenberger, A. J. (1994). Gender Passages in the NT: Hermeneutical Fallacies Critiqued. *Westminster Theological Journal*, 56 (Fall)(2), 259-283.
- Köstenberger, A. J., & Schreiner, T. R. (Eds.). (2005). *Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15* (2nd ed.). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Köstenberger, A. J., Schreiner, T. R., & Baldwin, H. S. (Eds.). (1995). *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books.
- Kreitzer, L. J. (1993). Eschatology. In G. F. Hawthorne, R. P. Martin & D. G. Reid (Eds.), *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Kroeger Clark, C. (1986). 1 Timothy 2:12 - A Classicist's View. In A. Mickelsen (Ed.), *Women, Authority and the Bible*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity.
- Kroeger Clark, C., & Evans, M. J. (Eds.). (2002). *The IVP Women's Bible Commentary*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Kroeger Clark, R., & Kroeger Clark, C. (1992). *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker.
- Kuhn, T. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Kurek-Chomycyz, D. A. (2006). Is There an "Anti-Priscan" Tendency in the Manuscripts? Some Textual Problems with Prisca and Aquila. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 125(1), 107-128.
- La Due, W. J. (2003). *The Trinity Guide to the Trinity*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International.
- Ladd, G. E. (1974). *A Theology of the New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.
- Lawson, V. (1995). Scraps of sustenance of the journey out of patriarchy: Acts 1:1-14 in feminist perspective. In M. Confoy, D. A. Lee & J. Nowotny (Eds.), *Freedom & Entrapment: Women Thinking Theology*. North Blackburn, Victoria: Dove.
- Lee, D. A. (1995). Freedom, spirituality and the body: Anti-dualism in 1 Corinthians. In M. Confoy, D. A. Lee & J. Nowotny (Eds.), *Freedom & Entrapment: Women Thinking Theology*. North Blackburn, Victoria: Dove.
- LiDonnici, L. R. (1992). The Images of Artemis Ephesia and Greco-Roman Worship: A Reconsideration. *The Harvard Theological Review*, 85 (4), 389-415.
- Liefeld, W. L. (1989). A Plural Ministry View: Your Sons and Your Daughters Shall Prophesy. In B. Clouse & R. G. Clouse (Eds.), *Women in Ministry: Four Views*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Liefeld, W. L. (1999). *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, The NIV Application Commentary: from biblical text to contemporary life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Liefeld, W. L. (2004). The Nature of Authority in the New Testament. In R. W. Pierce & R. M. Groothuis (Eds.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: complementarity without hierarchy*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Lockyer, H. S. (Ed.). (1986). *Nelson's Illustrated Bible Dictionary: an authoritative one-volume reference work on the Bible, with full-color illustrations*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

- Louth, A. (Ed.). (1989). *Eusebius: The History of the Church from Christ to Constantine* (Revised ed.). London: Penguin Books.
- Maddocks, F. (2001). *Hildegard of Bingen: The Woman of Her Age*. London: Headline Book Publishing.
- Magill, K. J. (2005). *Julian of Norwich: mystic or visionary?* London; New York: Routledge.
- Maier, G. (1994). *Biblical Hermeneutics* (R. W. Yarbrough, Trans.). Wheaton, IL: Crossway Books.
- Malone, M. T. (2000-2003). *Women and Christianity*. Blackrock, Co Dublin: Columba Press.
- Malone, M. T. (2001). *The First Thousand Years: Women & Christianity* (Vol. 1). Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Marlowe, M. D. (2004). *The Translation of : A Response to Mark Strauss and I. Howard Marshall*. Retrieved 9 May, 2005, from <http://www.bible-researcher.com/adelphos.html>
- Marshall, A. (1974). *The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament: the Nestle Greek text with a literal English translation* (A. Marshall, Trans. 3rd ed.). London: Bagster.
- Marshall, I. H. (2004a). Brothers Embracing Sisters?: Technical Papers. *The Bible Translator*, 55/3 (July 2004), 303-310.
- Marshall, I. H. (2004b). Mutual Love and Submission in Marriage: Colossians 3:18-19 and Ephesians 5:21-33. In R. W. Pierce, R. M. Groothuis & G. D. Fee (Eds.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: complementarity without hierarchy* (pp. 186-223). Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Marshall, I. H., & Towner, P. H. (2004). *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Pastoral Epistles*. London; New York: T & T Clark International.
- Martin, R. P. (1983). Reconciliation: A Study of Paul's Theology. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 102(3), 508-509.
- McDonald, L. M. (2006). Canon of the New Testament. In *The New Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* (Vol. 1 A-C, pp. 536-547). Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press.
- Mead, G. H. S. (1931). *Fragments of a Faith Forgotten* (Third ed.). London.
- Meeks, W. A. (Ed.). (1972). *The Writings of St. Paul: A Norton Critical Edition*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc.
- Meeks, W. A., Bassler, J. M., Lemke, W. E., Niditch, S., & Schuller, E. M. (Eds.). (1993). *The HarperCollins Study Bible: New Revised Standard Version* (Vol. New York): HarperCollins Publishers, Inc.
- Metzger, B. M. (1968). *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission Corruption and Restoration* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Metzger, B. M., & Ehrman, B. D. (2005). *The Text of the New Testament: Its Transmission, Corruption, and Restoration*. New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meyers, C. L. (1985). Harper's Bible Dictionary. In P. J. Achtemeier (Ed.), *Harper's Bible Dictionary* (pp. 249-270). San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Mickelsen, A. (1989). An Egalitarian View: There Is Neither Male nor Female in Christ. In B. Clouse & R. G. Clouse (Eds.), *Women in Ministry: Four Views* (pp. 173-206). Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Miller, J. E. (2003). Some Observations on the Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14:34-35. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 26(2), 217-236.

- Milne, M. K. (1985). Artemis of the Ephesians. In P. J. Achtemeier (Ed.), *Harper's Bible Dictionary*. San Francisco: Harper & Row Publishing.
- Moo, D., J. (1981). The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15: A rejoinder. *Trinity Journal*, 2, 198-222.
- Moo, D. J. (1999). The Law of Christ as the Fulfillment of the Law of Moses: A Modified Lutheran View. In S. N. Gundry (Ed.), *Five Views on Law and Gospel* (pp. 319-376). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Mounce, W. D. (2000). *Word Biblical Commentary: Pastoral Epistles* (Vol. 46). Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson, Inc.
- Niccum, C. (1997). The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Cor 14.34-35. *New Testament Studies*, 43, 242-255.
- Nyland, A. (2004). *The Source New Testament: With Extensive Notes on Greek Word Meaning*. Parramatta, NSW, Australia: Smith and Stirling Publishing.
- Oden, T. A. (1989). *First and Second Timothy and Titus*. Louisville: J. Knox Press.
- Osborne, G. R. (1977). Hermeneutics and Women in the Church. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 20 (December), 337-352.
- Osborne, G. R. (2006). *The Hermeneutical Spiral: A Comprehensive Introduction to Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Oster, R. (1990). Ephesus as a Religious Center under the Principate I. Paganism before Constantine. In W. Haase (Ed.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt II* (Vol. II, pp. 1661-1728). New York: W. de Gruyter.
- Padfield, D. (2002). *Temple of Isis, Philae Island, Egypt*. Retrieved 7 February, 2006, from <http://www.padfield.com/2002/isis.html>
- Padgett, A. (2005). *The Scholarship of Patriarchy (on 1 Timothy 2:8-15)*. Retrieved 24 November, 2005, from <http://www.cbeinternational.org/new/freearticles/1Timothy./html>
- Patterson, D. K. (2005). What Should A Woman Do In The Church? One Woman's Personal Reflections. In A. J. Kostenberger & T. R. Schreiner (Eds.), *Women in the Church: An analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15* (pp. 149-174). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Payne, P. B. (2004). The Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14:34-35: A Response to J. Edward Miller. *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 27 (1), 105-112.
- Phillips, J. B. (1974). Foreword (A. Marshall, Trans.). In *The Interlinear Greek-English New Testament: the Nestle Greek text with a literal English translation* (3rd ed.). London: Samuel Bagster & Sons Limited.
- Pierce, R. W., Groothuis, R. M., & Fee, G. D. (2004). *Discovering Biblical Equality: complementarity without hierarchy*. Downers Grove, IL: InterVarsity Press.
- Plummer, R. L. (2005). Something Awry in the Temple? The Rending of the Temple Veil and Early Jewish Sources that Report Unusual Phenomena in the Temple around AD 30. *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society*, 48 (2), 301-316.

- Pope Benedict XVI. (2006). *Meeting with the member of the Roman Clergy: Address of His Holiness Benedict XVI*. Retrieved 22 June, 2007, from http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/benedict_xvi/speeches/2006/march/documents/hf_ben-KVI_spe.20060302_roman_clergy-en.html
- Porter, M. (1995). The Christian origins of feminism. In *Freedom & Entrapment: women thinking theology* (pp. 208-223). North Blackburn, Victoria: Dove.
- Porter, S. E. (1993). What Does It Mean to be 'saved by Childbirth' (1Timothy 2.15)? *Journal for the Study of the New Testament*, 49, 87-102.
- Poythress, V. S. (1979). Analysing a Biblical Text: What are we after? *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 32 (4), 319-331.
- Quinn, J. D., & Wacker, W. C. (2000). *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Raming, I. (1976). *The Exclusion of Women From the Priesthood: Divine Law or Sex Discrimination*. Metuchen, NJ: The Scarecrow Press.
- Ramsay, W. M. (1901). Ephesus. *The Biblical World*, 17(3), 167-177.
- Rengstorf, K. H. (1985). διδάσκειν Outside the New Testament (G. W. Bromiley, Trans.). In G. Kittell & G. Friedrich (Eds.), *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* (Vol. IV, pp. 135-165). Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Ricoeur, P. (1981). *Essays on Biblical Interpretation*. London: SPCK.
- Ricoeur, P. (1991). *From text to action: essays in hermeneutics II* (K. Blamey & J. Thompson, Trans.). London: Athlone.
- Robbins, V. K. (1992). *Jesus the teacher: a socio-rhetorical interpretation of Mark*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Robbins, V. K. (1996). *The tapestry of early Christian discourse: rhetoric, society, and ideology*. London; New York: Routledge.
- Rogers, C. L., Jr, & Rogers, C. L., III. (1998). *The New Linguistic and Exegetical Key to the Greek New Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.
- Rosen, R. (2000). *The World Split Open: How the Modern Women's Movement Changed America*. New York and London: Penguin.
- Rossi, M. A. (1991). Priesthood, Precedent and Prejudice. On Recovering the Women Priests of Early Christianity. *Journal of Feminist Studies*, 7(1), 73-94.
- Ruether Radford, R. (2002). *Gender, Ethnicity, & Religion: Views from the Other Side*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress.
- Ruether, R. R. (1985a). The Future of Feminist Theology. *Journal of the American Academy of Religion*, 53(4), 703-713.
- Ruether, R. R. (1993). *Sexism and God-Talk: Toward a Feminist Theology* (Tenth Anniversary ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ruether, R. R., & Keller Skinner, R. (Eds.). (1981). *Women and Religion in America*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Rush, O. G. (1996). *The Reception of Doctrine: An Appropriation of Hans Robert Jauss' Reception Aesthetics and Literary Hermeneutics*. Unpublished Doctorate, Pontificia Univeritas Gregoriana, Romae.
- Russell, L. M. (Ed.). (1985). *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible*. Oxford, England: Blackwell.
- Saint Chrysostom. (ca. 349–ca. 407). *Homily IX: 1 Timothy 2:11-15*. Retrieved 15 May, 2007, from <http://www.ccel.org/ccel/schaff/npnf113.v.iii.x.html>

- Salters, R. B. (1990). Masoretic Text. In R. J. Coggins & J. L. Houlden (Eds.), *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press International.
- Sanders, J. A. (2005). *Book Review of Biblia Hebraica Quinta: Fascicle 18: General Introduction and Megilloth*. Retrieved 2 May, 2006, from http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/4725_4867.pdf
- Saucy, R. L. (1994). Women's Prohibition to Teach Men. *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society*, 37 (1), 86-97.
- Schleiermacher, F. (1807). *Über den sogenannten ersten Brief des Paulos an den Timotheos*. Berlin: Realschulbuchhandlung.
- Schneiders, S. M. (1982). Women in the Fourth Gospel and the Role of Women in the Contemporary Church. *Biblical Theology Bulletin*, 12, 35-45.
- Schneiders, S. M. (1986). *Women And The Word: The Gender of God in the New Testament and the Spirituality of Women, 1986 Madeleva Lecture in Spirituality*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Schneiders, S. M. (1991a). *Beyond Patching: Faith and Feminism in the Catholic Church*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press.
- Schneiders, S. M. (1991b). *The Revelatory Text, Interpreting the New Testament as Sacred Scripture*. San Francisco: Harper.
- Schneiders, S. M. (2000). *With Oil in Their Lamps: Faith, Feminism, and the Future*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Schoeps, H. J. (1967). *An Intelligent Person's Guide to the Religions of Mankind* (R. Winston & C. Winston, Trans.). London: Gollancz.
- Scholer, D. (1984). *Women in Ministry*. Chicago: Covenant Press.
- Schreiner, T. R. (1993). Paul's View of the Law in Romans 10:4-5. *Westminster Theological Journal*, 55, 113-135.
- Schreiner, T. R. (2001). Women in Ministry. In J. R. Beck & C. L. Blomberg (Eds.), *Two Views on Women in Ministry* (pp. 177-235). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.
- Schreiner, T. R. (2005). An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15: A Dialogue with Scholarship. In A. J. Kostenberger & T. R. Schreiner (Eds.), *Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9-15* (pp. 85-120). Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (1984). *Bread Not Stone: the challenge of feminist biblical interpretation*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (1985). *The Book of Revelation: Justice and Judgment*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (1988a). *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*. New York: Crossroad.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (1988b). The Ethics of Biblical Interpretation: Decentering Biblical Scholarship. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 107 (1), 3-17.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (1989). Text and Reality - Reality as Text: the problem of a feminist historical and social reconstruction based on texts. *Studia Theologica*, 43 19-34.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (1992). *But She Said: Feminist Practices of Biblical Interpretation*. Boston: Beacon Press.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (1993a). *Discipleship of equals: a critical feminist ekklesia-logy of liberation*. New York: Crossroad.

- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (1995). *Jesus: Miriam's child, Sophia's prophet: critical issues in feminist Christology*. London: SCM Press by arrangement with the Continuum Pub. Co.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (1996b). For women in men's world: a critical feminist theology of liberation. In E. Schüssler Fiorenza (Ed.), *The power of naming: a Concilium reader in feminist liberation theology* (pp. 3-13). Maryknoll: Orbis Books.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (1996c). Breaking the silence - becoming visible. In E. Schüssler Fiorenza (Ed.), *The power of naming: a Concilium reader in feminist liberation theology* (pp. 161-174). Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (1999a). *Rhetoric and Ethic: The Politics of Biblical Studies*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (2001). *Wisdom Ways: Introducing Feminist Biblical Interpretation*. New York: Orbis Books.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (Ed.). (1993b). *Searching the Scriptures: 1. A Feminist Commentary*. London: SCM.
- Schüssler Fiorenza, E. (Ed.). (1994). *Searching the Scriptures: II. A feminist Commentary*. New York: Crossroad.
- Schweitzer, A. (1968). *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* (W. Montgomery, Trans.). New York: Seabury Press.
- Seval, M. (1986). *Step by Step Ephesus*. Istanbul, Turkey: Minyatur Publications.
- Spencer, A. B. (1974). Eve at Ephesus. *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society*, 17 (215-222).
- Spencer, A. B. (1989). *Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.
- Spencer, A. B. (2004). Jesus' Treatment of Women in the Gospels. In R. W. Pierce, R. M. Groothuis & G. D. Fee (Eds.), *Discovering Biblical Equality: complementarity without hierarchy* (pp. 126-141). Leicester, England: Inter-Varsity Press.
- Spender, D. (1980). *Man Made Language*. London: Routledge.
- Spurrell, H. (1985). *A Translation of the Old Testament Scriptures from the Original Hebrew*. London: James Nisbet & Co.
- Stanton Cady, E. (1993). *The Woman's Bible*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Stendahl, K. (1976). *Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and other Essays*. Philadelphia: Augsburg Fortress Press.
- Stendahl, K. (1984). The Bible as a Classic and the Bible as Holy Scripture. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 103 (1), 3-10.
- Storkey, E. (2000). *Created or Constructed? The Great Gender Debate*. Paternoster Press: Carlisle, UK.
- Strelan, R. (1996). *Paul, Artemis, and the Jews in Ephesus*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Strong, J. (1996). *The New Strong's Exhaustive Concordance of the Bible*. Nashville: Thomas Nelson Publishers.
- Thomas, C. M. (1995). At Home in the City of Artemis: Religion in Ephesus in the Literary Imagination of the Roman Period. In H. Koester (Ed.), *EPHESOS Metropolis of Asia: An Interdisciplinary Approach to its Archaeology, Religion, and Culture*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.

- Thompson, A. J. (2004). The Pietist Critique of Inerrancy: J.A. Bengel's Gnomon as a Test Case. *Journal of Evangelical Theological Society*, 47 (1), 71-88.
- Tolbert, M. A. (1983). Defining the Problem: The Bible and Feminist Hermeneutics. *Semeia*, 43, 113-126.
- Torjesen, K. J. (1993). *When Women Were Priests: Women's Leadership in the Early Church and the Scandal of their Subordination in the Rise of Christianity*. San Francisco: HarperCollins.
- Towner, P. H. (2006). *The Letters to TIMOTHY and TITUS*. Grand Rapids, MI; Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- Tucker, R., & Liefeld, W. L. (1987). *Daughters of the Church: Women and Ministry from New Testament Times to the Present*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan - Academie.
- Tulip, M., & McPhillips, K. (1998). Religion and Spirituality. In B. Caine, M. Gatens, E. Grahame, J. Larbalestier, S. Watson & E. Webby (Eds.), *Australian Feminism: a companion*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.
- Valleskey, S. P. (1995, 24 April 1995, 9 May (revised)). *A Study of the Word ἀθθεντέω* Paper presented at the South Central District Pastoral Conference, Flower Mound, TX.
- Vincent, M. R. (1998). *Vincent's Word Studies* (First Electronic Edition STEP Files ed. Vol. 4: Epistles). Hiawatha, IA: Parsons Technology, Inc.
- Votaw Weber, C. (1896). The Epistles of Paul to Timothy and Titus. *The Biblical World*, 7(2, Feb), 130-138.
- Wainwright, E. M. (1997). But who do you say that I am? *Pacifica*, 10(2), 156-172.
- Wallace, D. B. (2001). *Part III: From the KJV to the RV (from Elegance to Accuracy)*. Retrieved 24 March, 2006, from http://www.bible.org/page.asp?page_id=1824
- Waters, K. L., Sr. (2004). Saved Through Childbearing: Virtues as Children in 1 Timothy 2:11-15. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 123 (4), 703-735.
- Weiss, H. F. (1990). διδάσκειν In H. Balz & G. Schneider (Eds.), *Exegetical Dictionary of the New Testament* (pp. 316-319). Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company.
- White, E. (1995). Feminist understanding and the place of critique: A hermeneutical response to Daphne Hampson's Theology and Feminism. In M. Confoy, D. A. Lee & J. Nowotny (Eds.), *Freedom & Entrapment: Women Thinking Theology*. North Blackburn, Victoria: Dove.
- White Fowler, R. (2001). The Concept of "Authoritative Teaching" and the Role of Women in Congregational Worship. *Ordained Servant*, 10 (1), 10-13.
- Wilshire, L. E. (1988). The TIG Computer and Further Reference to Authentem in 1 Timothy 2:12. *New Testament Studies*, 34 (1), 120-134.
- Wilshire, L. E. (1993). 1 Tim 2:12 Revisited: A Reply to Paul W. Barnett and Timothy J. Harris. *Evangelical Quarterly*, 65 (1), 43-55.
- Winter, B. W. (2003). *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: the appearance of new women and the Pauline communities*. Grand Rapids, MI: W. B. Eerdmans Pub.
- Witherington, B. (1984). The Anti-Feminist Tendencies of the "Western" Text in Acts. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, ciii, 82-84.
- Witherington, B. (1988). *Women in the Earliest Churches*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Wollstonecraft, M. (1992). *A Vindication of the Rights of Woman*.
Hammondsworth, Eng: Penguin.
- Wolters, A. (2004). A Semantic Study of *authentēs* and its Derivatives. *Journal of Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism*, 1, 145-175.
- Young Dickey, P. (1990). *Feminist Theology/Christian Theology: In Search of Method*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Young, F. M. (1994). *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.