BEFORE YOU READ THESE NOTES I want to explain a few things. First, these are not my “study notes.” These are “teaching notes.” That is, they do not include all my research or reasoning but include that which I wanted to share when I did the final teaching. Second, I have labored to include sources, page numbers, and even links to free resources online when possible. In some cases, these resources are difficult to find so I thought it would be helpful for you to have an easy way to access them. I know these notes are not formatted in a way that makes them easy to read (as in a paper or essay) but that’s because they are my teaching notes. I format them so that I can teach with them, not read them. Third, on occasion you may come across a section of my notes where the font of the text is very small. This indicates something that I did NOT want to include in the teaching video, but I did want to include in the notes for those who may need it. I shrunk the font as a way of keeping myself from teaching it unintentionally but kept the text there for others to enlarge and see. Finally, I pray this helps you.

Women in Ministry part 12: 1 Timothy 2:11-15

**INTRO**

* I’ve spent a year studying all the most controversial passage in the Bible.
  + Delayed with health issues.
  + I’ve never put this much time into studying just one passage or creating just one video.
* Women in ministry is one of the biggest debates in the Christian world right now (Westernized).
* The amount of scholarly work is crazy.
  + Everyone trying to prove their side
* But NO passage is more hotly and thoroughly debated than 1 Timothy 2.
  + This video is going to be a thorough examination of the debate over 1 Tim 2.
* This video is an examination the most controversial and debated passage of the Bible in the most controversial and contentious issue in western world Christianity.
  + - Women in Ministry, part 12, 1 Tim 2:11-15

* Let’s just read it and tell me if you don’t see why there’s so much argument over it.
  + **1 Timothy 2:11–15 (ESV) 11Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness. 12I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet. 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—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.** 
    - We’re going deep into the meaning and the debates and popular myths about this passage today.
      * A lot of poor scholarship, genuine confusion.
* It is extremely important that you recognize WHY I waited to deal with 1 Tim 2 until the next to last video in this series
  + This is video 12!
    - Over 27 HOURS on everything else the Bible teaches on this topic.
      * I saved this one for last.
  + **Because one E claim is that many Cs use this passage poorly.**
    - Westfall, *“Historically, 1 Timothy 2: 12 is the primary text that has been used up to the present to ban women from certain activities and functions within the church, regardless of a woman’s training, skills, or spiritual gifts. It has provided a lens or exegetical grid through which all other Scripture is applied to women.”* Westfall, Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle's Vision for Men and Women in Christ (p. 279).
  + I was avoiding two potential errors
    - 1- Ignoring the rest of Scripture
      * There’s much to learn from all of Scripture. Cs who rely entirely on 1 Tim 2 tend to have a harder, more restrictive, and less nuanced view than the Bible does. Because they have left out so much info.
    - 2- Making it seem like the C view rests on one passage
      * By focusing on 1 Tim 2 we can feed into the idea that the C case depends on just this passage.
        + As this series has shown, gender roles are thoroughly taught throughout the Bible, starting in Genesis.
  + But, I didn’t just wait to talk about 1 Tim 2!
    - I refused to make any previous interpretation depend on it entirely.
      * I pointed out, briefly, that other interpretations I have offered are consistent with this but never once did I depend entirely on 1 Tim 2 to establish any view.
    - The C view is WELL supported, and consistently taught throughout Scripture even if we somehow made 1 Tim 2 disappear entirely.
      * Cs may overly emphasize 1 Tim 2 but the C view does NOT depend on it as necessary for proving itself biblical.
  + I was more than willing to change my theology
    - I preferred it.
* Format for today
  + Briefly teach the passage as I understand it.
    - It will make the beginning of the video an easy place to find a simple explanation.
  + Go over each debate in great detail.
    - There are a TON.

**001 WHAT THE PASSAGE APPEARS TO BE SAYING**

* We’ll talk about all of 1 Timothy as we go on, but for now, let’s just focus on the most relevant section.

**1 Timothy 2:11–15 (ESV)**

**11Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness.**

**12I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet.**

**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—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.**

* This is inflammatory to westerners.
  + But I want to set that aside for now.
  + Let’s just focus on understanding it.
    - If you view the passage through irritation, you won’t view it clearly.
* The straightforward view
  + Vs 11 - Women can learn
    - Against culture
      * a place for discipleship and learning all that men learn.
        + Already we bump against some patriarchal and complementarian views

Bible college courses.

Post-mil theology book – “I’ll decide when we become post-mil”

* + - Yet, gender roles are to be preserved…
      * we see from the following verses that “quietly with all submissiveness” isn’t merely the posture everyone has when being taught but is ALSO connected to gender roles.
      * In vs 12 we see that “remain quiet” is contrasted with “teach or exercise authority”
  + Vs 12 - Woman can’t teach/have authority over men in the church
    - This seems to be the elder role and the elder function.
      * That is, not just the title but the specific activity of teaching and having authority in the way that an elder does according to the New Testament.
        + The application in Paul’s time would have been

1- The public teaching of doctrine that happened at every church gathering.

2- To wield authority over men in ways such as judging prophecy, enacting church discipline, or giving elder/pastor

The basic application is simple. The full application into all variety of scenarios is a big question I’ll handle later.

Can she teach theology in a Bible college?

Can she have authority over men outside the church setting or in a lesser fashion than an elder does?

* + Vs 13-14 – Paul explains some reasons for this sex-based policy.
    - 2 reasons
      * 1- Creation’s order (vs 14)
        + See video #2

Prefall.

* + - * + Some scoff at this as “primogeniture” but the Holy Spirit teaches this is the right view of Gen 2.
      * 2- The consequences of the fall
        + Eve’s deception somehow pushes for this rule.
        + Debates

Does that mean all women are easily deceived?

We’ll tackle that later.

Does that mean we are supporting the suffering of the fall instead of reversing it in Christ?

* + - * + What’s clear is this.

Both creation and the fall push for Paul’s policy on women in ministry.

These are transcultural and make it futile to attempt to dismiss it.

* + - This is incredibly consistent with the other hours of study we’ve put into this topic so far.
      * Genesis shows gender role differences
      * The lack of female priests in the OT
      * Women in all roles of ministry in the NT except elder and apostle
      * Husband’s headship relationship with their wives
        + Direct teaching about submission to husbands
      * The head covering issues of 1 Cor 7
  + Vs 15 has no straightforward meaning. It must be studied carefully.
    - I’ll examine all the options in detail as we go on.
    - But DON’T think that this verse will overturn the obvious meaning of the rest of the passage.
      * We don’t use the obscure to change what’s clear, it’s the other way around.
  + This view can be overcome by careful study
    - But you can’t blame people for generally seeing it this way.
      * An approach like this is pretty well represented throughout time.
      * But things are changing.
        + Egalitarian scholars have been working hard to produce scholarship to show us that this passage has been misunderstood.
    - Here’s an example of some of these newer interpretations.
      * Many of you will never have heard this stuff before.

**002 HOW EGALITARIAN SCHOLARS SEE THE PASSAGE**

* **A sample of various egalitarian views.**

**1 Timothy 2:11–15 (ESV)**

**11Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness.**

* This is the only actual command. Let her learn!
  + Cs and Ps have misunderstood the emphasis of the passage by missing this.

**12I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet.**

* “I do not permit” refers to his personal opinion, not an apostolic ruling.
* It’s actually “I am not permitting for now” and was just about a present issue
  + NOT a timeless practice.
* “quiet” is a mistranslation, it should say “peaceful.”
  + So it doesn’t limit speaking.
* This whole thing was just for Ephesus
  + Even in the first century it wasn’t a practice of all churches.
* “teach” just means “teach false doctrine”
  + In fact, 1 Timothy is primarily about false doctrine and there are a number of ways we can see that this is the real issue, not gender roles.
    - Es have a few different ways of supporting this view.
  + Or “teach in a domineering way”
  + Or something other negative thing that NOBODY should be doing.
* “Exercise authority” is a mistranslation
  + It means “incite violence”
    - Or “highjack authority”
    - Or something else that NOBODY should do.
  + History proves this true and misogynistic translators have hidden it from us.
    - We will go into a ton of detail on this.
      * I even hired a scholar to provide the first public translation of an ancient papyri to help us examine all ancient uses of the term.
* “Over a man” should be “over her husband”
  + This whole passage is about marriage and has nothing to do with church leadership or activities.

**13For Adam was formed first, then Eve;**

* This isn’t saying Adam being made first gives him a higher authority than Eve.
  + It’s fighting the Ephesian cult of Artemis which taught that woman was made first and resulted in women trying to dominate over men!
    - Ephesus was hyper-feminist
  + It’s not giving us male authority, it’s rejecting anyone’s authority and establishing equality against the cult of Artemis.

**14and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor.**

* Adam and Eve are just analogies for the danger of being an uneducated teacher.
  + Women were less educated, so Paul didn’t want them teaching YET.
    - Once they got educated, they could.
    - So, the application of 1 Tim 2 is only “don’t let people be teachers and leaders till they know doctrine well”

**15Yet she will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.**

* Women would call out to Artemis for help in the dangers of giving birth
  + This is a promise that God will help them
  + So, it proves that the cult of Artemis really is the main issue behind this passage, legitimizing the other interpretations.
* There are other issues as well
  + Timestamps below

**003 WAS THIS JUST PAUL’S PERSONAL OPINION?**

* Some Es find a way to say that 1 Tim 2:12 doesn’t really apply to the church at large by how they interpret the verb “I do not permit”
* We’ll be looking at 4 different approaches Es have on this. Saying that “I do not permit” implies…
  + 1) Personal opinion not apostolic ruling
    - “I”
  + 2) Non-universal application
  + 3) Some kind of time-limited instruction.
    - “am not”
  + 4) Paul having a limited jurisdiction.
* Way #1 - The verb forms reveal this prohibition is limited
  + Several egalitarians put forward this kind of argument.
    - Payne, Belleville, Grenz,
  + **004 P i am**
  + 1- *“Paul often chose the first person singular (“I”) present active indicative (“am not permitting”) to indicate his own personal advice or position for a situation that is not universal.”* Man and Woman, 320
    - Is that enough of a rule to be a guide for interpretation?
      * “Often” becomes “rule”
      * We’ll find, you can’t build anything off this reliably.
    - There are problems with thinking that Paul means to indicate something is not universal when he uses a first person, present, active, indicative verb.
      * **005 M nothing2**
      * Douglas Moo says, *“the use of the verb epitrepw in the present tense implies nothing as to the universal nature of Paul's prohibition, Payne contends that the formulation does suggest such a restriction.”* Moo, 199
        + You have to look at the context to see if it’s universal or not.
      * **006 M point**
      * *“The point to be made here is that epitrepw is never used of a permission or prohibition which could be universal but is restricted.”* Ibid., 199.
        + **007 M impos**
        + Moo’s example, *“For example, when Jesus “gives permission” to the Gadarene demons to enter the swine (Mark 5:13), a universal application is plainly impossible.”* Ibid., 199.
    - This is merely looking for a clue where one doesn’t exist. You can’t just take first person, present, active, indicative verbs as if they mean a command can’t be universal.
      * See Romans 12:1
        + ***Romans 12:1 (ESV) 1I appeal to you therefore, brothers, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship.***
      * Or 1 Tim 2:1 (also present, active, indicative)
        + ***1 Timothy 2:1 (ESV) 1First of all, then, I urge that supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings be made for all people,***
    - Payne’s seems to imply Douglas Moo agrees with his reasoning.
      * **008 P moo**
      * *“Moo justifiably states, “Paul’s use of the present indicative in exhortations and commands is also relatively rare. . . . Advice for a current situation was being given [to Timothy].””* Man and Woman, 320.
      * **009 M paper**
        + The paper that Payne is quoting is actually a paper Douglas Moo wrote as a response to Philip Payne. Here are some relevant details. <https://womeninthechurch.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2014/10/Douglas%20%20Moo%20The%20Interpretation%20of%201%20Timothy%202%2011-15%20A%20Rejoinder.pdf>

You’d think Moo agrees with Payne that…

the tenses of “I am not permitting” show Paul is offering advice that is not meant to be taken as a general rule.

But Moo believes the “*prohibitions are universal*” Moo, 199

Why is that?

We need to read more of Moo’s quote

* + - * Moo’s second point
        + **010 M frame**

*“It seems to me that Payne has framed the question wrongly in assuming that Paul uses the present tense to restrict his advice. It is not so much the temporal limitation which the tense can suggest which leads Paul to use the construction, but the note of personal appeal which is implied… the personal address to Timothy, in which advice for a current situation was being given, virtually demands the use of the present tense. Therefore… the first person present of epitrepw* allows *for a limited application but does not constitute clear evidence for it.”* Moo, 200.

He’s NOT helping Payne’s point here.

It’s not that 1 Tim 2:12 is non-universal because it was advice for a current situation.

* + - * That’s why Moo says, it “implies nothing as the universal nature of Paul’s prohibition”
      * Payne overstates.
        + **011 M over**
        + *“As a matter of fact, however, I think Payne overstates the case for finding a personal and temporal restriction in the use of the term epitrepw in 1 Tim 2: 12. He gives the impression that Paul consistently distinguished his personal advice from "permanently valid instruction'' when such is not the case. It is only rarely that Paul makes such a differentiation-and when he does, it is precarious to infer any less authority: the words are still the words of the Apostle Paul, writing inspired Scripture.”*

This could easily apply to some of Payne’s 1 Cor 7 examples.

* + - * Payne’s “hidden premise”
        + **012 M hidden**
        + *“There appears to be a hidden disjunctive premise in Payne's argumentation here: either Paul's personal advice or universally valid principles. But, of course, Paul is usually giving both.”*

I’ll give you more examples of this soon.

* + Belleville has a similar argument.
    - **013 B some merit**
    - *“Some have suggested that the present indicative is used because it allows Paul to give a temporary restriction: “I am not permitting [at this time]” (JB). This has some merit. “Do not let a woman teach . . .” would certainly communicate a universal norm. If this wasn’t Paul’s intent, then a shift from a command to a present state of affairs would make sense.”* Bellville, Two Views, 81.
      * Very soft
      * 5 problems with Belleville’s view.
      * 1- It’s Paul the apostle, AS the apostle
        + “I” primarily points to a person, not a time.
        + The weight of the “I” depends on the person it points to.

When your little brother says “I don’t want you to do that” vs your father saying it, it’s different.

* + - * + Paul commonly gives apostolic instructions with a first person indicator.
        + Rom 12:1
        + 1 Cor 1:10
      * 2- It’s his practice in all places and by implication is to be Timothy’s practice in Ephesus as well.
        + 1 Tim 2:8
        + 1 Tim 2:12

Note Paul does it as his policy and shares this with Timothy to apply it in Ephesus as well.

This seems like an apostolic teaching for churches in general.

* + - * 3- It’s grounded in creation.
        + 1 Tim 2:13-14
      * 4- It’s tied to a clear command “let a woman learn in silence with all submission.”
        + Belleville says that if Paul said “do not let a woman teach…” then it would be universal.

See again, **013 B some merit**

* + - * + But this is merely the second half of a command that starts exactly the way that Belleville admits would be a universal norm.
      * 5- I don’t know any translations that handles it that way.
        + Belleville refers to JB but I’m not sure who that is. Some particular scholar, most likely, but not an actual Bible translation. She didn’t provide a footnote.

It’s not JB Phillips

* + - * + I surveyed 30 English translations, dating back to the Tyndale Bible from 1526.
        + **014 thirty translations**

ASV, BBE, CEB, CJB, HCSB, DBY, ESV, GNT, GW, JUB, KJV, LEB, NASB, NCV, NIV, NKJV, NLT, NRSV, RHE, RSV, TYN, WBT, WEB, WNT, WYC, YLT, NET, ISV, WEUST, GNV.

Not conclusive evidence, but important.

If “some individuals” translating it this way has merit, then we should probably consider the merit of the almost universal consensus of those who don’t.

* + - Schreiner responds to this line of reasoning.
      * **015 S some**
      * *“Some egalitarians have appealed to the phrase ouk epitrepw (“I do not permit”) to support their case, arguing that the indicative mood demonstrates the exhortation is not even a command and that the present tense suggests the exhortation is merely a temporary restriction to be lifted once women are qualified to teach (see, e.g., Philip B. Payne, “Libertarian Women in Ephesus: A Response to Douglas J. Moo’s Article, ‘1 Timothy 2:11–15: Meaning and Significance,’” TJ 2 [1981]: 170–72; Grenz, Women in the Church , 127–28). Both assertions are incorrect. Paul often uses indicatives to introduce commands. E.g., the famous admonition to give one’s whole life to God (Rom. 12:1–2) is introduced with the indicative (“I exhort”). It is linguistically naive to insist commands must be in the imperative mood (see 1 Cor. 1:10; Eph. 4:1; Phil. 4:2; 1 Tim. 2:8; 5:14; 2 Tim. 1:6; Titus 3:8). Nor can one appeal to the present tense to say the command is merely temporary. The same argument could then be used to say Paul desires believers to give their lives to God only for a brief period of time (Rom. 12:1) or he wants the men to pray without wrath and dissension merely for the present time (1 Tim. 2:8), but in the future they could desist.” -* Two Views, 322 (fn 87)
      * It appears to be a “special rule,” only applied when desired.
        + Es only seem to apply it to this one verse.
        + When Paul uses the indicative or present tense elsewhere, even in this same chapter, they don’t follow that rule.
  + Payne’s adds another layer to this point.
    - Payne offers a number of examples of this sort of thing. All of them from 1 Cor 7.
      * **016 P four**
      * *“Four times in 1 Cor 7:7, 26, 32, 40 and again in Phil 4:2 Paul uses the identical grammatical construction: first person singular present active indicative verb form (θέλω, νομίζω, θέλω, δοκῶ, παρακαλῶ) associated with one or more present active infinitives (εἶναι, ὑπάρχειν, εἶναι, εἶναι, ἔχειν, φρονεῖν) to express his current desire or conviction, not a universal demand.”* Payne, Man and Woman, 320
        + So, it’s the coupling of verbs.

1st person active indicative verb WITH a present active infinitive.

In 1 Tim 2:12 it’s “I do not permit” and “teach” or “have authority”

* + - * + But I’m not sure ALL those examples in 1 Cor 7 work
      * But, if it’s a rule, that this construction means Paul isn’t giving a universal demand… then it would hold true pretty close to every time.
        + So I did a search.
        + 7 examples of the full construction (first person, singular, present, active, indicative verb associated with one or more present, active infinitives. Each of these seems like a universal application is appropriate.

**017 Examples**

***Romans 11:25 (ESV) 25Lest you be wise in your own sight, I do not want you to be unaware of this mystery, brothers: a partial hardening has come upon Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles has come in.***

***\*\*\*Romans 12:3 (ESV) 3For by the grace given to me I say to everyone among you not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think, but to think with sober judgment, each according to the measure of faith that God has assigned.***

***\*\*\*Romans 16:17 (ESV) 17I appeal to you, brothers, to watch out for those who cause divisions and create obstacles contrary to the doctrine that you have been taught; avoid them.***

***\*\*\*1 Corinthians 5:11 (ESV) 11But now I am writing to you not to associate with anyone who bears the name of brother if he is guilty of sexual immorality or greed, or is an idolater, reviler, drunkard, or swindler—not even to eat with such a one.***

***\*\*\*1 Corinthians 12:1 (ESV) 1Now concerning spiritual gifts, brothers, I do not want you to be uninformed.***

***1 Corinthians 14:5 (ESV) 5Now I want you all to speak in tongues, but even more to prophesy. The one who prophesies is greater than the one who speaks in tongues, unless someone interprets, so that the church may be built up.***

***\*\*\*Ephesians 4:17 (ESV) 17Now this I say and testify in the Lord, that you must no longer walk as the Gentiles do, in the futility of their minds.***

* + - So, Es will need a different approach
      * This leads us to a different approach. In how we define the verb “I permit” or epitrepw.

**018 THE WORD “PERMIT” SHOWS THIS DOESN’T APPLY TO US**

* Way #2- the definition of epitrepw.
  + Payne also argues that epitrepw itself, not just the tenses of the phrase. That the use of this term limits the permission to a specific, time-bound, non-general application.
  + **019 P every**
  + 1- *“Every occurrence of ἐπιτρέπω in the Greek OT refers to a specific situation, never to a universally applicable permission.”* Payne, 320
    - Sounds impressive
    - Only 2 in the OT proper.
      * Job 32:14 “And ye have commissioned a man to speak such words.”
      * Esther 9:14 “And he permitted it to be so done; and he gave up to the Jews of the city the bodies of the sons of Aman to hang”
        + Both are clearly limited

BUT, this is due to the nature of the action, not the verb epitrepw.

In Job, a specific set of words are permitted to be spoken.

In Esther, a specific group of men are to be hanged.

* + - * + Key: this is no reason to think the verb itself simply refers to a time limited permission.
    - 3 occurrences in 4 Maccabees (20-130AD)
      * These examples date from around the time of Paul, he may or may not have ever read 4 Mac.
      * **020 4 mac**
      * 4 Maccabees 4:17 (Brenton LXX En) 17who had made a covenant, if he would give him this authority, to pay yearly three thousand six hundred and sixty talents.
        + About a king appointing a new high priest to the Jewish priesthood.

It’s basically sold for a cost.

* + - * + Intended to be an ongoing thing.

Lifetime appointment

Ongoing payment

Does Payne expect the term to refer to something that goes on for eternity? This seems enough to say it’s ongoing, and not temporary.

* + - * 4 Maccabees 4:18 (Brenton LXX En) 18And he committed to him the high priesthood and rulership over the nation.
        + Intended to be an ongoing thing.
      * 4 Maccabees 5:26 (Brenton LXX En) 26Those things which are convenient to our souls, he has directed us to eat: but those which are repugnant to them, he has interdicted.
        + Speaking of food laws. From the perspective of the writer, this is universally applicable to Jews, those he is speaking of.
  + **021 P vast**
  + *2- “Similarly, the vast majority of the NT occurrences of ἐπιτρέπω clearly refers to a specific time or for a short or limited time duration only.”* Payne, 320
    - Andrew Perriman agrees and says the word “is in every case related to a specific and limited set of circumstances”
      * As quoted here <https://margmowczko.com/1-timothy-212-and-1-corinthians-1434-epitrepo/>
    - As with the 2 OT examples, the way we know these are limited in any way is the clear context.
      * 1 example
        + ***Luke 8:32 (ESV) 32Now a large herd of pigs was feeding there on the hillside, and they begged him to let them enter these. So he gave them permission.***
    - Payne does acknowledge 3 exceptions to this rule.
      * The first two…
      * **Mark 10:4** and the parallel in **Matt 19:8**
        + He says Jesus doesn’t refer to a universal rule or permission about divorce because it wasn’t “from the beginning” and because Jesus weighs in against divorce.
        + **022 P mark**
        + *“In response to Mark 10:4 and Matt 19:8 (“Moses permitted [ἐπέτρεψεν] you to divorce your wives”), Jesus replied, “because your hearts were hard. But it was not that way from the beginning” (Matt 19:8; cf. Mark 10:5–12) and “what God has joined together, let man not separate. . . . Anyone who divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery against her” (Mark 10:9; cf. Matt 19:9, adding an exception for illicit sex). Jesus’ reply shows that ἐπιτρέπω does not refer to a universal or permanent permission.”* Man and Woman, 320-1

If “not universal” can mean “applies to a whole group of God’s people for at least 1400 years” then I wonder what value the term has.

It’s universal enough – all of God’s people

It’s for a really long enough time – 1400 years.

* + - * **1 Cor 14:34**
        + *“The third person singular form in 1 Cor 14:34 may be a rabbinic formula and may not have been in the original text.”* 320

Interpolation?

It’s not (see video #11)

Even if it was

It would still be a lasting prescription.

It’s a universal church rule regarding women speaking.

* + - * + In video #11 we went over 5 different views of 1 Cor 14:34.

Every single one of them takes this term as a lasting prescription.

* + - Payne seems wrong that, assuming 1 Cor 14:34 isn’t original,
      * **023 P never**
      * “the verb “to permit” (ἐπιτρέπω) never refers to a universal or permanent situation in any of its uses in the LXX or NT.” Payne, Man and Woman, 395.
      * Universal enough, permanent enough.
  + Lexicons
    - When you look up epitrepw in Greek lexicons
      * They don’t have “for a limited time” or “for a non-universal application” as part of the meaning of the word.
    - It’s wrong to try to push any time limit or application limit onto the meaning of the word.
      * It’s just like the English, “permit.”
  + Es need some other way to make their case work.
* Way #3 – The contrast with vs 11.
  + Bartlett: the contrast with vs 11 shows Paul is only giving “his current approach to a current problem”
  + **024 Bar paul**
  + Andrew Bartlett says, *“Paul positively commands that a woman should learn. Why does Paul make such a strong verbal contrast between this command and his next statement, that he is not permitting a woman to teach and assume authority over a man? Does this not rather create the impression that his restriction on women’s teaching is only a statement of his current approach to a current problem? He could have written ‘Women must never teach’ or some similar expression, but did not. The phrase which he uses seems a counter-intuitive choice of words to express a rule which Paul intends shall apply to all worship assemblies of the church in all times and places.*” Men and Women in Christ (p. 291)
  + I see a problem with interpreting this as a soft statement allowing for wiggle room in application.
    - Bartlett acknowledges that vs 11 is a strong command.
      * Yet, Bartlett treats vs 11 like the only thing it commanded was for a woman to learn. That’s part of it, but there’s more to the command.
        + **1 Tim 2:11**
        + She must learn with “quietly with all submissiveness”
        + These terms seem to be elaborated on in the following verses. Making the following verses part of the command and not a second, softer piece of information about how Paul does things.

The commands for “quietly with all submissiveness” correspond to vs 12’s “not to teach or exercise authority over a man.”

We’ll get to authentew later.

This elevates the issue beyond the softness Bartlett suggests.

* + There’s one last method to say it’s a limited prohibition.

**025 PAUL HAS NO JURISDICTION OVER US**

* Way #4- Bartlett’s “jurisdiction” argument
  + Andrew Bartlett puts it this way.
  + **026 Bart jur**
  + *“Complementarians say that ‘a woman’ in verse 12 refers generically to all women. But how can that be? In a context which does not involve the use of physical force, the expression ‘I do not permit’ only makes sense within a range of jurisdiction. Discussing the meanings of ‘permit’, Tom Schreiner gives the examples of saying to his daughter that she is not permitted to go into the street or is not permitted to drive his car at one hundred miles per hour. These statements make sense because he has jurisdiction over his daughter and his car. But he has no jurisdiction over other people’s daughters or cars. If he were to say that he does not permit ‘a girl’ to go into the street or to drive too fast, such a statement could not be taken to mean that he was laying down the law for all girls in all times and places. If, like Philip (Acts 21:9), he had four daughters, his words would be taken to apply to them. In the same way, Paul’s words must be for particular people over whom he has jurisdiction, as the apostle who built up their Christian community. There is nothing in the text to suggest that he is here meaning to claim jurisdiction over future generations everywhere. Thus, Paul’s words express a particular restriction. He is not directly laying down the law for all women.”* Bartlett, Men and Women in Christ, 292.
    - What an odd argument!
      * It requires limiting Paul’s “jurisdiction” to only the churches he planted directly.
        + How then did Paul write Romans?
      * Paul obviously has a wide jurisdiction as an apostle, called by Jesus to establish churches and direct them both in doctrine and in practice.
        + To say less fights against all of church history.
      * This "jurisdiction" argument backfires
        + It makes the passage even stronger.
      * Look at what comes just before Paul says what he permits.
        + **1 Tim 1:1** – Paul prefaces the whole letter within the context of him writing not as an advisor but as an “apostle of Christ Jesus by the command of God our savior and of Jesus Christ our hope”
        + **1 Tim 1:12** has Paul speaking of his unique calling to serve Jesus as an apostle

***1 Timothy 1:12 (ESV) 12I thank him who has given me strength, Christ Jesus our Lord, because he judged me faithful, appointing me to his service,***

It’s not insignificant that Jesus Himself appointed Paul. This is not only a statement of gratitude but one of position.

Note the previous verse which says… ***1 Timothy 1:11 (ESV) 1in accordance with the gospel of the glory of the blessed God with which I have been entrusted.***

* + - * Then we have number “I” statements from Paul
        + 2:1 **“*I urge that supplications…”***

Present, active, indicative.

* + - * + Then, he again asserts his unique and authoritative position in relation to the churches

***1 Timothy 2:7 (ESV) 7For this I was appointed a preacher and an apostle (I am telling the truth, I am not lying), a teacher of the Gentiles in faith and truth.***

* + - * + And bases the instructions in the following verses on THAT calling and authority

***1 Timothy 2:8–9a (ESV) 8I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarreling; 9likewise also that women should…***

* + - * + The debated “I am not permitting” is in this same line of authoritative, apostolic instructions.

***1 Timothy 2:11–12 (ESV) 11Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness. 12I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet.***

* + - * So, Bartlett’s point backfires for 3 reasons.
        + 1- Paul clearly appealing to his authority as an apostle to Gentiles in general
        + 2- Paul giving instructions to the churches BASED ON that authority

Men’s behavior, women’s behavior

* + - * + 3- It seems clear that, when Paul appeals to what he instructs people to do or what he will not permit them to do, he is doing it based on his apostleship and calling.

“I” refers to him as an apostle “do not permit” makes it an authoritative rule for the churches.

It may be that he writes it this way so that Timothy can show it to others as a way of elevating the instructions as being from Paul and not merely from Timothy.

* + - * + The one who will “not permit” is the Paul, functioning in his role as apostle to the Gentiles, appointed by Christ.
* Conclusion: The phrase “I do not permit” doesn’t lessen the universality or authority of the verse.
  + What’s next?

**027 THIS IS ABOUT WIVES, NOT WOMEN**

* The Common English Bible takes this view
  + 1 Tim 2:12 “I don't allow a wife to teach or to control her husband. Instead, she should be a quiet listener.” (CEB)
* Before getting into this in detail, we should recognize the stakes.
  + If it’s women in general, then…
    - Obviously, it applies to women and men’s relationships related to the teaching/authority roles
      * Another debate will follow about whether it relates to eldership or more. Some take it to apply to all of life and to mean that women should not be in any authoritative or teaching role such as government, university or business. Some take it to be limited to specific roles such as elder.
  + If it’s wives, then
    - It would mean a woman can’t do the verse 12 stuff over her *husband*.
    - Most of the women in most of the churches, at the time, were married.
    - So, it’s just about marriage.
      * But how would it apply for her to be an elder in a church where her husband is present during her teaching?
        + An interesting question.
* The case for “Wives”
  + NRSV footnote “or wife” “or husband”
    - Guny can mean women or wife
    - Anyr can mean man or husband
  + Verse 15 is “clearly” limited to mothers.
    - 1 Timothy 2:15 (ESV) 15Yet she will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.
    - We’ll come back to that one.
  + Some claim Paul consistently relates wives to husbands, not women to men.
    - Typically, yes.
    - But…
      * Much of the time the context clearly indicates husband/wife
* The case against “wives”
  + First, examples that show Paul doesn’t always refer to wives.
    - An example of “woman” which can’t be “wife”
      * 1 Corinthians 7:34 (ESV) 34and his interests are divided. And the unmarried or betrothed woman is anxious about the things of the Lord, how to be holy in body and spirit. But the married woman is anxious about worldly things, how to please her husband.
    - A comparison of man and woman which isn’t husband and wife
      * 1 Corinthians 11:12 (ESV) 12for as woman was made from man, so man is now born of woman. And all things are from God.
    - Another singular use of woman which isn’t wife
      * Galatians 4:4 (ESV) 4But when the fullness of time had come, God sent forth his Son, born of woman, born under the law,
  + What about the context in 1 Tim 2
    - The immediate context is about men and women, not husbands and wives.
    - **028 Moo not wives**
    - “vv 8-9 are clearly directed respectively to men and women, not husbands and wives; unless, indeed, Paul commands only husbands to pray and only wives to adorn themselves modestly.” Moo, 1 Timothy 2:11-15: Meaning and Significance, 63-4.
      * Consider the relationship between verses 8 and 10, leading into vs 11.
      * 8 is about men in general and not husbands.
        + ***1 Timothy 2:8 (ESV) 8I desire then that in every place the men should pray, lifting holy hands without anger or quarreling;***
        + Vs 9 corresponds to vs 8.

***1 Timothy 2:9 (ESV) 9likewise also that women should adorn themselves in respectable apparel, with modesty and self-control, not with braided hair and gold or pearls or costly attire,***

* + - * Vs 10 is clearly about all women.
        + ***1 Timothy 2:10 (ESV) 10but with what is proper for women who profess godliness—with good works.***
    - This is why Moo says that the context strongly supports the man/woman meaning as opposed to the husband/wife meaning.
      * “the context of the passage before us strongly supports the broader meaning.” Ibid., 64.
      * All of 1 Tim 2 fits better in a church gathering context than a family one.
        + Men praying in every place, modest clothing, teaching, learning,
      * Belleville agrees, “*“husband” and “wife” do not fit the broader context of congregational worship.”* Two Views, 79.
* Another support for “wives”
  + But verse 11 isn’t plural, it’s singular
    - Can we say that the singular “woman” of verse 11 changes this to being about a wife/husband relationship?
    - There’s no rule of Greek that says so.
      * Nothing about the singular makes it more likely to refer to a wife.
    - Why the singular?
      * It’s probably about the Eve example he’s going to use in vss 13-15.
        + She’s one woman who represents all women in the example Paul gives.
      * Adam and Eve CAN represent the husband and wife relationship but can also just be the prototypical male and female.
        + I agree with Belleville on this point.
        + **029 B nope**
        + Belleville, “*There is no indication whatsoever that Paul is shifting at verse 11 from women in general to married women in specific. True, Paul does refer to Adam and Eve in verses 13–14; but it is to Adam and Eve as the prototypical male and female, not as a married couple.”* Two Views, 79-80.
    - Other concerns
      * Why would a wife not be able to teach her husband?
        + The authority one makes some sense but why couldn’t she teach him something?

“teach” fits better in the context of a church gathering.

* + - * If she can be an elder and teach the congregation what is her husband supposed to do?
        + Go to a different church?
        + This awkwardness suggests the “wife” view is wrong.
    - Finally, this segways into Paul giving qualifications for who CAN teach and have authority in the form of being an elder. (ch 3)
      * That is not a marriage context.
      * Women seem excluded from this.
        + See video #4 – “Women Leaders in the New Testament” <https://www.youtube.com/live/U6qqT9jv-ic?feature=share>
  + Conclusion on the “wife” view:
    - This is about women and men, not merely wives and husbands
    - The context both before and after verse 12 is about men and women in general, not marriage.
    - The idea that wives can’t teach their husbands but that they can be a teaching elder in a church their husband attends is really odd.

**030 WHAT DOES “QUIETLY” MEAN?**

* The term occurs in vs 11 and again in vs 12.
* ***1 Timothy 2:11–12 (ESV) 11Let a woman learn quietly with all submissiveness. 12I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet.***
* Can mean one of two things (silence or peaceable behavior)
  + Silence or a peaceable behavior
    - Acts 22:2 “quiet” vs 2 Thes 3:12 “do their work quietly”
* A word on application… because BOTH of these possibilities can be wrongly applied.
  + What if it is “silent”?
    - No speaking in church at all, making announcements, worship
    - No noise in church at all, including singing.
    - OR, is it context specific?
      * Let’s look at the parallel
        + Acts 22:2 isn’t complete silence but a listening posture as opposed to the clamor before this.
      * Consider the context
        + “learning” in vs 11 shows that the silence is in the context of a teaching environment.
        + Vs 12’s “teach or have authority” does as well.
      * Consider the conflict with prophecy
        + Women prophesied (see video 11)
        + Or women speaking in tongues.
        + Or interpreting them.
    - If it DOES mean “silence” then it isn’t some kind of total silence.
  + What if it’s “peaceable behavior”?
    - Many people think that this meaning gets us away from verbal connotations.
      * As if it’s just affirming generic good behavior.
    - But, even if it means “peaceful” it probably STILL has verbal connotations.
      * Why?
        + Context!

Peaceable could mean working hard and paying your own way.

Could mean

* + - * + In vs 11, being “peaceful” in the context of “learning” involves verbal quietness.

“peaceful” involves MORE than being quiet verbally, but, in the context of a teaching and learning environment, it doesn’t involve LESS than that.

* + - * + Vs 12 also contrasts it with “teach or have authority” (which I will defend)

Again, reinforcing that this in a context in which “peaceful” will involve verbal connotations.

But this will depend on the analysis of vs 12.

So “peaceful” will be defined by the meaning of the rest of the passage.

* + - * + 1 Cor 14:34-35

See video 11 – context of judging prophecy

Shows that Paul sees proper behavior for women in the local church as having at least some limitations related to speaking.

* + - Am I saying the word meaning doesn’t change application at all?
      * No, there is a difference between the general term “peaceable” and the specific term “quiet.”
        + Peaceable means MORE than quiet, but not less, in this context.
  + So, which is it?
  + For “silence”
    - BDAG, Moo, DBL take this position.
    - 1. The immediate context of 1 Tim 2:11-12
      * The context is the teaching environment of the church gathering.
        + Implying silence, not just broadly peaceable behavior.
      * There’s a parallel relationship between 11 and 12.
        + The two qualifications of vs 11 (quietness, submission)
        + The two prohibitions of vs 12 (teaching, having authority)
        + If teaching is a direct parallel to quietness then it implies a verbal restriction.
    - The word can mean that.
      * Belleville has a strange claim about this.
      * **031 B silence**
      * *“Some translate the Greek phrase en hēsychia as “in silence” and understand Paul to be setting forth public protocols for women in public worship. However, the semantic range for hēsychia does not include “silence.””*
        + Discovering Biblical Equality (p. 208). InterVarsity Press. Kindle Edition.
      * Actually, it does.
        + Her footnote

**032 B s fn**

Her footnote says “See BDAG; cf. *LSJ* s.v.”

* + - * + BDAG

**033 BDAG silence**

BDAG says, "2 state of saying nothing or very little, silence" AND assigns this as the meaning in 1 Tim 2:11.

* + - * + What is going on here!?

**034 LSJ silence**

LSJ says, "2 silence, stillness"

* + For “peaceful”
    - 2 Thes 3:12 “do their work quietly”
    - Tom Schreiner says that nowadays most scholars take this position.
      * **035 S most**
      * Schreiner, *“Most scholars today argue that this word does not actually mean “silence” here but refers to a quiet demeanor and spirit that is peaceable instead of argumentative.”* Women in the Church, 186.
        + He even changed his own view to this one.
    - 1. 1 Tim 2:2
      * It uses a related word.
        + The adjective version (hēsychios)
        + Here it clearly refers to being peaceable, not silent.
      * In the same chapter.
        + See also “women likewise” vs 9.

That part seems weak to me.

* + - 2. The parallel in 1 Pet 3:4
      * ***1 Peter 3:4 (ESV) “but let your adorning be the hidden person of the heart with the imperishable beauty of a gentle and quiet spirit, which in God’s sight is very precious.”*** 
        + Adjective form.
        + Here it doesn’t mean “silence” and is on a similar topic as 1 Tim 2.
      * **036 S 1 pet**
      * “The parallel text in 1 Peter 3:4 also inclines us in the same direction, since the “gentle and quiet spirit” of the wife in the home scarcely means absolute silence.” Schreiner, Women in the Church, 3rd ed., 186.
        + A distant context but similar topic.

Marriage, not church

“quiet spirit” not “quiet” in contrast to “teaching”

* + - 3. A different word would have been more clear/natural if silence was the point.
      * **037 S sil**
      * “In addition, if Paul wanted to communicate absolute silence, he could have used the noun σιγή (“silence”) rather than ἡσυχία (“quietness”).” Schreiner, Women in the Church, 3rd ed., 186.
      * σιγή - silence
      * perhaps
  + Which is it?
    - I lean toward the minority position.
      * Why?
      * What’s the stronger influence on the meaning of the term? The immediate context or some more distant usage?
        + Why do we know 1 Tim 2:2 speaks of quietness as a peaceful life?

Because it is related to “peaceful,” “godly,” and “dignified.”

Teaching and learning are not in this context at all.

* + - * + Why do we know 1 Tim 2:12 does that?

In direct context it is related to

“learning” “submission”

“Not teaching or having authority over a man”

1 Tim 2:2, 1 Peter 3:4

* + - * + The immediate context implies silence and the larger context and parallel passage implies peaceful behavior.

But, the application won’t be significantly different if verse 12 means what I think it means.

* But, either way, it doesn’t mean…
  + 1- total silence.
  + 2- just peacefulness with no verbal connotations.
  + As Schreiner says, *“The resolution of this question is not of prime importance for the debate before us, for it does not drastically change the meaning of the text either way.”* Women in the Church, 186.
    - That will depend on other questions, such as…

**038 DOES THE CULT OF ARTEMIS CHANGE EVERYTHING?**

* What people DO with Artemis.
  + 1- Show that the key to 1 Tim 2 is seeing that Paul is responding to the cult of Artemis in Ephesus, not the more general issues that people assume.
    - It becomes a filter.
  + 2- Show a battle of the sexes where women were domineering over men
    - To say that Paul is only against such domineering
      * That, they say, is what verse 12 is really about.
    - Paul is just trying to restore equality where no sex has authority in relation to the other.
* Artemis was a false god that was a really big deal in Ephesus
  + **039 Artemis**
  + Acts 19 – “great is Diana [Artemis] of the Ephesians”
    - Scholars call her “Artemis of Ephesia/Ephesus”
* The Artemision
  + A massive temple to Artemis
    - **040 The Artemision**
    - Largest building in the Greek world.
    - One of the seven wonders of the ancient world
    - Over 350 by 180 feet
    - 127 columns, each 60 feet tall.
    - Solid marble
    - Built and rebuilt bigger and bigger until
  + It had many functions
    - Housed works of art
    - A bank
      * The temple received a lot of donations.
      * They loaned money out, at interest.
      * Because of its security wealthy people would deposit money there
    - A refuge
      * Because of its status as a sanctuary it served as an asylum and place for legal refugees.
    - A landowner
      * About 120 square miles of land. (Women in the Church, 36)
  + This temple was tied to the reputation and prosperity of the whole city.
* There’s a lot of false information in some egalitarian writings on the Artemis cult.
  + Look at N.T. Wright’s book, Surprised By Scripture
    - **041 NT Art**
    - *“And one of the main things we know about religion in Ephesus is that the main religion—the biggest temple, the most famous shrine—was a female-only cult. The Temple of Artemis”* Wright, N. T.. Surprised by Scripture (p. 80)
      * It was NOT female only.
        + ***Acts 19:27 (ESV) 27And there is danger not only that this trade of ours may come into disrepute but also that the temple of the great goddess Artemis may be counted as nothing, and that she may even be deposed from her magnificence, she whom all Asia and the world worship.”***

**042 Glahn Art 1**

Egalitarian, Sandra Glahn says, *“Artemis of the Ephesians had many male followers and was not a man-hater. Numerous inscriptions give evidence of male devotees”* The Identity of Artemis, fn 42.

* + - **043 NT Art 2**
    - *“As befitted worshippers of a female deity, the priests were all women. They ruled the show and kept the men in their place.”* Surprised By Scripture, 80
      * Reminder, I cover NT Wright at YOUR request.
      * Were all the priests female?
      * Marg Mowczko (a strongly egalitarian scholar) said the following <https://margmowczko.com/1-timothy-212-pauls-view-women-in-ministry/>
        + **044 Marg 1**
        + “…I have found no evidence that women were generally considered superior to men in first-century Ephesian society. It is true that the high-priest of the cult of Artemis Ephesia was sometimes a woman, but more often than not, the high-priest was a man.” More on this here: <https://margmowczko.com/the-prominence-of-women-in-the-cultic-life-of-ephesus/>
* But these falsehoods continue to propagate.
  + It’s rather shocking how many egalitarian views are based on unproven claims about Artemis of Ephesus
  + Belleville claims the cult taught that women had authority over men.
  + Belleville, in “Discovering Biblical Equality” 3rd edition, 224
    - Just came out last year.
    - Here, she asks, why would women be teaching in a domineering fashion?
    - **045 B superior**
    - “A probable explanation is that the women were influenced by the cult of Artemis, in which the female was exalted and considered superior to the male.”
      * No footnote for this claim.
      * I see no evidence to support it in any of the primary sources. Zilch.
    - **046 B art 1**
    - “Instead of seeking fellowship among her own kind, Artemis spurned the attentions of the male gods and sought instead the company of a human male consort named Leimon.” Discovering, 224.
    - **047 B art 2**
    - “This made Artemis and all her female adherents superior to men—a belief that was played out at the festival of the Lord of Streets, when the priestess of Artemis pursued a man.” Discovering, 224.
      * This appears to be misinformation.
      * She offers **three** footnoted sources to support it.
        + First, Pausanias, Description of Greece 8.53.3

Found here <https://www.theoi.com/Text/Pausanias8C.html>

**048 Pau 1**

[8.53.1] LIII. Such is the inscription at Tegea on Philopoemen. The images of Apollo, Lord of Streets, the Tegeans say they set up for the following reason. Apollo and Artemis, they say, throughout every land visited with punishment all the men of that time who, when Leto was with child and in the course of her wanderings, took no heed of her when she came to their land.

Ironically, the term “Lord of the Streets” is in reference to Apollo, not Artemis.

Artemis only visited cities occasionally. Apollo was the city dweller.

Odd to see a festival as proof that women were superior to men when it was named after a male god they called “Lord of the Streets”

**049 Pau 2**

[8.53.2] So when the divinities came to the land of Tegea, Scephrus, they say, the son of Tegeates, came to Apollo and had a private conversation with him. And Leimon, who also was a son of Tegeates, suspecting that the conversation of Scephrus contained a charge against him, rushed on his brother and killed him.

The accusation was probably that he mistreated Apollo and Artemis’ mother.

**050 Pau 3**

[8.53.3] Immediate punishment for the murder overtook Leimon, for he was shot by Artemis. At the time Tegeates and Maera sacrificed to Apollo and Artemis, but afterwards a severe famine fell on the land, and an oracle of Delphi ordered a mourning for Scephrus. At the feast of the Lord of Streets rites are performed in honor of Scephrus, and in particular the priestess of Artemis pursues a man, pretending she is Artemis herself pursuing Leimon.

This festival

Not about women exercising authority over men and showing it by a priestess pursuing a man.

It was a memorial of Artemis shooting an arrow at a bad guy named Leimon who wrongly murdered his brother and wronged Artemis’ mother. No gender issues appear to be present.

“performed in honor of Scephrus”

The MAN who was murdered.

I’m not sure they did this festival in Ephesus anyhow.

Yet Belleville calls him a “consort”

Seems to conclude Artemis was showing female superiority by choosing a human consort. Odd.

* + - * + Second, Sharon Gritz, Paul, Women Teachers and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus, 31-41

This section of the book (in my library) does nothing to establish anything about female superiority over men.

* + - * + Third, “Artemis”, Encyclopedia Britannica

**051 Brittanica A**

I found what I think is the correct entry here. <https://www.britannica.com/topic/Artemis-Greek-goddess>

This entry has NO reference to women having superiority over men in the cult

I thought, maybe it was an in an earlier version of the article?

The edit history (available on the website) shows no prior version having it either.

It does identify her as a fertility goddess, but that has problems too.

**052 Glahn Art 2**

Sandra Glahn says, *“But the writers of this encyclopedia, as do contemporary tour guides, conflated the Ephesian Artemis with all other manifestations of Artemis over time. It was not the writers’ goal to identify the exact nature of this goddess at the time of Paul.”* Glahn, The Identity of Artemis in First-Century Ephesus, 324.

* + S. M. Baugh’s comments in “Women in the Church” seem true.
    - **053 Baugh 1**
    - *“Furthermore, it cannot be shown that worship of such deities, or of any female deity, translated into societal status, rights, or power for women in ancient societies. To say that it did in Ephesus because of the centrality of the worship of Artemis Ephesia is sheer speculation that runs counter to the facts.”* Women in the Church, 1st Edition, 32.
    - **054 Baugh 2**
    - *“For instance, one way to deny that this city was a bastion of women’s rights or that Artemis Ephesia was a fertility deity with eunuchs and sacred prostitutes among her cult personnel is by evaluating the evidence (or lack thereof) adduce by those who maintain the “feminist Ephesus” position. We would find it wanting.”* Women in the Church, 1st Edition, 14.
      * The lack of footnotes for many of the claims about the Artemis cult is telling.
  + The POWER of this historical filter combined with the LACK of evidence has led to scholarly innuendo.
    - Seems like a current trend among egalitarian scholars
      * innuendo of feminist overreach in Ephesus.
    - New book by Nijay Gupta, “Tell Her Story”
    - **055 Gup 1**
    - *“This central focus on Artemis along with the origin legend of the Amazons gave the city a unique quality of female empowerment.”* Gupta, Tell Her Story, 177.
      * Amazons?
        + Many cities were said to have been founded by Amazons.

None of them are said to have been places where women had power over men.

I’ve never seen evidence that belief in Amazons resulted in female empowerment like the kind of hyper-feminism Es need for this interpretation.

* + Were the priests “female only” as N.T. Wright says?
    - No.
      * Men and women priests
        + We even know the names of some of the male priests

Servilius Bassus was one of them under Augustus, around Jesus’ time.

Another male “priest of Artemis” was named C. Julius Atticus

Another was Apollonius Politicus.

For all three see Women in the Church, 38.

In the 2nd century, Achilles Tatuis wrote a romantic novel which has a male priest of Artemis.

* + - * “Kouretes”
        + A group, prominent in the cult.

We have years worth of lists of their names from the first century.

All male.

* + - The following is a 44AD source saying that city leaders (Koinon), who would have been male, were selling priestly positions to various men.
      * **056 Ieph**
      * *“The temple of Artemis herself—which is an adornment to the whole province because of the magnificence of the building, the antiquity of the worship of the goddess, and the abundance of the incomes granted to the goddess by the Emperor—is being deprived of its proper revenues. These had been sufficient for the maintenance and for the adornment of votive offerings, but they are being diverted for the illegal wants of the Koinon’s leaders, according as they consider will bring them profit… While using the appearance of the divine temple as a pretext, they sell the priesthoods as if at public auction. Indeed, they invite men of every kind to their sale, then they do not select the most suitable men upon whose heads the crown would fittingly be place. (Instead) they restrict incomes to those who are being consecrated to as (little) as they are willing to accept, in order that they themselves might appropriate as much as possible.”* IEph 17, 1-20
        + This is quoted from Baugh’s article “The Apostle Among the Amazons,” 166.
      * This establishes TWO things
        + 1 – The priests of Artemis are not all female

The terms here are generic, not feminine.

Generally used of men or of men and women inclusively.

* + - * + 2 – The male leadership of the city exercising authority over the cult.

The “koinon” according to Baugh, were male “city magistrates.” Women in the Church, 64.

* + - * + **057 G book**
        + I can add to this the research of Guy MacLean Rogers, in his book, “The Mysteries of Artemis at Ephesos,” who demonstrates that.

The Artemis cult was not primarily controlled by the priests and priestesses at this time. The ruling group of kouretes had even been relocated from the temple of Artemis to the house of the prytanis by Augustus, changing who controlled things in the temple.

Who is that?...

**058 G pryt**

*“The prytanis, as an elected official of the polis, reported not to the administration of the temple but to the Boule and to the demos.”*

Rogers, Guy MacLean. The Mysteries of Artemis of Ephesos (Synkrisis) . Yale University Press. Kindle loc. 2698.

**059 G art1**

*“they were deprived of the authority to prescribe categorically how her mysteries would be celebrated and so how the goddess would be defined at the celebration of her mysteries.”* Ibid.

**060 G art2**

*“The Kouretes took along with them the authority of the priests and priestesses of the Artemision to decide exclusively how the birth of Artemis was to be celebrated at the mysteries. By the end of the first century B.C., the prytanis supervised some of the most important rituals that took place during the celebration of Artemis’s mysteries, including the activities of the Kouretes.”* Rogers, Mysteries, loc. 2734.

* + - * **061 B this means**
        + *“Furthermore, the Persicus inscription demonstrates that officials in local government had direct control over access to the Artemisium’s priesthood.”* Baugh, Women in the Church, 38.
    - Baugh answers the question of who was in charge this way.
      * **062 B in charge**
      * *“What we find is something entirely expected for a Hellenic city of the imperial era: civil magistrates exercised supreme control over the Artemisium, while Roman governors actively meddled in their affairs.”* Women in the Church, 37.
    - Baugh goes through not only male priests but **men** serving with authority in a variety of other positions.
      * Such as the neopoioi, who functioned like a board of trustees for the temple property.
        + One, named Demetrius, some scholars think may have been the silversmith of Acts 19. (see Women in the Church, page 39 and footnote 36)
  + Here is some evidence that the city council (male) even regulated the female priestesses.
    - **063 Bau 1**
    - *“Apparently, the state council itself set the requisite donations and generosity for priestesses of Artemis, since another stone reads: “[ name lost] served as priestess of Artemis piously and generously . .  . and gave five thousand denarii to the city in accordance with the state council’s measure” (Neue Inschriften XI, 8, 176 [ca. AD 165]; emphasis added). We may suppose that the definition of “pious” priestly service at least partly included serving “generously.” And note again how the Ephesian state council (βουλή) was involved directly in the affairs of Artemis worship.”*
      * Women in the Church (Third Edition) (Kindle Locations 781-786). Crossway. Kindle Edition.
    - Baugh points out that in Paul’s time the Artemis of Ephesia had no female high priest.
      * Belleville responds
        + **064 B suburban**
        + *“Although Baugh is correct in saying that urban Ephesus lacked a high priestess during Paul’s day, he overlooks that suburban Ephesus did not. While Paul was planting the Ephesian church, Iuliane served as the high priestess of the imperial cult in Magnesia, a city fifteen miles southeast of Ephesus.”* Discovering Biblical Equality, 225.

But this feels like a dodge.

15 miles away

Different city

“Imperial cult” – which also was not a gynocracy

This also ignores the fact that lots of places which had female high priestesses didn’t have a belief that “women were superior to men.” Or result in feminism.

Often (not always) young girls.

* + - * Artemis had female and male priests, occasionally a female high priestess, a group of all males kouretes, but it was overseen, ultimately, by men, through the city rulers.
  + Even the book of Acts shows that Ephesus had male religious influence, not female
    - **065 B acts**
      * “Demetrius the silversmith and his guild (whom he addresses as andres, “men”) were in the marketplace deriving a lucrative profit from the Artemisium tourist trade (Acts 19:24-27). Luke also mentions the (male) Asiarchs who were members of the premier social circles in the province of Asia (Acts 19:31).” Baugh, The Apostle Among the Amazons, 158.
      * Baugh’s final point is only, and this matters, that “the Asiarchs were the social elite at Ephesus” – footnote 21 on pg 158
    - **066 B acts2**
    - “When we look further into Acts 19, we find hints of male involvement in Ephesian religious affairs. It was the Secretary of the People (γραμματεύς), certainly a man, who defused the excited mob in the theater by defending the goddess' honor (Acts 19:35-40). The Secretary mentions that Ephesus itself was "νεωκόρος of the great goddess" (Acts 19:35). This term, νεωκόρος, is frequently used for the individual or group charged with the oversight of a cult. Since women were not citizens of Greek πόλεις like Ephesus, it was the male citizen body of Ephesus—acting through its municipal officers, the γραμματεύς and the all-male βουλή ("State Council")—who claimed the oversight of the cult of Artemis Ephesia. We can safely infer from this slight NT evidence alone that religious affairs at Ephesus were not exclusively in the hands of women as the authors of Suffer Not a Woman allege.” Ibid. 158-9
      * Men all over the place.
  + There isn’t any evidence so far to substantiate the extreme claims.
    - **067 WB claims**
    - Wright – “*female-only cult,”* “*They* [women] *ruled the show and kept the men in their place.”*
    - Belleville – *“the women were influenced by the cult of Artemis, in which the female was exalted and considered superior to the male,” “This made Artemis and all her female adherents superior to men.”*
* Ephesus wasn’t JUST about Artemis; all manner of gods were worshipped there.
  + This leads us to an important question.
  + Did the religious environment of Ephesus in general support the view that there was a “hyper-feminist Ephesus” thing going on?
    - **068 B eph**
    - *“The majority of these deities, even the goddesses, were served by male priests at Ephesus, which is a bit unusual, since “a priestess very commonly officiated for goddesses and a priest for gods” in Greek cults, according to the leading authority on ancient Greek religion.”* Baugh, Women in the Church, 3d ed., 35.
      * Baugh is referring to Walter Burkurt here.
  + Nor does Ephesus have a disproportionately large number of females in high positions as compared to other, patriarchal cities of the time.
    - Women in high positions?
      * Some in association with a husband or father
      * Some too young to be in real power
      * Few that may have had power (though it seems unclear as to how much)
    - I’m not spending time on it here.
      * Not because I didn’t privately study the topic
      * It just doesn’t warrant a section in today’s video.
        + Not enough to establish a movement of hyper-feminism.
* Other ways to get an Artemis filter for 1 Tim.
  + Glahn: Paul starts 1 Tim with “God our savior” because Artemis was so often called “savior”
    - ***1 Timothy 1:1 (ESV) 1Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by command of God our Savior and of Christ Jesus our hope,*** 
      * Also in Eph 5:23; Phil 3:20; 1 Tim 2:3, 4:10; 2 Tim 1:10; Titus 1:3, 1:4, 2:10, 2:13, 3:4, 3:6
      * Of 24 uses of sotyr in the NT we have 12 from Paul
        + Only 3 of which are in 1 and 2 Timothy.
        + Titus alone has 6 uses.
  + Glahn: Paul mentions Adam and Eve to counteract the creation story of the Artemis cult in Ephesus.
    - **069 G creation**
    - “One might also see an Artemis influence in Paul’s reference to limiting women or wives teaching. He gives this reason for the restriction that he says is his practice: “For Adam was formed first, then Eve” (v. 13). To Jewish people, the Adam-and-Eve narrative was the old, familiar creation story. But for Gentiles—the focus of Paul’s ministry—the Genesis narrative was new. The non-Jewish members of Timothy’s spiritual community were well versed in a far different creation story. They had a special pride of place about this story, because they believed its events—known throughout the empire—took place near their city. In the Artemis cult’s origin narrative, the woman came first, and her twin, Apollo, followed. In Timothy’s context the creation story from Genesis contradicts the local story and would have served as a logical corrective. To the Ephesians, woman came first and was preeminent; to Jews, the woman was not only second, but she was even deceived. This is not to suggest Eve was a prototype of females’ sin. Rather, the facts about Eve knock women back to a place of equality with men.” Here, <http://aspire2.com/2022/01/artemis-of-ephesus/>
    - Belleville agrees with this basic idea.
      * **070 B creation**
      * *“An Artemis influence would help explain Paul’s correctives in 1 Timothy 2:13-15. It was believed that Artemis appeared first and then her male consort. However, the biblical story is just the opposite. Adam was formed first and then Eve (1 Tim 2:13). Then too, it was Eve who was deceived (1 Tim 2:14)—hardly a basis to claim superiority.”* Discovering Biblical Equality, 224.
    - This requires thinking two things
      * 1) The origin of Artemis story resulted in women dominating men.
        + Any evidence of this?

No.

Not of the causality or of the idea that women should dominate men in the Artemis cult.

* + - * + But, we have the same story of Artemis EVERYWHERE and no evidence of it having this impact.

**071 G backstory**

Glahn admits, *“Still, in the minds of those referring to her in the first and second centuries, Artemis Ephesia had the same backstory as every other Artemis.”* Glahn, Identity, 328.

Artemis worshippers around the Greco-Roman world didn’t take this as female superiority to males.

* + - * 2) The origin of Artemis is a natural correspondence to the creation story in Genesis.
        + It’s not.

Artemis starts there. Men and women don’t.

Artemis is defined there. Women are not.

It’s not a creation story and it’s artificial to compare it to Adam and Eve in 1 Tim 2.

* + - Conclusions Glahn has on vs 13-14.
      * 1- Paul isn’t offering principles, he’s offering a story.
        + Odd.
        + Either/or thinking.
      * 2- The story is not meant to show women are in any different role (related to authority) than men, it is to show they are equal. It counters the female superiority implied by the Artemis story and brings the genders back to equality, not to an imbalance.
        + Even IF Artemis is being contrasted with Eve, this isn’t an egalitarian contrast.
    - But
      * The Artemis story isn’t a creation narrative. Nor is it saying something about women in general.
        + Her mom, Leto, is pregnant with twins, from Zeus, and she gives birth to Artemis first, and Artemis (who, like other pagan gods, is born fully matured) helps with the 8-day labor of her brother, Apollo.
      * It’s NOT a man/woman couple.
        + It’s two gods who are siblings.
        + Belleville muddies this.

Again, **070 B creation**

*“It was believed that Artemis appeared first and then her male consort. However, the biblical story is just the opposite. Adam was formed first and then Eve (1 Tim 2:13).”* Discovering, 224.

Parallelomania.

* I don’t think egalitarians realize how RISKY this historical filter is.
  + They don’t just need feminist Ephesus.
    - They need HYPER-feminist Ephesus.
    - **071 Gup 2**
    - *“This could explain why Paul wrote to Timothy that he must intervene in a situation where Ephesian Christian women were trying to be domineering—not because they were striving for equality with the male leaders, but because they were trying to overpower them, influenced by a spirit of female strength.”* Gupta, Tell Her Story, 177.
    - Because, if it’s just an ancient version of egalitarianism, it backfires.
      * Paul is then reasserting complementarian views directly in response to feminism.
    - They need women DOMINEERING over men, not simply failing to believe in traditional roles.
      * But, there’s no support for such an extreme view.
* Other attempts to put Artemis in the background of 1 Tim
  + Taking a generic thing and trying to make it an Artemis thing
  + Gary Hoag
    - Quotes a work that shows women decorated their hair with gold during a festival to Artemis, and sees this practice in 1 Tim 2:9
      * His point: The hairstyle shows actual devotion to Artemis in particular, not just immodesty or some other generic issue.
      * Against:
        + 1- The text he quotes doesn’t show the hairstyles mean anything in relation to the cult.
        + 2- The text says that a reason they did this was because people would look for husbands/wives at this festival.
        + 3- It was common across that culture to consider such hairstyles immodest, without any reference to Artemis.
  + From Andrew Bartlett’s “Men and Women in Christ, 315.
    - **072 Bart 1**
    - *There are numerous implied cross-links between the text of 1 Timothy and the known religious life of Ephesus.*
      * Let’s look at 4 of them.
    - *1- “Deacons are required to hold to the mystery of the faith (3:9), not to the mysteries of Artemis and other pagan deities who were worshipped in Ephesus.”*
      * The use of “mystery”
      * Paul does seem to use this as a way of saying “Christ is better and true”
      * But, there were LOTS of mystery cults.
        + This doesn’t indicate Artemis.
    - *2- “Ephesians loudly claimed that Artemis was megas (‘great’ – Acts 19:27–28, 34–35), but Paul affirms that Jesus Christ, who embodied the mystery of godliness, is megas (1 Tim. 3:16).”*
      * It’s the mystery of godliness that is said to be great, not Jesus. Breaking the parallel.
    - *3- “The believers are the congregation of ‘a living god’ (3:15) not of a lifeless idol.”*
      * No contrast with idols is evident in this passage.
        + No specific indication of Artemis.
    - *4- “In 4:7–10 there is an implied contrast of true godliness with false teachings and devotion to Artemis (‘we have put our hope in a living god, who is a saviour of all people’).”*
      * A contrast with Artemis is assumed. Seemingly with the use of the terms “living God” and “saviour.”
        + Paul uses the phrase “living God” 6 times in total. One of them has a clear contrast with idols in general.

None of them with Artemis in particular.

* + - How many of these are uniquely related to Artemis?
      * None.
        + “great” “lord” “savior” “mystery” “idol”
    - How many, if related to pagan influence, are widely so?
      * All.
    - It doesn’t justify putting an Artemis filter over 1 Tim 2 such that it radically changes what would be the natural sense of the passage.
* If Artemis isn’t the overarching backdrop of false teaching, then what is?
  + Elements Paul targets
    - See 1 Timothy 1:3–11
      * Elements
        + Non-Christian doctrine.
        + Myths

Could be anything.

* + - * + Endless genealogies

Probably Jewish

No known relation to the Artemis cult

* + - * + Teaching the law (of Moses) wrongly

Where it should be used merely to expose sin and point to Christ.

* + - * All three of these make sense as Jewish related false teachings, not Artemis related ones.
    - 1 Timothy 4:1–5 (ESV)
      * Forbidding marriage
        + Artemis? One possible influence

But it’s underestablished.

* + - * + Ascetic influences were known to be a wide problem far beyond the influence of the Artemis cult.
        + Over-realized eschatology.
        + ***2 Timothy 2:18 (ESV) 18who have swerved from the truth, saying that the resurrection has already happened. They are upsetting the faith of some.***
      * Like in 1 Cor, an over-realized eschatology, leading to abstinence.
        + This isn’t specifically an Artemis thing, it’s a distortion of Christian doctrine.
        + This seems to be a major problem in Corinth.

This fits the 1st century evidence well.

* + - * Artemis isn’t mentioned explicitly or even implied in 1 Timothy.
      * 1 Tim 4 also mentions forbidding certain foods
        + Again, Jewish
        + Not in Artemis
    - ***1 Timothy 4:7 (ESV) 7Have nothing to do with irreverent, silly myths. Rather train yourself for godliness;*** 
      * Myths again.
        + Probably extrabiblical stuff in general, not specifically Artemis related.
    - 1 Timothy 6:3–5
      * Any “different doctrine”
        + Generic.
      * Teaching that neglects godly living.
      * Money grubbing.
        + Also generic
    - 1 Timothy 6:20–21
      * Avoid any detours into unestablished doctrines.

Conclusions

* Reading the Artemis cult into the background of 1 Tim 2 is unjustified.
  + We should at least avoid doing so to the point where it radically changes our interpretation of the passage.
    - And that’s what the E view needs.
* We don’t see any reason that this is what Paul was referring to.
* Such readings make up a fictional hyper-feminist Ephesus situation that didn’t really exist.
* Such readings not only ADD a context that isn’t there, but they also REMOVE the context that IS there.
  + Paul isn’t making a ruling based on Artemis but based on Eden.
* Finally,
  + Even IF there was a hyperfeminist Ephesus Paul was reacting to…
    - He doesn’t simply establish “egalitarianism.”
      * He establishes complementarianism.
        + Given the analysis of authentew
        + Women in general are not to teach or authentew over men.

Not just “false teach.”

* + - * + Women in general are to have observe complementarian submission.
* It’s time we come to what may be the center of the whole debate on this passage…

**073 IS “HAVE AUTHORITY” A WRONG TRANSLATION?**

* No exaggeration
* **074 Blom 2**
  + Craig Blomberg, *“With verse 12 we come to what may be the single most scrutinized verse of Scripture in recent scholarship.”* Two Views, 168.
  + Single word
  + Tons of scholarship/arguments
    - Going over it in detail… necessarily.
    - New scholarship
* Read it
  + ***1 Timothy 2:12 (ESV) 12I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet.***
* Why this word is the focus of a massive debate. (Lay of the land)
  + Happax legomena
    - Only in 1 Tim 2:12 in the NT
    - Not in the OT (LXX)
    - Only 8 times before 312.
  + Diverse definitions
    - Given definitions from varying scholars
      * **075 Auth def**
      * “to exercise authority”
      * “to assume authority”
      * “to incite violence”
      * “murder”
      * “to dominate/get ones way”
      * “perpetrator”
      * “originator”
      * “author”
      * They aren’t all legit.
        + Some scholars multiply meanings beyond necessity.
  + How it changes 1 Tim 2:12
    - **076 dif trans**
    - Belleville (E)
      * “I do not permit a woman to teach a man **in** **a** **dominating** **way**”
        + Two Views, 89.
    - Payne (E)
      * “I am not permitting a woman to teach and **assume** **authority** over a man”
        + Man and Woman, 443.
    - Kroeger (E)
      * “not to teach or to **represent** **herself** **as** **originator** **of** man.”
        + Good News for Women, 190.
    - Wilshire (E)
      * “I do not permit a woman to teach or **to initiate violence** over a man”
        + 1 Timothy 2:12 Revisited, 52.
    - Köstenberger (C)
      * “I do not permit a woman to teach or **exercise** **authority** over a man”
        + Women in the Church, Kindle loc. 3219.
  + Cs tend to agree on the meaning of the term
  + Es tend to have a variety of views… but…
    - One thing egalitarians usually agree on
      * Whatever it means, it’s pejorative.
        + Paul isn’t forbidding authority women from having authority over men but some specific bad act, or bad use of authority, such that would be wrong for men to do OR women to do.
* Two questions dominate our study
  + 1- Does it carry the meaning relating to “authority” or something else?
  + 2- Does it have either pejorative connotation?
* First, let’s look at a common, shocking claim.
  + That it means “murderer”
* Method 1 – Murderer
  + It was really used that way!
    - Usually, kin-murderer.
  + Authentew (the verb) comes from authentys (the noun)
    - The difference is important
      * The noun isn’t the verb
        + And some books and articles ignore this and cause confusion.
    - It shows up in lexicons.
      * **077 Lex murder**
      * LSJ
        + “One who commits a murder.”
      * Thayer’s Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament
        + “Earlier usage, one who with his own hands kills either others or himself.”
      * WSNTDNT
        + “Murderer, a self-appointed killer with one’s own hand”
  + We even have some ancient Greek sources that tell us it refers to murder!
    - **078 Old lex 1**
    - Harpocration (II AD)
      * Murder
    - Phrynichus (later II AD)
      * One who murders by his own hand
    - Hesychius of Alexandria (late IV AD)
      * Murderer
    - Aelius Dionysius (early II AD)
      * The murderer by his own hand
    - Notice that some of these are near Paul’s time.
  + How SOME Es use it.
    - Linda Belleville says…
      * **079 B pause**
      * *“…should give us pause in opting for the translation “to exercise or to have authority over.””* Belleville, Two Views, 83.
    - Wilshire implies we should see some meaning related to murder in 1 Tim 2!
      * **080 W reject**
      * Leland Wilshire says that he rejects the idea that *“the idea of murder is not integral to the basic meaning of the word”* Wilshire, Tim 2:12 Revisited, 44.
      * Weighs in heavily on his translation of “incite violence.”
    - Payne uses this to suggest a pejorative meaning.
      * **081 P negative**
      * *“As Chantraine noted, the αὐθέντ- root words are typically strong and emotionally-laden words with negative or dominating overtones such as: murderer, domestic murderer, perpetrator, or autocrat.”* Payne, Man and Woman, 363.
    - I’ve seen people online saying this alone proves 1 Tim 2 isn’t complementarian.
  + But this is all clumsy.
    - It leaves out important bits of information.
    - The first thing we need to understand is that there is more than one version of Greek.
  + 1- Classical Greek vs Koine
    - Classical Greek is not Koine Greek
      * **082 Moun classic**
      * Classical Greek (8th-4th BC) <https://www.billmounce.com/greekalphabet/greeklanguage>
      * In Paul’s time common people didn’t use Classical.
        + They used Koine.

Koine even means “common”

* + - * + Jay Treat tells us how these were different.

**083 Treat**

*“Generally, it may be said that there are many shifts in the meaning of words and in the frequency of their usage.”* <https://www.sas.upenn.edu/~jtreat/koine/classical.html>

* + - * + But! There were some people still using the classical definitions, in spite of the fact that normal people didn’t.

Like someone who uses Shakespearean language today.

* + - * Enter the “Atticists”
        + Who were they?

Not normal Greek speakers.

Writers who tried to ignore current usage of words and copy older Classical usage.

Every writer we have that uses authentys for murder is shows signs of this.

* + - * + **084 Wil class**
        + Wilshire says, “from the end of the first century BC, was the 'Atticist Movement' or 'Second Sophistic Movement' whose members argued that the only 'correct' Greek was the kind used by classical Attic writers.” Wilshire, Authentew in 1 Tim 2:12, 123.

This difference REALLY matters when it comes to understanding authentew.

What if it was only these Atticists who used authentys for “murder”?

Then it wouldn’t factor in to 1 Tim.

* + - * + It’s like someone trying to copy King James English when writing a story.

It’s not evidence of the current usage of a word.

* + - * + So, when evaluating word usage it’s important to ask if the author has “literary pretensions” meaning that they are trying to copy old Attic usage instead of current Koine usage.
      * Let’s ask the important question now.
        + Who in the period around the NT actually uses authentys for murder?
        + Multiple scholars agree that it was only “writers with literary pretensions”

For example, the Wisdom of Solomon 12:6.

**085 Wis 12 6**

*“These parents who murder helpless lives, you willed to destroy by the hands of our ancestors,”* Wis 12:6 (NRSV)

12:6 uses it in the old sense “kin-murderer”

It was written around 100 BC

Not properly part of the OT.

Whoever wrote the Wisdom of Solomon was trying to imitate Attic tragedians.

One scholar who has written on this is David Gill, and what he said is important.

**086 W Gill**

*“See D. Gill, ‘The Greek Sources of Wisdom XII 3-7’, VT 15 (1965), pp. 383-86. According to Gill, a striking feature of this passage is ‘the great number of words and phrases reminiscent of the language of Greek tragedy’ (p. 384), one example of which is authentys in v. 6 (p. 385).”* Wolters, A Semantic Study, 151.

To show how out of date this usage was we can see that ancient translations of the Wisdom of Solomon didn’t know that authentys even had that meaning.

**087 W wis of s**

The Old Latin (2nd century AD) translates it with “auctores,” probably meaning progenitors.

The Peshitta (II AD) skips over the word, implying the translators didn’t know what to do with it, perhaps because “masters” wouldn’t fit the context.

The Armenian has “masters/lords”

The Syro-Hexapla (Syriac) has “rulers” (VII AD)

The Arabic has “suicides”

* + - * This explains why some lexicographers still tried to tell people authentys meant “murder” even in the 2nd and 3rd centuries AD.
        + They were Atticists.

**088 W literary**

*“The former* [use of authentys as murderer] *is an Attic usage which was artificially kept alive by a few authors with literary pretensions, but which was no longer understood by the great majority of Greek-speakers.”* Wolters, A Semantic Study, 152.

* + - * + Let’s look at them in a bit more detail now.

Because some egalitarians don’t quote them in enough context.

* Ancient lexicographers defining authentys or authentew
  + **089 Atticists**
  + Phrynichus (later II AD)
    - Two different definitions
    - “one who murders by his own hand”
    - “master” (despotys)
      * Not a pejorative term.
    - More info:
      * **090 Phrynichus**
      * *“The late second century AD Grammarian Phrynichus, in his Ecloga (or Selections) writes that one should never utilize the word authentys to mean 'master' (despotys) as was done, he says, by the rhetoricians of his day in the courts of law, but one should use it only to define persons who murder with their own hand (Ecloga 96).”* Wilshire, Authentew in 1 Tim 2:12, 121.
        + What is remarkable here is NOT that he wants to define the term in what he thinks is an old Attic (and “proper”) way, it’s that he lets us know how others were actually using it.

“master”

Not pejorative.

* + Moeris (early III AD)
    - Said “Authentein” in Hellenic speech means “autodikein” in Attic.
    - More info:
      * Belleville skews this, I think.
      * **091 B Moeris**
      * Belleville says, “Second-century lexicographer Moeris states that authentēs has become commonplace for “dictator” and is no longer fit for the literary use of “murderer.”” DBE, 220.
        + Though I don’t see “dictator” as accurate.
        + She provided no source or footnote for this definition.
      * **092 LSJ autodikein**
      * LSJ defines autodikos as “within your own jurisdiction.”
      * We’ll come back to this one later
        + Since it’s one of the handful of early uses of the verb.
  + Hesychius of Alexandria (?- late IV AD)
    - **093 Hes lex**
    - Verb: “Authentein”
      * “to execute authority” (this is the term in 1 Tim 2:12)
    - Noun: “Authentys” gets three definitions. In this order of preference.
      * “one who executes authority”
      * “one who does things with his own hand”
      * “murderer”
    - More info:
      * The TOP one fits 1 Tim 2 quite well.
      * Wilshire says, *“He gives no reason for his listing although it may reflect his perception of the common usages of his day.”* Wilshire, 125.
      * These definitions do NOT bleed through to each other.
        + A common egal view.
  + Aelius Dionysius (early II AD)
    - **094 Lex dio**
    - Noun: “not the master, but the murderer by autocheira”
    - More info:
      * He’s an example of someone fighting against common usage to push for Atticist preferences that don’t reflect normal speech.
      * Wolters says,
        + **095 W point**
        + *“This point emerges clearly from a number of Atticistic lexical works, which warn their readers against using authentys in the current sense ‘master’, but are unclear on the proper Attic meaning of the word. One of the earliest of these is the lexicon of Aelius Dionysius (early second century AD), which explains authentys as meaning ‘not the master, but the murderer by autocheiria.” Wolters, A Semantic Study, 150.*

See, H. Erbse, *Untersuchungen zu den attizistischen Lexika* (Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1950), p. 111 (#194)

* + - * Again, the definitions don’t overlap.
    - **096 Quotes Attic**
      * “The lexica and scholia simply illustrate the fact that authentys in the meaning ‘kin-murderer’ was no longer a living part of the language after the turn of the era.” **Wolters**, A Semantic Study, 150.
      * “Needless to say, it is a great mistake to take the definitions and usages of the Atticists as a reliable guide to the meaning of authentys and its derivatives in Hellenistic Greek.” **Wolters**, A Semantic Study, 170.
      * “The difficulty of using these writers of the 'Atticist Movement' is that we cannot tell if they are using meanings that are still current in Greek vocabulary or whether they are in a 'make believe' land of an earlier 'pure' Attic language.” **Wilshire**, Authentew in 1 Tim 2:12, 122.
      * Douglas **Moo**, “…such condemnation, coming from Atticists, proves only that the word was part of the vernacular.”
    - Many NT lexicons don’t even include the murder definition.
      * They don’t see it as relevant to the NT.
        + You shouldn’t either.
    - Many scholars acknowledge this.
      * **097 Mow master**
        + Egalitarian, Mowczko, “‘master’ became the more usual meaning from the first century onwards in ordinary Koine (‘common’) Greek, gradually eclipsing any sense of ‘murderer.’” Marg Mowczko, <https://margmowczko.com/authentein-1-timothy2_12/>
* There are two different broad meanings for authentys
  + One is murder. Faded from the tongue of the common people by Paul’s time.
  + The other is master.
  + They don’t overlap.
* Sense #2 Master
  + Al Wolters did an extensive study of the use of the term through time.
  + 30 times before 312 AD.
    - **098 W examples**
    - Wolters, *“I have identified some 30 examples of this meaning in the extant Greek literature which predates AD 312. It should be pointed out that in none of these cases is ‘master’ used in the pejorative sense of ‘autocrat’ or ‘despot’. In fact, it is used twice in Christian contexts to refer to the lordship of Jesus Christ.”* Wolters, A Semantic Study, 148.
      * One disputed use in 5th century BC
      * 4 uses in 1st century AD
      * 22 in the 2nd
      * 3 uses in the 3rd
    - This seems totally independent of any “murder” or “criminal” connotations.
    - These examples are also closer in time to Paul.
    - They also exist in Koine Greek, instead of the primarily Classical usage of Authentys as murderer.
  + The E view doesn’t require us to think the word means “murder,” just that it is pejorative. Since the “murder” meaning doesn’t help us with that, Es offer a number of other pieces of evidence.
    - Belleville’s 2 examples of Astrological texts to show a pejorative meaning
    - Dorotheus of Sidon’s Astrologicum (likely a 1st century occurrence of authentys)
      * **099 B Doro**
      * “*The astrological texts.* Authentēs with the commonplace meaning “domineer” likely occurs in first-century AD astrologer Dorotheus of Sidon: “If Jupiter aspects the moon from trine . . . it makes them governors or judges of people or soldiers, especially if the moon is increasing; but if the moon is decreasing, it does not make them dominant [authentas] but subordinate” (hyperetoumenous).” Discovering, 216.
      * Simple contrast (the difference is the moon)
        + If Jupiter aspects the moon from trine

And the moon is INCREASING…

People will be

Governors or judges

But, if the moon is DECREASING…

People will be

NOT authentas

Subordinate.

* + - * + WHERE are we getting a pejorative meaning from?

Her translation – “dominant”

Which she takes to be pejorative.

* + - * + Authentas corresponds to governors and judges.

BEING a governor or judge

A positive thing.

A person in authority

* + - * + I read a bunch of this book to see if it would shed light on Belleville’s chosen example of authentys as a negative term.

Jupiter is causing this effect.

Jupiter is generally associated with positive things in Dorotheus.

Here’s a different section from Dorotheus with a similar idea.

**100 Carm1**

“If Jupiter aspects the moon from trine, it will increase the praise for the native and he will have rank and status. Look concerning what I told you at the time of the native’s fortune; one of these will be a leader, a chief for men, while another of them will be a leader in business, and another of them for commerce, and another of them in the leadership of armies, especially if the moon is increasing.” Carmen Astrologicum, 2.14.13-15.

Not a pejorative “dominate” but a positive “leading.”

* + - * We see the same idea again here.
        + Jupiter makes men prosperous. But if the moon is decreasing it results in harm.
        + **101 Carm2**
        + “If Jupiter aspects the moon from opposition while the moon is western [and] increasing in number, then he will be celebrated with respect to [his] livelihood, a famous man, and he will be one of those who relies on himself and will not obey another, especially if the Moon is less in degrees than Jupiter. If the Moon is greater in degrees, then it is harmful because [there will be] a decrease in [his] livelihood [and] afflictions and agony will come to him.” Carmen Astrologicum, 2.16.20-21.

The movement of the moon can flip the fate.

* + - * Jupiter has good effects, but the moon can overpower them.
        + **102 Carm3**
        + “Every time Jupiter aspects a star it turns it toward good… In every time and in every situation Jupiter is good because it increases the properness and good or diminishes from the evil and misfortunes and destroys them.” 5.30.9, and 12.

IN our original quote. Authentas seems to refer to having authority.

**099 B Doro**

If the moon is increasing then Jupiter’s impact makes the man an authority over people or soldiers.

If the moon is decreasing it undoes this and instead of being an authentas (one with authority) he becomes subordinate.

In other words, “subordinate” is undesirable, “authentas” is desirable and positive.

* + - Finally,
      * There’s a parallel text
        + attributed to Vettius Valens who wrote near the time of Dorotheus. It seems to say exactly what I’m suggesting Dorotheus is saying.
      * **103 W vet**
      * “There is also a text attributed to Vettius Valens, which uses authentikos [adjective] in a context much like that of the just-quoted paraphrase of Dorotheus:

“For if the Moon waxes, they will be *high-ranking* officers; if it wanes, they will be servants of the leaders.””

* + - * + Wolters, An Early Parallel, 683.
  + Belleville’s chosen example backfires.
  + A second example from Belleville is from Ptolemy.
    - But we will come back to that one later…
      * First, let’s talk about something called a “cognate”
        + It’s not a toothpaste.
* What is a cognate?
  + A “cognate” is a related word.
    - Like running is related to run. Or enchantment is related to enchant.
  + COGNATES push the usage of “authentys” as “master” back even further.
  + Why?
    - Authentew (authentein) in 1 Tim 2:12 is itself a cognate of the noun authentys
      * **104 W agree**
      * “…scholars are in broad agreement that αὐθεντέω is derived from that noun [authentys].” Wolters, Women in the Church, 67.
    - We’ll look at several examples which come chronologically after authentys and are derived from it.
    - **105 W cognates**
      * Authentikos – “authoritative”
        + More info:

First appearance 2nd century BC

Letters of Cicero (I BC)

*Tetrabiblos* of Ptolemy (II AD)

And later patristic and astrological literature.

Cicero, *Att.* 9.14.2 and 10.9.1; Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatika* (*Tetrabiblos*) 4.3.6 (p. 178 in the Boll–Boer edition); .4.11 (p. 184); 4.7.5 (p. 195); 4.7.10 (p. 197); 4.10.9 (p. 207). See also Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.7.38.6, and Vettius Valens, *Anthologiae, Appendix I* (ed. D. Pingree; Leipzig: Teubner, 1986), 381.21. Origen, *Fragmentum 116 in Lamentationes* (*PG* XIII, col. 660B), also published in *Origenes Werke* (GCS, 3; ed. E. Klostermann; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1901), 277.7.

It can also mean “original” as in a “master-copy” of a document. Especially applied to legal documents.

**106 W authentikos**

“As a number of scholars have pointed out, authentikos meaning ‘original’ is based on the meaning ‘authoritative’.” Wolters, A Semantic, 154 [see footnote 55 there]

* + - * Authentia
        + More info:

“The abstract noun authentia… almost always refers to authority or sovereignty, and is thus also clearly based on authentys ‘master’.” Wolters, A Semantic, 161

1st attestation 3 Macc 2.29.

I BC

Pejorative?

**107 W never**

“To the best of my knowledge it is never used in a pejorative sense before AD 312, and very rarely thereafter.” Wolters, 161.

* + - * Authentysis – “exercise of authority”
      * Authentria – feminine equivalent of master, “mistress.”
    - They all are based on a meaning related to “master”
      * Use of cognates isn’t always helpful. I’ve seen it abused. But, here it is helpful.
      * **108 W all**
      * “the senses of the derivatives, as Chantraine has pointed out, are all based on authentys in the meaning ‘master’.” Wolters, 153.
        + And “murder” or any pejorative meaning isn’t present.
    - They show up quite early!
      * Here’s how this works.
        + Since they (1) show up early and (2) are based on already using authentys to mean “master” then (3) authentys must be known to mean “master” by the time these derivatives show up.
        + Therefore, we can push back the usage of authentys as “master” to at least the earliest usage of a derivative of this.

This pushes against the view some Es take.

That the word didn’t mean that till just after Paul.

* + - * **109 W results**
      * “The result of our survey of the derivatives of authentys is that they are indeed all dependent for their meaning on authentys ‘master’. We thus find further confirmation of the earlier conclusion that it was only in the meaning ‘master’ that authentys was part of the living language after the classical period.” Wolters, A Semantic Study, 163.
* This seems to help us answer another E method of avoiding “authority” as the meaning in 1 Tim.
  + Confusion.
    - **110 Wil confuse**
    - “Sometimes this type of study yields a coherent picture, other times a barely discernable image. I am afraid that with I Tim. 2:12 we have more of the latter than the former.” Wilshire, 1 Timothy 2:12 Revisited, 44.
      * We just don’t know what it means because it’s used in so many ways.
    - It’s really odd that Wilshire says this.
      * Because so many read his analysis and concluded it supported the meaning of “authority”
        + He had to write an additional paper saying he didn’t.

It seems the evidence spoke for itself but he opted for “instigate violence”

Based purely on the context of 1 Tim 2:12!

We’ll get to that later.

* We discussed the noun but what about the VERB authentew (which we find in 1 Tim 2:12)?
  + **111 Wil authority**
  + Wilshire, “There are authors, roughly contemporaneous with Paul (Apollonius Rhodius, Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Flavius Josephus, Appian of Alexander, Philo Judaeus, LXX-Wis), who use the word almost exclusively with the meaning of 'to murder/murderer' or 'to perpetrate a crime/perpetrator of a crime'. **But there are, however, a series of citations immediately before, during, and after the time of Paul where some sort of meaning connected with 'authority' is found for the word *authentew).*”** Wilshire, The TLG Computer and to Authentew in 1 Timothy 2.12, 130.
  + Wilshire’s conclusions.
    - **112 Wil conclusion**
    - “In conclusion, the 314 literary citations of the TLG computer (plus the pertinent preferences in BAGD analysed by Knight along with others found in the papyri) may be of help in understanding the meaning of 1 Tim 2. 12. Sometime during the spread of koine, the word *authentew* went beyond the predominant Attic meaning connecting it with murder and suicide and into the broader concept of criminal behaviour. It also began to take on the additional meanings of 'to exercise authority/power/rights' which became firmly established in the Greek Patristic writers to mean 'to exercise authority'.” Ibid., 131.
      * Side note: he does not make a case for either a pejorative OR ingressive meaning when the term is being used to refer to “authority”
        + It seems our options, on Wilshire, are

1) criminal behavior (with illegal connotation)

2) or exercise authority (without negative or ingressive connotation loaded into it).

Which better fits 1 Tim 2:12?

* This is going to get complicated… right now.
  + When we come to the only 8 times the verb is used before 312 AD.
* Method 2 – interpreting the very few examples we have prior to 312 AD.
  + Comp view
    - Wolters will say these do not show negative connotation.
  + Egal view
    - They are negative or pejorative, so 1 Tim 2:12 is likely negative as well.
    - **113 West corpus**
    - “In the Greek corpus, the verb αὐθεντέω refers to a range of actions that are not restricted to murder or violence. However, the people who are the targets of these actions are harmed, forced against their will (compelled), or at least their self-interest is overridden, because the actions involve the imposition of the subject’s will over against the recipient’s will, ranging from dishonor to lethal force.” Westfall, Paul and Gender, 292.
    - And Belleville – speaking of several of these 8 examples
      * **114 B fact**
      * “In fact, all known extrabiblical instances of authentein (rare though they be) prior to the second century AD without exception have to do with power or domination.” Two Views, 95-6.
    - Are all those pejorative?
      * Westfall “forced against their will (compelled)”
      * Belleville “have to do with power”
      * In a modern view perhaps. Not biblical.
        + That’s not pejorative. It could be a simple use of authority.

The govt. forces people not to commit crimes. That’s good.

* + - * + 1 Cor 5:1-5
        + 2 Cor 13:1 of those who are sinning “I will not spare them”

Paul saw this as a positive use of authority.

Yet it was about using his power against their will.

* 1- Philodemus, De Rhetorica 2.133
  + This use can’t help us.
    - The text survives in a handmade copy that has multiple issues.
      * 1- Lack of spaces
        + Leaves it open to be reconstructed in various ways, so that we aren’t sure the word is even being used.
      * 2- This copy may not represent the original
        + Scholars have good reason to question whether the hand written copy is an accurate reproduction of the original. See Women in the Church, 72.
      * **115 W nope**
      * Wolters says, “In any case, given the obscurity and fragmentary character of this text, its hypothetical occurrence there cannot make any reliable contribution to determining its meaning.” Women, 73.
        + Belleville agrees that “the text too fragmented to be certain.”
* 2- The Papyrus BGU 1208.38
  + 26/7 BC (before Paul)
  + This one was really hard for me to figure out. But now I’m really excited to share it with you.
  + Different scholars have wildly different claims about it.
  + I’ll just show you the passage and you can see how odd it sounds.
    - The writer of the letter is a guy named Tryphon, he writes to a guy named Asclepiades.
    - **116 1208 ital**
      * **“And since *I had* *exercised*/*asserted authority* toward him, he agreed within the hour to secure for Kalatytis the boatman at the same fare.”** BGU 1208.38-42, translated by Gary Manning. (Italics mine)
    - Payne
      * **117 P theory**
      * “It relates an incident when a slave of Asklepiades refused to pay the boatman Calatytis his boat fare. Tryphon writes an apology to the slave’s owner, explaining that when he intervened, acting with self-assumed authority (αὐθεντηκότος) over the slave, he consented to pay within the hour.” Payne, Man and Woman, 365.
        + 4 major claims to show that authentew here is negative and unauthorized.
      * 1. The guy is a slave
        + **118 P t2**
        + **“And since *I had* *exercised*/*asserted authority* toward him [slave], he agreed within the hour to secure for Kalatytis the boatman at the same fare.”**
        + No evidence cited.
      * 2. Specifically, a slave of Asclepiades.
        + **119 P t3**
        + **“And since *I had* *exercised*/*asserted authority* toward him [slave of Asclepiades], he agreed within the hour to secure for Kalatytis the boatman at the same fare.”**
        + No evidence cited.
      * 3. The letter is an apology from Tryphon to Asclepiades.
        + No evidence cited.
        + Just that another scholar, Werner, thought so.
      * 4. The thing Tryphon made this slave agree to do is pay money to the boatman.
      * So Tryphon, the writer of the letter, is something of a stranger to Asclepiades. He overstepped and ordered Asclepiades’ slave around and now he writes a letter to apologize for that.
        + Payne quotes John Werner to support this. Showing that Werner views the passage this way. But there’s no evidence given to prove these claims.
        + All this is to show that authentew is being used in a negative sense.

“self-assumed authority” that wasn’t properly given.

So 1 Tim 2:12 can just be a statement that women can’t take authority without being properly given it.

So, she can be an elder, just not self-appointed.

* + - Belleville has different claims (Discovering Biblical Equality, 217-18)
      * Tryphon is actually the *brother* of Asclepiades.
        + “[Trypho]n, to his brother”
      * He writes to his brother to update him about a payment problem in the family business.
      * Her translation is “Since I took a firm stand with him”
      * She argues that the meaning “authority” is not in the passage. Just one guy forcing another guy to do something. So, it’s about “power or control” but not authority.
        + She says the event is too “mundane” for it to be about authority.
        + **120 BGU Bel2**
        + “Yet this hardly fits the mundane details of the text (i.e., payment of a boat fare).” Ibid. 104.
        + **121 B nothing**
        + “There is therefore nothing in the correspondence that warrants a translation such as “exercise authority over him.” DBE, 218.
        + This is part of her case that

**122 B no warrant**

“So there is no first-century warrant for translating authentein as “to exercise or have authority over” and for understanding Paul in 1 Timothy 2:12 to be speaking of the carrying out of one’s official duties. Rather the sense in everyday usage is “to dominate,” “to get one’s way.”” Belleville, Two Views on Women in Ministry, 86.

She believes that the meaning “authority” comes only after Paul.

* + - Wolters has different claims about this papyrus.
      * His translation is
        + **123 Wol 1208 2**
        + “Since I had authority with respect to him, he immediately granted Kalatytis the ferryman a concession [which allowed the latter] to make a profit at the same rent.” Women in the Church, 73-4.
      * No mention of Tryphon being a brother of Asclepiades.
        + He says Tryphon may have been a senior official of the Roman taxation bureaucracy.
        + If so, he’s in a position of authority over Antilochos.
        + Antilochos is raising government rates on Kalatytis, the boatman.
        + Tryphon flexes his authority over Antilochos to keep the rates down and help Kalatytis.
      * He sees this use of authentew as a positive use of authority, from Tryphon’s perspective because…
        + **124 Wol pos**
        + “Although Tryphon appears to have overruled Antilochos, nothing in the context suggests that he did so without just cause; in fact, he seems to have been protecting Kalatytis from the notoriously extortionist practices of the τελῶναι. In any case, since Tryphon used αὐθεντέω to describe his own behavior, the verb unlikely had a pejorative connotation.” Women in the Church, 75.
    - **125 Bart 2**
    - Andrew Bartlett said, “Payne’s interpretation and Wolters’ interpretation are so different one would hardly know that the same text was under consideration.” Bartlett, Men and Women, 463.
      * Who’s right?
        + Nobody provides the full context of the letter.
        + It seemed like a lot of conjecture to me.
      * I searched for an English translation of the whole papyrus
        + Nope
        + One nerdy website had some Greek guys debating it and they seemed to conclude “until we get a translation of the whole papyrus we won’t know.
* So, I hired a scholar who handles ancient Greek papyri to translate it.
  + Gary Manning.
    - **126 Man pap**
    - Contribution to scholarship.
    - Linked below.
* Here’s what I learned.
  + There’s a lot of damage on this papyrus
    - **127 BGU 1208**
    - It contains a lot of special terms related to business
    - But the section we care about is largely intact.
    - And it’s part of a group of 7 letters that, together, give us a good deal of info to clarify the meaning, and rule out some wrong opinions.
      * Manning provided translations for all of this.
      * And full commentary, even interaction with Payne, Belleville, and Wolters.
* My summary
  + Tryphon does call Asclepiades his brother, but this is an informal title.
    - Another letter in this collection (BGU 1209) shows they aren’t literally brothers.
    - Tryphon does work for Asclepiades in his family business.
      * 3 of the 7 letters in this collection are between the two of them.
  + This letter is about resolving a business dispute about costs related to ferrying sheep across the Nile.
  + Asclepiades had some sheep shipped across the Nile. But after the fact, his bill was bigger than it was supposed to be. It seems that someone increased the costs.
    - Probably a guy named Antilochos. Who, in the letter, “imposed” fees related to shipping sheep across the Nile.
  + But, according to Tryphon, the payment they previously agreed on was increased by Antilochos. Tryphon has been working to resolve this problem and writes the letter to update Asclepiades that he has achieved some success.
  + This letter isn’t an apology, it’s a report of some measure of success about this business problem.
  + In the letter, we learn that when he found out the rate had been increased Tryphon had Asclepiades hold back payment. Just like you might stop payment on a bill that’s over the agreed-on amount. This may have been to give him time and leverage to get the rate back down to the lower amount the previously agreed on.
  + During this time Tryphon went to the cops.
    - **128 Man 1**
    - “Tryphon to the brother, greetings and good health always. After arriving from the inland/upper [regions], I acquired through Soterichos [6 lett.] the note which you had sent by his people, in which you asked [me] about the error/fraud of Kalatytis, which, after reading, I [informed?] the *strategos*, because of the hatred of evil he has…”
      * This isn’t “mundane” like Belleville claimed. It’s a very official, legal problem.
  + Then Tryphon talks about a meeting he had to resolve the issue.
  + The passage
    - **129 Man 11**
    - **“And since *I had* *exercised*/*asserted authority* toward him, he agreed within the hour to secure for Kalatytis the boatman at the same fare.”** BGU 1208.38-42, translated by Gary Manning. (Italics mine)
      * Probably Antilochos.
  + He tells Asclepiades that the lower payment has been agreed to by the person in charge of setting the rates for such things (probably Antilochos). Tryphon used some sort of authority he had over him to get him to agree to the lower payment.
    - Could be two things.
      * The strategos
      * The stopped payment
    - Authentew is in the perfect tense here.
      * **130 Man 6**
      * **“A common way that a perfect tense functions is to describe a condition or state that exists because of a prior event. That seems to fit the context here. Tryphon did not inherently have authority over Antilochos, but in the recent past he brought to bear two means of authority: he made a complaint to the *strategos*, and he and Asclepiades withheld payment on this contract. These two actions result in him now having some ability to push Antilochos to agree to terms that Tryphon thinks are fair. The translation “Since I had exercised authority” or “since I had asserted authority” thus seem to be consistent with this sense of the passage.”** Manning, BGU 1208, 5.
        + So, it’s not that Tryphon was using authority in that moment, it’s that he had already used it.
* Manning says that Payne’s analysis “has a number of mistakes” (Payne’s view is in Man and Woman 365-70)
  + **131 P slave 3**
  + 1- Antilochos is a slave - “a slave of Asclepiades refused to pay Catalytis his boat fair”
    - **132 Man 2**
      * **“No slave is mentioned in the papyrus”** Manning, BGU 1208: Translation and Explanation, 6.
      * **“He apparently set prices over docking and negotiated other aspects of the contract, and is not a slave.”** Ibid.
      * Incidentally he doesn’t need to pay Kalatytis, he needs to agree on the rate of the shipping costs.
  + 2- Payne claims Asclepiades is the owner of the slave
    - **133 P slave**
    - Payne, “Just as Americans normally refrain from disciplining other people’s children, so Romans ordinarily refrained from commanding other people’s slaves. That is why the author feels a need to send the slave’s owner an apologia, an explanation of the circumstance.” Payne, Man and Woman, 367.
      * This reconstruction is completely wrong. So his interpretation of authentew is wrong.
    - The guy (Antilochos) is not Asclepiades’ slave. He is a third party who sets rates for shipping costs.
    - It’s actually Tryphon who works with or for Asclepiades.
  + 3- Payne, says this letter is an **apology** from Tryphon to Asclepiades
    - **134 Man 3**
    - **“Further, this is not an apology letter at all. It would be more accurate to say Tryphon is reporting some limited success in resolving several business difficulties.”** Manning, BGU 1208, 6.
    - This is important because Payne bases his claim that this is a pejorative use of authentew on the claim that the letter is an apology. Tryphon is saying he is sorry for doing authentew.
    - **135 P slave 2**
    - “His letter of apology to the slave’s owner confirms that he had no such authority.” Payne, Man and Woman, 368.
      * Manning’s analysis flips that upside down.
        + Tryphon’s biggest success is in his use of authentew. It’s a good thing from his and Asclepiades’ perspectives.
        + **136 Man 4**
        + **“Payne suggests that Tryphon did not have any authority over the (mislabeled) slave, and so he must have assumed that authority improperly. Without assuming much about the meaning of αὐθεντέω, it is clear that Tryphon’s previous legal actions explain Tryphon’s authority. Tryphon’s overall tone suggests that he believes his actions were correct, and he believes the other side is guilty of fraud.”** Manning, BGU 1208, 7.
* What about Belleville’s view?
  + Belleville has different claims (Discovering Biblical Equality, 217-18)
    - Tryphon is actually the *brother* of Asclepiades.
      * “[Trypho]n, to his brother”
        + Informal title.
    - He writes to him to update him about a payment problem in the family business.
      * True.
    - Her translation is “Since I took a firm stand with him”
      * True-ish.
      * She excludes authority.
        + **137 Man 5**
        + **“Belleville suggests the translation “since I took a firm stand with him.”47 Although “firm stand” gives the general idea of what Tryphon did, it does not adequately account for the legal steps that Tryphon has taken. It is not merely that Tryphon spoke firmly on this occasion; he had previously taken legal actions that gave him the advantage.”** Manning, BGU 1208, 6.
        + Proving that it’s not “too mundane” of a situation to mean authority.
        + Nor is it about forcing his way without rightful authority.
* **138 M 1**
* **“Many of Wolters’ comments on BGU 1208 are quite reasonable. However, his “hypothetical background” does not seem to fit information found in the rest of this letter or in the other family letters. Wolters acknowledges that his reconstruction is tentative.”** Manning, BGU 1208, 7.
  + Wolters’ suggestion that Tryphon was a “senior official of the Roman taxation bureaucracy” is wrong because…
    - 1- Such officials tend to use their titles when writing letters like this. (see Manning, 7)
    - 2- This letter and the other two in this collection between Asclepiades and Tryphon prove he works for Asclepiades in the family business.
  + Wolters thought Antilochos was a “tax farmer” but Manning says he is a government official who sets rates for dock rentals and ferry charges but isn’t a tax farmer (see Manning, 7)
  + Wolters said Tryphon was trying to keep Kalatytis from losing money but the letter shows his primary concern is saving money for Asclepiades. (Ibid.)
  + While Manning corrects Wolters hypothetical background for this letter, he thinks Wolters is correct that this is authentew as positive use of authority. (Ibid.)
* Side issue
  + Belleville and Payne also have claims that “toward him” or “over him” is incorrect.
    - “Pros auton”
    - Manning deals with that on page 6.
* Conclusions on BGU 1208
  + **116 1208 ital**
    - **“And since *I had* *exercised*/*asserted authority* toward him, he agreed within the hour to secure for Kalatytis the boatman at the same fare.”** BGU 1208.38-42, translated by Gary Manning. (Italics mine)
  + This use of authentew, from before Paul is a positive use of authority.
  + It might be ingressive. “asserted”
    - If an ingressive sense is there, “asserted,” then it is rightful and not the egalitarian view of “taking authority without it being properly delegated.”
    - If it has the same meaning in 1 Tim 2:12 then it’s “become” not “presume”
  + There’s a ton more. I’ve left out a lot for simplicity’s sake.
    - You can read it yourself in the links below the show or on biblethinker.org
    - Anyone reading Wolters on this should read Manning.
* **3- The Astrological Treatise Methodus Mystica**
  + C. 1 AD.
    - Some people have neglected this passage since George Knight mistakenly dated it to the 1500s. A number of scholars before and after this have shown why it is from far earlier. See Wolter’s paper on this <https://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/54/54-4/JETS_54-4_673-684_Wolters.pdf>
  + The larger section gives seven different fates for people depending on where planets are.
    - * + 1) Leader and ruler
        + 2) royal man
        + 3) great man
      * The last four of the seven are in this quote.
        + The list of seven fates seems to flow in a generally negative direction, the worst of all being the last.
      * **139 Herm**
      * “Hermes in the post-ascension of the place of access signifies a common laborer; and if it is in the bounds of Ares, it signifies one making a living from fire or iron. But if in the bounds of Kronos [it signifies] a manager [making a living] from theft or waterside trades. But if the benefic planets are in quartile aspect [it signifies] the one who is superior to the foregoing [τὸν τούτων αὐθεντοῦντα] in his occupation, and yet earns nothing.” Women in The Church, 76.
        + The worst one, the last one, seems to describe a slave.

There are two different translations I’ve seen for this.

“superior” to other people in occupation

“full command” of artisan occupations.

* + - * This is a strange text. But, it shows a contemporary use of authentew with no negative connotation.
        + It’s saying something **positive**… though what follows is negative.
        + Minimally, there is no negative connotation here.
    - 4- Aristonicus Alexandrines, On the Signs of the Iliad, I.694 (9.694)
      * C. 1 AD.
      * αὐθεντῶν
      * Of the person speaking, describing them as the one whom the words “originate” from.
        + Wolters translation, “the *originator* of the speech” [ὁ αὐθεντῶν τοῦ λόγου] (Wolters)
        + Wolter’s says this occurs in later Greek as well.

“The meaning “originate” for αὐθεντέω, construed (as here) with the genitive of a noun describing a belief or action, also occurs in later Greek.” Women in the Church, 77. (also see fn there)

* + - * Belleville translation, “author”
        + PROBLEM – Belleville said every example had to do with power or domination. This one does not. It has, on her translation, to do with authorship. On Wolters’, with origination.
      * **No negative connotation** here
      * Is “author” related to “authority”?
        + Primary responsibility or control over something.
        + Several scholars say yes.

Wolters, A Semantic Study, 154, fn 55.

* + - * Doesn’t seem much like 1 Tim 2:12.
        + But it’s not negative.
    - **5- Ptolemy, Tetrabiblos 3.13.10**
      * C. 140 AD
      * This is one of Belleville’s examples of authentew being used in a negative way for “domineer.”
      * **140 B Ptol**
      * “the context in Ptolemy’s second-century work Tetrabiblos 3.13 is clear. The verbal adjective authentēsas with the sense “domineer” parallels “dictatorial” (epitaktikous).” Discovering Biblical Equality, 216.
        + It appears at paragraph 158/page 341 here [https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Ptolemy/Tetrabiblos/3D\*.html#13](https://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/E/Roman/Texts/Ptolemy/Tetrabiblos/3D*.html#13)
      * **141 FE sat**
        + From F.E. Robins translation, “If Saturn alone is **ruler** of the soul and **dominates** [authentytas] Mercury and the moon, if he has a dignified position with reference to the universe and the angles, he makes his subjects lover of the body, strong-minded, deep thinkers, austere, of a single purpose, laborious, dictatorial, ready to punish, lovers of property, avaricious, violent, amassing treasure, and jealous…” Tetrabiblos, 339-40. Emphasis mine.
        + Dictatorial doesn’t parallel authentysas in this passage.

The parallel is “ruler”

**142 FE sat2**

I see no reason to think any word in the list of attributes a soul gets from Saturn is paralleled in the relationship of Saturn with the moon and mercury.

Saturn having influence over/being in control of the moon and mercury is just the precondition for the list. It’s not that the nature of Saturn’s behavior toward these other bodies becomes one random element of the list and not the others.

* + - * + Belleville adds another support for a pejorative meaning.

**143 B sat abuse**

“The extended context makes plain that Saturn’s domination results in abusive, not beneficent, consequences.” DBE, 216.

But the list isn’t all negative.

“lover of the body” = healthy

“strong-minded”

“deep thinker”

“austere”

“of single purpose”

But she has a different translation!

**144 B Saturn**

“If Saturn alone **takes planetary control** [tēn oikodespotian] of the soul and **domineers over** [authentēsas] Mercury and the moon,” humanity is negatively affected, “**making [them]** lovers of the body, **obstinate**, **harsh**, **opinionated**, **troublemakers**, dictatorial [epitaktikous], ready to punish.”

DBE, 216-7.

**145 B Saturn FN**

And footnote: F. E. Robbins, Ptolemy, Tetrabiblos, LCL (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1948), 339n1. (DBE 698)

This is the same as my copy.

**146 oopsy**

“strong-minded” becomes “obstinate”

“deep thinker” becomes “harsh”

“austere” becomes “opinionated”

“of single purpose” becomes “troublemakers”

* + - According to Wolters’ survey Ptolemy uses the term authentikos [adjective] 5 other times in that same work.
      * I checked all five.
        + More here (see pg 684 and footnote 65 - <https://www.etsjets.org/files/JETS-PDFs/54/54-4/JETS_54-4_673-684_Wolters.pdf>
      * None are pejorative.
        + **147 Ptol 5**
        + 1. “independence” (as contrasted with dependence) 4.3.6

A positive connotation

* + - * + 2. “independent” (as contrasted with subordinate) 4.4.11

A positive connotation

* + - * + 3. “authority” 4.7.5

A positive connotation

* + - * + 4. “principle” (of places/locations) 4.7.10

Not pejorative

* + - * + 5. “the mastery and direction [authentikos] of its actions” 4.10.9

Direction of actions. (coupled with “mastery”)

A positive connotation

* + - * + Note: it’s not the noun but a cognate related to it.
      * Ptolemy doesn’t seem to use the term as negative.
        + Enlarge the font of the text below here to see the Ptolemy references with more detail.
      * Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatika* (*Tetr.*) 4.3.6 (AD 152–178)\*
        + “For if their attendance consists of planets of the same sect, or of the beneficent planets, greater **independence** and **security** will attend the dignities; but if it involves the opposite sect, or the maleficent planets, there will be **dependency** and **less** **security**.

Where authentikwteron is directly contrasted with “dependence”.

Definitely not pejorative.

Authority? Control?

* + - * Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatika* (*Tetr.*) 4.4.11\*
        + “For when they are rising or angular the actions which they cause are independent [authentikos], but if they are setting or declining from the angles, subordinate.” Ibid., 391.

No pejorative connotation is implied. It’s even unlikely since the counterpoint to “subordinate” isn’t “pejoratively using authority.” AND the situation describes is applied, in the rest of the section, to benefic and malefic planets, meaning that “authentikos” is either positive or capable of being applied to both positive and negative points.

* + - * Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatika* (*Tetr.*) 4.7.5\*
        + “must be assigned the greater authority [authentikwteron] and direction over friendship or enmity.” Ibid., 417.

This one is just translated as authority.

F.E. Robins further goes to show that isn’t a new understanding. He says that this text was paraphrased by the 5th century philosopher, Proclus, as “For that place will have the greater authority over…” (using the term “dunatwteron”)

* + - * Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatika* (*Tetr.*) 4.7.10\*
        + “the principle [authentikois] places” Ibid., 421.

Not pejorative.

Are these places in some sort of authority in relation to the nativity? This text is rather confusing.

* + - * Ptolemy, *Apotelesmatika* (*Tetr.*) 4.10.9\*
        + “the mastery and direction [authentikos] of its actions” Ibid., 445.
        + This text includes authentikos as a natural pair with “mastery” [despotikon].
        + Further, the context seems to be positive.
      * Wolter’s adds to the case that this isn’t a negative use.
        + **148 W Tetra 2**
        + “Because Saturn’s rulership in this case is associated with making people “lovers of the body,” some have argued that αὐθεντέω must have a pejorative connotation. But this is not the case, since in astrology the same words for planetary influence are used regardless of whether it has a positive or negative effect on people. Besides, in this case, αὐθεντέω describes a relationship not between Saturn and people but between Saturn and other planets.” Wolters, Women, 78.
      * He further says that this usage is a LOT like 1 Tim 2:12 because
        + Saturn is being spoken of with anthropomorphic terms
        + So this is a PERSONAL use of the word, rather than a non-personal.

Technically, “a genitive of the person… not a genitive of the thing.” Women, 79.

* + - * From what I can tell, this one isn’t positive or negative, just factual.
    - 6- Moeris Atticista, Lexicon Atticum s.v. αὐτοδίκην
      * 2nd or early 3rd century AD.
      * We dealt with this one earlier, where Belleville seems to have given it a pejorative meaning (dictator) without justification.
      * **149 W Moer**
      * “This may be translated as follows: “Αὐτοδικεῖν [‘ to plead one’s own cause’] in Attic [is] αὐθεντεῖν [‘ to act on one’s own’] in Hellenic Greek.”” Wolters, Women in the Church, 79.
      * Wolters offers three other ancient lexicons to support this non-pejorative definition. “act on one’s own” (in court)
        + See his work for details, here’s the summary.
        + **150 Wol act**
        + “On the basis of the foregoing evidence I would submit that αὐθεντέω in the Moeris entry means “act on one’s own.” As we shall see, this is, in fact, a common meaning of the verb in later Greek.” Women, 80.
      * Is this related to authority?
        + Plausibly.

One who pleads his own case (such as in court) is acting on their own authority.

* + - * This **doesn’t** seem to have a negative connotation.
    - 7- The Papyrus P. Tebtunis 276.28
      * An uncertain text.
      * It’s damaged and could be reconstructed in a couple of different ways.
      * It could be a noun or a verb.
      * We skip it.
    - 8- Scholion on Aeschylus, Eumenides 42
      * This one is important.
        + Viewable in English here <https://www.open.ac.uk/people/sites/www.open.ac.uk.people/files/files/eumenides-definitive.pdf>
      * The only use of the verb to mean murder.
        + **151 Wol murd**
        + “This scholion reads as follows: ἐμφατικῶς τοῦτο νεωστὶ αὐθεντηκότα παρίστησιν. “This [word] vividly portrays one who has just committed murder.”” Women, 81.
      * On the E side, Belleville has taken this view.
        + **152 B Orest**
        + “The murderer, who has just now *committed an act of violence* [authenthkota].” Belleville, Two Views, 96.
      * The C side
        + Orestes has just killed his own mother.

Therefore, this is a singular use of the verb authentew to mean what authentys meant in the older Greek.

Kin-murderer.

**153 W not**

“By not recognizing the connection with the Attic sense of αὐθέντης, some scholars have mistakenly translated the verb here more generally as “commit an act of violence” (so Belleville174) or have even given it the meaning “initiate” (so Huttar175).” Women 81-2.

* + - * + The context matters.

It’s a scholarly commentary on an Attic Greek work. Where the person is using the verb authentew in a singular and odd usage connected to older Attic use of the noun for kin-murder.

It doesn’t seem applicable to 1 Tim 2 and doesn’t seem representative of any typical usage of the verb in Paul’s time.

* + - * + The dating and authorship are in question

Payne says scholars generally view it as being just before Paul

Wolters makes a case, and he’s not alone, that it’s a good deal later (see Women in the Church, 82)

* + - * + Wolter’s opinion seems plausible…

**154 W assume**

“I myself am inclined to believe that the Aeschylus scholion is late and represents an example of an “Atticistic hypercorrection,” that is, a mistake in usage by an Atticist purist who assumed— because the noun αὐθέντης in Attic meant “murderer” and because the verb αὐθεντέω is derived from αὐθέντης— that the proper Attic meaning of the verb must be “murder.” In fact, however, there is no evidence that the verb ever occurred in Attic and no evidence that it ever had the meaning “murder” anywhere outside of the Aeschylus scholion itself.” Wolters, Women in the Church, 82-3.

* + - * If the Es are right that this represents a known use in Paul’s time
        + It’s kin murderer and doesn’t apply to 1 Tim 2

“one who commits violence” is inaccurate.

Generalizes a specific use.

* + - * + If Wolters is right

Then it’s just one author being confused.

* + **Conclusions on 8 examples of the verb before Constantine.**
    - My summary
      * **155 Auth sum**
      * 1. N/A
      * 2. Translation = superior (positive)
      * 3. Translation = asserted authority (positive)
      * 4. Translation = author/originator (neutral)
      * 5. Translation = mastery (neutral)
      * 6. Translation = act on one’s own (neutral)
      * 7. N/A
      * 8. Translation = kin-murderer (negative)
      * The term does NOT automatically imply negative connotation.
        + A regular egalitarian talking point on authentew is wrong.
        + 1 Tim 2 would need to provide context to make it negative, positive, or neutral.

As Wolter’s acknowledges, *“they provide a rather slim basis on which to establish the meaning of the verb in 1 Timothy 2:12.”* Women, 83.

* + In my studies I have found that there are a lot of myths about authentew.
    - Many people are overconfident in their assertions about the term
  + Before we move on to how early Christians understood the term I need to point out an important issue with Linda Belleville’s work on authentein.
    - We’ve seen many good reasons to conclude the word means “authority” but she seeks to deny that meaning in the 1st century.
    - Her case is that it can mean “dominate” but not “authority.”
      * **156 B no warrant**
      * “So there is no first-century warrant for translating authentein as “to exercise or have authority over” and for understanding Paul in 1 Timothy 2:12 to be speaking of the carrying out of one’s official duties. Rather the sense in everyday usage is “to dominate,” “to get one’s way.”” Belleville, Two Views on Women in Ministry, 86.
        + Dominate, control, but NOT authority.
        + Two sources

**157 B MandM**

James Moulton and George Milligan state that the authent- word group is very well established in the popular vocabulary of “despot,” “autocrat.” Discovering Biblical Equality (pp. 220-221). InterVarsity Press. Kindle Edition.

**158 MandM 1**

Available for free download here <https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/book_vocabulary-of-the-greek-testament_moulton-milligan.html>

**159 MandM 2**

(page 91) Authentys is “master” and that is the connection to 1 Tim.

1 Tim 2:12’s usage comes from “master, autocrat” not “despot.”

“Despot” isn’t there. “Master” is. So, “have authority” works.

What about “autocrat”? That is pejorative.

Though I personally question how common that meaning is, based on my own studies.

But “authority” is the common meaning between both possible ideas.

Belleville makes two major mistakes that can mislead people.

1- She claims authority isn’t part of the meaning of the word while quoting a source that says it is.

2- She removes the term “master” and replaces it with “despot” to imply this source agrees with her that the word is pejorative by definition.

* + - * + Let’s look at her second source for claiming authentew didn’t have “authority” as part of it’s meaning in Paul’s time.

**160 B UBS**

Belleville’s claim about the UBS handbook. “United Bible Society translators Daniel Arichea and Howard Hatton translate authentein in 1 Timothy 2:12 as “to control in a domineering manner.” Discovering Biblical Equality, 211.

UBS handbook

**161 UBS hand**

Here’s a section from that same source, showing that they do think “authority” is part of the word’s meaning.

“And finally, women should be *submissive* and should not *have authority over men. Submissiveness* includes the elements of recognition, subordination, and obedience; the addition of *all* indicates the intensity and extent of the submission; hence NRSV “learn … with full submission.” Or one may translate “be completely submissive to the authority of the men as teachers.” This perhaps means that the women should submit to the authority of the men as teachers and should accept with humility and obedience what is taught to them. The logical offshoot of this is that women should not teach men or have authority over them. *To have authority* translates a Greek verb that means “to control,” “to dominate,” “to control in a domineering manner.” Arichea, D. C., & Hatton, H. (1995). [*A handbook on Paul’s letters to Timothy and to Titus*](https://ref.ly/logosres/ubshbk75?ref=Bible.1Ti2.11-12&off=1262&ctx=d+listen+silently.%E2%80%9D+~And+finally%2c+women+s) (p. 58). United Bible Societies.

Again, I don’t think “in a domineering manner” is automatically implied by the word. As we’ll see when we look at the church fathers.

The point here is that Belleville is trying to say “authority” is NOT part of the word and quotes two sources for this who both say that it is.

* We are FAR removed from Paul. Trying to understand a language that isn’t our own…
  + How did Christian writers after Paul used the authentew wordgroup?
  + The info below is primarily Wilshire (an egalitarian)
  + In the Greek Church Fathers
    - “the word authentew takes on the predominant meaning of ‘authority’” 125.
      * “predominant” may be an understatement.
    - These men are important because they represent how early Greek speakers understood the term.
  + Irenaeus (c. 115-202 AD)
    - “authority”
    - Three uses in Against Heresies (c. 180 AD)
      * Wilshire says, “each of the contexts seems to demand the meaning of ‘authority.’” 125.
    - Used of God as well.
  + \*Clement of Alexandria\* (150-215AD)
    - A special case because only Clement, among these, had classical training. This makes him more likely to be aware of Attic usage of the term.
    - 5 times
    - 2 “authority”
      * Including the use “the authority of the Lord” (Paed. 2.3.36.1.4)
    - 3 “suicide” or “murder”
      * **162 Wil clement**
      * “In the *Stromata,* he is responding to the religions and philosophies of this classical background. Possibly the multiple meanings of the word come from this complex intellectual involvement.” Wilshire, Authentew, 126
      * Clement is the only Greek father to use this meaning.
    - Interesting..
      * Though he is aware of the “murder” meaning, this does not overlap into any pejorative meaning for the word when it’s used of “authority”
  + Origin (185-253 AD)
    - Two uses
    - “authority” both times
      * One is shows this is his interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12
      * **163 Origin**
      * “I do not permit a woman to teach”— not without qualification, but—“ nor to have authority [αὐθεντεῖν] over a man.” I will demonstrate this point from elsewhere as well, even though that text stands as a rather secure statement about the woman not being the man’s leader in [the ministry of] the word [περὶ τοῦ μὴ τὴν γυναῖκα ἡγεμόνα γίνεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ἀνδρός].”
        + See C.   Jenkins, “Origen on 1   Corinthians. IV,” JTS 10 (1909), 42, lines 19– 23. <https://womeninthechurch.co.uk/2015/03/16/origen-on-1-corinthians-14-re-montanists/>
    - Origin didn’t see it as “assume authority” either
      * “be” vs “become” (see Wolters, Women in the Church, 87)
  + The word *authentew* in its various forms, is found to mean authority in every example here…
  + **164 Wil fathers**
  + Amphilochius, IV AD (6 citations)
    - “authority”
  + Asterius, IV-V AD (7 citations)
    - “authority”
  + Athanasius, IV AD (8 citations)
    - “authority”
  + Basil, IV AD (15 citations with one being a quote from 1 Tim 2. 12).
    - “authority”
  + Gregory of Nazianzus, IV AD (2 citations)
    - “authority”
  + Gregory of Nyssa, IV AD (6 citations)
    - “authority”
  + Pseudo-Justin Martyr, III-V? AD (9 citations)
    - “authority”
  + Palladius, IV-V AD (3 citations)
    - “authority”
  + Sozomenus, V AD (2 citations).
    - “authority”
  + Epiphanius, IV AD (9 citations)
    - Always “authority”
      * Sometimes of the apostles, Jesus, the Godhead, or the Fathers.
  + Eusebius, 265-339 AD (26 citations)
    - Always “authority”
  + John Chrysostom, 350-407 AD (124 times in his authentic works)
    - “authority”
      * Be it human or divine.
    - 24 more times in spurious works attributed to Chrysostom
      * Also “authority” every time.
    - Debate on one passage in Chrysostom.
      * **165 Chrys 1**
      * Payne, “Chrysostom (d. AD 407) writes in Hom. in ep. ad Col. 10.1 (11.396C), “Do not, therefore, because thy wife is subject to thee, act the despot”104 (Μὴ τοίνυν, ἐπειδὴ ὑποτέτακται ἡ γυνή, αὐθέντει). PGL 262 translates this, “play the despot, act arbitrarily.” As in 1 Tim 2:12, “being subject” contrasts with αὐθέντει, except here it is men who are not to αὐθέντει. If it means “to have authority,” then, Chrysostom wrote, “do not have authority over your wife”!” Payne, Man and Woman, 381-2.
    - Is this pejorative?
      * People on both sides tend to agree that it is.
      * But some egals don’t mention that Chysostom also comments on 1 Tim 2 (Payne, Bartlett)
      * Here Chrysostom is explaining what some might see as a contradiction when Paul says women should teach other women in Titus 2:3-4 but restricts them teaching in 1 Tim 2:12
        + **166 Chrys 2**
        + ““But I do not permit a woman to teach.” But listen to what [Paul] added: “Nor to have authority [αὐθεντεῖν] over a man.” For to men it is permitted to teach both men and women from on high; to women he permits the word of exhortation at home, but nowhere does he allow them to preside [προκαθῆσθαι], or does he let them hold an extended discourse. For this reason he added the words “nor to have authority [αὐθεντεῖν] over a man,” “so that they can instruct” (he says) “the young women.” Wolters, Women in the Church, 87-8.

See John Chrysostom, Hom. Tit. Homilia 4 (PG 62.683).

* + - * + My point?

Chrysostom shows us the word can carry a pejorative connotation.

Baldwin says this is hyperbole

And says this is the ONLY time we see it used in this hyperbolic way.

He also shows us it isn’t assumed to carry that whenever it shows up.

We know it’s pejorative because context forces that.

Chrysostom’s own understanding of the word (which is what egals are pointing to) is that it’s NOT pejorative in 1 Tim 2:12.

It’s something that is positive when a man does it, as far as he knows.

Payne’s application of Chrysostom’s first quote to 1 Tim 2 contradicts Chrysostom’s own understanding of 1 Tim 2.

* + - * + A third quote from Chrysostom shows he doesn’t see the term as inherently negative.

Daniel Doriani points out that, in his Homilies on Timothy, says this about of the fall in Gen 3,

**167 Chrys 3**

“Chrysostom says that Eve “exercised authority once *wrongly”* (authentysen hapax kakws). The implication obviously is that Chrysostom could not make the negative force felt without the addition of kakws, and therefore, he did not regard the verb authentew as negative in itself.” Daniel Doriani, Women in the Church, 1st edition, 227.

* + Wolters adds another example people tend to overlook.
    - The Cyrilli Lexicon (V AD)
      * Ascribed to Cyril of Alexandria
        + Overlooked because some would doubt it is really from him. But Wolter’s makes a good case for it on pages 79-80 of Women in the Church, 3rd edition.
      * **168 Cyr lex**
      * Wolters explains “1 Tim 2:12 “The meaning of αὐθεντέω is here explicitly equated with ἐξουσιάζω, “to exercise authority,” a verb that is neither pejorative nor ingressive in its meaning.” Women in the Church, 88-9.
        + It’s a word that egals often say Paul could have used to mean just that.
        + Some disregard this as a later source but Wolters convincingly shows it’s not. See Women, 88-9 and footnotes.
  + Church fathers who knew Greek thought the word referred to authority
    - They did not (even Chrysostom) think the term generally implied negative or ingressive connotations (not “domineer” or “assume”)
    - **169 West book**
    - In her book, Paul and Gender, Westfall never covers these quotes from Chrysostom, which shows that Chrysostom doesn’t see this pejorative meaning as inherent to the word, even when discussing 1 Tim 2 specifically.
  + They even used it of God/Jesus!
    - How do egalitarians explain that as pejorative?
    - **170 West bad**
    - Westfall, “Forcing a person against their will in a destructive way is appropriate for divine sovereignty in righteous judgment (Sodom and Gomorrah and the wicked), and it was believed to be appropriate for absolute authorities and government officials who were enforcers (e.g., an executioner); but if it is unauthorized, it is almost always inappropriate.” Westfall, 292.
      * To say unauthorized use of authority is bad isn’t saying anything special about authentew if it is used of authorized authority.
        + This is a strange argument.
      * Plus, it’s used multiple times of Jesus commanding Lazarus to come forth.
        + This isn’t “against their will in a destructive way”

It’s very positive.

* Believe it or not, there’s a TON more on this word.
  + Studies of its use after 312 AD
    - For this I recommend Women in the Church, 3rd edition, 89-110.
  + But we can see that there is 1st century warrant for “authority” but not for an assumed negative connotation.
* **Early translations of 1 Tim 2:12**
* How have translations handled “authentein”?
* Two claims from SOME egalitarians.
  + 1- “have authority” is a new trend
  + 2- male patriachalists who are opposed to women teaching have manipulated the translation of 1 Tim 2:12 in modern English Bibles.
  + **171 B unbroken**
  + *“In fact, there is a basically unbroken tradition, stemming from the oldest version and running down to the twenty-first century, that translates authentein as “to dominate” and not “to exercise authority over”:”* Two Views on Women in Ministry, 86.
    - **172 B usurp**
      * She offers four examples.
        + Geneva, Casiodoro de Reina, Bishop, KJV
      * Note: “usurp authority” doesn’t mean “dominate”
        + None say “dominate”
    - Nevertheless, she says it’s an “unbroken tradition”
    - What changed?
      * **173 B blame**
      * *“English translations from the 1940s to the early 1980s tend to obscure this. A hierarchical, noninclusive understanding of leadership is partly to blame. Women aren’t supposed to be leaders, so the language of leadership, where women are involved, tends to be manipulated. First Timothy 2:12 is one of the primary places where this sort of bias surfaces.”* Belleville, Two Views, 87.

Really?

She cites several translations from before 1930

Not one which she thinks gives a non-pejorative reading.

The impression is clear.

Patriarchalists changed translation choices in the 1930s.

* + - * + I’ve seen it all over the comments, and on Twitter, especially Twitter.
    - In DBE (2021) she changes her approach a bit.
      * We’ll come back to that.
    - But her case is believed by others.
      * in 2023, a brand new book by egalitarian scholar, Nijay Gupta’s, “Tell Her Story”.
        + **174 G tell her story**
      * **175 G on B usurp**
        + Gupta says, *“But consider this: the King James Bible (in the early seventeenth century) translated authenteō as “usurp authority over the man,” taking this verb with a negative meaning. In fact, that has been a more historical approach to the meaning of this verb until the late twentieth century. For example, Linda Belleville has traced a unified reading of this verb through the centuries:”* Gupta, Tell Her Story, 170.
* 2 Problems with Belleville’s “basically unbroken tradition”.
  + 1- She says the early modern Spanish version is pejorative when it isn’t.
    - A 1560 translation.
    - “take” is ingressive but not inherently negative.
  + 2- There are non-pejorative readings in other early versions
    - **176 W others**
      * Sahidic Coptic (2nd century): *erjoeis* (related to *joeis*, “lord”)
      * Bohairic Coptic (3rd century): *ethreserjōj* (related to *jōj*, “head”)
      * Gothic (4th century): *fraujinom* (related to *frauja*, “lord”)
      * Harklean Syriac (7th century): *mštlṭw* (*meštlāṭû*) (related to *šalîṭā*, “ruler”)
        + See Women in the Church, 84-5.
    - According to Al Wolters, the only exception is the Peshitta
    - Meaning the trend is against a pejorative reading!!
      * This seems important.
* Belleville takes a different approach in her recent work, it seems,
  + In DBE, published in 2021, she dropped the “unbroken tradition” claim. But she reproduced her previous claims almost verbatim.
    - She still claims that modern translations are manipulating the text
      * **177 B bias**
      * *“English translations stemming from the 1940s to the present tend to gloss over the difficulties. A hierarchical, noninclusive understanding of leadership is partly to blame. Women are not supposed to be leaders, so the language of leadership, where women are involved, tends to be manipulated. One of the primary places where this sort of bias surfaces is 1 Timothy 2:12. Post–World War II translations routinely render the clause as “I do not permit a woman to teach or to have [or exercise] authority over a man.” However, earlier versions and translations were not so quick to do so.”* DBE, 210.
      * **178 B bias2**
      * *“In fact, there is a notable translation history beginning with the oldest versions that translates authentein negatively as “to domineer,” “usurp,” “lord over,” or “dictate.””* DBE, 210
        + It’s implied that old translations have a negative reading and new ones don’t, due to manipulation.

Same idea

I can’t overstate how big of a claim this is.

It influences people who don’t remember the details but echo the idea.

* + - What follows is 29 examples of “negative” readings throughout history.
* Belleville, in DBE, offers 29 examples of what she sees as “negative” readings. (DBE, 210)
  + 5 ancient ones
    - **179 B early T**
    - 5 “early translations” from 2nd-5th century
    - The 2 Latin ones fails
      * She reads Latin translations as if they are pejorative/negative since they use “dominari”
      * Dominari, at that time, was not pejorative
        + Wolter’s responds to this idea.
        + **180 W dominari**
        + “But the Latin verb, though it can on occasion carry such a negative nuance, regularly has a neutral or positive sense, simply meaning “rule,” “reign,” or “govern.” As examples of its positive sense, consider the places where the Vulgate uses *dominor* to describe the rule of God (see Judg. 8: 23; 2 Chron. 20: 6; Ps. 58: 14[ 59: 13]; Dan. 4: 14); the rule of the Messiah of Old Testament expectation (see Num. 24: 19; Pss. 71[ 72]: 8; 109[ 110]: 2; Zech. 6: 13); or the rule of Jesus Christ in the New Testament (see Rom. 14: 9). A remarkable example of this positive use is found in one of the letters of Jerome, the translator of the Vulgate. In discussing the difference between a king and a bishop, he writes that “the former subdues by intimidation, the latter rules [*dominatur*] by serving.” 190 In Jerome’s usage, the ruling indicated by *dominor* is consistent with servant leadership.” Women 85-6.

I checked a couple different Latin dictionaries which confirmed that dominari did not generally imply a negative connotation as Belleville asserts.

* + 2. She neglects several Latin translations which have three other Latin words used for authentys, none of which are pejorative.
    - * + **181 W Latin**
        + Other old Latin versions (3rd century on)

*“The so-called Vetus Latina, dating from the third century on, have four different translations”* Women in the Church, 84.

VL 1: *praupositam esse* (related to *praepositus*, “commander”)

VL 2: *dominare* (related to *dominus*, “lord”)

VL 3: *dominari* (related to dominus, “lord”)

VL 4: *principari* (related to princeps, “ruler”)

* + - * Her 3rd example is the Coptic
        + **\*179 B early T**
        + “be lord of him”
        + “be lord” is not negative.
        + Here on page 799a <https://archive.org/details/CopticEnglishDictionary/page/n815/mode/2up>
    - Her 4th example is weird.
      * Wolters used the same example as a neutral reading!
        + **\*176 W others**
      * “Gothic (AD fourth century): “nor to usurp authority over the man” (nih fraujinon faura waira)”
        + DBE, 211.
        + So, I checked the footnotes.
      * Her footnote –
        + **182 B fn**
        + Project Wulfila (Belgium: University of Antwerp, 2004). Compare Gerhard Köbler, Gotisches Wörterbuch (Leiden: Brill, 1989), 166-67. See also Gerhard Balg, A Comparative Glossary of the Gothic Language with Especial Reference to English and German (Westermann, 1889), 105: “Fraujinon faura with the dative ‘lord it over,’ ‘rule over.’” DBE, 698.
      * The 1st one – Project Wulfila
        + **183 Gothic wulfila**
        + Shows the Gothic, but the English is just the KJV, it’s not a translation they are providing.

The KJV is NOT a translation of Gothic.

* + - * + The site doesn’t offer definitions of these words.
        + Yet this appears to be where her translation comes from!

**PIC B gothic**

* + - * The 2nd one – Gerhard Koebler
        + **184 Gothic dict1**
        + He offers both definitions: “lord it over, rule over”

Does he mean it to be perjorative?

* + - * + <https://www.koeblergerhard.de/got/got_f.html>
        + I emailed Dr. Koebler to find out

**185 GK me**

**186 GK germ**

**187 GK eng**

* + - * + The German

Herrschen, herr sein

“ruler, be lord/mister”

I find it hard to believe the term means something in English that it doesn’t mean in German.

* + - * + The Greek

Kat epitaghn (in authority)

Does it mean something in English it doesn’t mean in German OR Greek?

* + - * The 3rd one.
        + “A Comparative Glossary of the Gothic Language” by Gerhard Hubert Balg (1887)

**188 Gothic dict**

To be lord or king, to rule over.

Page 105 <https://archive.org/details/comparativegloss00balguoft/page/104/mode/2up>

Belleville’s claim “lord it over”

Actual quote “be lord or king, rule over”

* + - * I checked several… none give the negative meaning of usurp or “lord it over.”
        + <https://www.academia.edu/12787999>
        + **189 Goth et dic1**
        + **190 Goth et dic2**

Just “rule” not “lord it over” or anything negative.

* + - * + **191 Goth d2b**

Mœso-Gothic Glossary (1868)

“lord, master” with fraujinon

<https://books.google.com/books?id=VBsJAAAAQAAJ&printsec=frontcover>

* + - * + There are others.

You can get free access to a number of Gothic resources right here - <https://www.lexilogos.com/english/gothic_dictionary.htm>

* + - 5. Syriac Peshitta
      * That works.
  + **4 of the 5 ancient ones backfire.**
    - If trends matter… the non-pejorative reading is supported.
  + Next, 8 “English” ones from the 16 to early 20th centuries
    - **192 B eng T**
    - The first two are not English.
    - The second is not “negative”
      * 6. Erasmus
        + usurp
      * 7. Complutensian Polyglot Bible
        + Wrong – dominari
    - Most have “usurp”
      * Which isn’t that strong of support
    - Only 2 of the 6 have “domineer” which strongly supports her view.
      * 8. Bishops
        + Usurp
      * 9. Geneva
        + Usurp
      * 10. KJV
        + Usurp
      * 11. Websters
        + Usurp
      * 12. Fenton
        + Dominate
      * 13. Goodspeed
        + Domineer
    - She selectively uses translations to get her “notable translation history” (DBE, 211.)
    - But leaves out other versions from the same time period, which are not pejorative.
      * Luther “be the leader”
        + **193 others**
        + 11 other English translations from this time period that don’t have a pejorative (usurp) meaning.

Wycliffe (1395): “have lordship”

Tyndale (1526): “have authority over”

Matthew Bible (1537) “have authority over”

Duay-Rheims (1752): “use authority”

Sawyer (1858): “have authority over”

<https://archive.org/details/newtestamenttran0000unse_e8o0/page/n6/mode/1up>

Young’s Literal Translation (1862): “to rule”

Common English Bible (1866): “have authority over”

<https://www.gutenberg.org/cache/epub/26361/pg26361-images.html#b54>

English Revised Version (1881): “tell him what to do”

Darby Bible (1890): “exercise authority”

Robert Young (1898): “to rule”

<https://archive.org/details/holybibleconsist00youn/page/145/mode/1up>

Rotherham (1902): “have authority over”

* + - Calvin’s Latin translation also breaks the unbroken tradition.
      * On this see Women in the Church, page 284, since there is a fault in a popular English edition of Calvin’s commentaries at this point.
    - Luther, Tyndale, and Calvin are all left out!
      * **194 Bur down**
      * As scholar Denny Burk points out, “She has also downplayed versions from three leading Protestant Reformers (Luther, Tyndale, Calvin), all of whom disprove her thesis of a “virtually unbroken tradition” of translation before the twentieth century.” Women, 284.
    - I’m not saying they were all one-sided.
      * They go both ways. It’s just that Belleville’s idea of an unbroken tradition is wrong on all counts. There isn’t even a majority
  + USURP - But, how do we explain the reading “usurp” authority Erasmus, the KJV, etc.?
    - Did all these translators think “usurp authority” meant what some Es think it means?
      * Blomberg responds to Belleville on this
        + **195 B usurp2**
        + *“Citing English translations that render the verb as “usurp authority” can be a bit misleading, for this expression probably means “usurping the authority that belongs to the men” rather than just “exercising authority in an improper way.””* Two Views on Women in Ministry, 118.
      * E view: a woman can be an elder, just not…
        + 1. Abuse that role (domineering fashion)
        + 2. Claim that role without proper appointment (so long as they are appointed by the church its ok)
      * It seems likely that many of them thought that a woman taking the role of an elder was, by its nature, a usurping of authority.
        + I’d prefer that view if “usurp” was accurate.

1- It’s only directed to women over men.

2- It is coupled with teaching (more on that as we go)

3- It’s based on creation

There’s no reason to base a command not to usurp on creation differences between men and women.

* + - Greek scholar, Dan Wallace puts it this way.
      * **196 Wal on usurp**
      * “The KJV translators mistranslated this verb because they knew Latin better than they knew Greek. And in the sixteenth century, Erasmus of Rotterdam--the man who was the first to publish a Greek New Testament--rendered authenteo this way. He produced five Greek New Testaments, and all of them were Greek-Latin diglots. That is, Greek was on one page and his Latin translation of the same was on the facing page. By the fourth century AD, authenteo had come to mean 'usurp.' But it didn't have this force earlier. Consequently, Erasmus translated the verb as usurpare (from which, obviously, English gets 'usurp'). His translation was based on Greek usage that was 300+ years after the time of the New Testament. Remarkably, Erasmus produced his Greek New Testament as a way to correct Jerome's Latin Vulgate. Jerome was the fourth century scholar who brought uniformity to the Latin versions of the Bible by gathering them up, along with several Greek copies, and trying to discern what was the original wording. In other words, Jerome was much closer to the time of the original than Erasmus was. And in Jerome's Vulgate (which became the official "inspired" version for the Catholic Church), he translated authenteo as dominare. This Latin verb means, principally, "to exercise authority." Only secondarily does it have a negative force. It was probably the best Latin verb to use for *authenteo*.

OK, if you're still tracking with me, let's go back to Erasmus. He based his translation on his reading of Greek writers who lived during or after the time of Jerome. And because of this, he didn't grasp the actual meaning of authenteo in [1 Tim 2:12](javascript:%7b%7d). And since authenteo is a rare word in Greek literature, the KJV translators simply consulted the Latin in their Greek-Latin diglot to discern the meaning of the verb. And what did they find? Usurpare. Hence, an illegitimate translation made its way into the translation of the Bible. But today, the vast majority of English translations understand the term to be neutral.”

* + - * + Source - <https://bible.org/question/light-1-tim-212-when-paul-states-women-should-not-teach-or-exercise-authority-over-men-do-y>
      * Belleville’s account, which is followed by other E scholars, seems quite wrong.
        + Wrong on many points.
  + Next, 16 “contemporary translations”
    - **197 B con T**
    - 2 Spanish
    - 4 French
    - 2 are repeats
      * 21st century KJV is a new edition, not a new translation
      * Webster Revised also seems the same.
    - 1 is Latin – and it’s dominari again.
      * Nova Vulgata
    - 1 is Italian and seems it could go either way (NVB)
    - The TNIV (2005 footnote)
      * **198 B tniv**
      * Footnote?
      * Why does it say footnote?
        + Because the text says this

**199 TNIV 1 tim 2 12**

Intentionally ambiguous, not negative.

**200 TNIV 1 tim 2 12 FN**

Or *teach a man in a domineering way;* or *teach or to exercise* (or *have*) *authority over a man*

* + - * + The TNIV was folded into the 2011 NIV which says, “assume authority” no footnote.
    - About 10 of the 16 are negative.
  + 14. Spanish UBS
  + 15. New Berkeley Version in Modern English
  + 16. NEB
  + 17. Jerusalem Bible in French
  + 18. Nova Vulgata
    - Another Latin translation
  + 19. French Traduction Oecumenique
  + 20. New Translation
  + 21. 21st Century KJV
    - Repeat (not a new translation)
  + 22. Webster Revised
    - repeat
  + 23. NVB San Paolo Edizione
    - Dominare, the Italian term
      * Source shows it could go either way, negative or not.
        + <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/italian-english/dominare>
  + 24. CEV
  + 25. The Message
  + 26. TNIV (2005 footnote)
  + 27. La Bible. Traducion oecumenique
  + 28. Modern English Version
    - usurp
  + 29. ISV
    - Instigate conflict
  + She doesn’t mention a SINGLE outlier.
    - That’s the important part
      * On her telling
        + Early translations are negative
        + Modern manipulated ones are not
        + Many other modern ones are negative.
  + I’ve heard there are over 500 English translations of the Bible.
    - So a selective list like this isn’t impressive.
  + IF translations matter then a less selective survey is better.
* English translation survey
  + Biblestudytools.com offers a good resource here
  + ASV
    - have dominion
  + Bible in Basic English
    - Rule over
  + Common English Bible
    - Control
  + Complete Jewish Bible
    - Exercise authority
  + HCSB
    - Have authority
  + Darby
    - Exercise authority
  + ESV
    - Exercise authority
  + GNT
    - Have authority
  + God’s Word
    - Have authority
  + Hebrew Names Version
    - Exercise authority
  + Jubilee Bible 2000
    - Usurp authority
  + KJV
    - Usurp authority
  + Lexham English Bible
    - Exercise authority
  + TMB
    - Tell a man what to do
  + NASB
    - Exercise authority
  + NCV
    - Have authority
  + NIRV
    - Have authority
  + NIV
    - Assume authority
  + NKJV
    - Have authority
  + NLT
    - Have authority
  + NRSV
    - Have authority
  + Douay-Rheims
    - Use authority
  + RSV
    - Have authority
  + Third Millennium Bible
    - Usurp authority
  + Tyndale
    - Have authority
  + Webster
    - Usurp authority
  + World English Bible
    - Exercise authority
  + Weymouth New Testament
    - Have authority
  + Wycliffe
    - Have lordship
  + Young’s Literal Translation
    - Rule
  + Of 30 translations, 7 have a negative meaning.
    - 23 do not.
* What about non-sectarian translations that are well-respected?
  + **201 Ts nonsec**
  + NRSV
    - “Have authority”
  + ESV
    - “Exercise authority”
  + NASB
    - “Exercise authority”
  + NKJV
    - “Have authority”
  + NIV
    - “Assume authority”
  + CSB
    - “Have authority”
  + NLT
    - “Have authority”
  + NET
    - “Exercise authority”
  + None are negative, none support the E view.
* It actually looks to be a very different trend than what Belleville claims.
  + Generally non-pejorative translations throughout time with reasonable explanations for exceptions.
    - “Dominate” is more of a recent trend but it’s not present in the most respected translations we have in English.
  + Some Es are propagating falsehoods about this.
* **Another egal method of seeing a negative meaning in the word is etymology**
  + Etymology refers to the origin of a word
    - Disaster – likely from dis and aster meaning “bad star”
  + Examples (these are especially regarding the second part of authentew)
    - **202 Etym**
      * “to thrust out”
        + Catherine Kroeger.
      * “achieving”
        + Phillip Payne.
      * “arms”
        + A. T. Robertson
      * “effect, accomplish”
        + More common theory since the 19th century.
      * “let go”
        + Michael Briel
      * “motion”
        + A. J. Van Windekens
      * There are others.
    - Catherine Kroeger once argued “authentew” had an erotic meaning because
      * Kroeger, “Ancient Heresies,” 13.
      * 1- autos – self
      * 2- imni – thrust out
      * “to thrust out from oneself.
    - Philip Payne
      * Payne, Man and Woman, 363– 65.
      * 1- autos – self
      * 2- ἁνύω – with smooth breathing
      * “self-achieving”
      * From which he gets “assume authority” for 1 Tim 2:12.
    - Michael Breal
      * Michel Bréal, “Étymologies,” Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris 12 (1903), 7, and Robertson, Grammar of the Greek New Testament, 148.
      * 2- inmi – let go
    - A. T. Robertson
      * Entea – arms
    - Dominant theory since the 19th century is…
      * “…defended by P. Chantraine and others, which holds that the second element is ἑντης, said to be related to the Greek ἁνύω (with rough breathing), meaning “effect, accomplish.”” Women, 111.
    - Paul Krestchmer
      * “who accepted ἑντης (but not ἁνύω) as a root of αὐθέντης/“master” but proposed the root θείνω for αὐθέντης/“ murderer.” Women, 111.
        + That is, two different roots for two different used.

“He in turn was followed by J.   H. Moulton and George Milligan, Carroll Osburn, and George Knight, while Friedrich Zucker later came to the same conclusion independently.” Women, 111.

* + - “The more recent etymological dictionary of Greek by A.   J. Van Windekens also rejects the dominant etymology and takes the second element of αὐθέντης in all its senses to be θείς.” Women, 111.
  + 2 Problems
    - 1- Etymology is often an unreliable guide.
      * “Appeal to etymology, and to word formation, is therefore always dangerous.” Linguistics and Biblical Interpretation, 132.
        + *Orchard* once meant a treeless garden.
        + The Latin root of December means “ten”
    - 2- Scholars can’t agree on what the root actually is.
      * **203 W etym**
      * “The trouble with such proposals, even apart from the dangers of falling into the etymological fallacy, is that in the case of αὐθέντης and its derivatives, scholars cannot agree on what the etymology is.” Women in the Church, 111.
  + Conclusion:
    - Some meaning related to authority is most likely.
      * Fits cognates
      * Fits use of the noun authentys
      * Fits some uses of authentew from near Paul
      * Fits Kostenberger’s study
        + Since the alternate meanings are pejorative (domineer, wrongly take authority)
    - Egalitarian surveys of the word usage tend to misrepresent things.
* **FINALLY, we get to the context of 1 Tim 2:12**
  + The earlier stuff was to help establish what the word COULD mean, but context is king.
  + First, let’s look at the phrase “teach or have authority”
  + One scholar has made a strong case that the we can prove that Paul is using “authentew” in a positive sense because of the way it’s phrased in 1 Tim 2:12
    - The basic idea has two parts
      * 1. This way of phrasing things always joins either two positive terms or two negative terms. The terms share a positive or negative value.
      * 2. “Teach” is a positive term in this passage.
      * 3. Therefore, authentew is a positive term.
    - This is huge.
      * It would mean that the “authentew” can’t be inherently negative.
        + Rules out “usurp authority”
        + Rules out “domineer”
        + Rules out “instigate violence”
        + Rules out just about every egalitarian view.
      * Even if it MIGHT have a negative meaning in some cases, it can’t in 1 Tim 2.
* Köstenberger’s case (Women in the Church, 3rd edition, chapter 3)
  + He builds an impressive case that the phrasing of vs 12 forces the two terms to both be positive or both negative in meaning.
  + **204 K chapter**
    - In chapter 3 of Women in the Church.
      * It’s good work.
        + Plenty of egalitarian scholars have been persuaded by it.
    - This may seem overly involved and long but I cut out about 14 pages from just this section so keep it as simple as I could. Bear with me.
    - I’ll just summarize his work and then deal in detail with the pushback people give.
      * The verse
        + **205 K 1**
      * Two infinitives
        + **206 K 2**
      * Joined by oude
        + **207 K 3**
      * Prohibited or permitted
        + **208 K 4**
      * Always BOTH positive or BOTH negative.
    - He examined 42 times that the NT used a similar construction.
      * Two infinitives, joined by oude, whether permitted or forbidden, the terms are BOTH positive or BOTH negative.
      * In every case the two terms are both positive or both negative.
    - One example
      * Rom 14:21
      * **209 K 5**
      * **210 K 6**
        + Eating meat and drinking wine are inherently good things in Romans 14.
  + Köstenberger expanded his search to documents from the 1st century outside the NT.
    - He found dozens of examples.
    - All are consistent.
      * The pair of concepts are both positive or both negative and are denied.
    - Again, all examples support the idea that if “teaching” is viewed positively in 2:12 then “have authority” is meant that way too.
      * Ruling out a large group of egalitarian views.
* How scholars responded.
  + Wide agreement.
    - **211 K 7**
    - The *“pattern has been accepted as valid even by virtually all other egalitarian scholars, including Marshall, Keener, Padgett, Giles, and Webb.”* Köstenberger, Review of Belleville’s “Teaching and Usurping Authority,” 10.
* While it seems the majority of scholars are persuaded by Köstenberger you’ll probably want to know about those who push back.
  + Linda Belleville.
    - She says he errs in only looking at verbs and not nouns. That he should look at nouns because didaskein and authentein are infinitives (which she calls verbal nouns)
      * **212 B nouns**
      * “It behooves us, therefore, to correlate nouns and noun substitutes in addition to verbs. This greatly expands the possibilities.” Belleville, Discovering, 222.
        + This gives her more to work with… but it’s a waste of time.
      * **213 K 8**
      * K responds, “I have taken pains to ransack first-century Greco-Roman literature not just for verbs or nouns joined by οὐδέ but very specifically for infinitives joined by οὐδέ, and I thus find Belleville’s objection difficult to fathom.” Women, 163.
        + Yeah, nothing is more like an infinitive than an infinitive. Expanding to nouns is unnecessary.
    - She also offers examples to break the pattern.
      * **214 B 1**
      * “Köstenberger has recently argued that positive and negative pairings (of either nouns or verbs) cannot be found. However, such pairings do in fact exist. Revelation 2:20 is a key example:” Discovering, 223.
        + ***Revelation 2:20 (ESV) 20But I have this against you, that you tolerate that woman Jezebel, who calls herself a prophetess and is teaching and seducing my servants to practice sexual immorality and to eat food sacrificed to idols.***

Against Belleville, the teaching and seducing (or deceiving) are both negative in this passage for they are both qualified with “to practice sexual immorality”

It is never positive to teach people to practice sexual immorality.

* + - * + Further, “ouk... oude” isn’t even used in this passage.

It’s “kai teaching kai seducing”

“kai” is just the Greek word for “and.”

**215 B 2**

She says, “kai… kai correlation is a close parallel with the 1 Timothy 2:12 ouk… oude correlative.”

No, it’s not.

* + - She says, “First Maccabees 2:36 provides a second example:” Discovering, 224.
      * This example is also problematic for her.
        + “1 Maccabees 2:36 (NRSV) 36But they did not answer them or hurl a stone at them or block up their hiding places,”

For her example to work “not answer” must be positive and “hurl a stone” or “block up” must be negative.

* + - * Without a specific question “not answer” merely means “didn’t react”
        + BDAG
      * “Answering,” “casting a stone,” or “blocking up their hiding places” are all seen as negative in this passage.
        + Why?

Since they would involve further activity on the Sabbath.

The passage is showing the piety of the men who are unwilling to submit to be active on the Sabbath.

It doesn’t pair a positive “answering” with a negative “casting a stone.”

A casual reader might assume one of those is positive and the other negative, the writer of 1 Mac does not appear to.

Outside the context of the Sabbath –

Doing all three of those things would be good.

They weren’t pacifists.

During the Sabbath

Doing any of them is bad.

* + - * + It shows the piety of the men who are unwilling to submit to be active on the Sabbath.
    - Those are her only two examples given. They both fail and this reinforces Köstenberger’s idea.
      * **216 Blom 1**
      * Blomberg says that, despite Belleville writing extensively on this topic, “to my knowledge no one has yet discovered an example of a pair of verbs, including infinitives, correlated with the Greek conjunction oude, in which one of the actions is positive (like the teaching here) and the other negative (as in domineering).” Blomberg, Two Views, 118.
  + Payne pushes back.
    - He gives another counter-example to break the pattern.
      * Supposedly a positive and negative terms being joined by oude.
    - ***2 Thessalonians 3:7–8 (ESV) 7For you yourselves know how you ought to imitate us, because we were not idle when we were with you, 8nor did we eat anyone’s bread without paying for it, but with toil and labor we worked night and day, that we might not be a burden to any of you.*** 
      * Notice there is no prohibition here, just a description of what he didn’t do.
      * Idleness is obviously negative
      * Payne says “eating anyone’s bread” is a positive term because...
        + **217 P 1**
        + 1) “Cultural convention supports that Paul would have shared meals without financially reimbursing each host.” Payne, 1 Tim 2.12 and the Use of oude, 243
        + 2) “1 Cor 9.3-14 argues that Paul should have this right” Ibid.
        + 3) “Phil 4.16-19 praises the Philippians for sending him aid” Ibid.
        + 4) “Rom 12:13 commands hospitality” Ibid.
        + 5) “1 Cor 10:27 commands acceptance of hospitality” Ibid.
      * **218 K Payne**
        + This quote is too long to include but answers Payne well.
      * In short, Payne gives several examples of eating which are positive and concludes that “eating someone else’s bread,” in this passage, is also positive.
        + Payne’s examples boil down to two things

1- eating as pay

2- eating as a guest

* + - * + But should we assume such contexts?

“eating anyone’s bread without paying” can be positive OR negative.

It can be applied to a hosting situation (positive)

Within that it can be applied to a situation where you overstay your welcome and mooch off your host too much.

***Proverbs 25:17 (ESV) 17Let your foot be seldom in your neighbor’s house, lest he have his fill of you and hate you.***

It seems likely that Paul DID do this in the positive sense and we should think the 3 points from Payne that relate to hospitality don’t relate to 2 Thes 3:8.

It can be a result of theft – negative.

It can be eating bread in relation to idleness, which is inherently bad.

***Proverbs 31:27 (ESV) 27She looks well to the ways of her household and does not eat the bread of idleness.***

He clearly means it in a negative sense in this passage since he applies it this way in vs

***2 Thessalonians 3:10–12 (ESV) 10For even when we were with you, we would give you this command: If anyone is not willing to work, let him not eat. 11For we hear that some among you walk in idleness, not busy at work, but busybodies. 12Now such persons we command and encourage in the Lord Jesus Christ to do their work quietly and to earn their own living.***

So, it is a neutral term that CAN be used in positive or negative ways.

But Paul’s context dictates a negative meaning.

Therefore, we don’t have any examples of a negative joining with a positive.

* + More pushback from Payne
    - He offers 9 examples where he says a positive verb is joined to a negative one, with oude. (1 Tim 2.12 and the Use of oude to Combine Two Elements to Express a Single Idea, New Test. Stud. 54, pp 235-253.)
      * I reject them all, here’s one example, his first. (people typically put best examples first)
        + **219 P wronged**
        + “1) 2 Cor 7.12: ‘it was not on account of the one who did the wrong *nor* (oude) on account of the one who was wronged’ (NRSV). Here, one of the two parts joined by oude elicits sympathy (the innocent, ‘wronged’ party), the other antipathy (‘the one who did the wrong’).

Payne makes it look positive by changing from "wronged" which is negative to "innocent" which is positive.

The reason “the one wronged” elicits sympathy is because it’s negative. Like, “the one that got beat up.”

Everyone wants to be “the one who is innocent” while nobody wants to be “the one who was wronged.”

* All that brings us to this great clarity.
  + Given his insights, we can figure out if authentein is positive or negative by asking whether didaskein is.
    - Authentein COULD go either way
      * Positive: “to exercise authority”
      * Negative: “to seize authority” or “to domineer”
* Is DISASKW positive or negative?
  + It occurs 97 times in the NT
  + Kostenberger summarizes the data well…
    - **220 K 9**
    - “we find that the vast majority of its usages are positive. In fact, when the Evangelists use διδάσκω in connection with Jesus, they will at times clarify the content (“‘ you . .  . teach the way of God,’” Luke 20: 21) or manner (“ he was teaching them as one who had authority,” Matt. 7: 29) of his teaching, but more often than not, they speak of it in a rather absolute sense: Jesus “went about among the villages teaching” (Mark 6: 6); he “taught in their synagogues, being glorified by all” (Luke 4: 15); “the chief priests and elders of the people came up to him as he was teaching” (Matt. 21: 23). In cases where the content is not specified, the context assumes a positive connotation.” Women, 131.
      * I surveyed all 97 examples of didaskw in the NT.
        + Usually positive.
        + It’s used 40 times without qualifier.

All positive.

* + - * + Not ONE example of a negative use without a qualifier.
        + In Paul (excluding 1 Tim 2:12)

Uses it 14 times

Only 1 of those is negative

Titus 1:11 “…teaching for shameful gain what they ought not to teach.”

All other times it’s positive, including 3 times without qualifier.

4 if you count 1 Tim 2:12

* + - * + “teach” without qualification is always positive.
  + Padgett pushes back
    - **221 Pad teach**
    - “Köstenberger is wrong to assert that “to teach” is always positive in Paul, as Titus 1:11, 1 Timothy 1:7 and 6:3 make clear. In the Pastorals, at least, “to teach” can indeed be negative. This fact undermines a major point the book seeks to make” Alan G. Padgett, "The Scholarship of Patriarchy (on 1 Timothy 2:8-15): A Response to *Women in the Church*," *Priscilla Papers* 11, no. 1 (Winter 1997): 24.
    - 4 problems with this
      * 1- K didn’t say “always positive” but that it’s always positive when it’s standing alone without some specific context forcing a negative meaning.
      * 2- Titus 1:11 is a perfect example
        + Titus 1:11 (ESV) 11They must be silenced, since they are upsetting whole families by **teaching for shameful gain what they ought not to teach.**

This is the ONLY negative use.

With qualifier.

* + - * 3- 1 Tim 1:7 isn’t didaskw and it isn’t negative.
        + 1 Timothy 1:7 (ESV) 7desiring to be **teachers of the law**, without understanding either what they are saying or the things about which they make confident assertions.

“teachers of the law” is νομοδιδάσκαλος,

Being a “teacher of the law” (is not inherently bad. Paul goes on to say how it can be properly taught.

* + - * 4 – 1 Tim 6:3 is negative but also isn’t didaskw.
        + 1 Timothy 6:3 (ESV) 3If anyone **teaches a different doctrine** and does not agree with the sound words of our Lord Jesus Christ and the teaching that accords with godliness,
        + Heterodidaskalei – “to teach contrary to standard instruction” BDAG

Paul uses it **twice** in 1 Tim (1:3 and 6:3) but not in 1 Tim 2:12.

* + More reasons to say didaskw is positive.
    - Women can do it to children and other women.
    - Men can do it.
  + Conclusion: Didaskw is positive. Therefore, authentew is positive.
* There are also contextual clues in 1 Tim 2:11-12 add to the case for taking authentein as a positive thing.
  + Parallels
    - Vs 11 “learning” corresponds with vs 12 “teaching”
      * A positive context
    - Vs 11 “in all submission” corresponds with vs 12 “authentein”
      * Submission is a positive idea in the NT (unlike in our culture)
      * This contrast further supports “exercise authority” as a proper meaning of authentein.
    - If Paul was ok with women teaching good doctrine, as opposed to false, and having authority that is approved, as opposed to domineering or self-assumed, then we wouldn’t see “learning” and “submission” as the alternatives.
      * We would see “teaching good things” and “properly appointed” or “properly exercised” authority as the alternatives.

Kostenberger’s study also rules out another egalitarian tactic.

OUDE – Some Es will abuse the term “or” to change the meaning of the 2:12

* **222 B 01**
* Belleville ““I do not permit a woman to teach so as to gain mastery over a man,” or “I do not permit a woman to teach with a view to dominating a man but to have a quiet demeanor [literally, ‘to be in calmness’].” Discovering Biblical Equality (p. 223). InterVarsity Press. Kindle Edition.
* Payne too
* Keener used to have this view as well.
  + **223 K oude 1**
  + Keener, “We could thus read Paul’s phrase as, “I am not allowing a woman to teach in such a way as to domineer over men.”” Keener, Paul, Women, and Wives, Kindle loc. 2051.
    - That was in 1992.
* But, in 1998 he said
  + **224 K oude 2**
  + “He [Köstenberger] is probably correct that “have authority” should be read as coordinate with “teach” rather than as subordinate (“teach in a domineering way”).” Keener, Review of Women in the Church, JETS 41/3 (September 1998), 514
  + And in Two Views, most recently revised in 2005,
    - **225 K oude 3**
    - “In contrast to my former position on this issue, however, I believe Paul probably prohibits not simply “teaching authoritatively” but both teaching Scripture at all and having (or usurping) authority at all. In other words, women are forbidden to teach men—period.” Keener, Two Views, 231.
      * He then makes a case that this only applies to uneducated people, not women generally.
* Conclusions
  + The egalitarian view that requires authentein to be a usurping of authority seems ruled out by a study of the term.
    - So, it doesn’t mean “to teach in a way that wrongly takes authority”
  + Oude doesn’t turn the second term into an adjective
    - “to teach in a way that is authoritative”
  + Oude does seem to connect two terms with a single idea behind them!
    - Oude implies teaching and authority are connected.
    - In the immediate 1 Timothy context of eldership entailing those things specifically, I think we can fairly see that teaching is in relation to authority even though authority isn’t turned into an adjective.
  + If a woman were to teach in some way that doesn’t relate to church authority it’s a different issue.
    - That’s consistent with Priscilla teaching Apollos.
    - That’s consistent with 1 Tim 2 being a precursor to discussing who can be an elder.
    - It is challenging to think of how this applies to seminaries, YT channels, etc.
      * Those things didn’t exist in Paul’s time.
        + He wasn’t directly addressing them.
      * I suppose that if there’s some way of doing it without entailing eldership type roles then it is at least “not forbidden”.
      * In my view, this would allow it but only if steps are taken to avoid the natural slide into the role of a pastor/elder in the NT sense.
      * I’ll tackle more application questions in the final summary video of this series.
  + More reason to reject the over-application of 1 Tim 2:12
    - I hope the Patriarchalists will think on this.
    - If all teaching is off limits, how does that explain Priscilla
      * You may say “but her husband was there too”
        + So, it means all teaching isn’t off limits.
      * A woman can’t teach a man how to play piano.
    - If all teaching is off limits, then all authority is too.
      * A woman couldn’t have male employees
        + A woman couldn’t have servants

Surely they did in NT times and this wasn’t ever seen as an issue.

“Bondservants obey your masters” would naturally apply male bondservants with female masters.

* + - * Deborah couldn’t be a judge
      * Queens couldn’t command any men
    - What is the very next thing Paul talks about in 1 Timothy?
      * Qualifications for elders
        + Which point toward men exclusively.
* Authentew means “have authority” or “come into a position of authority”
  + All other meanings should be set aside for this passage.
  + E views don’t work.

**THE “BUNCH OF FEMALE FALSE TEACHERS” VIEW**

* The basic idea is that women were forbidden to teach or have authority *because* they were a particular source of false teachers, possibly due to women commonly having less education at the time.
  + The conclusion is that only people who aren’t ready to teach good doctrine are forbidden from teaching.
    - 1 Tim 2 doesn’t limit women.
* Keener represents this position,
  + **226 K teach**
  + “The one passage in the Bible that specifically prohibits women from teaching is addressed to the one church where we know false teachers were effectively targeting women. A primary problem in Ephesus was false teaching (1 Tim. 1:3–20; 4:1–7; 6:6–10, 20–21; 2 Tim. 2:16–26; 3:5–13; 4:3–4), and the primary false teachers (who were men—1 Tim. 1:20; 2 Tim. 2:17) were exploiting the women in order to spread their false teaching. How do we know this? If women as a rule were less educated than men, they would become a natural target as those particularly susceptible to such false teaching. Thus, it isn’t surprising to learn that these false teachers targeted women in the households (2 Tim. 3:6) who were proving to be incapable of learning correctly (3:7; cf. 1 Tim. 4:7).” Keener, Two Views on Women in Ministry, 232.
* Payne has a similar view.
  + **227 P women**
  + “Paul’s primary concern in 1 Timothy is not the original false teachers, but with the impact they have made, especially on women. Paul wants Timothy to address a second round of false teaching particularly by women in the Ephesian church. Thus, although Paul’s letters affirm many women in church leadership, here in Ephesus false teaching by women was a big enough threat that Paul restricts teaching by women.” Payne, Man and Woman, 334.
* Points in the egalitarian case
  + **228 Points**
  + **1**- 1 Timothy is primarily concerned with false teachings/teachers. (1 Tim 1:3-4, 6-7, 19-20; 4:1-3, 7; 6:3-5, 20-21).
  + **2**- Women were targeted by those false teachers (2 Tim 3:6-7).
  + **3**- Generally, women were less educated than men, so they were more susceptible to false teaching (so it’s situational and not gender based).
  + **4**- Women became false teachers in Ephesus. (1 Tim 4:7; 5:13)
  + **5**- Paul solves this problem by forbidding women from teaching or having authority (temporarily) until they are educated enough and able to teach properly. (1 Tim 2:11-12)
  + Every step of this argument has flaws.
    - Steps 3, 4, and 5 have fatal flaws.
* **1**- 1 Timothy is primarily concerned with false teachings/teachers.
  + The implication is that there is enough of a background of false teachers in 1 Timothy that we can see false teachers as the unstated issue in 1 Timothy 2:12
    - Even though nothing in that passage talks directly about false teachers.
  + False teaching is a major issue in 1 Timothy.
    - But is it a pervasive issue?
      * Can I assume it’s in the background of 2:12 without any clear indication?
  + Ways to see false teaching behind 1 Tim 2:12
    - 1- The stated purpose of the book is false teaching
      * **229 Wes purp**
      * “If we treat 1 Timothy as a real letter, we will look for its purpose in the beginning of the body of the letter. According to John White, “The body-opening is the point at which the principal occasions for the letter are usually indicated. . . . The body-opening lays the foundation . . . from which the superstructure may grow.”” Westfall, Paul and Gender, 298.
      * Westfall points to 1:3-20
      * She concludes,
        + **230 Wes purp2**
        + “The purpose of 1 Timothy is to “instruct certain individuals not to spread wrong teaching and not to pay attention to myths and endless genealogies” (1: 3b– 4).” Westfall, Paul and Gender, 303.
      * But Paul literally says why he is writing later on.
        + ***1 Timothy 3:14–15 (ESV) 14I hope to come to you soon, but I am writing these things to you so that, 15if I delay, you may know how one ought to behave in the household of God, which is the church of the living God, a pillar and buttress of the truth.***
        + That’s not about false teaching. It’s about proper Christian behavior.
        + Stated purpose trumps opening section.
        + The point is that the book is not all about false teaching. It’s all about proper Christian beliefs and behavior.
      * The purpose of the book keeps us open to 2:12 being about false teaching. But it doesn’t push the issue.
        + 2:12 could be about proper Christian behavior.
        + We need more.
      * But isn’t Paul’s main “charge” to Timothy to deal with false teachers? (1:3)
        + No.

It’s *a* charge, but there’s more.

* + - * + Just like 1 Tim is about more than false teaching, Paul’s charges Timothy with many things that go beyond dealing with false teaching.
        + 7 examples.

**231 1 Tim charges**

4:11 “command and teach these things”

4:12 “set the believers an example in speech, in conduct, in love, in faith, in purity.”

4:13 “devote yourself to the public reading of Scripture, to exhortation, to teaching.”

4:15 “Practice these things, immerse yourself in them, so that all may see your progress.”

4:16 “Keep a close watch on yourself and on the teaching.”

5:21 “In the presence of God and of Christ Jesus and of the elect angels I charge you to keep these rules without prejudging, doing nothing from partiality.”

6:13 “I charge you in the presence of God…”

* + - 2- The book talks about false teaching a lot
      * Belleville says
        + In “Two Views on Women in Ministry” Belleville says…

**232 B 35 percent**

35 percent of 1 Tim is about false teaching.

**233 B 20 percent**

And 20 percent is about women.

**234 B 60 percent**

“Some are quick to point out that there are no explicit examples of female false teachers in 1 Timothy, and they are correct. No women (teachers or otherwise) are specifically named. Yet this overlooks the fact that attention to false teaching and women occupies about 60 percent of the letter. It would therefore be foolish—not to mention misleading—to neglect considering 1 Timothy 2 against this backdrop.” Discovering Biblical Equality, 207.

Foolish and misleading…

But what conclusion does she make?

It’s implied, not stated.

* + - * Verses that clearly relate to false teaching
        + **235 Fverses**
        + False teaching: 1:3-11, 19-20; 4:1-7; 6:3-10, 20-21 (28 verses)

This can give a false impression.

* + - * + Here’s the list of verses that don’t show any obvious sign that they’re about false teaching.
        + **236 Overses**
        + Other: 1:1-2, 12-18; 2:1-15; 3:1-16; 4:8-16; 5:1-25; 6:1-2, 6-19 (90 verses)

Almost all of them are about either proper Christian behavior or proper Christian beliefs.

* + - * Remember, the point of this is to suggest we can assume that false teaching is what’s behind 1 Tim 2:12, even though the passage doesn’t indicate it.
        + The majority of this letter is not obviously about false teaching.

Nothing in chapters 2, 3 (or 5).

* + - * What else does 1 Tim talk about?
        + Here’s a list of 13 things.

**237 1 tim about**

Paul urges lots of prayer.

A Christian lifestyle that’s peaceful, godly, and dignified.

Men not being angry or quarreling.

Women being modest, respectable, and having a lifestyle of doing good works.

Elder requirements – mostly godly character traits.

Deacon requirements – godly character traits.

What to do with different kinds of widows.

The need for Christians to provide for their loved ones financially.

Payment for elders.

Dealing with elders who persist in sin.

How Christian bondservants should behave.

Christian masters.

Warnings about the love of money.

* + - * + Etc.

Should we assume false teaching is behind all these things?

No. These match the stated purpose.

* + - * The entire section around 2:12 is not about false teaching.
        + All of chapters 2 and 3.

It’s in the middle of a section of 31 verses that don’t appear to be about false teachings.

* + Step one does not work.
    - We shouldn’t assume a false teaching context into a passage in 1 Timothy where it’s not clearly there.
      * It’s possible, but we need good reason beyond the fact that it’s a passage in 1 Tim.
* **2**- Women were targeted by those false teachers (2 Tim 3:6-7).
  + ***2 Timothy 3:6–7 (ESV) 6For among them are those who creep into households and capture weak women, burdened with sins and led astray by various passions, 7always learning and never able to arrive at a knowledge of the truth.***
  + True. Just not exclusively.
  + Targeted for what?
    - Probably to pay the false teachers.
  + The Priscilla problem.
    - She is present in Ephesus at the time
    - Yet, Es will use the circumstances in 2 Tim 3 to show support female false teachers as the reason Paul won’t let any women teach.
      * But Priscilla is, all Es agree, a capable and solid teacher!
      * So their view doesn’t fit the evidence.
* **3**- Generally, women were less educated than men, so they were more susceptible to false teaching (so it’s situational and not gender based).
  + This is generally true, but people can go too far with it.
  + Keener’s application of 1 Tim 2:12
    - **238 K edu**
    - “If the problem with the Ephesian women was their lack of education and consequent susceptibility to false teaching, the text provides us a concrete local example of a more general principle: *Those most susceptible to false teaching should not teach*.” Keener, Two Views, 233
* How educated were women in general?
  + All agree that, on average, women were less educated than men.
    - Especially in advanced disciplines like philosophy and medicine.
  + But some scholars paint a picture like they were totally ignorant.
  + Jewish women had the least education it seems.
  + Greek and Roman women had more.
  + The rich women had the most.
    - Baugh, who specializes in the historical study of Ephesus, points out…
      * **239 B 3q**
      * *“Upper-class women participated in other forms of education in Ephesus, particularly private lectures in salons.”* Baugh, Women in the Church, 3rd ed., 59.
      * *“As for women’s literacy, daughters of the upper classes needed some level of education for their duties in managing large households.”* Ibid., 59.
      * *“And though they were not commonly found in fields like philosophy, women did read and write literature and poetry during this period.”* Ibid., 59.
        + We have several poems written from women in Ephesus, in devotion to the goddess Hestia.
      * Paul’s warnings about the elaborate clothes and hairstyles of women implies some of these upper-class women were part of the church in Ephesus.
    - Sharon Hodgin Gritz – who offers a self-professed “feminist hermeneutical approach” (Paul, Women Teachers, Pg 4)
      * She also says women had more education than some have commonly thought.
        + **240 G 1**
        + “Rome did educate its daughters. Women, again especially the rich women, were probably not as ignorant as some writers have portrayed them.” Paul, Women Teacher, 19.
        + **241 G 2-4**
        + “The Hellenistic period brought the widespread practice of education for younger girls.” Ibid., 19.
        + “Plato encouraged the intellectual training of women as did the later Plutarch. The Stoics especially stressed the need to educate women.” Ibid., 19.
      * But she says this was different in Jewish contexts at the time.
        + “First-century Judaism limited the education of women primarily to domestic arts. They had no other formal education.” Ibid., 23.

Though we know they did attend synagogues

* + It’s hard to think this was the reason for 1 Tim 2:12.
    - At least a minority of women were educated enough to stop a wholesale block on women teaching men.
      * Why ALL women?
      * And why are they only kept from teaching MEN?
* But this whole idea is very unchristian.
  + General education was NOT a requirement for Christian leaders OR teachers.
    - Not in the quals for elders. (1 Tim 3, Titus 1)
  + Why? Because Christian education matters, not general education.
    - Remember who Jesus picked to be apostles? The nobodies.
      * ***Acts 4:13 (ESV) 13Now when they saw the boldness of Peter and John, and perceived that they were uneducated, common men, they were astonished. And they recognized that they had been with Jesus.*** 
        + Jesus chose fishermen, and mostly other uneducated people.
      * The “educated” were the scribes and pharisees.
      * Jesus loved this fact.
        + ***Matthew 11:25 (ESV) 25At that time Jesus declared, “I thank you, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that you have hidden these things from the wise and understanding and revealed them to little children;***
      * Paul loved it too
        + ***1 Corinthians 1:20–21 (ESV) Where is the one who is wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the debater of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? For since, in the wisdom of God, the world did not know God through wisdom, it pleased God through the folly of what we preach to save those who believe.***
      * Baugh points out that ancient education focused largely on public speaking, but he clarifies that this was NOT an important thing for Christian teachers to have.
        + **242 B paul**
        + *“Paul himself specifically rejected the showy devices of the sophists and rhetoricians as the essential component of his own preaching (e.g., 1   Cor. 1: 17; 2: 1– 2), and he never required such qualifications for male teachers and elders (e.g., 1   Tim. 3: 1– 7; Titus 1: 5– 9).”* Baugh, Women in the Church, 3rd ed., 59.
    - It’s really weird to suddenly interpret Paul like he only wants to have teachers in the church who have had a high level of education outside of Christian doctrine.
  + What mattered was NOT general education or the ancient equivalent of a college degree.
    - What mattered was Christian education.
* Did the Ephesian women have *that* kind of education?
  + The church in Ephesus started, it seems, in 52AD
  + Paul spent 2-3 years teaching them
    - How well did Paul teach them?
    - Paul tells us (farewell to the Ephesian elders in Acts 20)
      * **243 Paul teach**
      * ***Acts 20:20 (ESV) “I didn’t shrink from declaring to you anything that was profitable. And teaching you in public and from house to house”***
      * ***Acts 20:26–27 (ESV) 26Therefore I testify to you this day that I am innocent of the blood of all, 27for I did not shrink from declaring to you the whole counsel of God.”***
      * ***Acts 20:31 (ESV) 31Therefore be alert, remembering that for three years I did not cease night or day to admonish every one with tears.*** 
        + There were women in Ephesus who were taught by Paul for as long as the apostles were taught by Jesus!
  + After that, Paul left Timothy in Ephesus for a long time, just to ensure proper teaching continued. (1 Tim 1:3-4)
  + We also know that Apollos ministered there and encountered Priscilla and Aquilla.
    - There’s obviously one woman educated in Christian theology there!
    - And we even know she was present there when 2 Tim was written (Paul greets her)
      * Typically, Es will say the same problem was present in 2 Tim.
  + Around 62-64AD Paul writes 1 Tim. 10-12 years later.
    - “Uneducated women” would have to be newer converts.
      * If that was the concern, Paul would just say not to let new converts teach, just like he told Timothy not to lay hands on new believers to appoint them to ministry.
    - But many educated women were there.
* **4**- A significant number of women became false teachers in Ephesus. (1 Tim 4:7; 5:13)
  + What the Es need,
    - Such a significant problem of female false teachers that it can justify barring all women from teaching men.
    - Wayne Grudem rightly points out that,
      * **244 G prim**
      * “And unless women were primarily responsible for spreading the false teaching, Paul’s silencing of the women (in the egalitarian view) would not make sense.” Grudem, Evangelical Feminism, Kindle loc. 7467.
  + This is a KEY piece of the puzzle.
    - Consider if you think it’s true.
  + E claims
    - 1- 1 Tim 5:13 shows women were false teachers
    - ***1 Timothy 5:13 (ESV) 13Besides that, they learn to be idlers, going about from house to house, and not only idlers, but also gossips and busybodies, saying what they should not.*** 
      * Most people see widows who are wasting time.
    - How do they see female false teachers here? 3 ways
      * **245 3 ways**
      * 1- “house to house” refers to house church gatherings
      * 2- “saying what they should not” implies teaching
      * 3- Gossips = false teachers
    - We’ll tackle 1 and 2 first.
      * **246 B para**
      * “Further, the parallel language between the itinerant women at Ephesus (“going about from house to house . . . saying things they ought not to”; 1 Tim 5:13 NIV) and the false teachers at Crete (“disrupting whole households by teaching things they ought not to teach”; Titus 1:11 NIV) is striking.” Belleville, Discovering Biblical Equality, 207.
        + It’s “striking,” but what does it mean?

Belleville doesn’t clearly say.

* + - * + I think she intends us to see women false teachers in 1 Tim 5:13 because of “parallel language”

1- None of the “parallel language” indicates false teaching.

House (neither use implies house churches)

Ought not

2- The non-parallel language indicates idle, time wasting women.

Young widows

Who get financial aid (because of being widows)

Who become idle.

“going about from house to house” is an expression of their idleness.

They aren’t travelling false teachers going to house churches to teach.

* + - * **247 B saying**
      * “Saying things they ought not to” points to a teaching role—perhaps along the lines of what is found in Titus 2:3–4.” Belleville, Two View, 50.
        + It’s an expression of idleness, not false doctrine.

See 5:13

The immediate context guides us.

* + - * + Does “saying” imply “teaching”

It’s a general word for speaking.

It could if the context dictates it.

Didaskw would.

The context needs to supply that meaning, not the word.

* + - * + Couple the general sense of “speaking” and the terms “gossips and busybodies” and it really doesn’t look like teaching.
      * Another problem with the E view
        + It seems likely that whatever they were doing in 5:13, it was **directed toward other women**, not teaching Christian groups of mixed gender.

**278 W network**

“Although the women are not singled out for abuse in public teaching, they are criticized directly and indirectly for repeating influential narratives (myths and genealogies) and spreading gossip and slander from house to house. This reflects a very real social pattern among women in a semi-segregated culture, where women communicate, educate, and socialize with women. The women’s network was a primary way that news spread and communication occurred in the community.” Cynthia Long Westfall, Paul and Gender, 302.

Westfall, an egalitarian, helps to show why this plan doesn’t work.

* + - * + If 1 Tim 5:13 was something women did primarily with other women, then 1 Tim 2:12 isn’t fixing it.
    - The word “gossips” in 1 Tim 5:13 implies “false teachers.”
      * Phluaros – in the NIV it’s translated “busybodies”
      * **279 K GF**
      * “As Gordon Fee has demonstrated to me, a survey of every use in extant Greek literature of the word translated “busybodies” in 5:13 reveals that the word was used for those speaking nonsense, and in moral and philosophical contexts it typically refers to those spreading false or improper teaching.” Two Views 232.
        + He doesn’t give the data or a reference to it but says that Fee showed him and that the evidence is overwhelming.

I wonder if “moral and philosophical contexts” is creating a category that isolates the wrong bits of data. How does one determine a “moral context” and what bits are left out which might apply to 1 Tim 5:13?

* + - * **280 LSJ gossips**
      * LSJ – “silly talk, foolery, nonsense” “tattler, babbler”
      * BDAG – related to pluw “to babble”, used to describe “mediocre writers,”
      * Grudem responds to this idea.
        + **281 Gru gos**
        + *“The standard lexicons do not mention the sense, “to communicate false teaching,” and such a verbal idea would be surprising to find for a definition of an adjective in any case. The BDAG definition is simply “gossipy,” and LS says, “silly talk, foolery, nonsense; tattler, babbler.” No English translation known to me gives the sense “to communicate false teaching,” and the sense “gossips” is the near-unanimous sense in modern translations (NASB, NIV, ESV, RSV, NRSV, NLT, NKJV).”* Grudem, Evangelical Feminism, Kindle loc. 7453.

I actually didn’t see any lexicon that mentioned it at all.

* + - * But this likely would have just been among women.
        + So a prohibition on women teaching MEN wouldn’t help.
      * Jon Stott responded to these views…
        + **282 Stott**
        + “Dr Gordon Fee identifies these young widows with the ‘weak-willed women’ of 2 Timothy 3:6–7, whom the false teachers had won over. Their ‘going about from house to house’ and their ‘saying things they ought not to’ he then interprets as their disrupting the house churches with their heterodox views. It is an ingenious reconstruction, but Paul gives no explicit indication that they are doing more than wasting their time in frivolous talk.” Stott, J. R. W. (1996). *Guard the truth: the message of 1 Timothy & Titus*, 134.

Stott is right, 1 Tim 5:13 is just about widows who are wasting time.

* + Just read it in context.
    - 1 Tim 5:4-16
      * This is why they aren’t to be added to “the list.”
      * The list is clearly a financial support list.
        + But may include ministry responsibilities.

Prayer, hospitality, care ministry.

Note the requirements

**283 reqs**

1. Alone and without financial support from family (5:4-8)

2. Consistent in prayer (5:5)

3. 60 or older (5:9)

4. Was faithful in prior marriage (5:9)

5. Was a good mother (5:9)

6. Is hospitable (5:10)

7. Washes the feet of believers (5:10)

8. Takes care of the afflicted (5:10)

9. Has a history of devoting herself to good works (5:10)

What’s missing?

Teaching

It’s true that requirements like these are said for potential elders. But they are not uniquely “elder” things.

Taken as a whole they indicate a good Christian woman and not an elder.

* + - * Not itinerate false teachers.
  + ***1 Timothy 4:7 (ESV) 7Have nothing to do with irreverent, silly myths. Rather train yourself for godliness;*** 
    - “silly myths”
      * Westfall sees this term as indicating
        + “…the women are the source of myths…” (Paul and Gender, 308)
        + “…the source of stories from older women…” (Paul and Gender, 312)
        + Others do this as well

Mary Conway, Discovering Biblical Equality, 50.

**284 P old wives**

“Women may have been the originators of some of the false teaching as is suggested by Paul’s warning against “myths characteristic of old women” in 4:7.” Payne, Man and Woman, 304.

* + - The lexicons are very consistent. This means “characteristic of old women” but none say it indicates “old women as a source”
      * Not teachings that have their source in older women.
    - Does the term imply stories that literal old women are telling?
      * No
        + “You play ball like a girl”
        + Philosophers used it as an intellectual version of “you play ball like a girl.”
  + Indications that the false teachers Paul is concerned about are male, not female.
    - 1- The warning in Acts
      * ***Acts 20:29–30 (ESV) 29I know that after my departure fierce wolves will come in among you, not sparing the flock; 30and from among your own selves will arise men speaking twisted things, to draw away the disciples after them.*** 
        + Who will rise up?

Not women, not people, but MEN.

The plural of **ἀνήρ** – a man, opposed to a woman. (LSJ)

* + - 2- Later, they are still male.
      * 2 Tim 3:6
        + Men who sometimes target women.
        + But they are men.
    - 3- What gender are the false teachers Paul mentions?
      * Male.
      * Hymenaeus and Alexander
        + Implied by 1:20
      * All known false teachers are male.
    - 4- The historical records in Ephesus show male teachers but not female ones.
      * **285 B do not**
      * Baugh
      * *“we have no direct evidence that women taught in any official or public capacity at Ephesus… And Ephesian women do not appear as the sophists, rhetors, teachers, philosophers, or their disciples in our ancient sources, whereas several men do.”* Baugh, The Apostle Among the Amazons, 158.
        + This is a very helpful article. Here’s the link <https://heidelblog.s3.us-west-1.amazonaws.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/10084032/Baugh_Amazons.pdf>
      * It sure would be strange to see a massive problem of female false teachers in the Christian church in Ephesus when we don’t seem to see any female teachers in the city at all, even its non-Christian circles, let alone false ones in the Christian church.
      * In Acts we get some indications of male religious influence, not female
        + **286 B ap1**
        + “Demetrius the silversmith and his guild (whome he addresses as andres, “men”) were in the marketplace deriving a lucrative profit from the Artemisium tourist trade (Acts 19:24-27). Luke also mentions the (male) Asiarchs who were members of the premier social circles in the province of Asia (Acts 19:31).” Baugh, The Apostle Among the Amazons, 158
        + **287 B ap2**
        + “When we look further into Acts 19, we find hints of male involvement in Ephesian religious affairs. It was the Secretary of the People (γραμματεύς), certainly a man, who defused the excited mob in the theater by defending the goddess' honor (Acts 19:35-40). The Secretary mentions that Ephesus itself was "νεωκόρος of the great goddess" (Acts 19:35). This term, νεωκόρος, is frequently used for the individual or group charged with the oversight of a cult. Since women were not citizens of Greek πόλεις like Ephesus, it was the male citizen body of Ephesus—acting through its municipal officers, the γραμματεύς and the all-male βουλή ("State Council")—who claimed the oversight of the cult of Artemis Ephesia. We can safely infer from this slight NT evidence alone that religious affairs at Ephesus were not exclusively in the hands of women as the authors of Suffer Not a Woman allege.” Baugh, The Apostle Among the Amazons, 158-9
  + Other E claims
    - Implications
      * Similar terms used of false teachers and of women
        + False teachers deceive and are deceived

Eve was deceived

* + - * + weak
    - That criticisms of false teachers are *similar* to statements about some women
      * True-ish
      * But none of them imply those women were false teachers.
        + Nor that barring them from teaching men would help
        + Nor that barring ALL women would help
* **5**- Paul solves this problem by forbidding women from teaching or having authority (temporarily?) until they are educated enough and able to teach properly. (1 Tim 2:11-12).
  + **Perhaps he temporarily limits all women.**
    - “I do not permit” implies both that it is ongoing and that it is his practice in all churches as an apostle.
  + **Perhaps he limits a subcategory of women**
    - uneducated women
      * Keener’s view which doesn’t work.
    - women who are teaching falsely
      * neither didaskw or authentew mean that
    - women who Paul just spoke of.
      * Bartlett view
  + Paul clearly stops all women from teaching men in particular
    - Further, it is his normal practice as an apostle and he expects Timothy to continue it.
* Conclusion:
  + The “Bunch of Female False Teachers” view fails.

**288 WHY DOES PAUL APPEAL TO ADAM AND EVE?**

* ***1 Timothy 2:13–14 (ESV) 13For Adam was formed first, then Eve; 14and Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived and became a transgressor.***
* Important questions about the Adam and Eve references.
  + What is the basic purpose of verses 13-14?
  + Why does he bring up that Adam was formed first?
  + What’s the meaning behind Eve’s deception?
    - Are women more easily deceived than men?
  + What is the basic purpose of verses 13-14?
    - To provide justification for the ruling of verses 11-12.
      * “for”
  + What does Paul mean by bringing up creation order?
    - Keener says it is an analogy about uneducated people. We already dealt with that view.
      * See video 2 for how that and other things in Genesis 2 indicate Adam having a greater authority than Eve.
    - Some see it as combating a false creation narrative from the Artemis cult
      * We’ve already seen why that doesn’t work.
    - Schreiner, and many others, myself included, see it as transcultural.
      * **289 S adam**
      * “*It should be said in reply that an argument from the OT based on the created order is almost certainly transcultural. Jesus argued from creation in defending monogamy and God’s intention that husbands and wives should not divorce (Matt. 19:3–9); Paul argued from creation in prohibiting homosexuality (Rom. 1:26–27). There is no reason, in the case of 1 Timothy 2:13, to think Paul is only arguing analogically. Paul prohibits women from teaching and exercising authority over men because of God’s intention in creating men and women.”* Schreiner, Two Views, 260.
      * Vs 11-12 is transcultural and applies today.
    - I don’t see any reasonable way around this.
      * The view that the Artemis cult had a creation story Paul is refuting doesn’t work.
      * The view that this is just an analogy for uneducated people doesn’t work.
      * It’s very straightforward

**290 ARE WOMEN MORE EASILY DECEIVED THAN MEN?**

* + What is the meaning behind Eve’s deception?
    - **291 Eve abcd**
    - A: Women are easily deceived. This is an additional reason why they can’t teach or have authority over men.
      * Many of you believe this. Or you’ve heard it taught.
        + “women preachers always end up leading people astray”
        + “well, women are more easily deceived”
        + I’ve heard it from those who used to be my leaders as well.

That’s a big deal.

It impacted how women were treated in the fellowship, and not in a good way.

* + - B: One of the consequences of Eve being deceived is additional problems in marriage and a reiteration of a husband’s authority. (Gen 3:16)
      * This consequence falls on all women because Eve represented them all in a particular way.
      * I say “additional reason” because it isn’t the only reason. There’s a creation related reason and a fall related reason. This is important for later.
    - C: Eve represents anyone who can be deceived, and it’s not any kind of comment on women or their role
      * Couple this with the “women were less educated” view and we merely have a prohibition on anyone who is less educated being a leader/teacher over men.
    - D: It’s just showing that Eve isn’t greater than Adam. It speaks of egalitarian views.
      * Couple it with the feminist Ephesus view and we only have a corrective to a false Artemis creation narrative that says “see, women are the superior ones.” It’s just
    - How context pushes against wrong views. (Note these 4 things)
      * 1. Eve is contrasted with Adam
        + So, it’s about a difference between men and women, not just between educated people and uneducated ones.
        + Further, it reads into the text to suggest that Eve was uninformed.
      * 2. Eve is being used a representation of women specifically.
        + Remember the shift from “women” in vs 9-10 to “a woman” in vs 11-12.
        + Again, this is a gender-based comparison, not education level, or something else.
        + There’s something fundamentally different between the genders.
      * 3. This is not introducing a NEW idea but defending a previous idea.
        + Vs 11-12 is the idea.
        + “all women are easily deceived” is wrong for multiple reasons.

1. It’s a new idea.

2. The first statement on Eve is about something that is ONLY true of Eve and which has an impact on all women. This second statement is likely the same, rather that something that is true of all women.

3. No other teaching in Scripture supports this.

On many occasions it is women who are NOT deceived.

Abigail saves her husband’s life because she knows what danger he is in, even though he doesn’t.

Deborah is a judge of Israel, and a rather good one, in a time when Barak, the man, was deceived by fear.

Huldah, the prophetess, speaks truth to the king. She was entrusted with a prophetic role by God. A strange thing if universal female deception was the problem. We know from Scripture that prophets can become deceived. Surely, women would be barred from that role if they were so easily deceived that they couldn’t have the role of elder.

When Amnon forced himself on Tamar, she was the one with truth and wisdom, while Amnon was so deceived that his “love” turned into “hate.”

When nobody knew what was going on with Jesus, a woman anointed Him for burial. She had more clarity than anyone else there.

4. The passage never even says that EVE is more easily deceived by nature. Just that she WAS deceived.

5. Paul uses Eve as a warning for deception that ANY Christian can fall into.

***2 Corinthians 11:3 (ESV) 3But I am afraid that as the serpent deceived Eve by his cunning, your thoughts will be led astray from a sincere and pure devotion to Christ.***

This is soft evidence, but it seems unlikely that Paul would use Eve’s deception as something we are all to watch out for if the point of the passage is to teach that women in particular are easily deceived.

I’ve noticed something…

This can cause men to be arrogantly overconfident, because they aren’t as prone to “the deception of women.”

Dismissive of women as wrongheaded by nature.

Yet Paul seems to think we are.

4. If women are more easily deceived then MEN are more likely to willfully rebel against God.

Does that mean that women are more sincere?

How could anyone be fit for leadership and teaching?

* + - * 4. The differences between Adam and Eve are not balanced.
        + Adam was made first, Eve was second.
        + Adam was not deceived, Eve was deceived.
        + Conclusion: It isn’t responding to a hyperfeminist Ephesus by restoring egalitarian views. It is showing an unbalanced authority between men and women.
      * 5. In Genesis, we are told the consequence of Eve’s deception will reverberate into the male female relationship. Not that it results in all women being more easily deceived.
        + Gen 3:16

So, Paul isn’t introducing a new idea that all women are more easily deceived than men, therefore they can’t be in certain roles. He’s just doing what we did in video #2.

Seeing that both creation AND the fall give role differences between men and women.

* + Objection: Mike, this means you are supporting the fall instead of reversing it.
    - This can be seen all over egalitarian writings.
    - It is rhetorically powerful…
      * It feels like you’re fighting against the very purpose of Christ’s sacrifice.
    - But it’s not me. It’s God.
      * God still has us die, still has men working hard, still has women in pain in childbirth, still has role distinctions. These are ALL true for Christians and don’t get overturned until the resurrection.
      * We do fight against the conflict that results from the fall.
        + A woman’s desire to overly control her husband.
    - In addition: Paul gives TWO reasons, one of which is prior to the fall.
      * The fall statement is likely a reiteration of a prior state of affairs with the addition of conflict.
      * It’s not introduced at the fall!
* Conclusion on Adam and Eve
  + The rules we see in verses 11 and 12 are supported by transcultural principles we find in Genesis 2 and 3.
    - It still applies today.
* But what does “saved in childbearing” mean?

**292 WHAT DOES “SAVED THROUGH CHILDBEARING” MEAN?**

* **15Yet she will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.**
* Options and how they impact interpretation of the passage as a whole.
  + **Saved** = (1) eternal salvation, (2) harm of some kind
  + **She** = (1) Eve, (2) Mary, (3) women in general
  + **Childbearing** = (1) giving birth, (2) raising kids, (3) a woman’s role in being a wife and mother.
* Views
  + **293 vs15 views**
  + 1- Saved from physical death in childbirth.
  + 2- Saved spiritually in spite of pain in childbirth.
  + 3- Saved spiritually by having kids
  + 4- Saved spiritually through proper female roles.
  + 5- Saved spiritually through the messiah.
  + Others aren’t worth the time.
    - Which is a tough choice
      * Some will think “but Mike, you didn’t cover this view!”
      * Most likely, the tools I give you here will let you do it yourself.
* **View 1 - Saved from death in giving labor.**
  + **294 K v15**
  + “The third position is that this verse refers to women being “brought safely through” childbirth.” Keener, Paul, loc. 2241
    - So, the childbirth isn’t part of what saves her, instead, childbirth presents dangers to the woman which she will be saved from.
  + Pro (2 major points for this view)
    - 1- Swzw
      * **295 K v15 2**
      * ““Saved” means “delivered” or “brought safely through” more often in ancient literature than it means “saved from sin.” Paul, loc. 2241.
    - 2- Extrabiblical quotes to show that women
      * **296 K v15 3**
      * (1) Women felt the need for help in child labor
      * (2) Were known to call on pagan gods for such help
      * (3) May have been accustomed to calling on Artemis, a known cult deity in Ephesus
      * (4) Jewish beliefs at the time connected the possibly fatal dangers of childbirth to Eve while appealing to God for help.
        + So the cultural context can show us something the passage doesn’t clearly indicate
      * For 1 – It’s generally accepted that death in childbirth was far more common and was on the minds of the women and men of the time.
        + Due to diets lacking in iron, less advanced medicine, and perhaps other factors.
      * For 2 –
        + One example
        + **297 K v15 4**
        + Plutarch Roman Questions 2, "Diana; whom (last named) women in their labour and travell of childe-birth, are wont to call upon for helpe." <https://www.gutenberg.org/files/57513/57513-h/57513-h.htm>

Not the Diana of Ephesus, it’s Diana of Rome.

* + - * For 3 - But, “It is not unlikely that the Ephesian Artemis also absorbed this function.” Keener, Paul, loc. 8752
        + A bit soft but…
        + Marg Mowzcko points to more (<https://margmowczko.com/1-timothy-212-in-context-2/>)

In about 100AD, Plutarch wrote about the destruction of the Ephesian temple of Artemis, that happened to have burned down, he says, on the same day that Alexander the Great was born, in 356BC. Plutarch records that a man named Hegesias wanted to explain WHY Artemis of Ephesus didn’t protect her temple.

**298 K v15 5**

“It was no wonder that the temple of Artemis was burned down, since the goddess was busy bringing Alexander into the world.” Plutarch, Life of Alexander, 1.3.6. [http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/plutarch/lives/alexander\*/3.html](http://penelope.uchicago.edu/Thayer/e/roman/texts/plutarch/lives/alexander*/3.html)

* + - * + Two solid quotes from the 3rd century show that, by that time for sure, she was being called on for such things. \*see footnote 6 here <https://margmowczko.com/1-timothy-212-in-context-2/>
      * For 4 – It is reasonable to think Jewish women called on God for help in childbirth.
        + Keener offers a number of ancient quotes to establish it.

Jewish connection between Eve’s sin and both pain and death in childbirth

* + - * All 4 of his points seem solid enough.
  + Challenges for this view.
  + 1- But Paul never uses swzw that way.
    - Paul uses swzw 28 times in total. In no other case is it used like this.
    - **299 K nowhere**
    - *“It is true that Paul nowhere else uses “saved” to mean “saved in childbirth,” but it should be kept in mind that Paul nowhere else speaks of coming safely through childbirth.”* Keener, Paul, loc. 2243.
      * Two problems with this logic.
      * 1- Dia
        + Dia rarely refers to “during the time of”
        + Porter says,
        + **300 K v15 6**
        + *“Although this is a grammatical possibility, the major difficulty with this view is that the most convincing examples that grammarians cite of the temporal use of dia have clear temporal words, for example, day, year, night (Acts 1:3; 5:19; 24:17; Gal 2:1).”* Porter, What Does it Mean, 97.

**301 K v15 7**

Acts 1:3 “appearing to them during (dia) forty days”

Acts 5:19 “during (dia) the night”

Acts 24:17 “after (dia) several years”

Gal 2:1 “after (dia) fourteen years I went up again”

* + - * + What this means

It seems unlikely.

* + - * 2- Keener’s rescue is to say that this is the only place where Paul speaks of coming safely through childbirth.
        + There are two problems with this.

1- This doesn’t acknowledge the depth of the problem of saying Paul uses swzw this way here.

It’s not just that we don’t have examples of Paul using this word to refer to “coming safely through childbirth.”

Paul never uses “swzw” to mean anything other than salvation in the ultimate sense.

28 times total, 7 times in the pastoral epistles.

**302 F v15**

Gordon Fee adds, “Moreover he uses an entirely different word for the idea of being “kept safe” throughout his letters (see, e.g., 2 Tim. 3:11 and 4:18)”[[1]](#footnote-1) Fee, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, 75.

I counted 8 times (Rom 15:31; 2 Cor 1:10 [3 times]; 2 Thes 3:2; 2 Tim 3:11; 2 Tim 4:17, 18;

2- This looks like circular reasoning.

How do I know Paul is using swzw for being brought safely through childbirth here, as opposed to always using it for eternal salvation?

Answer: You know it’s how Paul is using it here because that’s how Paul is using it here.

* + - * **303 M v15**
      * Moo, says this option “can probably be excluded also: swzw consistently indicates salvation from sin in Paul, and the conditional clause is hard to explain in this reading.” Moo, 1 Timothy 2:11-15, 71.
        + This brings us to the third problem with Keener’s interpretation.
        + The conditional clause!

IF they continue…

* + - * The verse now implies women won’t die in childbirth if they are genuine Christians.
        + **304 K v15 8**
        + “But this suggestion also raises the question of how the ἐάν clause then functions. Is the clause saying that all who come through childbirth do so because they believe, implying that all who die in childbirth do not believe? This seems extremely unlikely.”[[2]](#footnote-2) George Knight, The Pastoral, 145.

“if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.”

Why did your wife die in labor? She didn’t continue in….

This doesn’t fit reality.

This doesn’t fit the rest of the NT

This doesn’t fit Paul’s own theology about suffering and death.

* + - * Does Keener react to this?
        + Not that I’ve seen.
        + This is a view, it seems, many embrace without working through the implications.
  + Finally, what do we make of the point that the death-in-labor view fits the context of 1 Tim 2 where Paul alludes to the curse, which increases women’s pains in labor.
    - As with the messianic interpretation, this one is consistent with the idea that Paul has Gen 3 in mind, namely, the increased pains of child birth.
      * BUT, those who hold this view aren’t saying women will be saved from increased pains in labor, they are saying women won’t die in labor.
        + So, this interpretation has a flaw.

It takes Paul to be alluding to increased labor pain (which women will not be saved from) when Paul is actually thinking of death in labor, which he promises women will be freed from (though they are not, in practicality).

* + - So the Gen 3 connection doesn’t seem to work on the “saved from death in giving labor” view.
  + In summary,
    - Doesn’t fit swzw
    - Doesn’t fit ean
    - Doesn’t fit Pauline theology or NT theology.
    - Doesn’t fit Christian experience
    - Doesn’t fit the Gen 3 context of increased labor pains which Christian women are not kept from, as opposed to death in labor.
    - Feels like an idea that is adjacent to 1 Tim 2:8-15 (somewhat off topic)
  + Some make too much of this view
    - The Artemis connection
      * It shows the whole passage relates to Artemis. Affirming that women are just being kept from copying Artemis cult behaviors such as a woman domineering over a man, though her leading a man is ok. (Keener doesn’t push this)
    - As reversal of the curse
      * It speaks of the reversal of the curse, which affirms egalitarian views, since the curse is the source of women’s subordination.
      * Or, (C), as affirmation of yielding to the subordination spoken of in the curse (your husband will rule over you) until the final salvation comes.
    - I see both of these as unevidenced.
      * The death-in-labor view doesn’t seem to weigh in on the C vs E debate at all.
  + This rules out other views as well.
    - Any view that takes swzw to refer to something less than Christian salvation doesn’t seem worthwhile.
      * S. Jebb view - by observing her proper role (teknogonia) and maintaining Christian virtues, the woman will be kept from the error just mentioned (lording it over the husband and being deceived).
        + An E or C might take this view
        + The error being domineering vs eldership
        + S. Jebb, “A Suggested Interpretation of 1 Tim 2:15,” ExpTim 81 (1968-70) 221.
* **View 2 - Saved in spite of pain in childbirth.**
  + **305 Scott 15**
  + “It seems best to take the Greek preposition in the phrase ‘through childbearing,’ not in its usual sense of ‘by means of’ but as denoting a condition. ‘She will be saved even though she must bear children.’ That is, Eve, the representative woman, was condemned to painful child-birth as the penalty for her sin, and this penalty is still exacted. But woman, no less than man, will be saved, in spite of the continuing mark of Divine displeasure, if women live the true Christian life”[[3]](#footnote-3) E. F. Scott, The Pastoral Epistles, 28.
    - Appealing. We’d like a simple resolution.
    - “saved” = salvation
    - “bear children” = give birth
    - “she” = Eve, who represents women in general.
    - But, “through” [dia] is changed…
      * “yet she must” or “in spite of” or “even though”
      * This disregards that she is saved “**through**” childbearing.
        + Which seems that it must either mean the childbearing saves her or she is saved from some danger related to childbearing.
    - Tom Schreiner says that “Scott’s view has been consistently rejected.” Women, 220.
      * **306 Scott 15 2**
      * “Unfortunately, this interpretation violates the semantic range of διά, and thus Scott’s proposal has been consistently rejected.” Women, 220.
      * It’s just not a known meaning of the term.
        + A big enough issue that most reject his view.
* **View 3 - Saved spiritually by having kids.**
  + Not a popular view.
  + Seems to take the passage in a very straightforward way.
  + Dia’s possible meanings
    - *Through* as in efficient cause (causally)
      * ***Romans 3:20c (ESV) “since through the law comes knowledge of sin.”***
      * This is how view #3 takes it.
    - *Through* as in attending circumstances. (situationally)
      * ***1 Corinthians 3:15 (ESV) “If anyone’s work is burned up, he will suffer loss, though he himself will be saved, but only as through fire.”***
        + The fire doesn’t save him, he is saved as someone who lost their rewards in a fire.
        + An example of swzw with dia.
    - There are other meanings for *dia* but none seem good candidates for 1 Tim 2:15.
    - Either is possible.
      * BDAG says 1 Tim 2:15 could go either way.
    - How do we decide?
      * Jared August, associate professor of New Testament and Greek at Northeastern Baptist, helps
      * **307 Dia**
      * “The phrase σῴζω διά + genitive is used seven times in Paul’s epistles: Rom 5:9; 1 Cor 1:21; 3:15; 15:2; Eph 2:8; 1 Tim 2:15; Titus 3:5. Of these instances, only 1 Cor 3:15 uses this phrase to indicate attendant circumstance. The other five (or six, including 1 Tim 2:15) all use the phrase to indicate instrumentality. This does not prove that 1 Tim 2:15 indicates instrumentality, but it certainly provides evidence in favor of this understanding.” Jared August, What Must She Do to Be Saved, <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/themelios/article/what-must-she-do-to-be-saved-a-theological-analysis-of-1-timothy-215/>
  + A reason to reject this view is that it would radically contradict Paul’s own theology.
    - “But Mike, you’re just reading your theology into the text.”
      * No, I’m not saying “that’s not my theology, so Paul didn’t mean that.”
      * I’m saying “Paul has very clearly laid out his understanding of how we are saved and we should give weight to the idea that he won’t contradict his own view, and won’t do it in a vague way which could FAIRLY be interpreted differently.”
        + See Romans series <https://youtube.com/playlist?list=PLZ3iRMLYFlHvQ9G4NCvuiN4Evbp13uQa1>
        + Not to mention Paul’s view of singleness as acceptable, even good (1 Cor 7)
      * When can you fairly reject an interpretation like this?
        + 1- Clear teachings rule unclear ones.
        + 2- There is a reasonable interpretation of the passage in question that harmonizes with the clear passages.
        + My example

Kris Vallotton prophet.

* + IF you take swzw to mean Christian salvation and childbearing to mean the act of having kids then you should take dia as attendant circumstances.
    - It’s open in the Greek and it’s consistent with Paul.

These last two views seem viable.

* View 4 - Saved through proper female roles.
  + Moo’s preferred view
  + **308 Moo v15**
  + “It is not through active teaching and ruling activities that Christian women will be saved, but through faithfulness to their proper role, exemplified in motherhood.”
    - So, there is a contrast in roles.
    - The woman will honor Christ through being godly in her own role, not the man’s, which Paul has just said he does not permit her to perform.
    - It’s an affirmation of role differences, a very complementarian thing.
  + His case
    - 1- Saved = spiritual sense.
      * **309 Moo v15 2**
      * “swzw retains its natural Pauline sense, deliverance from sin and its condemning power, perhaps especially here in the ultimate, eschatological sense.”
    - 2- That it “suits the context of vv 9-14, where the issue is obviously the proper sphere of women’s activities.”
      * That works
    - 3- “[this view] finds support in the larger context, for a frequently recurring motif in the Pastoral Epistles is the need for Christian women to devote themselves to the care of homes and the raising of children”
      * ***1 Timothy 5:10 (ESV) 10and having a reputation for good works: if she has brought up children, has shown hospitality, has washed the feet of the saints, has cared for the afflicted, and has devoted herself to every good work.***
      * ***1 Timothy 5:14 (ESV) 14So I would have younger widows marry, bear children, manage their households, and give the adversary no occasion for slander.***
    - 4- False teachers were counseling abstention from marriage, so this teaching was needed.
      * ***1 Timothy 4:3 (ESV) 3who forbid marriage and require abstinence from foods that God created to be received with thanksgiving by those who believe and know the truth.***
  + How he handles dia (through).
    - “dia will indicate not the ultimate cause, but the efficient cause”
      * “Attendant circumstances”
      * Schreiner further explains.
      * **310 Sch works**
      * *“Since Paul often argues elsewhere that salvation is gained not on the basis of our works (e.g., Rom. 3: 19– 4: 25; Gal. 2: 16– 3: 14; 2   Tim. 1: 9– 11; Titus 2: 11– 14; 3: 4– 7), I think it is fair to understand the virtues described here as a result of new life in Christ.”* Women, 223.
      * **311 Sch works 2**
      * *“What Paul means is that abiding in godly virtues and obeying apostolic instruction are necessary for salvation; they are necessary because they function as the evidence of new life in Christ.”* Women, 224.
    - “teknogonia [childbearing] is one of those “good works” (v 10) through which the Christian women preserves her place in the salvific scheme.” Moo.
  + Moo acknowledges “a serious difficulty with this view”
    - “Does v 15 imply that women experience ultimate salvation only insofar as they beget children?” Moo responds…
      * 1- That would be incompatible with Paul’s clear teachings.
        + 1 Cor 7 shows that singleness is not only acceptable but is preferable to marriage and having kids.

IF you have that gift.

So, how can this be so widely connected to female salvation, implying something different than 1 Cor 7?

* + - * + Moo says it’s typical and representative of a woman’s role but not comprehensive in application.

Few women were called to singleness.

But still, this makes it awkward to see such emphasis in relation to salvation’s fruit.

Why not just say women will be blessed, or honoring God in childbearing?

* + - * 2- teknogonia “may represent, by synecdoche, the general scope of activities in which Christian women should be involved.”
        + Part of this is his view that the term is used here to refer to raising children, not just birth.
        + Bear children = proper female role

This can stop the challenge that women clearly don’t all have to have kids even in honoring Christ maximally with their lives (see 1 Cor 7)

Childbearing is just a stand-in for proper female roles. And single women can still do that.

Problem: I don’t know of any example of it being used this way

**312 Port 1**

Stanley Porter says, “Apart from later Christian writers, in all four [extrabiblical] contexts in which this word is used, where the meaning can be determined with any degree of certainty it denotes the specific act of bearing children” fn 24, <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/themelios/article/what-must-she-do-to-be-saved-a-theological-analysis-of-1-timothy-215/>

Moo suggests Paul may use it that very way later in 1 Tim.

***1 Timothy 5:14 (ESV) 14So I would have younger widows marry, bear children, manage their households, and give the adversary no occasion for slander.***

Others point out this is a chronological sequence.

Marry, bear children, manage households.

I agree.

There are other Greek words known to have the meaning of child-raising, not childbirth, which would be a better fit for a role designation term.

Paul uses one in 1 Tim 5:10 “brought up children”

But, we have very few examples to choose from

It makes sense to see it as representing uniquely female roles.

“get married, have kids” = a kind of role acceptance and life commitment.

* + - * 3- This is something godly women do, it does not earn them salvation but exhibits a person who has genuinely received salvation.
        + Dia = attendant circumstances.
  + So, weaknesses
    - Childbearing as child-rearing seems unlikely.
      * But, childbearing as an indicator of female roles seems legit and that would be enough.
    - Seems to connect, too strongly, genuine salvation to marriage and kids, when Paul sees singleness as a rare gift but one that fully honors God.
  + This view may be right.
    - but I prefer another.
* View 5 - Saved spiritually through the Messiah.
  + Explained
    - Eve fell and became a transgressor, so she needs salvation, which comes through the promised Messiah, first mentioned as the seed of the woman in Gen 3:15.
      * All women will be saved through that childbearing/messiah if they have genuine faith that shows itself in godly living.
    - ***1 Timothy 2:13–15 (ESV) 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—if they continue in faith and love and holiness, with self-control.***
    - In vs 14 Paul mentions Genesis 3 and the ultimate problem of sin.
      * “became a transgressor”
        + This brings up what is always in Paul’s mind. Ultimate salvation.
      * So he connects this with the gospel
        + Specifically, through the concept of the very first prophecy of Christ, found in the very passage he is referring to in vs 14.

***Genesis 3:15 (ESV) 15I will put enmity between you and the woman, and between your offspring and her offspring; he shall bruise your head, and you shall bruise his heel.”***

* + - * The she/they of vs 15 means that, as Eve is saved through the Messiah so too will others be, if they “continue in faith, love, holiness, and self control.”
        + I take “they” to be women in general but other views could work.

“They” as Adam and Eve’s children (all humanity)

“They” as Adam and Eve.

Though it feels a bit clumsy to me.

* + Support
    - 1- Verse 15 doesn’t indicate WHO she is.
      * Swtheisetai – “she will be saved”
      * The lack of any indication of WHO will be saved forces us to look back and see who Paul was just talking about.
        + Vs 14 “she will be saved” corresponds to vs 14 “the woman was deceived and became a transgressor”
        + Tying the term to Eve primarily.
      * This seems more likely than skipping over vs 13-14 to connect “she” to verse 11. Being women, but not Eve.
    - 2- This makes sense of how vs 15 is meant to help some problem in vss 14-15
      * Which is one of the only things almost everyone agrees on with vs 15.
      * In vs 14 Eve transgressed (this is what she must be saved from)
      * In vs 15 Eve will be saved
    - 3- More support is that Genesis 2-3 is clearly in Paul’s mind as he referenced it in vs 13-14.
      * Eve’s creation (Adam formed first)
      * Eve’s deception (became a transgressor)
      * Eve’s seed crushing the head of the serpent (childbearing)
      * So, the “childbearing” comment fits the role of the seed of Eve overcoming the Serpent.
        + So we see not only Eve’s creation, deception, and transgression in the context of Genesis 2-3, we also see Eve’s salvation connected to that same passage, by recognizing that Paul isn’t referring to “childbearing” in general but the childbearing that relates to the fall in Gen 3. The promised Messiah.
    - 4- It takes “dia” naturally
      * Either way might work
        + Causing salvation
        + Attending salvation
    - 5- It takes “swzw” in a typical Pauline way
    - 6- The definite article.
      * There is a definite article in 1 Tim 2:15, which MIGHT specify some specific act of teknogonia and not teknogonia in general. Lending toward a messianic interpretation.
        + Though, the article, in Greek, doesn’t have to be specifying something like the English, “the” does.
      * It seems this article doesn’t force an interpretation of specificity but it is consistent with it.
    - 7- This is an extremely early view, being held by several church fathers.
  + PUSHBACK
    - Schreiner offers the following points against this view
      * 1- it requires interpreting the “she” of vs 15 as Mary. An unnatural shift.
        + **313 S mary**
        + “One must also slide from seeing the subject of σωθήσεται as Eve to Mary, but to read the latter into the verse is highly arbitrary.” Schreiner, Women, 219.
        + I know some early church commentaries said that.
        + I don’t agree.
        + The seed in Gen 3 was that of Eve.
        + The person in 1 Tim 2:14 was Eve.
        + “She” as Eve makes sense.
      * 2- Paul never teaches salvation comes through the incarnation (childbearing).
        + Schreiner pushes against this view saying,
        + **314 S v15 2**
        + *“Those who posit a reference to Jesus’s birth have subtly introduced the notion that salvation is secured as a result of giving birth to him, whereas the text speaks not of the result of birth but of the actual birthing process.”* Women in the Church, 3rd ed., 219.
        + **315 S v15**
        + *“nor does Paul elsewhere say that salvation comes through the incarnation. The noun τεκνογονία emphasizes the actual giving birth to a child, not the result or effect of childbirth.”* Schreiner, Women, 219.

Maybe that rules it out?

Gordon Fee says the same

The incarnation is not the whole story of salvation but it is necessary for it.

Perhaps “childbirth” is focused on because it’s Eve’s unique part in Christ’s coming, so it’s emphasized.

* + - * + Still, why not just take dia as “attendant circumstances”

Schreiner actually does this when he prefers the “saved by proper female roles” view.

George Knight says that the construction of swzw with dia means that salvation is coming through, but not by, childbearing.

* + - * 3- The presence of the article isn’t strong evidence for this view.
        + He’s right. It’s inconclusive. It merely ALLOWS for the view but doesn’t prove it.
    - Stanley Porter says the tense of “shall be saved” doesn’t work with Eve as the woman.
      * **316 Port 2**
      * “Although it must be conceded that ‘the woman’ of v. 14 could be Eve, the inferring of Eve as the subject of the future verb in v. 14 does not carry great conviction. The attitudinal force of the future form of the verb in v. 15 is one of expectation, that is, it grammaticalizes of conveys not a temporal conception (past, present or future) but a marked an emphatic expectation toward a course of events. Since Even’s fortunes have already been determined, they are beyond any further expectation, so this solution is unlikely.”
        + Paul uses “saved” in this variety of ways.

Romans 5:9 (ESV) 9Since, therefore, we have now been justified by his blood, much more shall we be saved by him from the wrath of God.

Also a future, passive, indicative verb.

Even for Eve, the fulness of salvation is a future thing.

And, since Paul intends to rope in ALL women as potentially included in the same salvation (the “they” of v 15), he speaks with a future tense.

* + - * Jared August responds
        + **317 Jar odd**
        + “Although it may appear odd that the future tense is used in reference to this salvation (especially in reference to *Eve’s* salvation), this is characteristic of Paul’s writing in the Pastoral Epistles. In both 1 Timothy 4:16 and 2 Timothy 4:18, σῴζω is used in the future tense, in reference to final salvation (or sanctification).” <https://www.thegospelcoalition.org/themelios/article/what-must-she-do-to-be-saved-a-theological-analysis-of-1-timothy-215/>
    - The best pushback I’ve seen is that it is an odd view of “teknogonia” (childbearing).
      * **318 Gut if**
      * Guthrie says, “if that were the writer’s interpretation, he could hardly have chosen a more obscure or ambiguous way of saying it” *Pastoral* *Epistles*, 78.
        + Yet Guthrie still thinks this is the right interpretation.
      * “childbearing” is a noun, not a verb. Interesting.
      * The general idea is that teknogonia is too odd of a fit for the messianic application
        + 1- Gen 3 is on topic.
        + 2- It logically flows as far as how the transgression will be dealt with and salvation will be achieved
        + 3- The NT, including Paul, often uses OT typology

Hagar and Sarah as an allegory

Christ is the Rock

Frequently, the child of promise

* + - * + 4- Paul is speaking of Christ like this, in this very context.

***1 Timothy 2:4–6 (ESV) 4who desires all people to be saved and to come to the knowledge of the truth. 5For there is one God, and there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, 6who gave himself as a ransom for all, which is the testimony given at the proper time.***

In 1 Tim 2:4-5 we have “saved” and the how, a “mediator”

As in 1 Tim 2:15 we have “saved” and the how “childbearing”

* + - * + 5- Paul speaks of Eve typologically here, why not speak of childbearing typologically?
        + 6- Paul does emphasize the humanity of Jesus, and his birth, as important in our salvation.

In 1 Tim 2:4-6, the way Jesus saves is by both being “the man” and by being a “ransom”

His ability to be our mediator is connected to His human birth.

***Galatians 4:4 (ESV) 4But when the fullness of time had come, God sent forth his Son, born of woman, born under the law,***

* + - * + 7- Shorthand with Timothy

***1 Timothy 3:16 (ESV) 16Great indeed, we confess, is the mystery of godliness: He was manifested in the flesh, vindicated by the Spirit, seen by angels, proclaimed among the nations, believed on in the world, taken up in glory.***

Vindicated = *Romans 1:4 (ESV) 4and was declared to be the Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead, Jesus Christ our Lord,*

You could only know what this means through other scriptures.

Paul likes typology

***1 Corinthians 10:1–4 (ESV) 1For I do not want you to be unaware, brothers, that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea, 2and all were baptized into Moses in the cloud and in the sea, 3and all ate the same spiritual food, 4and all drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank from the spiritual Rock that followed them, and the Rock was Christ.***

Vague reference without much explanation.

* + - * How would we apply this interpretation?
        + Women’s status

Different in role.

Equal in salvation

This is actually an important NT teaching, which Paul cares about, when he calls us all “sons” and says there is no male or female in Christ. Peter does as well, in 1 Peter 3.

Uniquely the sex that brought forth Jesus.

Who was born of a virgin.

This view is consistent with complementarian perspectives.

Affirming differences and high status at the same time.

* + - * + This kind of view is promoted by…

Liddon, *First* *Timothy*, 20; Ellicot, *Pastoral Epistles* 38-39; Lock, *Pastoral Epistles 33,* Williams, *Apostle Paul 113.*

Williams makes a point of refuting the idea that this equals an immediate reversal of the effects of the fall related to women’s roles.

* + In other words, vs 15 says
    - Women are fully saved as men are. Through Christ.
      * C or E connotations will arise from interpretations of 11-14, not 15.

**319 THE “ELDERS DON’T HAVE AUTHORITY ANYWAYS” VIEW**

* There are some other views or issues that don’t easily fit into any other place in this video.
  + Before I give you the final conclusions on 1 Tim 2, I’d like to address these things.
* 2. The “elders don’t have authority anyways” view
  + I’ve noticed a few egalitarian scholars offering a distorted view of the concept of authority. This is a view that can really flip our understanding of a lot of Scripture related to these issues.
  + In short, they say that elders didn’t have religious authority in the NT church.
  + Authority was basically spread out among all the people equally.
    - To paraphrase Dash from the movie Incredibles, “saying that everyone has authority is another way of saying nobody has authority”
  + The point of this is…
    - 1) Elders didn’t have any particular authority
    - 2) Any statement limiting a woman’s authority should be seen in this context.
      * Therefore, women can be elders and apostles, because like all elders and apostles, they can do so without wielding authority.
      * There is only congregational authority.
  + Logically, this seems to work.
    - Biblically, it fails.
  + **320 B frankly**
    - “Quite frankly, one is hard-pressed to find a biblical link between local church leadership and “authority” (exousia). The NT writers simply do not make this connection. In fact, no leadership position or activity in the NT is linked with authority—with one exception. In 1 Corinthians 11:10, Paul states that a female’s head covering is her “authority” (exousia) to pray and prophesy in corporate worship.” Belleville, Two Views 64.
    - For the head covering claim, which is false, see video 10
    - Support?
      * The Greek word “exousia” (authority) occurs about 100 times in the NT but never linked with local church leadership.
        + An argument from silence.
  + **321 B frankly 2**
  + “A look at the relevant NT texts shows it is the church that possesses authority and not particular individuals (or positions, for that matter).” Belleville, Two Views, 65.
  + **322 B frankly 3**
  + “The church possesses authority; church leaders do not—be they male or female.” Belleville, Two Views, 69.
    - This is an either/or fallacy.
      * The church has authority and its leaders have more than the rest.
* Why is this wrong?
  + Why in Matt 18 do the elders make the decision about excommunication?
    - Because they have authority.
  + Why in 1 Cor does Paul decide, against the Corinthians' choice, to excommunicate?
    - Because he has more authority than the whole local church does.
  + Why does Paul tell believers he could command them if he chooses? Such as in Philemon
  + Why does Hebrews 13:17 say this?
    - ***Hebrews 13:17 (ESV) Obey your leaders and submit to them, for they are keeping watch over your souls, as those who will have to give an account. Let them do this with joy and not with groaning, for that would be of no advantage to you.***
      * Elders have authority.
      * She counters by saying that the submission the church is told to give is voluntary, therefore its leaders don’t really have authority. (see Two Views, 67-8)
        + Another either/or fallacy.
  + The authority of the NT is based on the authority of the apostles.
  + Paul’s defense of his own genuine apostleship is because it means the authority of his teachings.
    - Belleville isn’t even consistent in this stuff.
      * She says that Nympha was a homeowner and therefore had authority over the church that gathered in her home
        + **323 B nympha 2**
        + “Patronage of a house church was an authoritative role. The householder in Greco-Roman times was automatically in charge of any group that met in his or her domicile.” Discovering, 87.
        + **324 B nympha 1**
        + “Under Roman law, Nympha had legal responsibility for and hence *authority* over the church that met in her house (Col 4:15).” Discovering, 89.
        + She concludes that this makes Nympha an overseer/elder in the church.
      * Then she says nobody had authority in the local church
  + I could go on and on but…
    - How big of a deal is this?
      * It sacrifices the nature of God’s appointed authorities in His church in order to support wrong interpretations of Scripture to defend egalitarianism.
    - It’s true that people overemphasize authority
    - It’s true that we can forget Jesus’ concern that we see greatness as servanthood.
    - But it’s also true that these things INFORM our view of authority and don’t remove all authority from all roles in the church.
* Elders have authority
  + We can’t get around the NT teaching on gender roles by denying this.

**325 CONCLUSIONS ON 1 TIMOTHY 2**

* The Complementarian position does NOT depend on 1 Tim 2
  + But 1 Tim 2 fully supports it.
  + Not patriarchal, not egalitarian.
* Women are to fully participate in Christian education.
  + This is a big deal. Against some of the stronger patriarchal views.
* It’s not just Paul’s personal opinion
  + It’s his ruling as an apostle and it’s his constant teaching in churches all over.
  + Paul doesn’t have “limited jurisdiction” which no longer applies to us today.
* It’s not time-bound.
  + “I do not permit” doesn’t mean “I don’t permit for the time being”
* It’s not about some particular problem in Ephesus
  + Not about a slew of female false teachers
  + Not about some quirk related to the Artemis cult
    - There’s a ton of false claims about the Artemis cult floating around in Egalitarian writings, even the most recent ones.
    - Not a false creation narrative
    - Not a hyper-feminist Artemis teaching
      * The Artemis cult is not the key to understanding 1 Timothy.
* It’s not about wives and husbands
  + It’s about men and women
* It’s not about all social settings.
  + Just church leadership, in particular, eldership functions.
  + A woman can be a boss
  + She can teach men in other contexts
  + She can have authority in other contexts
* The “quiet” terminology isn’t total silence
  + It’s just in contrast to teaching.
  + Women can speak prophetically, make announcements, worship, etc.
* “have authority” is a good translation for vs 12.
  + It is not all authority but that which is similar to eldership in the church.
  + If “assume authority” is correct then it is not pejorative. It just means a woman isn’t to step into the role of elder at all.
    - It’s not just saying she can’t take it on herself without proper authorization.
  + Ancient uses of the term, related words, ancient translations, the very context of 1 Tim 2, and a slew of evidence all confirm this.
    - It’s not a conspiracy of chauvinists.
* The “teaching” verse 12 forbids isn’t false teaching or any kind of bad teaching.
  + It is the kind of teaching that comes with authority to the local church on a regular basis.
    - What we should be getting nearly every Sunday from the pulpit.
* The term “teach or have authority” shouldn’t be understood as…
  + “teach in a domineering fashion”
  + “teach with assumed authority”
  + It should be understood as teaching that is done with authority such as what we ought to have in churches all the time.
    - Other kinds of teaching aren’t forbidden here.
* This whole thing is absolutely based on gender.
  + A woman can do all the stuff in verse 12, just not over a man.
* It’s based on creation and the fall.
  + This isn’t because of some Artemis cult creation story
  + It shows that the rule about genders is supported by God’s created design, as well as being reaffirmed at the fall
    - Therefore, it applies today in all cultures.
  + The idea that we must fight it because it’s connected to the fall sounds good but goes against Scripture.
* Eve’s deception does not mean that women are more easily deceived.
  + I hope people will go back and relisten to that section if they disagree.
* The restriction is NOT because women had less education.
  + It’s gender based.
* “Saved through childbearing” is tough.
  + It’s not about being saved from death or pains while giving birth
  + It’s not about being saved in spite of the fact of labor pains
  + I think it refers to Christ
  + But it may be a reference to the importance of a woman’s role and a statement that a woman is saved not BY living out that role but in association with it.
    - In which case it affirms that women have the full status of co-heirs with Christ
      * A common thing to see whenever gender issues are brought up in the NT.
* 1 Tim 2:12 means what it looks like.
  + This is a debate, but it shouldn’t be.
    - Aside from vs 15, it’s all pretty straightforward in most current translations.
  + I’ve been so disappointed in egalitarian arguments.
* NEXT
  + Summary and application
  + What about YouTube channels where women talk about theology?
  + A one-off lecture at a church on a theological topic
  + Sharing announcements
  + Worship leading
  + Teaching a parenting message from the Sunday pulpit
  + Women in apologetics
    - At a conference?
    - From the Sunday pulpit?
  + A woman being interviewed by the senior pastor
  + Teaching at a Bible college or seminary
  + Leading a church ministry
    - Food or hospitality ministry
  + Being a small group leader
  + Head usher
  + Hosting a podcast where they discuss how weird Andy Stanley has become
  + And more.
  + I’m not saying I have answers for all this stuff, but let’s try to get as much light on it as we can.
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