

REVISED EDITION

CONTRIBUTORS

Linda L. Belleville

Craig L. Blomberg

Craig S. Keener

Thomas R. Schreiner

TWO
VIEWS
ON

WOMEN IN MINISTRY



Stanley N. Gundry, series editor
James R. Beck, general editor

COUNTERPOINTS
BIBLE & THEOLOGY

A PDF COMPANION TO THE AUDIOBOOK

ZONDERVAN™

Two Views on Women in Ministry—Revised Edition
Copyright © 2001, 2005 by James R. Beck

Requests for information should be addressed to:

Zondervan, Grand Rapids, Michigan 49530

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Two views on women in ministry / Linda L. Belleville . . . [et al.] ; general editor,
James R. Beck.—2nd ed.

p. cm.— (Counterpoints)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN–10: 0-310-25437-X (softcover)

ISBN–13: 978-0-310-25437-9

1. Women clergy. I. Belleville, Linda L. II. Beck, James R. III. Series:

Counterpoints (Grand Rapids, Mich.)

BV676.T96 2005

262'.14'082—dc22

2005008670

All Scripture quotations, unless otherwise indicated, are taken from the *Holy Bible: Today's New International Version*®. TNIV®. Copyright © 2001, 2005 by International Bible Society. Used by permission of Zondervan. All rights reserved.

Scripture quotations in Thomas R. Schreiner's essay are taken from the *New American Standard Bible*, © Copyright 1960, 1962, 1963, 1968, 1971, 1972, 1973, 1975, 1977, 1995 by The Lockman Foundation. Used by permission.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means—electronic, mechanical, photocopy, recording, or any other—except for brief quotations in printed reviews, without the prior permission of the publisher.

Printed in the United States of America

05 06 07 08 09 10 /❖ DCI/ 10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

WOMEN IN MINISTRY: AN EGALITARIAN PERSPECTIVE

Linda L. Belleville

Footnotes

¹E.g., the role of women in the church is reduced to an analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15 in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, eds. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin (Grand Rapids: Baker), 1995.

²See, e.g., Douglas Moo, “1 Timothy 2:11–15: Meaning and Significance,” *TJ* 2 (1981): 175.

³See, however, Robert Culver, “A Traditionalist Position: Let Your Women Keep Silence,” in *Women in Ministry: Four Views*, ed. Bonnidell Clouse and Robert G. Clouse (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1989), 36; more recently, Bruce Ware (“Male and Female Complementarity and the Image of God,” *JBMW* 7 [2002], 20) argues that men bear God’s image directly and women only derivatively; hence the priority of male over female. Evangelical scholarship (with rare exception) has come to see that female self-deception and a derivative divine image conflict with scriptural teaching elsewhere. If women were so inclined, Paul would have forbidden women from teaching *per se*. But he does not do so; indeed, he does just the opposite. For instance, he instructs older women to teach and train the younger women (Titus 2:3–4). Also, while Paul does assert that all human beings without exception sin, at no time does he suggest that women are more susceptible to sin’s deceiving activity than men (e.g., Rom. 3:9–20). In fact, it was two *men* (not women) Paul expelled from the Ephesian church for false teaching that stemmed from personal deception (1 Tim. 1:19–20).

⁴Compare Moo in “1 Timothy 2:11–15,” 175, and ten years later in “What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority over Men? 1 Timothy 2,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, ed. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1991), 189–90.

⁵Berta Delgado, “Baptists take stand on role of women,” *Dallas Morning News*, Nov. 10, 1999, 1.

⁶Trinity Evangelical Divinity School Catalog (2003/2004), "Statement on Gender References in Speech and Writing"; and "Women's Programs" (Dean of Students), pp. 46, 51. These statements were removed subsequent to the writing of this essay.

⁷See, e.g., John Piper, "A Vision of Biblical Complementarity: Manhood and Womanhood Defined According to the Bible," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 35–36.

⁸See Alvera Mickelsen, ed., *Women, the Bible and Authority* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity Press, 1986), 4.

⁹See, e.g., "CBMW Books and Resources," *CBMW News* 1 (Nov. 1995): 15 (renamed *Journal for Biblical Manhood and Womanhood (JBMW)* with the March 1998 issue).

¹⁰See, e.g., *CBMW News* 2 (June 1997): 1–13; "A List of Translation Inaccuracies Primarily (but Not Exclusively) Related to Gender Language in the TNIV" (online at www.cbmw.org/resources/tniv/inaccuracies.pdf, 2003; Wayne Grudem, "Cultural Pressures on Language Are Not Always Neutral" (online at www.cbmw.org/tniv/cultural_pressures.php, 2003).

¹¹E.g., *Women in Ministry: Four Views* is labeled as feminist for the "clear editorial sympathies of the editors" (*CBMW News* 1 [Nov. 1995]: 12).

¹²Nearly half of a 1997 *CBMW News* issue was devoted to the "ironic" and "tragic" egalitarian position at Willow Creek ("Willow Creek enforces egalitarianism," *CBMW News* 2 [Dec. 1997]: 1, 3–6).

¹³The English translation unless otherwise indicated is Today's New International Version (TNIV).

¹⁴For further discussion, see John Oswalt, "bāšār," *TWOT*, ed. R. L. Harris, G. L. Archer, and B. K. Waltke (Chicago: Moody Press, 1980), 1:136; Claus Westermann, *Genesis 1–11* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981), 233.

¹⁵See Oswalt, "kābaš," *TWOT*, 1:430.

¹⁶See Bruce Ware, "Summaries of the Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions on the Role of Women in the Home and in Christian Ministry" (2004), 4; online at www.cbmw.org/resources/articles/positionssummaries.pdf. Compare Raymond C. Ortlund Jr., "Male-Female Equality and Male Headship," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 104.

¹⁷The CBMW appeals to the context of Gen. 2:18. "The context makes it very unlikely," they argue, "that *helper* should be read on the analogy of God's help because in verses 19–20, Adam is caused to seek his 'helper' first among the animals"; online at www.cbmw.org/questions/45.php. However, what is overlooked is the fact that the animals' *priority* in creation does not qualify as an עֵזֶר. It is the woman's qualitative distinction from the animals and her sameness with the man that qualify her as an עֵזֶר כְּנֶגְדּוֹ (a "help corresponding to him").

¹⁸See Ortlund, "Male-Female Equality," 104.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, 102–3.

²⁰*Ibid.*, 99–100.

²¹See Anthony Thiselton, "The Supposed Power of Words in the Biblical Writings," *JTS* 25 (1974): 283–99; George Ramsey, "Is Name-Giving an Act of Domination in Genesis 2:23 and Elsewhere?" *CBQ* 50 (1988): 33.

²²See Linda Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church: 3 Crucial Questions* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), 102–3.

²³CBMW continues to ignore the function of naming in antiquity. Indeed, they now emphasize that Adam named his wife not once but twice, thereby signifying “in an OT cultural context, Adam’s right of authority over the one whom he named” (Ware, “Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions,” 6).

²⁴Ortlund, “Male-Female Equality,” 98.

²⁵See, e.g., “*ādām*” in BDB, HALOT, and TDOT Hebrew lexica. Compare “*ādām*,” in NIDOTTE, ed. W. A. VanGemeren (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1997), 1:264.

²⁶See DV, Reina-Valera, Luther, KJV, NKJV. Although “of his flesh and of his bones” is lacking in the earliest Alexandrian texts, its antiquity is attested by its presence in the Old Latin, the Vulgate, and the second-century church father Irenaeus.

²⁷Ware, “Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions,” 9.

²⁸Wayne Grudem (“*Kephalē Revisited*,” *ChrT* 46 [June 2003]): 12) thinks that *kephalē* here bears the sense *beginning*, or *first in a series* (e.g., *A* is the beginning of the alphabet) and not *beginning*, or *source*. He is certainly correct that this is a common meaning of *kephalē*. The difficulty here, though, is that “desire as the *first of a series* of every kind of sin” does not really fit, while “desire as the *source, origin, or root* of every kind of sin” does. A close parallel to *epithymia gar estin kephalē pasēs hamartias* is 1 Timothy 6:10: *rhiza gar pantōn tōn kakōn estin hē philargyria* (“For the love of money is a *root* of all kinds of evil”).

²⁹See Ortlund, “Male-Female Equality,” 109; Ware, “Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions,” 6.

³⁰For “curse,” see Ware, “Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions,” 6.

³¹See, e.g., Ortlund, “Male-Female Equality,” 107; Susan Foh, “A Male Leadership View,” in *Women in Ministry: Four Views*, 75–76.

³²Man’s ruling over woman forecasts a “restored role differentiation through redemption in Christ” (Ware, “Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions,” 5).

³³The man’s “ruling over woman . . . can be either rightfully-corrective or wrongfully-abusive” (Ware, “Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions,” 5).

³⁴See, e.g., Gordon Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC 1; Waco, Tex.: Word, 1987), 81.

³⁵CBMW imports “to rule over” into Genesis 4:7 (Ware, “Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions,” 6). The Hebrew *wēʾēleykā tēšūqātō* is literally “and for you is its [sin’s] yearning” and not “sin desires to rule over you.”

³⁶“Mother” and “father” were titles given to benefactors and synagogue officers of some stature in the Jewish community. See, e.g., *CII* 694 (third century): “I Claudius Tiberius Plychamos . . . father of the synagogue at Stobi . . . erected the buildings for the holy place . . . with my own means without in the least touching the sacred [funds].” An early second-century inscription from Italy ranks “father of the synagogue” before *gerosiarch* (a high-ranking official of the local Jewish ruling council). For further inscriptions and discussion, see Bernadette J. Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues* (BJS 36; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982), 83–90.

³⁷For discussion, see Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

³⁸For discussion, see Wayne Meeks, *The First Urban Christians* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press, 1983), 76.

³⁹Jason, for instance, posted bond to ensure the good behavior of his client Paul (Acts 17:5–9), and the Philippian church sent Paul money as the need arose (Phil. 4:10–19; cf. 1 Cor. 9:15–18 and 1 Thess. 2:9). For a concise treatment of Greco-Roman patronage, see Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 45.

⁴⁰See Bernadette J. Brooten, “‘Junia . . . Outstanding among the Apostles’ (Romans 16:7),” in *Women Priests*, ed. Leonard Swidler and Arlene Swidler (New York: Paulist, 1977), 141–43; Peter Lampe, “Junia/Iunias: Sklavenherkunft im Kreise der vorpaulinischen Apostel (Rom. 16:7),” *ZNW* 76 (1985): 132; Lampe, “Die stadtrömischen Christen in den ersten beiden Jahrhunderten,” *WUNT* 2.18 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987): 156–64; and Richard S. Cervin, “A Note Regarding the Name ‘Junia(s)’ in Romans 16:7,” *NTS* 40 (1994): 464–70. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (*Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 79–81) claim that the name “Junia” was rare. The difficulty, however, is that they limited their search to a *literary* Greek database where only the names of the famous appear—such as Brutus’s sister Junia. And, even so, they found only three of the actual seven present in the database. Daniel Wallace’s footnote on Romans 16:7 in the NET repeats the inaccuracy: “The feminine name *Junia* . . . is quite rare in Greek (apparently only three instances of it occur in Greek literature outside Rom 16.7, according to the data in the *TLG*.)” And compare the more recent CBMW’s “Question 38” in “Fifty Crucial Questions” (2003); online at www.cbmw.org/questions/38.php. The Council also failed to do a search of the standard patristic reference sources J. P. Migne’s *Patrologia Graeca* and *Patrologia Latina*, which yield six Greek fathers and fourteen Latin fathers. The latter are particularly significant, since the name *Junia* is the feminine form of the Latin *Junius*—a prestigious clan of the day. It was the custom of freedmen and freedwomen to adopt the *nomen gentilicium* of their patron, which explains the 250 or more *Junia* in and around Rome.

⁴¹Piper and Grudem claim to have found a masculine *Junias* in Origen and Epiphanius (*Index discipulorum* 24.125.18–19). But they overlook the fact that the masculine in Origen (the other two references are feminine) is actually the error of Rufinus’s Latin translation of Romans. Now we have a complete critical edition, which shows that *Junias* is a variant in two of three twelfth-century manuscripts that belong to a single subgroup, while earlier manuscripts have *Junia* (Caroline P. Hammond Bammel, *Der Römerbriefkommentar des Origenes: Kritische Ausgabe der Übersetzung Rufins* (3 vols.; *Vetus Latina, Aus der Geschichte der lateinischen Bibel* 16, 33, 34; Freiburg: Herder, 1990, 1997, 1998). Also, numerous inaccuracies (including a masculine *Priscas*) have caused patristic scholars to question the authorial attribution of *Index discipulorum*, especially since it was only first attributed to Epiphanius in the ninth century.

⁴²German translations from Luther forward, Dutch translations, and French translations were also masculine, while Italian and Spanish translations (until recently) were feminine. Yet, there is no linguistic basis for the masculine. Early Germanic and French versions were dependent on the Byzantine text type, which has a feminine accent. So the source of the masculine *Junias* may well reflect Luther’s personal disposition against an apostolic attribution.

⁴³See Bruce Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. (Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994), 475.

⁴⁴The German Bible Society's sixth printing (2001) of the United Bible Societies' fourth revised edition happily has corrected the mistake and omits the masculine circumflex in both the text and the apparatus.

⁴⁵See John Thorley, "Junia, A Woman Apostle," *NovT* 38 (1996): 24–26.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, 25. See also P. Chantraine, *La formation des noms en grec ancien* (Paris: Champion, 1933), 31–32. Bauckham (*Gospel Women*, 168, n. 253) rightly notes that the nonexistence of a contracted form is hardly surprising, since *Iouianos* itself is rare (found only once).

⁴⁷For discussion, see L. L. Belleville, "Iouinian . . . ἐπίσημοι ἐν τοῖς ἀποστόλοις: A Re-examination of Romans 16:7 in Light of Primary Source Materials," *NTS* (forthcoming).

⁴⁸See LSJ, MM, *PGL*, L&N. Michael Burer and Daniel Wallace ("Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Re-examination of Rom 16.7," *NTS* 47 [2001]: 76–91) appeal to Louw and Nida's lexicon as supporting "well known to." However, the entry at 28.31 reads "pertaining to being well known or outstanding either because of positive or negative characteristics—'outstanding,' 'famous,' 'notorious,' 'infamous.'" Indeed, Louw and Nida render Romans 16:7 as "they are outstanding among the apostles."

⁴⁹E.g., Nigel Turner (*Syntax*, vol. 3, in *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, ed. Moulton, Howard, and Turner [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1963], 261) states that "in" or "among" for *en* plus the plural dative is the primary meaning in the Greek of the NT period; see, e.g., 2 Thess. 1:4: "Therefore, among God's churches we boast about your perseverance and faith" (emphasis added).

⁵⁰For a list of NT examples of an adjective followed by *en* plus the personal plural dative as "inclusive," see A. T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research* (Nashville: Broadman, 1934), 587.

⁵¹See Burer and Wallace, "Was Junia an Apostle?" 86–87; compare 87 and 90, "every instance." Burer and Wallace do in fact concede, somewhat grudgingly, that the one certain instance (Lucian, *On Salaried Posts*, 28) actually supports the traditional view of Romans 16:7.

⁵²Proclus (third-century leader of the Phrygian Montanists) places the prophetic ministry of Philip's daughters in Hierapolis, Asia.

⁵³Another female prophet during NT times was a Philadelphian woman named Ammia (Eusebius, *Hist. eccl.* 5.17.2–4). Second-century Montanists Priscilla and Maximilla used women like Ammia and Philip's daughters to legitimize their own prophetic office (*Ibid.*, 5.17.4).

⁵⁴See Origen (PG 14.1279–80, 1289–90); Rabanus Maurus (PL 111–12); Haymo of Faversham (PL 117.505); Hatto of Vercelli (PL 134.282A–B); Bruno of Querfurt (PL 153.119–20); Herveus Burgidolensis (PL 181).

⁵⁵See, e.g., "Rufina, a Jewess, *synagogue ruler*, built this tomb for her freed slaves and the slaves raised in her household. No one else has a right to bury anyone here" (second century, Smyrna, Asia Minor [CII 741; IGR IV.1452]). Compare Peristeria of Thebes in Thessaly (a city in Greece [CII 696b]), Theopempte of Myndos in Asia Minor (a short distance from Ephesus [CII 756]), and Sophia of Gortyn in south-central Crete (CII 731C). See Hannah Safrai, "Women and the Ancient Synagogue," in *Daughters of the King*, ed. Susan Grossmann (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1974), 41; Shaye J. D. Cohen, "The Women in the Synagogues of Antiquity," *Conservative*

Judaism 34 (1980): 25; Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 137–38; Randall Chestnutt, “Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman Era,” in *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity*, vol. 1, ed. Carroll Osborne (Joplin, Mo.: College Press, 1993), 124; Dorothy Irvin, “The Ministry of Women in the Early Church,” *Duke Divinity School Review* (1980): 76–86; Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 21–31.

⁵⁶See, e.g., “The tomb of the blessed Mazauzala, *elder*. She lived [. . .] years. Rest. God is with the holy and the righteous ones.” (SEG 27 [1977] no. 1201). Compare “Tomb of Faustina the *elder*. Shalom” (CII 597); “Sophia of Gortyn, *elder* and head of the synagogue of Kisamos” (CII 731c); “Tomb of Rebeka, the *elder*, who has fallen asleep” (CII 692); “Tomb of Beronikene, *elder* and daughter of Ioses” (CII 581); “Tomb of Mannine, *elder*, daughter of Longinus, father, granddaughter of Faustinus, father, 38 years” (CII 590; SEG 27 [1977] no. 1201); “Here lies Sara Ura, *elder* [perhaps “aged woman”]” (CII 400); “[. . .] gerousiarch, lover of the commandments, and Eulogia, the *elder*, his wife (Antonio Ferrua, “*Le catacombe di Malta*,” *La Civiltà Cattolica* [1949]: 505–15).

⁵⁷See Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 58–59, 95–96.

⁵⁸Jerome, *Epist.* 127.2–7. For further discussion, see Walter Liefeld’s article “Women and Evangelism in the Early Church” (*Missiology* 15 [1987]: 297).

⁵⁹See LSJ, s.v.

⁶⁰Although the term *diakonos* is not used in Acts 6:1–6, the activity of caring for those with material needs is certainly present.

⁶¹Cf. 1 Cor. 16:15–18; 2 Cor. 8:18–24; Phil. 2:19–30. See Linda Belleville, “A Letter of Apologetic Self-Commendation: 2 Cor. 1:8–7:16,” *NovT* 31 (1989): 142–64.

⁶²Some translate *gynaikas* in 1 Timothy 3:11 as “their wives.” This is highly unlikely for several reasons. First, the grammar does not support it. If Paul were turning to the wives of deacons, he would have written “*their* women likewise” (*gynaikas tas autōn hosautōs*) or included some other indication of marital status. Also, there are no parallel requirements for the wives of overseers in the immediately preceding verses. Why would Paul highlight the wives of one group of leaders and ignore the wives of another? More, to read “likewise their wives are to be . . .” is to assume that all deacons’ wives possessed the requisite gifting and leadership skills. This plainly contradicts Pauline teaching elsewhere (e.g., 1 Cor. 12:11). For further discussion, see Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 60–64.

⁶³Women were also ordained to the diaconate in Italy and Gaul, but their numbers did not match those in the Eastern churches. For discussion, see P. Hünermann, “Conclusions Regarding the Female Diaconate,” *TS* 36 (1975): 329.

⁶⁴See also R. Gryson, *The Ministry of Women in the Early Church* (Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press, 1976), 90–91; D. R. MacDonald, “Virgins, Widows, and Paul in Second Century Asia Minor” (*SBLSP* 16; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1979), 181, n. 11.

⁶⁵Women in the early centuries were able to take advantage of their social mobility to visit friends and set up networks for evangelism. See Wendy Cotter, “Women’s Authority Roles in Paul’s Churches: Countercultural or Conventional,” *NovT* 36 (1994): 369.

⁶⁶See *Didascalia Apostolorum* 3.

⁶⁷See LSJ, s.v.

⁶⁸See LSJ, s.v.

⁶⁹See LSJ, s.v.; BDAG, s.v.

⁷⁰See Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 65–67.

⁷¹For discussion, see Bonnie Thurston, *The Widows: A Women's Ministry in the Early Church* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 54.

⁷²The genuine canons of Hippolytus were preserved in Arabic, Ethiopic, Coptic, and Latin versions and translated into French by M. L. McClure and into English by L. Duchesne in a volume titled *Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*, in *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution* (New York: E. & J. B. Young, 1903), 531. For the order of widows in the early and late councils, see the canons of Basil #24 (fourth century) and canon #40 of the Quinisext Council (seventh century).

⁷³The church's philanthropic work on behalf of widows was a natural outgrowth of Judaism. One of the ministries of the local synagogue was meeting the basic needs of the sojourner and the poor in their midst. The latter group would have included widows. See Bruce Winter, "Providentia for the Widows of 1 Timothy 5:3–16" (*TynBul* 39 [1988]: 31–32, 87).

⁷⁴"Candace"; "Cleopatra," in *Encyclopaedia Britannica* CD-ROM (2001). The CBMW disallows Athaliah on the basis of her being "a wicked usurper of the throne" (Ware, "Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions," 3). This overlooks the fact that not a few of Israel's and Judah's kings are described in the same way. Usurper or not, she was still head of state.

⁷⁵See Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 94–95.

⁷⁶Inscriptions dating from the first century until the middle of the third century place these women in Ephesus, Cyzicus, Thyatira, Aphrodisias, Magnesia, and elsewhere. See R. A. Kearsley, "Asiarchs, Archiereis, and the Archiereiai of Asia," *GRBS* 27 [1986]: 183–92.

⁷⁷See, e.g., Steven M. Baugh, "A Foreign World: Ephesus in the First Century," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 43–44.

⁷⁸See Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 31–38; Riet Van Bremen, "Women and Wealth," in *Images of Women in Antiquity*, ed. A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt (Detroit: Wayne State Univ. Press, 1987), 231–41.

⁷⁹See Kearsley's carefully documented study, "Archiereiai of Asia," 183–92.

⁸⁰See Baugh, "Foreign World," 42–45. The primary difficulty with Baugh's study is that it confined itself to Ephesian inscriptions and data and so wasn't broad-based enough to accurately reflect the religious and civic roles of first-century women in either Asia or in the Greco-Roman empire as a whole. To ignore the oriental cults (especially Isis) and their impact on women's roles is particularly egregious. See the detailed discussion and presentation of the evidence in Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 31–38.

⁸¹See Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, 23–25.

⁸²See Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 49–50.

⁸³See D. A. Carson, "'Silent in the Churches': On the Role of Women in 1 Corinthians 14:33b–36," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 153.

⁸⁴In the NT, pastoring is inseparable from teaching. This is clear from Ephesians 4:11, where the two nouns *poimenas* and *didaskalous* have a single article and are connected by *kai*. This arrangement of the grammatical pieces serves to conceptually unite the two ideas and should be translated "pastor-teachers." For discussion, see Maximilian Zerwick, *Biblical Greek* (Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 1963), #184.

⁸⁵The REB's "minister" for *diakonon* also falls short. "Minister" was not the officially recognized position it is today. Another unlikely translation is "deaconess" (NASB, RSV, JB, NJB, Phillips), for the feminine term *diakonissa* was not in use until the Nicene Council in AD 325 (canon 19). For further discussion, see A. A. Swidler, "Women Deacons: Some Historical Highlights," in *A New Phoebe: Perspectives on Roman Catholic Women and the Permanent Diaconate*, ed. V. Ratigan and A. Swidler (Kansas City, Mo.: Sheed & Ward, 1990), 81; V. V. FitzGerald, "The Characteristics and Nature of the Order of the Deaconess," in *Women and the Priesthood*, ed. Thomas Hopko (Crestwood, N.Y.: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1983), 78.

⁸⁶The leadership list in Ephesians 4:11 (NIV) is a good example of the gender inclusivity of the Greek masculine. "[Christ] . . . gave some to be apostles [*tous apostolous*], some to be prophets [*tous prophētas*], some to be evangelists [*tous euangelistas*], and some to be pastors and teachers [*tous poimenas kai didaskalous*]." Women are named in each of these roles (e.g., Junia [Rom. 16:7]; Philip's daughters [Acts 21:9]; Syntyche and Euodia [Phil. 4:2]; and elderly widows at Ephesus [1 Tim. 5:9–10]).

⁸⁷The primary function of Jewish elders was that of community leaders. They held no official status in the local synagogue. This is quite different from Christian elders, who seem to have had official standing in the early church. See Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, rev. ed. (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1979), 3:87–107.

⁸⁸See LSJ, s.v., and BAGD, s.v.

⁸⁹For further discussion, see J. Neuffer, "First-Century Cultural Backgrounds in the Greco-Roman Empire," in *Symposium on the Role of Women in the Church*, ed. J. Neuffer (Plainfield, N.J.: General Council of the Seventh-Day Adventist Church, 1984), 69.

⁹⁰Some traditionalists associate the Greek *prohistēmi* with "exercise of rule" or "authority" and cite 1 Thess. 5:12; 1 Tim. 3:4–5; 5:17 as examples. However, there is no lexical basis for this association. Louw and Nida list as meanings: (1) guide, (2) be active in helping, and (3) strive to. Compare BAGD and LSJ, s.v. The Greek term literally means "to stand before," or "to lead," and is used in contexts where the main idea is to shepherd or care for God's people (i.e., a pastoral association). In Rom. 12:8, e.g., *prohistēmi* is grouped with the spiritual gifts of offering practical assistance to those in need ("give generously," "show mercy"). Also, in 1 Tim. 3:4–5, to *prohistamenon* the church is to "care for" (*epimelēsetai*) it. This fits with the role of a *prostatēs* ("benefactor," "protector") in the culture of the day. See LSJ, s.v.

⁹¹See Linda Belleville, "Authority," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, eds. G. Hawthorne, R. Martin, and D. Reid (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1993), 54–59.

⁹²See LSJ, s.v.; L&N 37.48–49.

⁹³*Hypeikō* is found only here in the NT. The verb means "to yield, give way, submit." In Homer's *Iliad* 16.305, e.g., it refers to making room for another person by yielding one's seat. See LSJ, s.v. "Obey" is therefore not an accurate translation.

⁹⁴*Agrypneō* means "to watch over, stay alert," implying continuous and wakeful concern. See L&N, s.v.

⁹⁵See LSJ, s.v.; TLNT 3:424.

⁹⁶The Evangelical Covenant Church, *The Covenant Book of Worship* (Chicago: Covenant Press, 1981), 298.

⁹⁷See *CBMW News* 1 (Nov. 1995), 1.

⁹⁸See, e.g., James I. Packer, "Let's Stop Making Women Presbyters," *ChrT* 35 (Feb. 11, 1991): 20; James A. Borland, "Women in the Life and Teachings of Jesus," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 120; Ware, "Egalitarian and Complementarian Positions," 8.

⁹⁹See n. 1, p. 21.

¹⁰⁰F. W. Grosheide (*The First Epistle to the Corinthians* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1953], 341–43) states that "women are allowed to prophesy but not when the congregation officially meets."

¹⁰¹It is not clear who "the others" are. They could be other prophets (v. 29), the rest of the congregation, or those with the gift of discernment. The latter two options find support elsewhere in Paul's writings. In 1 Thessalonians, he urges the congregation to test prophecies, with the intent of proving their genuineness (5:21). And he pairs the gift of discernment with the gift of prophecy in 1 Cor. 12:10. Based on the context, the last option is the likeliest. It is Paul's expectation that speaking in tongues will be followed by interpretation (14:27–28), so it makes sense to think that prophecy would in turn be subjected to the scrutiny of those gifted to determine whether the speaking is truly from God.

¹⁰²See, e.g., Richard and Catherine Kroeger, "Pandemonium and Silence at Corinth," in *Women and the Ministries of Christ*, ed. R. Hestenes and L. Curley (Pasadena, Calif.: Fuller Theol. Seminary, 1979), 49–55; Kroeger and Kroeger, "Strange Tongues or Plain Talk," *Daughters of Sarah* 12 (1986): 10–13.

¹⁰³See, e.g., Joseph Dillow, *Speaking in Tongues: Seven Crucial Questions* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975), 170.

¹⁰⁴See, e.g., James Hurlley, "Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women? A Consideration of 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 and 1 Corinthians 14:33b–36," *WTJ* 35 (1973): 190–220; E. Earle Ellis, "The Silenced Wives of Corinth (1 Cor. 14:34–5)," in *New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. E. J. Epp and Gordon Fee (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 216–18; Wayne Grudem, *The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1982), 249–55; Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 52.

¹⁰⁵See, e.g., W. F. Orr and J. A. Walther, *1 Corinthians* (AB; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976), 312–13; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 2d ed. (HNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1971; repr. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1987), 332; cf. L. Ann Jervis, "1 Corinthians 14:34–35: A Reconsideration of Paul's Limitation of the Free Speech of Some Corinthian Women," *JSNT* 58 (1995): 60–73.

¹⁰⁶See, e.g., G. Engel, "Let the Woman Learn in Silence. II," *ExpTim* 16 (1904–05): 189–90; Scott Barchy, "Power, Submission, and Sexual Identity Among the Early Christians," in *Essays on New Testament Christianity*, ed. C. Wetzel (Cincinnati, Ohio: Standard, 1978), 68–70.

¹⁰⁷See, e.g., Neal Flanagan and Edwina Snyder, "Did Paul Put Down Women in 1 Cor. 14:34–36?" *BTB* 11 (1981): 1–12; Chris Ukachukwu Manus, "The Subordination of Women in the Church: 1 Cor. 14:33b–36 Reconsidered," *RAT* 8 (1984): 183–95; David Odell-Scott, "Let the Women Speak in Church: An Egalitarian Interpretation of 1 Cor 14:33b–36," *BTB* 13 (1983): 90–93; Odell-Scott, "In Defense of an Egalitarian Interpretation of 1 Cor 14:34–36: A Reply to Murphy-O'Connor's Critique," *BTB* 17 (1987): 100–103; Gilbert Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 151–52; Linda McKinnish Bridges, "Silencing the Corinthian Men, Not the Women," in *The*

New Has Come, ed. A. T. Neil and V. G. Neely (Washington, D.C.: Southern Baptist Alliance, 1989); Charles Talbert, "Biblical Criticism's Role: The Pauline View of Women as a Case in Point," in *Unfettered Word*, ed. R. B. James (Waco, Tex.: Word, 1987), 62–71. Verse 36 begins with the particle $\bar{\epsilon}$ (translated "What!" in the KJV and RSV), which (it is argued) Paul uses to reject or refute what has come before (see Daniel Arichea, "The Silence of Women in the Church: Theology and Translation in 1 Cor. 14:33b–36," *BT* 46 [1995]: 101–12). One difficulty is that there is no indication verses 34–35 are a quotation (like one finds elsewhere in 1 Corinthians [6:12, 13; 7:1b; 8:1b; 10:23]). Also, while the particle $\bar{\epsilon}$ can express disapproval, it is a double $\bar{\epsilon}\bar{\epsilon}$ that functions in this way and not the single $\bar{\epsilon}$ found in 11:36. See LSJ, s.v.

¹⁰⁸See, e.g., Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 147, 151.

¹⁰⁹For further discussion, see Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 32.

¹¹⁰D. A. Carson calls this "unbearably sexist" ("Silent in the Churches," 147), but it is only so if judged by modern educational standards. It is crucial to read the text in light of first-century Greco-Roman culture and not twenty-first century Western culture. For more on cultural background, see Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 31–32.

¹¹¹Both are equally Paul's practice. See, e.g., Eph. 5:1 NIV: "Be imitators of God, therefore, *as dearly loved children*," and Eph. 5:8 AT: "*As children of light*, so walk." Yet, Paul's other appeals to universal practice appear only as a concluding point. "Timothy," Paul writes, "will remind you of my way of life in Christ Jesus, *as I teach everywhere in every church*" (1 Cor. 4:17 AT). "Each should retain the place in life that the Lord assigned . . . and so I command in all the churches" (7:17 AT). "If anyone wants to be contentious about this, *we have no other practice—nor do the churches of God*" (11:16 NIV). "For God is not a God of disorder but of peace—*as in all the congregations of the Lord's people*" fits this pattern exactly (14:33b). Also, to start a new paragraph at verse 33b would produce an awkward redundancy: "*As in all the churches of the saints, let the women in the churches be silent.*" Why repeat "in the churches" twice in one sentence? Plus, "Let the women . . ." is a typical Pauline start to a new paragraph (e.g., Eph. 5:22; Col. 3:18 AT). Thus, it is wrongheaded for traditionalists to treat as a given the start of a paragraph at verse 33b and thus assume the universality of Paul's injunction in verse 34. See, e.g., D. A. Carson's statement ("Silent in the Churches," 147) that "Paul's rule [of silence] operates in all the churches."

¹¹²The sudden spotlight on married women, the awkward change of subject ("When you [plural] gather" [vv. 26–33] . . . "Let them [women] be silent" [vv. 34–35] . . . "Or did the word of God originate with you [plural]" [vv. 36–40]), and the seeming contradiction between verse 34 and 11:5 were difficult for copyists in the early centuries. This is obvious from the different places these verses appear in the text tradition. In some early manuscripts and versions, verses 34–35 follow verse 40 (D F G Itala, a Vulgate manuscript); in other early manuscripts and versions, verses 34–35 come after verse 33 (p^{46} \aleph A B Ψ K L Itala, Vulgate, Syriac, Coptic, and others). Also there is a barumlaut sign in codex Vaticanus indicating awareness of a textual problem, and p^{46} \aleph A D and 33 have a breaking mark at the beginning of verse 34 and at the end of verse 35. Codex Fuldensis (sixth-century manuscript of the Vulgate) has a scribal sign directing the reader to skip verses 34–35 and go to the text of verses 36–40 in the margin. (It does not move verses 34–35 to the end of the chapter, as Carson asserts ["Silent in the Churches," 141].) See Metzger, *Textual Commentary*, 499–500. The paragraphing of

the UBS and Nestle-Aland editions at verse 33b and then again at verse 37 is therefore highly misleading. For a detailed treatment, see Philip B. Payne, "Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1 Cor 14.34–5," *NTS* 41 (1995): 240–62; Payne, "Ms. 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14.34–5," *NTS* 44 (1998): 152–58.

The text tradition and versional evidence have led some scholars to conclude (with understandable justification) that verses 34–35 are not original to 1 Corinthians. See, e.g., Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 699–705; Jacobus Petzer, "Reconsidering the silent women of Corinth—a note on 1 Corinthians 14:34–35," *ThEv* 26 (1993): 132–38; Payne, "Fuldensis and 1 Cor 14.34–5," 240–62; Peter Lockwood, "Does 1 Corinthians 14:34–35 Exclude Women from the Pastoral Office?" *LuthThJ* 30 (1996): 30–37; Payne, "Ms. 88," 152–58.

¹¹³D. A. Carson ("Silent in the Churches," 152) believes Paul is citing Genesis 2:24. Yet to forsake existing loyalties, cleave to one's spouse, and become "one flesh" is the language of mutuality, not hierarchy.

¹¹⁴Other suggestions include submission to (1) the elders of the church, (2) those who evaluate prophecies, and (3) one's own spirit.

¹¹⁵See Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 36–38.

¹¹⁶The NIV's translation of 1 Timothy 5:20 ("those who sin are to be rebuked publicly, so that the others may take warning") is misleading. The tense and mood are present indicative. So Paul is not treating a hypothetical possibility ("Should any sin, they are to be rebuked publicly") but a present reality ("Those who continue in sin, rebuke in the presence of all" NASB). The TNIV is closer to the mark: "Those elders who are sinning you are to reprove before everyone."

¹¹⁷This is also the case for the rest of the NT. See *sigāō* in Luke 9:36; 18:39; 20:26; Acts 12:17; 15:12–13 and *sigē* (noun) in Acts 21:40 and Rev. 8:1. For *hēsychia* (and related forms) as "calm" or "restful," see Luke 23:56; Acts 11:18; 21:14; 1 Thess. 4:11; 2 Thess. 3:12; 1 Pet. 3:4. For the sense "not speak," see Luke 14:4 and, perhaps, Acts 22:2.

¹¹⁸For further discussion, see Kevin Giles, "Response," in *The Bible and Women's Ministry: An Australian Dialogue*, ed. A. Nichols (Canberra: Acorn Press, 1990), 73.

¹¹⁹R. H. Charles's edition of the Pseudepigrapha (*The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, 2 vols. [London: Oxford, 1913]) has "they shall also be registered according to their former *restricted status*." But this does not fit the lexical range of possibilities for *authentia*.

¹²⁰L&N 37.35–47; 48–95. *Authentein* is noticeably absent from either of these domains.

¹²¹Evangelical scholarship has been erroneously dependent for its understanding of *authentein* on George Knight III's 1984 study ("*Authenteō* in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2:12," *NTS* 30 [1984]: 143–57) and his translation of *authenteōs pros auton* as "I exercised authority over him." Yet this hardly fits the mundane details of the text (i.e., payment of a boat fare). Nor can *pros auton* be understood as "over him." The preposition plus the accusative does not bear this sense in Greek. "To/toward," "against," and "with" (and less frequently "at," "for," "with reference to," "on," and "on account of") are the range of possible meanings. See LSJ 1497 [C. *with the accusative*]. Here it likely means something like "I had my way *with* him, or perhaps "I took a firm stand *with* him."

¹²²See Philodemus, "The Rhetorica of Philodemus," trans. Harry Hubbell (Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences [1920], 23:306). Knight's analysis is flawed. He states that "the key term is *authent[ou]sin*" and claims that the rendition offered by Hubbell is "they [orators] are men who incur the enmity of those in authority." But Hubbell actually renders *authent[ou]sin* rightly as an adjective meaning "powerful" and modifying the noun "lords."

¹²³Although Dorotheus and Ptolemy postdate Paul, they nonetheless provide an important witness to the continuing use of *authentēō* to mean "to hold sway over," "to dominate," and to the developing meaning of "leader," "chief," in the post-apostolic period.

¹²⁴See Moeris, *Attic Lexicon*, ed. J. Pierson (Leyden, 1759), 58. Compare fourteenth-century Atticist Thomas Magister (*Grammar* 18.8), who urges his pupils to use *autodikein* because *authentēin* is vulgar.

¹²⁵See, e.g., Theodor Nageli, "Authenteō," in *Der Wörschatz des Apostles Paulus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1905), 49–50; compare MM, "Authenteō," and Liddell, Scott, and Jones, *Greek-English Lexicon*, "Authenteō," to have full power over"; online at www.perseus.tufts.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.04.0057%3Aentry%3D%2317366.

¹²⁶Louw and Nida also note that "to control in a domineering manner" is often expressed idiomatically as "to shout orders at," "to act like a chief toward," or "to bark at." The use of the verb in 1 Tim. 2:12 comes quite naturally out of the word "master," or "autocrat"; cf. BDAG, which defines *authentēs* as "to assume a stance of independent authority, give orders to, dictate to," s.v.

¹²⁷The noun *authentēs* used of an "owner" or "master" appears a bit earlier. See, e.g., *Shepherd of Hermas* 9.5.6: "Let us go to the tower, for the *owner* of the tower is coming to inspect it." For the second-century dating of the *Hermas* 5.82, see Michael Holmes, *Apostolic Fathers*, 2d ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992), 331. There is a disputed reading of *authentēs* in Euripides' *Suppliant Women* (442). Arthur Way (*Euripides: Suppliants* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1971], 534) emends the text to read *euthyntes* ("when people *pilot* the land") instead of *authentēs*. David Kovacs (*Euripides: Suppliant Women, Electra, Heracles* [Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 1998], 57) deletes lines 442–55 as not original. Thus Carroll Osburn erroneously cites this text as "establishing a fifth-century B.C. usage of the term *authentēs*, meaning 'to exercise authority,'" and mistakenly faults Catherine Clark Kroeger for not dealing with it (Carroll Osburn, "Authentēs [1 Timothy 2:12]," *ResQ* [1982]: 2, n. 5).

¹²⁸A wide range of moderns follow the same tradition: *Louis Segond Version* (French, 1910): "I do not permit the woman to teach, neither to take authority over [*prendre autorite sur*] the man." *Goodspeed* (1923): "I do not allow women to teach or to domineer over men." *La Sainte* (French, 1938): "I do not permit the woman to teach, neither to take authority over [*prendre de l'autorité sur*] the man." NEB (1961): "I do not permit a woman to be a teacher, nor must woman domineer over man." BJ (French, 1973): "I do not permit the woman to teach, neither to lay down the law for [*faire la loi a*] the man." REB (1989): "I do not permit women to teach or dictate to the men." *The Message*: "I don't let women take over and tell the men what to do." *The New Translation* (1990): "I do not permit a woman to teach or *dominate* men." CEV (1991): "They should . . . not be allowed to teach or to tell men what to do."

There are two notable exceptions: (1) Martin Luther (1522): "Einem Weibe aber gestatte ich nicht, daß sie lehre, auch nicht, daß sie des Mannes Herr sei." Luther, in

turn, influenced William Tyndale (1525–26): “I suffer not a woman to teach, neither to have authority over the man.” (2) DV (1582): “But to teach I permit not vnto a woman, nor to haue dominion ouer the man” The DV, in turn, influenced the ASV (“nor to have dominion over a man”) and subsequent revisions of Reina’s *La Santa Biblia*. See, e.g., the 1602 Valera revision: “*ni ejercer domino sobre* [neither to exercise dominion over].”

¹²⁹Other examples (all AT) include (1) *Synonyms*: “neither labors nor spins” (Matt. 6:28); “neither quarreled nor cried out” (Matt. 12:19); “neither abandoned nor given up” (Acts 2:27); “neither leave nor forsake” (Heb. 13:5); “neither run in vain nor labor in vain” (Phil. 2:16). (2) *Closely related ideas*: “neither the desire nor the effort” (Rom. 9:16); “neither the sun nor the moon” (Rev. 21:23). (3) *Antonyms*: “neither a good tree . . . nor a bad tree” (Matt. 7:18); “neither the one who did harm nor the one who was harmed” (2 Cor. 7:12). (4) *General to particular*: “you know neither the day nor the hour” (Matt. 25:13); “I neither consulted with flesh and blood nor went up to Jerusalem” (Gal. 1:16–17). (5) *Natural progression of closely related ideas*: “born neither of blood, nor of the human will, nor of the will of man” (John 1:13); “neither the Christ, nor Elijah, nor the Prophet” (John 1:25); “neither from man nor through man” (Gal. 1:1). (6) *Goal or purpose*: “neither hears nor understands [i.e., hears with the intent to understand]” (Matt. 13:13); “neither dwells in temples made with human hands nor is served by human hands [i.e., dwells with a view to being served]” (Acts 17:24). See Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 176–77.

¹³⁰Along somewhat similar lines, Donald Kushke (“An Exegetical Brief on 1 Timothy 2:12,” *WisconsinLuthQ* 88 [1991]: 64) suggests that *oude* introduces an explanation: “to teach in an authoritative fashion.”

¹³¹Philip Payne highlighted the importance of the “neither . . . nor” construction in a paper presented at an ETS annual meeting (“*Oude* in 1 Timothy 2:12,” [Nov. 21, 1986]). His own position is that “neither . . . nor” in this verse joins two closely associated couplets (e.g., “hit-and-run”—“teach-and-domineer”).

¹³²See Pausanias, *Guide to Greece* 4.31.8; 8.53.3. Artemis is sometimes misrepresented as the goddess of the hunt. She became known as a huntress in tracking down Oeneus son of Porthaon, king of Calydon, because in sacrificing the firstfruits of the annual crops of the country to all the gods, Artemis alone was forgotten. It is told that in her wrath she sent a boar of extraordinary size and strength, which prevented the land from being sown and destroyed the cattle and the people that fell in with it. See Pseudo-Apollodorus, *Library* 1.67; Pausanias, *Guide to Greece* 7.18.10.

¹³³For further details, see Sharon H. Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:9–15 in Light of the Religious and Cultural Milieu of the First Century* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1991), 31–41; “Artemis,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online* at www.eb.com. “Of the daughters of Coeus, Asteria in the likeness of a quail flung herself into the sea in order to escape the amorous advances of Zeus, and a city was formerly called after her Asteria, but afterwards it was named Delos. But Latona for her intrigue with Zeus was hunted by Hera over the whole earth, till she came to Delos and brought forth first Artemis, by the help of whose midwifery she afterwards gave birth to Apollo” (Pseudo-Apollodorus, *Library* 1.27).

¹³⁴Traditionalists typically interpret *gar* at the start of verse 13 as causal rather than explanatory, and so they see it as introducing a “creation order” dictum: Women (so it goes) must not teach men because men according to the order of creation were intended to lead; and Eve’s proneness to deception while taking the lead demonstrates this. This reading of the text is problematic for a number of reasons. First, there is nothing in the context to support it. In fact, verse 15 is against it: “Women must not teach men because Eve was deceived, but she will be saved through childbearing” is nonsense. Second, although some are quick to assume a creation-fall ordering in verses 13–14, virtually all stop short of including “women will be saved [or kept safe] through childbearing” (v. 15). To do so, though, is to lack hermeneutical integrity. Either all three statements are normative or all three are not.

¹³⁵As the mother-goddess, Artemis was the mother of life, the nourisher of all creatures, and the power of fertility in nature. Maidens turned to her as the protector of their virginity, barren women sought her aid, and women in labor turned to her for help. See Gritz, *Mother Goddess at Ephesus*, 31–41; “Artemis,” *Encyclopaedia Britannica Online*. S. M. Baugh (“A Foreign World,” 28–33) takes issue with the premise that Artemis worship was a fusion of a fertility cult of the mother-goddess of Asia Minor and the Greek virgin goddess of the hunt. The fourth-century BC “Rituals for Brides and Pregnant Women in the Worship of Artemis” (*LSCG Suppl.* 15) and other literary sources support the fusion. See Gritz, *Mother Goddess at Ephesus*, 31–41; F. Sokolowski, *Lois sacraes de l’Asie Mineure* (Paris, 1955).

¹³⁶See, e.g., Michael Stitzinger, “Cultural Confusion and the Role of Women in the Church: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:8–14,” *CBTJ* 4 (1988): 34; James Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 216.

¹³⁷See Piper, “Vision of Biblical Complementarity,” 50–51.

¹³⁸Wayne Grudem, “An open letter to egalitarians,” *JBW* 3 (March 1998): 1, 3–4.

¹³⁹Every Greek lexicon I consulted states that Ephesians 5:21 has no secular parallel. See, e.g., BAGD, s.v.; *TLNT* 3:424–26. Even the NT concept of submission has no secular parallel.

¹⁴⁰*TLNT* 3:426.

¹⁴¹Grudem’s claim that *allēlous* [sic] in Ephesians 5:21 takes the common meaning “some to others” (as opposed to “each to the other,” “mutually” [BAGD, s.v.]) does not have a lexical basis (“An open letter,” 3; “The Myth of Mutual Submission,” *CBMW News* 1 [1996]: 3). “Some to others” does not fit Galatians 6:2 (“Carry each other’s burdens”), 1 Corinthians 11:33 (“When you gather to eat, you should all eat together”), or Revelation 6:4 (“To make people [on earth] slay each other”), as the CBMW would claim.

¹⁴²*Heautōn* functions as a reciprocal pronoun in Ephesians 5:19. It is used this way already in classical times. *Allēlōn* and *heautōn* often appear alongside one another (e.g., Luke 23:12; 1 Cor 6:7; Col. 3:13, 16). See BDF #287.

¹⁴³See LSJ, s.v.

¹⁴⁴Compare Leland Wilshire, “1 Timothy 2:12 Revisited: A Reply to Paul W. Barnett and Timothy J. Harris,” *EvQ* 65 (1993): 46–47.

¹⁴⁵For this reading, see Friedrich Preisigke, “*Authenteō*,” in *Wörterbuch der griechischen Papyrusurkunden*.

¹⁴⁶George Knight (“*Authenteō* in Reference to Women,” 145) misreads (or perhaps mistypes) translator F. E. Robbins’s (LCL edition) “angles” as “angels.” H. Scott Baldwin, one of the editors of *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, once again cites Knight’s inaccuracy rather than doing a “fresh analysis,” as the book’s subtitle claims (see his “Appendix 2: *Authenteō* in Ancient Greek Literature,” in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 275).

¹⁴⁷See, e.g., *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*.

¹⁴⁸See M. D. Shertzer, *The Elements of Grammar* (New York: Macmillan, 1986), 45–46.

¹⁴⁹See BDF #445.

¹⁵⁰As, e.g., Andreas J. Köstenberger does in “A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Timothy 2:12,” in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 81–103.

¹⁵¹Nigel Turner (*Syntax*, vol. 3, in *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 134) classifies infinitives as “noun forms.”

¹⁵²See, e.g., James A. Brooks and Carlton L. Winbery, *Syntax of New Testament Greek* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1979), esp. “The Infinitive as a Modifier of Substantives,” 141–42). Köstenberger (“Complex Sentence Structure,” 81–103) does not seem to recognize that the infinitive is a verbal noun.

¹⁵³Compare “you know *neither* the day *nor* the hour” (Matt. 25:13 NRSV); “*neither* did I consult with flesh and blood *nor* did I go up to Jerusalem to meet with those who were apostles before me” (Gal. 1:16–17 AT, emphasis added).

¹⁵⁴In Ephesians 5:22–23, the lack of articles with *kephalē* and *sōtēr* is significant. If the text read “the Head” and “the Savior” of the church, we might think in terms of a CEO. However, the absence of articles means these two nouns describe rather than define (i.e., point not to a specific person or thing but rather to its nature or quality; so not “the Savior” (a title) but “savior,” “deliverer,” “preserver”). For discussion, see Zerwick, *Biblical Greek*, #171–73.

¹⁵⁵Ephesians 5:30 in the Western and Byzantine families of manuscripts and versions and in church fathers from the second century on reads, “For we are members of his body, of his flesh and of his bones.”

¹⁵⁶See previous note.

¹⁵⁷E.g., Bruce Ware (“Male Priority in Man and Woman”) argues that men bear God’s image directly and women only derivatively; hence the priority of male over female (see n. 3).

¹⁵⁸See David W. Jones, “Egalitarianism and Homosexuality: Connected or Autonomous Ideologies,” *JBMW* 8 (Fall 2003): 5.

A RESPONSE TO LINDA BELLEVILLE

Thomas R. Schreiner

Footnotes

¹See Al Wolters, "A Semantic Study of *Authentēs* and Its Derivatives," *JGRChJ* 1 (2000): 145–75; H. Scott Baldwin, "A Difficult Word: *Authenteō* in 1 Timothy 2:12," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, eds. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 65–80.

²See Andreas Köstenberger, "A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Timothy 2:12," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 81–103.

A RESPONSE TO LINDA BELLEVILLE

Craig S. Keener

Footnotes

¹Craig S. Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1992; rev. with new introduction, 2004).

²Craig S. Keener, *And Marries Another: Divorce and Remarriage in the Teaching of the New Testament* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 90–91.

WOMEN IN MINISTRY: A COMPLEMENTARIAN PERSPECTIVE

Craig L. Blomberg

Footnotes

¹The classic study remains G. R. Beasley-Murray's *Baptism in the New Testament* (London: Macmillan, 1962). Particularly influential was Paul K. Jewett (*Infant Baptism and the Covenant of Grace* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978]), precisely because he argued for believers' baptism from a Reformed perspective, which is normally known to advocate infant baptism.

²Particularly influential was Geoffrey W. Bromiley (*Children of Promise: The Case for Baptizing Infants* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1979]).

³James R. Beck and Craig L. Blomberg, eds., *Two Views on Women in Ministry* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001).

⁴"Neither Hierarchalist nor Egalitarian: Gender Roles in Paul," in *ibid.*, 329–72. A minimally revised version of this essay has been submitted to Stanley E. Porter in keeping with his hopes that a projected volume on Pauline theology (which he would edit) may still be forthcoming.

⁵William J. Webb, *Slaves, Women and Homosexuals: Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2001), 242–43.

⁶Thomas R. Schreiner, review of *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, ed. Beck and Blomberg, *SBJT* (forthcoming). From the egalitarian side, Julia Bloom, in her review of our book (*Mutuality* [Winter 2001]: 27), agrees.

⁷See esp. Marjorie Warkentin, *Ordination* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

⁸See esp. Steve Walton, *A Call to Live: Vocation for Everyone* (London: SPCK, 1994).

⁹Laudable, detailed attempts on the complementarian side have been made by Stephen B. Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ* (Ann Arbor, Mich.: Servant, 1980), 371–570; and the chapters in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, eds. John Piper and Wayne Grudem (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1991), represented in pp. 280–331. Supporting egalitarianism, see Mary S. van Leeuwen, *Gender and Grace: Love, Work and Parenting in a Changing World* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1990); van Leeuwen, *My Brother's Keeper: What the Social Sciences Do (and Don't) Tell Us About Masculinity* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2002).

¹⁰On these verses, cf. esp. Richard S. Hess, "Splitting the Adam: The Use of *ʿādām* in Genesis i-v," in *Studies in the Pentateuch*, ed. J. A. Emerton (Leiden: Brill, 1990), 1–15.

¹¹See James B. Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 207–9.

¹²So, e.g., Linda L. Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church: Three Crucial Questions* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), 103.

¹³See Thomas Finley, "The Relationship of Woman and Man in the Old Testament," in *Women and Men in Ministry: A Complementary Perspective*, eds. Robert L. Saucy and Judith K. TenElshof (Chicago: Moody Press, 2001), 55.

¹⁴Cf. Bruce K. Waltke with Cathi J. Fredricks, *Genesis: A Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 88.

¹⁵Cf. Kenneth A. Mathews, *Genesis 1–11:26* (NAC; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1996), 213.

¹⁶Cf. Gordon J. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (WBC; Waco: Word, 1987), 70

¹⁷Cf. Victor P. Hamilton, *The Book of Genesis Chapters 1–17* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 179–81.

¹⁸Leading some to speak of this as the first unfortunate example of sex-role reversal, as, e.g., Raymond C. Ortlund Jr., "Male-Female Equality and Male Headship," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 107.

¹⁹Derek Kidner, *Genesis* (TOTC; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1967), 71.

²⁰Cf. G. W. Ramsey, "Is Name-Giving an Act of Domination in Genesis 2:23 and Elsewhere?" *CBQ* 50 (1988): 24–35.

²¹There is, significantly, a broad consensus on this, not only among evangelical complementarians but among nonevangelical scholars as well (who then go on to reject the timeless authority of the pattern they detect). Cf. esp. David J. A. Clines, "What Does Eve Do to Help? and Other Iredeemably Androcentric Orientations in Genesis 1–3," in *What Does Eve Do to Help? and Other Readerly Questions in the Old Testament*, ed. David J. A. Clines (JSOTSup; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 25–48.

²²So esp. Aída B. Spencer, *Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry* (Nashville: Nelson, 1985), 29–42. Cf. throughout Gilbert Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles: A Guide for the Study of Female Roles in the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985).

²³Cf. Thomas Finley, "The Ministry of Women in the Old Testament," in *Women and Men in Ministry*, 74.

²⁴Mary Hayter (*The New Eve in Christ* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987], 60–79), e.g., thoroughly discusses "Priesthood in the Old Testament," acknowledging numerous factors involved in prohibiting women from officiating. But the heart of the matter remains the cultural framework of pre-Christian patriarchal society far removed from our own.

²⁵E.g., Mary J. Evans, *Woman in the Bible* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1983), 30.

²⁶For a detailed survey, see Athalya Brenner, *The Israelite Woman: Social Role and Literary Type in Biblical Narrative* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985). See also the contributions to *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity*, ed. Carroll D. Osburn (Joplin, Mo.: College Press, 1993–1995), 1:25–39; 2:37–153; Carol L. Meyers, *Discovering Eve: Ancient Israelite Women in Context* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1988).

²⁷Cf. K. Lawson Younger Jr., *Judges* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2002), 159.

²⁸As Joseph Blenkinsopp (*Sage, Priest, Prophet: Religious and Intellectual Leadership in Ancient Israel* [Louisville, Ky.: Westminster, 1995], 79) summarizes, "The crucial difference between prophet and priest is that the former is called while the latter is appointed to office and therefore dispenses salvation by virtue of the office rather than through personal charismatic endowment." For good introductions to the ministry of prophets, see his pp. 115–65; also David L. Petersen, *The Roles of Israel's Prophets* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1981).

²⁹Cf., e.g., the chapter in Rebecca M. Groothuis, *Good News for Women: A Biblical Picture of Gender Equality* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997), 189–207, titled "The Bible and Women in Leadership," which, while rightly pointing out key roles of women in leadership in both Testaments, fails to engage sufficiently questions of levels of leadership and thus makes it appear that if certain roles are open, all of them must be.

³⁰Particularly sensitive to and balanced in interacting with feminist concerns is Karen Jobes, *Esther* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999).

³¹Joyce Baldwin, *1 & 2 Samuel* (TOTC; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1988), 280.

³²See esp. Ben Witherington III, *Jesus the Sage: The Pilgrimage of Wisdom* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994).

³³Cf. further Jack P. Lewis, "The Capable Wife (Prov 31:10–31)," in *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity*, 2:155–80.

³⁴Cf. esp. Tremper Longman III, *Song of Songs* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).

³⁵For defense of this interpretation see Robert L. Hubbard Jr., *The Book of Ruth* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1988), 212.

³⁶See Walter C. Kaiser Jr., *Toward Old Testament Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1983), 182–90.

³⁷Phyllis Trible, *Texts of Terror: Literary-Feminist Readings of Biblical Narratives* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984).

³⁸Cf. the detailed survey of Alice O. Bellis (*Helpmates, Harlots, and Heroes: Women's Stories in the Hebrew Bible* [Louisville, Ky.: Westminster, 1994]), who, as a womanist interpreter, still does not hesitate to point out what she believes are demeaning roles and portraits.

³⁹For excellent introductions to the priesthood more generally, see Blenkinsopp, *Sage, Priest, Prophet*, 66–114; and Richard D. Nelson, *Raising Up a Faithful Priest: Community and Priesthood in Biblical Theology* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster, 1993).

⁴⁰These themes recur throughout Ross S. Kraemer and Mary R. D'Angelo, eds., *Women and Christian Origins* (New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1999).

⁴¹See the surveys of Meir Bar-Ilan, *Some Jewish Women in Antiquity* (Atlanta: Scholars, 1998); Leonard J. Swidler, *Biblical Affirmations of Woman* (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1979).

⁴²Bernadette J. Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues* (BJS 36; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982).

⁴³See Judith R. Wegner, *Chattel or Person? The Status of Women in the System of the Mishnah* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 1988).

⁴⁴Tal Ilan, *Jewish Women in Greco-Roman Palestine* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1996), 226.

⁴⁵Cf. the surveys in Prudence Allen, *The Concept of Woman: The Aristotelian Revolution, 750 BC-AD 1250* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997); Eva Cantarella, *Pandora's Daughters: The Role and Status of Women in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Baltimore, Md.: Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 1987); Matthew Dillon, *Girls and Women in Classical Greek Religion* (London: Routledge, 2002).

⁴⁶See esp. Jane F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana Univ. Press, 1986). Cf. also Suzanne Dixon, *Reading Roman Women: Sources, Genres, and Real Life* (London: Duckworth, 2001).

⁴⁷Bruce W. Winter, "The 'New' Roman Wife and 1 Timothy 2:9-15: The Search for a *Sitz im Leben*," *TynBul* 51 (2000): 285-94.

⁴⁸See esp. the overviews of Deborah F. Sawyer, *Women and Religion in the First Christian Centuries* (New York: Routledge, 1996); Sarah B. Pomeroy, *Goddesses, Whores, Wives, and Slaves: Women in Classical Antiquity* (New York: Schocken, 1975).

⁴⁹Cf. Ingrid R. Kitzberger, ed., *Transformative Encounters: Jesus and Women Re-viewed* (Leiden: Brill, 2000); and Elisabeth Moltmann-Wendell, *The Women around Jesus* (New York: Crossroad, 1982).

⁵⁰Cf. Craig L. Blomberg, "The Liberation of Illegitimacy: Women and Rulers in Matthew 1-2," *BTB* 21 (1991): 145-50.

⁵¹Cf. Stephen Farris, *The Hymns of Luke's Infancy Narratives* (JSNTSup 9; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1985).

⁵²For an overview of options, see Glenna S. Jackson, "Have Mercy on Me": *The Story of the Canaanite Woman in Matthew 15.21-28* (JSNTSup 228; London: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002). Jackson herself suggests the woman becomes like a "psalmist in lament" to be self-empowered with a new identity. Matthew, in turn, uses her story as a paradigm for "enemy women" becoming full members of his Jewish-Christian community.

⁵³This passage should not be confused with a later anointing by Mary of Bethany (Mark 14:1-9 par.; John 12:1-8), where there is no hint of sin on the part of the female protagonist and where the symbolism deals with preparation for Christ's death.

⁵⁴Cf. Craig L. Blomberg, "'Your Faith Has Made You Whole': The Evangelical Liberation Theology of Jesus," in *Jesus of Nazareth, Lord and Christ*, ed. Joel B. Green and Max Turner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 80-82.

⁵⁵Rightly Spencer, *Beyond the Curse*, 58.

⁵⁶Contra *ibid.*, 62.

⁵⁷It is at least possible she was a victim all along of unscrupulous men, since she would not have had the power to initiate the divorces herself and since her current companion may not have wanted to legally marry one with such a past. We have no evidence to say one way or the other; the very fact that few scholars even raise the alternate possibility says something about entrenched, even if unconscious, sexist interpretations! See Alice Mathews, *A Woman Jesus Can Teach* (Grand Rapids: Discovery House, 1991), 24-26.

⁵⁸On this aspect of Jesus' ministry, see further Satoko Yamaguchi, *Mary and Martha: Women in the World of Jesus* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2002); Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

⁵⁹Cf. further Jane Kopas, "Jesus and Women: Luke's Gospel," *ThTo* 43 (1986): 192-202.

⁶⁰Most notably, among recent writers, in J. Dominic Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991), esp. pp. 341–44.

⁶¹See esp. John P. Meier, *A Marginal Jew: Rethinking the Historical Jesus*, vol. 3 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 19–197.

⁶²E.g., Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles*, 236.

⁶³Cf. Grant R. Osborne, “Women in Jesus’ Ministry,” *WTJ* 51 (1989): 259–91; John H. Elliott, “Jesus Was Not an Egalitarian: A Critique of an Anachronistic and Idealist Theory,” *BTB* 32 (2002): 75–91; Elliott, “The Jesus Movement Was Not Egalitarian but Family-Oriented,” *BibInt* 11 (2003): 173–210; Kathleen E. Corley, *Women and the Historical Jesus* (Santa Rosa, Calif.: Polebridge, 2002).

⁶⁴See, e.g., Wayne A. Grudem, *The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1982); David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983); Christopher Forbes, *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and Its Hellenistic Environment* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1995); Ben Witherington III, *Jesus the Seer: The Progress of Prophecy* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1999).

⁶⁵Denied by those listed in the previous note. But see Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 960–61; Thomas W. Gillespie, *The First Theologians: A Study in Early Christian Prophecy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 23–28; and esp. David Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979), 213: Christian prophets are “those who have grasped the meaning of Scripture, perceived its powerful relevance to the life of the individual, the Church and society, and declare that message fearlessly.”

⁶⁶See esp. Ivoni R. Reimer, *Women in the Acts of the Apostles: A Feminist Liberation Perspective* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), who concludes that Acts’s portrait remains “androcentric,” even while introducing with varying degrees of emphasis important liberating motifs.

⁶⁷A balanced analysis appears in Wendell Willis, “Priscilla and Aquila—Coworkers in Christ,” in *Essays on Women in Earliest Christianity*, 2:261–76.

⁶⁸For a brief review of every reference to a named woman in the Pauline Epistles, see Andreas Köstenberger, “Women in the Pauline Mission,” in *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul’s Mission*, eds. Peter G. Bolt and Mark Thompson (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2000), 221–47.

⁶⁹See Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 1993), 729.

⁷⁰E.g., Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 914.

⁷¹E.g., Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 787. Schreiner teaches at The Southern Baptist Theological Seminary but, sadly, very few Southern Baptists allow for women deacons.

⁷²See Anne Jensen, *God’s Self-Confident Daughters: Early Christianity and the Liberation of Women* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster, 1996), 59–73; Clark, *Man and Woman in Christ*, 117–23.

⁷³Spencer (*Beyond the Curse*, 115–16) goes so far as to call Phoebe a leader over Paul! Cf. also Groothuis, *Good News for Women*, 196.

⁷⁴E.g., Thomas R. Schreiner, "The Valuable Ministries of Women in the Context of Male Leadership," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 219–20; Caroline F. Whelan, "Amica Pauli: The Role of Phoebe in the Early Church," *JSNT* 49 (1993): 67–85.

⁷⁵Cf. Schreiner, *Romans*, 795–96; Köstenberger, "Women in the Pauline Mission," 229–31.

⁷⁶Most recently, Michael H. Burer and Daniel B. Wallace, "Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Re-examination of Rom 16.7," *NTS* 47 (2001): 76–91. Evaluating this study is difficult because the evidence presented is highly selective, the numbers of true parallels to *episēmos* plus *en* plus the dative are limited, and, even in their so-called closest parallel (from *Pss. Sol.* 2:6), Burer and Wallace translate "among" in a locative sense, even though the first noun is not a subset of the second.

⁷⁷Cf., respectively, Robert Saucy, "The Ministry of Women in the Early Church," in *Women and Men in Ministry*, 178; Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 54.

⁷⁸Cf. further John Thorley, "Junia, A Woman Apostle," *NovT* 38 (1996): 18–29; Richard S. Cervin, "A Note Regarding the Name 'Junia(s)' in Romans 16.7," *NTS* 40 (1994): 464–70.

⁷⁹A classic study remains E. Earle Ellis, "Paul and His Coworkers," *NTS* 17 (1971): 437–52.

⁸⁰E.g., Groothuis, *Good News for Women*, 197; Spencer, *Beyond the Curse*, 107–8.

⁸¹On both texts, cf. I. Howard Marshall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999), 243, 574.

⁸²E.g., Spencer, *Beyond the Curse*, 109–12.

⁸³See, e.g., Marianne M. Thompson, 1–3 *John* (IVPNTC; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1992), 151.

⁸⁴On which, see esp. Virginia R. Mollenkott, *The Divine Feminine: The Biblical Imagery of God as Female* (New York: Crossroad, 1983). To recognize these metaphors does not commit us actually to using terms like "mother" or the feminine pronoun "she" for God, which Scripture does *not* do.

⁸⁵For a thorough study, see Bonnie B. Thurston, *The Widows: A Women's Ministry in the Early Church* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989).

⁸⁶The lack of repetition of the definite article suggests to most commentators that this is an example of Granville Sharp's rule loosely applied. "Pastors" and "teachers" are not entirely separate gifts; each involves some element of the other.

⁸⁷E.g., Walter L. Liefeld, 1 and 2 *Timothy, Titus* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), 116–17.

⁸⁸On the nature of the various spiritual gifts, see esp. Kenneth Hemphill, *Spiritual Gifts: Empowering the New Testament Church* (Nashville: Broadman, 1988); Siegfried Schatzmann, *A Pauline Theology of Charismata* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1987).

⁸⁹E.g., Timothy George, *Galatians* (NAC; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1994), 282–92.

⁹⁰E.g., Stanley J. Grenz with Denise M. Kjesbo, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1995), 99–107.

⁹¹Ben Witherington III, "Rite and Rights for Women—Galatians 3.28," *NTS* 27 (1981): 601. For Christians from Roman backgrounds, there may have been a contrast with the rite of passage for adolescent boys in which they donned a fancy new toga as a sign of adulthood. See J. Albert Harrill, "Coming of Age and Putting on Christ: The *Toga Virilis* Ceremony, Its Paraenesis and Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Galatians," *NovT* 44 (2002): 252–77.

⁹²See Witherington, "Rite and Rights," 593–94. Cf. also Ed L. Miller, "Is Galatians 3:28 the Great Egalitarian Text?" *ExpTim* 114 (2002): 9–11.

⁹³See Richard W. Hove, *Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1999), 69–76, 107–21.

⁹⁴For a rare attempt to deny this is the context, see Harold R. Holmyard III, "Does 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 Refer to Women Praying and Prophesying in Church?" *BSac* 154 (1997): 461–72. For seven reasons for assuming this is the correct context, see Craig Blomberg, *1 Corinthians* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 219.

⁹⁵See, respectively, William O. Walker Jr., "The Vocabulary of 1 Corinthians 11.3–16: Pauline or Non-Pauline," *JSNT* 35 (1989): 75–88; and Thomas P. Shoemaker, "Unveiling of Equality: 1 Corinthians 11:2–16," *BTB* 17 (1987): 60–63.

⁹⁶See, e.g., Wayne Grudem, "Does *Kephalē* ('Head') Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples," *TJ* 6 (1985): 38–59 (arguing for only "authority over"); and Berkeley and Alvera Mickelsen, "What Does *Kephalē* Mean in the New Testament?" in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, ed. Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1986), 97–110 (arguing for only "source").

⁹⁷Authors defending "authority" draw especially on the Septuagint, Philo, and Plutarch; those favoring "source" draw on Philo (again), Herodotus, Artemidorus, the Orphic literature, and *L.A.E.* See Andrianjatovo Rakotoharintsifa, *Conflicts à Corinthe* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1997), 208.

⁹⁸Most meticulous of all in rebutting those who would cite texts claiming "source" without "authority" as the full meaning of the word is Wayne Grudem, "The Meaning of *Kephalē* ('Head'): An Evaluation of New Evidence, Real and Alleged," *JETS* 44 (2001): 25–65.

⁹⁹Stephen Bedale, "The Meaning of *Kephalē* in the Pauline Epistles," *JTS* 5 (1954): 214. See also the "matriarch" of modern liberal Christian feminism, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 229.

¹⁰⁰See Walter L. Liefeld, "Women, Submission and Ministry in 1 Corinthians," in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, 134–54; Andrew C. Perriman, "The Head of a Woman: The Meaning of *Kephalē* in 1 Corinthians 11:3," *JTS* 45 (1994): 602–22; Richard S. Cervin, "Does *Kephalē* Mean 'Source' or 'Authority Over' in Greek Literature? A Rebuttal," *TJ* 10 (1989): 85–112.

¹⁰¹E.g., Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles*, 137–38.

¹⁰²Cf., respectively, Jason D. BeDuhn, "'Because of the Angels': Unveiling Paul's Anthropology in 1 Corinthians 11," *JBL* 118 (1999): 300–301; E. Earle Ellis, "The Silenced Wives of Corinth (1 Cor. 14:34–5)," in *New Testament Textual Criticism*, ed. Eldon J. Epp and Gordon D. Fee (Oxford: Clarendon, 1981), 213–20; Jerome D. Quinn and William C. Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (ECC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 199–200.

¹⁰³See, e.g., David E. Blattenberger, *Rethinking 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 through Archaeological and Moral-Rhetorical Analysis* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Mellen, 1997).

¹⁰⁴Cf. further Blomberg, *1 Corinthians*, 210–11, 215.

¹⁰⁵For a wonderfully tactful and successful model of implementing this within a complementarian church structure, see Sarah Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2003), 311–18. Prayer and prophecy, in fact, sum up the essence of Christian worship. As Francis Watson (“The Authority of the Voice: A Theological Reading of 1 Cor 11:2–16,” *NTS* 46 [2000]: 525) phrases it, “In prophecy one articulates the word of God to the congregation, in prayer one articulates the word of the congregation to God; and in the conjunction of these activities there occurs the divine-human dialogue that lies at the heart of the Christian community’s life and worship.”

¹⁰⁶Rakotoharintsifa (*Conflicts à Corinthe*, 219–20) stresses that the notion that the man is not fully honored without the woman’s glory also guards against the view that does not ascribe equal dignity to the woman.

¹⁰⁷See esp. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “A Feature of Qumran: Angelology and the Angels of 1 Corinthians xi.10,” *NTS* 4 (1957): 48–58.

¹⁰⁸But following the influential article by Morna D. Hooker, “Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Corinthians xi.10,” *NTS* 10 (1966): 410–16.

¹⁰⁹Matt. 9:6 (par. Mark 2:10; Luke 5:24); Rev. 11:6; 14:18; 16:9; 20:6. Cf. also the similar constructions with synonyms for *epi* (Luke 19:17; 1 Cor. 7:37) or without forms of the verb “to have” (Luke 9:1; Rev. 2:26; 6:8; 13:7).

¹¹⁰Cf. Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (SP; Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical, 1999), 411.

¹¹¹E.g., Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles*, 133–34.

¹¹²Judith Gundry-Volf, “Gender and Creation in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16: A Study in Paul’s Theological Method,” in *Evangelium, Schriftauslegung, Kirche*, eds. J. Ådna, S. J. Hafemann, and O. Hofius (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997), 152.

¹¹³Cf. Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 844–46. Moreover, the “natural” thing for hair to do is to grow long if it is not cut! Thus, Khiok-Khng Yeo, “Differentiation and Mutuality of Male-Female Relations in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16,” *BR* 43 (1998): 20.

¹¹⁴Contra Marlene Crüsemann (“Irredeemably Hostile to Women: Anti-Jewish Elements in the Exegesis of the Dispute about Women’s Right to Speak [1 Cor. 14.34–35],” *JSNT* 79 [2000]: 21), who calls the text “a comprehensive prohibition of public speaking, applying to all Christian women”!

¹¹⁵For one example from each perspective, see, respectively, Winsome Munro, “Women, Text and the Canon: The Strange Case of 1 Corinthians 14.33–35,” *BTB* 18 (1988): 26–31; and Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 699–708.

¹¹⁶Philip B. Payne (“Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1 Cor 14.34–5,” *NTS* 41 [1995]: 240–62; and “Ms. 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14.34–5,” *NTS* 44 [1998]: 152–58) has argued that marginal additions and symbols in a handful of manuscripts that do contain these verses nevertheless provide evidence of knowledge of a manuscript tradition that lacked them, but his arguments prove unconvincing. See Curt Niccum, “The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Cor 14.34–5,” *NTS* 43 (1997): 242–55; D. W.

Odell-Scott, "Editorial Dilemma: The Interpolation of 1 Cor 14:34–35 in the Western Manuscripts of D, G and 88," *BTB* 30 (2000): 68–74.

¹¹⁷E.g., recently, Collins, *First Corinthians*, 514–17. A flurry of studies proposed and discussed this view in the 1980s; today one finds little support for it.

¹¹⁸For the most persuasive versions of this option, cf. Craig A. Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1992), 80–88; Belleville, *Women Leaders and the Church*, 152–62. A new version has recently been proposed by Terence Paige, "The Social Matrix of Women's Speech at Corinth: The Context and Meaning of the Command to Silence in 1 Corinthians 14:33b–36," *BBR* 12 (2002): 217–42. Paige argues that the only kind of speaking Paul is forbidding is ordinary conversation between women and men to whom they are not related, which still would have been seen as dishonorable in Greek society. But this is precisely *not* what *laieō* consistently means in 1 Corinthians 14 (see below, p. 164).

¹¹⁹D. A. Carson, "'Silent in the Churches': On the Role of Women in 1 Corinthians 14:33b–36," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 147.

¹²⁰See Douglas J. Moo, "'Law,' 'Works of the Law,' and Legalism in Paul," *WTJ* 45 (1983): 73–100.

¹²¹Esp. Gen. 3:16, common among older commentators. E.g., A. T. Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1914), 325.

¹²²See esp. Ralph P. Martin, *The Spirit and the Congregation: Studies in 1 Corinthians 12–15* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1984), 87.

¹²³Cf. further Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, 188–93; Simon J. Kistemaker, *Exposition of the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NTC; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993), 511–15. On this view it is important to distinguish the task of rendering an authoritative evaluation on alleged prophecy—if its contents are true or not—from the charism of discerning spirits—recognizing, e.g., the presence of the demonic. See esp. Grudem, *The Gift of Prophecy*, 58–67.

¹²⁴Thus Thiselton, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 1150–61. Cf. James D. G. Dunn, *The Theology of Paul the Apostle* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 592.

¹²⁵So even Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 86–87.

¹²⁶Contra J. M. Holmes, *Text in a Whirlwind: A Critique of Four Exegetical Devices at 1 Timothy 2:9–15* (JSNTSup 196; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000), 117–39.

¹²⁷Most notably Richard Clark Kroeger and Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11–15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992). For a response, more historically nuanced, see Steven M. Baugh, "A Foreign World: Ephesus in the First Century," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, eds. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 13–52. Cf. also Sharon H. Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:9–15 in Light of the Religious and Cultural Milieu of the First Century* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1991), 157–58, conclusions that are almost always overlooked by the egalitarians who cite her.

¹²⁸As, e.g., with Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 111–12.

¹²⁹Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, 199. With a few exceptions, such adornment would be limited to the tiny but influential minority of wealthy women in town. Thus, Alan Padgett, "Wealthy Women at Ephesus: 1 Timothy 2:8–15 in Social Context," *Int* 41 (1987): 19–31.

¹³⁰Dressing elaborately for church, of course, is not always a flaunting of wealth. In African-American communities, dressing well for church is important for other reasons; many persons who are very poor dress well for church. The quality of clothing in black communities often serves a different cultural role than it does in white suburbia.

¹³¹Neither do three additional arguments relativize the passage, despite some claims to the contrary. (1) Paul's use of "I" remains authoritative—he regularly understands his instructions to come from the Lord; (2) his use of "permit," by being negated, leaves the command an absolute "I do not permit"; and (3) the present tenses do not mean that Paul's lack of permission is only for the present moment—given the use of infinitives (moods outside the indicative), the force is "I am *continually* not permitting . . ."

¹³²The observation that Paul's main concern lies with the *way* women learn (as in Thomas R. Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15: A Dialogue with Scholarship," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 122) does not undermine the force of this observation.

¹³³See Leland E. Wilshire, "The TLG Computer and Further Reference to *Authenteō* in 1 Timothy 2.12," *NTS* 34 (1988): 131.

¹³⁴Cf. Paul W. Barnett, "Wives and Women's Ministry (1 Timothy 2:11–15)," *EvQ* 61 (1989): 225–38.

¹³⁵Wilshire himself later clarified that he was opting for one of the earlier meanings—"to initiate violence." Thus Leland E. Wilshire, "1 Timothy 2:12 Revisited: A Reply to Paul W. Barnett and Timothy J. Harris," *EvQ* 65 (1993): 52. But this meaning scarcely fits this context!

¹³⁶See Andreas J. Köstenberger, "A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Timothy 2:12," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 81–103.

¹³⁷Marshall's objection (*Pastoral Epistles*, 458, n. 157) that if the text had read *heterodidaskalein* it would have been implying "but I do allow men to [give false teaching]" does not carry force, because the prohibition still could have been clearly framed to avoid this conclusion (e.g., "I do not permit the women to continue their false teaching").

¹³⁸See Philip B. Payne, "*Oude* in 1 Timothy 2:12," paper presented at the meeting of the Evangelical Theological Society (Atlanta, November 1986).

¹³⁹There is a growing scholarly consensus that women deacons are in view here. See Jennifer H. Stiefel, "Women Deacons in 1 Timothy: A Linguistic and Literary Look at 'Women Likewise . . .'" (1 Tim. 3.11)," *NTS* 41 (1995): 442–57.

¹⁴⁰See Douglas J. Moo, "The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11–15: A Rejoinder," *TJ* 2 (1981): 202–4.

¹⁴¹Cf. George W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Epistles* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 143.

¹⁴²A key point, though probably overstated, throughout Kevin Giles, "A Critique of the 'Novel' Contemporary Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15 Given in the Book *Women in the Church*," *EvQ* 72 (2000): 151–67, 195–215. Cf. Andreas Kösten-

berger, "Women in the Church: A Response to Kevin Giles," *EvQ* 73 (2001): 205–24; Kevin Giles, "Women in the Church: A Rejoinder to Andreas Köstenberger," *EvQ* 73 (2001): 225–45.

¹⁴³Cf. the tortuous logic Hurley (*Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, 214–16) uses to get around this.

¹⁴⁴See Barnett, "Wives and Women's Ministry," 234.

¹⁴⁵Douglas Moo, "What Does It Mean Not to Teach or Have Authority over Men? 1 Timothy 2:11–15," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 190.

¹⁴⁶Craig L. Blomberg, "Not Beyond What Is Written: A Review of Aída Spencer's *Beyond the Curse*," *CTR* 2 (1988): 414. William D. Mounce (WBC; *Pastoral Epistles* [Nashville: Nelson, 2000], 142) is the only scholar to my knowledge who has interacted in any detail with my proposal. For his objections and my response to them, see my "Neither Hierarchalist nor Egalitarian," 367.

¹⁴⁷Blomberg, "Not Beyond What Is Written," 415. My approach combines the strengths of two studies—M. D. Roberts, "'Women Shall Be Saved': A Closer Look at 1 Timothy 2:15," *TSFBul* 5.2 (1981): 4–7; and Andreas J. Köstenberger, "Ascertaining Women's God-Ordained Roles: An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:15," *BBR* 7 (1997): 107–44. The next most likely alternative may be that *dia* ("through") refers to difficult circumstances through which women must pass (cf. similar grammar in 1 Cor. 3:15 and 1 Pet. 3:20), thus yielding the sense of "women will be saved *despite* suffering the pain of childbearing, so long as they continue in faith. . . ." So Simon Coupland, "Salvation through Childbearing? The Riddle of 1 Timothy 2:15," *ExpTim* 112 (2001): 303.

¹⁴⁸E.g., Richard M. Davidson, "Headship, Submission, and Equality in Scripture," in *Women in Ministry: Biblical and Historical Perspectives*, ed. Nancy Vyhmeister (Berrien Springs, Mich.: Andrews Univ. Press, 1998), 259–95.

¹⁴⁹For texts and analyses of arguably the closest parallels, see Angela Standhartinger, "The Origin and Intention of the Household Code in the Letter to the Colossians," *JSNT* 79 (2000): 117–30.

¹⁵⁰James D. G. Dunn, *The Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1996), 248.

¹⁵¹Peter T. O'Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 417.

¹⁵²Andrew T. Lincoln (*Ephesians* [WBC; Dallas: Word, 1990], 374) notes that commands to husbands to love their wives are infrequent outside the NT (citing only the Jewish sources *Pseudo-Phocylides* 195–97 and *b. Yevamot* 62b), and that *agapāō* is never used in Greco-Roman household codes as a husband's duty.

¹⁵³Points made convincingly throughout Stephen F. Miletic, "*One Flesh*" —*Ephesians* 5.22–24, 5.31: *Marriage and the New Creation* (AnBib; Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1988).

¹⁵⁴Cf. further Klyne Snodgrass, *Ephesians* (NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996), 285–318.

¹⁵⁵Cf. Ian A. McFarland, "A Canonical Reading of Ephesians 5:21–33: Theological Gleanings," *ThTo* 57 (2000): 344–56.

¹⁵⁶Cf. the very thoughtful applications throughout Sumner, *Men and Women in the Church*.

¹⁵⁷Cf. Craig Williford, president of Denver Seminary (class lecture, 2003), who defines spiritual leadership as “influencing a group of people to effectively complete their God-given task in a way that contributes to the whole movement of God worldwide.”

¹⁵⁸J. Ramsey Michaels, *1 Peter* (WBC; Waco, Tex.: Word, 1988), 157.

¹⁵⁹See esp. John H. Elliott, *1 Peter* (AB; New York: Doubleday, 2000), 585–99.

¹⁶⁰See esp. throughout Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*.

¹⁶¹Cf. Peter H. Davids, *The First Epistle of Peter* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 123.

¹⁶²See esp. Catherine Clark Kroeger and James R. Beck, eds., *Women, Abuse, and the Bible* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996).

¹⁶³See Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, 139–41; O’Brien, *Letter to the Ephesians*, 400–404.

¹⁶⁴See esp. Willard M. Swartley, *Slavery, Sabbath, War and Women* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald, 1983).

¹⁶⁵As with the “redemptive movement” hermeneutic of Webb (*Slaves, Women and Homosexuals*).

¹⁶⁶That this is the correct translation of this controversial verse has been decisively established by S. Scott Bartchy (*Mallon Chrēsai: First-Century Slavery and 1 Corinthians 7:21* [SBLDS 11; Missoula, Mont.: Scholars Press, 1973]).

¹⁶⁷The rest of this section is heavily indebted to their survey, which documents the generalizations made here.

¹⁶⁸See John R. W. Stott, *Issues Facing Christians Today* (London: HarperCollins, 1990), 254–84. Fairly close to this perspective is the combined presentation of chapters in Saucy and TenElshof, eds., *Women and Men in Ministry*. See also Ann L. Bowman, “Women in Ministry,” in *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, 239–99, which in turn built on her earlier discussions in “Women in Ministry: An Exegetical Study of 1 Timothy 2:11–15,” *BSac* 149 (1992): 193–213; and “Women, Spiritual Gifts and Ministry,” *FaithMiss* 14 (1996): 57–74. On the domestic side, a fairly equivalent treatment is Ronald and Beverly Allen, *Liberated Traditionalism: Men and Women in the Balance* (Portland, Ore.: Multnomah, 1985).

¹⁶⁹It is common, but fairly hypocritical, of complementarian churches to employ women in professional staff roles, give them the identical job descriptions as men called “pastors” who have held the same positions, but then call them merely “directors” (or some other alternative). It *does* appear that “pastor” in various NT contexts is interchangeable with “overseer” and “elder,” but, unlike the latter two titles, “pastor” is also a spiritual gift, given to men and women alike, so that churches should not hesitate to call anyone a pastor who is exercising such a gift in a consistent, recognized church position.

¹⁷⁰For support, see Robert Saucy, *The Church in God’s Program* (Chicago: Moody Press, 1972), 127–65.

¹⁷¹On the probability of multiple elders per church in each NT community, originally most likely one per house church, see Bradley Blue, “Acts and the House Church,” in *The Book of Acts in Its Graeco-Roman Setting*, ed. David W. J. Gill and Conrad Gempf (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 119–222.

¹⁷²See esp. the practical advice in Judith TenElshof and Robert Saucy, “The Complementary Model of Church Ministry,” in *Women and Men in Ministry*, 325.

¹⁷³See Webb, *Slaves, Women and Homosexuals*, 236–44.

WOMEN IN MINISTRY: ANOTHER EGALITARIAN PERSPECTIVE

Craig S. Keener

Footnotes

¹Because this essay is intended for a more general audience and because I have provided detailed documentation for most of my points elsewhere (see my *Paul, Women and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* [Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1992, rev. with new introduction, 2004]; articles on gender roles in *InterVarsity's Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*; *Dictionary of the Later New Testament and Its Developments*; and *Dictionary of New Testament Background* [esp. "Marriage," 680–693]), I document relatively lightly in this essay.

²Combining positions 2 and 3, Robert W. Yarbrough ("The Hermeneutics of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, eds. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995], 195, n. 181) recognizes that Scripture shows that God could use women as prophets or judges, though not explicitly as pastors.

³Some distinguish *gifts* from *offices*, but in Ephesians 4:11, the role of prophet stands alongside apostles, evangelists, and pastors-teachers as one of the ministries of the word that equips God's people for ministry. We should avoid distinguishing offices from gifts too arbitrarily, especially when someone receives a title (as in Exod. 15:20; Judg. 4:4; 2 Kgs 22:14; Isa. 8:3; Luke 2:36) and our term for "office" does not exist in Scripture (Eph. 4:8, 11 calls ministers "gifts"; "prophets" in 1 Cor. 14:29, 32 seems to refer to any who prophesy).

⁴Rather than devote space here to what head coverings mean, see my article on "head coverings" in *Dictionary of New Testament Background* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2000), 442–47; in less detail, my *Paul, Women and Wives*, 19–69. Gender segregation was impossible in house churches (see Bernadette J. Brooten, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues* [BJS 36; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1982], 103–38), so men would invariably hear women's prophecies.

⁵Concerning this passage, see my earlier work in *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1997), 190–213.

⁶Against the distinctions some make between prophets and those who prophesy, Paul seems to apply the former title to those who fulfill the latter function, at least on a frequent basis (1 Cor. 14:29, 32).

⁷For my comments on biblical allusions in Revelation, see my commentary (*Revelation* [NIVAC; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2000], various pages); Gregory K. Beale provides more detail in *The Book of Revelation* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), various pages.

⁸Jeremiah was still very young (2 Kgs 22:3; Jer. 1:2, 6). In any event, 2 Kings draws numerous parallels between the revivals under Josiah and, a century earlier, under Hezekiah—and Huldah’s role in this narrative precisely parallels that of Isaiah in Hezekiah’s day in 2 Kings 19:2–7.

⁹For the Moses allusion in John 1:14–18, see Marie-Emile Boismard, *St. John’s Prologue* (London: Blackfriars, 1957), 136–39; Anthony Hanson, “John 1.14–18 and Exodus XXXIV,” *NTS* 23 (1976): 90–101; Henry Mowvley; “John 1.14–18 in the Light of Exodus 33.7–34.35,” *ExpTim* 95 (1984): 135–37; Craig Keener, *The Gospel of John: A Commentary* (2 vols.; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2003), 405–26.

¹⁰Deborah perhaps once took the opportunity to affirm members of her gender in a distinctive way when she warned Barak—perhaps to shame him—that God would give Sisera into the hands of a woman; in any case, God fulfilled this prophecy when Jael put a spike into Sisera’s head (Judg. 4:9, 21).

¹¹For comments about those who wish to distinguish official ministry roles from gifts, see n. 3 above. When the title is applied, as in Romans 16:7, we have good reason to see a ministry role there!

¹²See Richard S. Cervin, “A Note Regarding the Name ‘Junia(s)’ in Romans 16.7,” *NTS* 40 (1994): 464–70 (an article brought to my attention by Michael Holmes). For a woman apostle here, see, e.g., Wayne Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven, Conn.: Yale Univ. Press, 1983), 47. J. B. Lightfoot (*Saint Paul’s Epistle to the Galatians* [London: Macmillan, 1910], 96, n. 1), who thought Junia to be male, doubts that any would have taken the phrase “as esteemed by the Apostles” were it not to circumvent the extension of the apostolate beyond the Twelve. The best defense of the minority view that the apostles merely thought well of them is Michael H. Burer and Daniel B. Wallace, “Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Re-examination of Rom. 16:7,” *NTS* 47 (2001): 76–91 (esp. 84–91), but the evidence can be sorted differently, and Richard Bauckham (*Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002], 166–180 (esp. 172–180) refutes this position.

¹³On husband-wife teams in other professions, see Jane F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (Bloomington, Ind.: Indiana Univ. Press, 1986), 240. To say Andronicus and Junia are both simply called by the husband’s proper title is to deny that Paul stated correctly what he meant, for he specifically employs a plural pronoun and verb in making the point.

¹⁴This is still true even if, as is probable, Paul’s greetings to some men alongside their households imply that these men held some positions in the churches that met in their homes.

¹⁵See, e.g., Xenophon, *Cyr.* 4.5.34. Bearers might also communicate a letter’s spirit (e.g., 1 Macc. 12:23; Cicero, *Fam.* 12.30.3; Eph. 6:21–22; Col. 4:7–8).

¹⁶For more detailed documentation, see my *Paul, Women and Wives*, 238–40.

¹⁷On a somewhat entertaining note, Rebecca Merrill Groothuis (*Good News for Women: A Biblical Picture of Gender Equality* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997], 222–23) points out that those who prohibit women from teaching men because “women are more easily deceived” often allow women to teach other women—the very people they would most easily lead into further deception.

¹⁸On the lack of early evidence for further gender segregation even in the synagogues, see Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 103–38; Shmuel Safrai, “The Synagogue,” in *The Jewish People in the First Century* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 908–44.

¹⁹See esp. the argument in Andreas J. Köstenberger, “A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Timothy 2:12,” in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 81–103, which, though not foolproof, is on the whole persuasive (see my review in *JETS* 41 [1998]: 513–16, against my earlier position in *Paul, Women and Wives*, 109). One could take both expressions as negative (false teaching and domineering), but I believe I can make my case, even granting the complementarian reading of much of the evidence. One could link “teaching” with elders (1 Tim. 3:2; 5:17), but that association is not always explicit (1 Tim. 1:3; 4:11, 13, 16; 6:2; 2 Tim. 2:2, 24; 3:10, 16; cf. especially Titus 2:3), and even if this passage prohibits women elders, we would still have to address whether the prohibition is local or universal.

²⁰Despite the use of the word *man* in many translations of this verse, 1 Timothy 3:1 uses a gender-neutral term, not the gender-specific *anēr*, to designate one seeking the office of elder.

²¹Besides the smaller pool of educated women, the majority of people “respectable” enough to be leaders in that culture (1 Tim. 3:2, contrast 2:9) would be men; part of the culture also mistrusted religions that liberated women from traditional roles (see my *Paul, Women and Wives*, 139–56). On the meaning of “one-woman man” in its first-century context, see my *And Marries Another: Divorce and Remarriage in the Teaching of the New Testament* (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1991), 83–103; even if Paul had been married before, it is unlikely that anyone in the first century would have applied the phrase to him at this point. On the widespread understanding that general principles might sometimes be qualified, see my *And Marries Another*, 21–28.

²²Jesus’ disciples did have female traveling companions (Mark 15:40–41; Luke 8:1–3), despite probable scandal (see Lucian, *The Runaways* 18; Ben Witherington III, *Women in the Ministry of Jesus*, SNTSMS 51 [Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1984], 117), but Paul had to exhibit greater concern for the scandal factor because he was trying to establish a church within Greco-Roman society. Jesus, by contrast, was deliberately moving toward confrontation with the authorities and his execution.

²³I follow my own research on the nature of apostles and prophets here (summarized in *The Spirit in the Gospels and Acts*, as well as “The Function of Johannine Pneumatology in the Context of Late First-Century Judaism” [Ph.D. diss., Duke University, 1991]) rather than that of Wayne Grudem (*The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians* [Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1982]), though I respect all and affirm most of Grudem’s work on the subject.

²⁴See, e.g., Valerie Abrahamsen, “The Rock Reliefs and the Cult of Diana at Philippi” (Th.D. diss., Harvard Divinity School, 1986).

²⁵I summarize the data more fully in *A Commentary on the Gospel According to Matthew* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 151, 311.

²⁶See my articles on “kissing” and “head coverings” in *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, 628–29; 442–47; or, less thoroughly, my *Paul, Women and Wives*, 19–69.

²⁷I sought to provide (albeit on a relatively popular level) much of the background that illustrates this point in *The IVP Bible Background Commentary: New Testament* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1993), 407–646.

²⁸See Rom. 1:7, 10, 13; 15:22–24; 16:1–27; 1 Cor. 1:2, 11–12; 4:17; 5:1–6; 6:6–8; 7:5; 8:9; 11:17–22; 16:5–12; 2 Cor. 1:1, 15–17; 1:23–2:13; 6:11–13; 7:5–16; 9:2–5; 10:6–16; 11:1–21; 12:11–13:10; Gal. 1:2, 4:12–20; Phil. 1:1, 4–8, 19; 4:2–3, 10–19; Col. 1:2, 2:1; 1 Thess. 1:1; 2:1, 17–18; 2 Thess. 2:1.

²⁹Cf., e.g., T. David Gordon (“A Certain Kind of Letter: The Genre of 1 Timothy,” in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 53–63), who argues from some universal instructions in the Pastoral Epistles.

³⁰On passages commending women’s ministry, see my *Paul, Women and Wives*, 237–57 (citing other sources); for the hermeneutical principle, see Gordon D. Fee and Douglas Stuart, *How to Read the Bible for All Its Worth*, 3d. ed. (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2003), 72–76. See also William Webb, *Slaves, Women and Homosexuals: Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2001); essays in Ronald W. Pierce, Rebecca Merrill Groothuis, and Gordon D. Fee, eds., *Discovering Biblical Equality: Complementarity without Hierarchy* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2004), 355–428; cf. F. F. Bruce, *A Mind for What Matters* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1990), 259–325.

³¹On the different interpretations undergirding and opposing slavery, see Glenn Usry and Craig S. Keener, *Black Man’s Religion: Can Christianity be Afrocentric?* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1996), 98–109; my *Paul, Women and Wives*, 184–224; and esp. Willard M. Swartley, *Slavery, Sabbath, War and Women* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald, 1983), 31–64, 198–204 (my *Paul, Women and Wives* would have profited had I read Swartley first).

³²Even some general principles in Paul’s letters, like many general exhortations in antiquity, could admit exceptions. To his call to submit to governing authorities (Rom. 13:1–7) Paul nowhere adds an explicit exception for disobeying immoral commands (see Acts 5:29), but his emphasis and priorities throughout his letters make it clear he would expect us to recognize such exceptions. For the same reason, even those who hold that husbands have a transcultural right to rule their families cannot ignore the general rules summoning all Christians to serve one another, submit to one another, and seek one another’s good—exhortations that at the very least qualify any Christian’s use of authority.

³³See my survey of views in *Paul, Women and Wives*, 74–80, where I also offer more detailed responses to the views cited in the next paragraphs. See also (more briefly but more current) my *1–2 Corinthians* (New York: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2005), 117–21; my “Learning in the Assemblies: 1 Corinthians 14:34–35,” in *Discovering Biblical Equality*, 161–71.

³⁴See Plutarch, *On Listening to Lectures* various passages; Aulus Gellius 18.13.7–8; 20.10.1–6; *Tosefta Sanhedrin* 7:10.

³⁵For documentation of Roman concern with Eastern cults subverting Roman traditional values, see my *Paul, Women and Wives*, 139–56.

³⁶See Heliodorus, *Aeth.* 1.21. Further on women's expected submission (increasingly ignored by Roman aristocrats but still ideal), see, e.g., Livy, *Hist. Rome* 34.2.9–14 (Cato's extreme view); 34.7.12; Valerius Maximus, *Facta* 3.8.6; Philo, *Hypoth.* 7.3; Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 2.200–201; Plutarch, *Bride* 19, 33, *Mor.* 140D, 142E; Artemidorus, *Onir.* 1.24; more fully, my "Marriage," 687–90. A few women pled cases, but they are reported as exceptional (Valerius Maximus, *Facta* 8.3); on criticisms of publicly vocal women, see, e.g., Musonius Rufus (in C. E. Lutz, "Musonius Rufus: The Roman Socrates," *YCS* 10 [1947]: 3–147 [at 42.14–15]).

³⁷On rude questions, see Plutarch, *On Listening to Lectures* 4, 11, 13, 18, *Mor.* 39CD, 43BC, 45D, 48AB; on women's lesser education (as a general rule), see documentation in my *Paul, Women and Wives*, 83–84, 126–27; also my "Marriage," 680–93.

³⁸Plutarch urges taking an interest in one's wife learning, against what he regards as the common view (*Bride* 48, *Mor.* 145BC), though he (unlike Paul) explicitly regards women as intellectually inferior (*Mor.* 145DE).

³⁹For usurping authority, which neither men nor women should do, see David M. Scholer, "1 Timothy 2:9–15 and the Place of Women in the Church's Ministry," in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, ed. Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1986), 205; Carroll D. Osburn, "Authenteō (1 Timothy 2:12)," *ResQ* 25 (1982): 2–4 (this interpretation was argued as early as the 1800s; "usurp authority over" appears earlier in the KJV). "Have authority over" seems supported by the thorough and careful survey of H. Scott Baldwin ("A Difficult Word: *Authenteō* in 1 Timothy 2:12," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 65–80), but this makes the somewhat controversial move of omitting the noun cognates and leaves only two pre-Christian references. It seems precarious to hinge the prohibition of half of Christians on acknowledging a call on such a disputed term. But in any event, the passage also prohibits teaching.

⁴⁰These arguments merely establish the possibility; one could conversely argue that Paul *does* draw on a more common rule from the stricter wording in 1 Corinthians 14:34 (the only other Pauline passage using this word for "permitting")—except that another Corinthian passage reveals that this passage must allow public prayer and prophecy (1 Cor. 11:4–5). In the same way, other statements within the Pastoral Epistles must qualify our understanding of this one.

⁴¹Gordon Fee provided me both a list of all the occurrences in extant Greek literature and copies of the fuller context of most of these texts, and the evidence is, as he points out, overwhelming.

⁴²On slander against the church for social roles, see full documentation in my *Paul, Women and Wives*, 139–56.

⁴³See the different interpretations in Gordon D. Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus* (NIBC; Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1988); Richard Clark Kroeger and Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11–15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992). Much of what I say in this section is borrowed from my article "Interpreting 1 Timothy 2:8–15," in *Priscilla Papers* 12 (Summer 1998): 11–13.

⁴⁴For other unquestionably situation-specific allusions, see 2 Timothy 1:2–6; 3:14–15; 4:20; Titus 1:4–5.

⁴⁵Even in Paul's day, this was probably one of his general principles to which he might permit exceptions; thus, church leaders should be husband of one wife (1 Tim. 3:2; Titus 1:6), possibly directed against teachers who advocated mandatory celibacy (1 Tim. 4:3; see my *And Marries Another*, 83–103, though also noting the emphasis may be marital fidelity). But Paul himself was unmarried and probably had never married (he was too young to have been a member of the Sanhedrin, even if the marriage rules were in force in his day). Paul warned Timothy not to rebuke others harshly (1 Tim. 5:1–2), but under different circumstances Paul rebuked Peter publicly (Gal. 2:14), which was normally considered inappropriate behavior (even by Paul himself—see 1 Tim. 5:19–20).

⁴⁶See Alan Padgett, "The Pauline Rationale for Submission: Biblical Feminism and the *hina* Clauses of Titus 2:1–10," *EoQ* 59 (1987): 39–52.

⁴⁷Groothuis, *Good News for Women*, 211.

⁴⁸Here I have used parts of my article "How Does Paul Interpret Eve in 1 Timothy 2?" *Priscilla Papers* 11 (Summer 1997): 11–13.

⁴⁹E.g., in Galatians 4:22–31, Paul specifically applies Hagar and Sarah to spiritual Ishmaelites (who want to circumcise Gentiles) and spiritual descendants of Abraham, but these are hardly the only analogies one might draw from these biblical characters, nor would he condemn today's medical circumcision of Gentile infants (which differs from the situation he addressed). Other inspired interpreters use Sarah as a model for Christian wives (1 Pet. 3:6) or for all believers (Heb. 11:11).

⁵⁰Given Paul's mission, it is not surprising many of his analogies concern the era of salvation he proclaims. Paul draws a natural analogy between the law of Moses and the gospel he preaches (Rom. 10:6–8); both, after all, are God's word. Likewise, the proclamation of Israel's restoration is an analogy for the gospel message (Rom. 10:15). He draws an analogy between the preservation of a remnant from the Assyrian judgment (Isa. 10:5, 21–24) and the ultimate future restoration of the survivors of his people (Rom. 9:27–29). Likewise, by faith the righteous would live through the impending Babylonian invasion (Hab. 2:4 in context); Paul applies the principle to the day of judgment (Rom. 1:17; Gal. 3:11). Perhaps for similar reasons, he applies imagery for Israel's future salvation (Isa. 49:8) to the present offer of salvation through his gospel (2 Cor. 6:2). Paul can draw a large-scale analogy between Moses and the apostolic ministry of the new covenant (2 Cor. 3:6–16), in which Moses' transforming revelation "of the Lord" in the exodus narrative corresponds to believers' transforming experience of the Spirit (vv. 17–18).

⁵¹Thus, Paul can draw analogies between Israel's provision in the rock and spiritual drink in Christ, between God's provision of food in the wilderness and the Lord's Supper, and between Israel's crossing the sea and the experience of Christian baptism (1 Cor. 10:1–4).

⁵²Genesis 3:16 and 4:7 are the only two OT texts that use these terms for "desire" and "rule" together (and two of only three using this term for "desire"); their proximity and identical construction invite us to interpret their construction together and to view 3:16 as a statement of marital contention in which the husband, being stronger, will prevail. An inspired, accurate *description* of the fall is not necessarily prescriptive, in contrast to inspired apostolic *affirmations* of women's ministry (see Rom. 16:1–2, a letter of recommendation, as is widely recognized—see, e.g., Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, 109). On Genesis 2–3, see further Joy Elasky Fleming, "A Rhetorical Analysis of Genesis 2–3 with Implications for a Theology of Man and Woman" (Ph.D. diss., University of Strasbourg, 1987).

⁵³As I noted in *Paul, Women and Wives* (208), the point of this comparison is not whether marriage is God-ordained (of course it is), but whether the particular patriarchal structures of marriage that undergird Greco-Roman household codes are God-ordained.

⁵⁴I have argued this at length, with fuller documentation than possible here, in *Paul, Women and Wives*, 139–224.

⁵⁵See the data in Daniel Doriani, “A History of the Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2,” in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 213–67.

⁵⁶See Luther’s conservative but critical use of the Roman liturgy (Paul J. Grime, “Changing the Tempo of Worship,” *ChrHist* 39 [1993]: 16–18); bear in mind, though, that Luther’s views on gender roles were progressive in his historical setting (see Steven Ozment, “Re-inventing Family Life,” *ChrHist* 39 [1993]: 22–26).

⁵⁷See Robert D. Linder, “Allies or Enemies?” *ChrHist* 39 (1993): 40–44.

⁵⁸See “Did You Know?” *ChrHist* 30 (1991): 3; also the more radical Hussites in Elesha Coffman, “Rebels to Be Reckoned With,” *ChrHist* 68 (2000): 39–41.

⁵⁹For some surveys, see Stanley J. Grenz with Denise Muir Kjesbo, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1995), 36–62; Nancy Hardesty, *Women Called to Witness: Evangelical Feminism in the Nineteenth Century* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1984); Catherine Booth, *Female Ministry: Women’s Right to Preach the Gospel* (New York: Salvation Army, 1975; 1st. ed., 1859); articles in *ChrHist* 82 (2004). See esp. the lengthy treatment in Ruth A. Tucker and Walter L. Liefeld, *Daughters of the Church: Women and Ministry from New Testament Times to the Present* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987). Note the expectation suggested by Acts 2:17–18.

⁶⁰See Leonard Swidler, *Women in Judaism: The Status of Women in Formative Judaism* (Metuchen, N.J.: Scarecrow, 1976), 97–111; my *Commentary on Matthew*, 689–90.

⁶¹See Acts 22:3; *m. Avot* 1:4; *Avot of Rabbi Nathan* 6; 38a; 11, §28B; *b. Pesahim* 3b; *Palestinian Talmud Sanhedrin* 10:1, §8. For sitting on chairs normally, see Safrai, “Home and Family,” in *The Jewish People in the First Century*, 737.

⁶²For one commendable example, see Thomas R. Schreiner, “An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15: A Dialogue with Scholarship,” in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 105.

WOMEN IN MINISTRY: ANOTHER COMPLEMENTARIAN PERSPECTIVE

Thomas R. Schreiner

Footnotes

¹It is clear, e.g., that Craig Keener (*Paul, Women and Wives: Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul* [Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1992], 3–4, 120) is influenced significantly by the sense of call many women feel.

²See Daniel Doriani, "A History of the Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9–15*, eds. Andreas J. Köstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 23–67.

³C. S. Lewis, *Surprised by Joy* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1955), 207.

⁴Karen Jo Torjeson (*When Women Were Priests: Women's Leadership in the Early Church and the Scandal of Their Subordination in the Rise of Christianity* [San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1993], 9–87) argues that women actually functioned as priests in the earliest part of church history. Ruth A. Tucker and Walter L. Liefeld (*Daughters of the Church: Women and Ministry from New Testament Times to the Present* [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1987], 63, 89–127), who are egalitarian scholars, are more careful and persuasive in their analysis of the evidence.

⁵See Mary A. Kassian, *The Feminist Gospel: The Movement to Unite Feminism with the Church* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1992); Robert W. Yarbrough, "The Hermeneutics of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 155–96; Harold O. J. Brown, "The New Testament Against Itself: 1 Timothy 2:9–15 and the 'Break-through' of Galatians 3:28," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 197–211. From a secular point of view, see Nicholas Davidson, *The Failure of Feminism* (Buffalo, N.Y.: Prometheus, 1988).

⁶For a helpful analysis of common hermeneutical errors on both sides, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, "Gender Passages in the New Testament: Hermeneutical Fallacies Critiqued," *WTJ* 56 (1994): 259–83.

⁷Unless otherwise noted, Scripture citations are taken from the New American Standard Bible (NASB).

⁸Darrell L. Bock, "Summary Essay," in *Three Views on the Millennium and Beyond*, ed. D. L. Bock (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999), 280. Incidentally, this is not a criticism of Bock's overall view, for I believe he is a complementarian.

⁹So Gretchen Gaebelein Hull, *Equal to Serve: Women and Men in the Church and Home* (Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell, 1987), 183–89.

¹⁰For a study of ordination, see Marjorie Warkentin, *Ordination: A Biblical-Historical View* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982).

¹¹Contra the normal Presbyterian view that distinguishes ruling and teaching elders in 1 Timothy 5:17. Of course, whether “elders” refers to an office is also debated. R. Alastair Campbell (*The Elders: Seniority within Earliest Christianity* [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998]) has recently proposed that an office is not designated by the term. Supporting the notion that an office is in view is Benjamin L. Merkle, *The Elder and Overseer: One Office in the Early Church* (New York: Peter Lang, 2003).

¹²The appointing of elders in “every church” indicates a plurality of leadership in local churches. So also Acts 20:17 refers to *presbyterous tēs ekklēsias*, showing that there were plural elders for a single church. This is the most plausible way of reading Philippians 1:1, as well as the other texts regarding elders.

¹³Stanley J. Grenz with Denise Muir Kjesbo, *Women in the Church: A Biblical Theology of Women in Ministry* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1995), 169. Amazingly, Grenz cites Ruth Tucker, who is an egalitarian, in support but cites no primary sources to prove his charge.

¹⁴On the topic of women learning Torah, see the balanced appraisal of Ben Witherington III, *Women and the Genesis of Christianity* (Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1990), 6–9.

¹⁵Some scholars see this verse as containing an early baptismal formula, but the prehistory of the text need not detain us here.

¹⁶Klyne R. Snodgrass, “Galatians 3:28: Conundrum or Solution?” in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, ed. Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1986), 161–81.

¹⁷Rebecca Merrill Groothuis (*Good News for Women: A Biblical Picture of Gender Equality* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 1997], 46) falls into this very error in defining equality. She does not derive her definition from Scripture but from classical liberal thought. For a persuasive critique of Snodgrass and egalitarian interpretations of Galatians 3:28, see Köstenberger, “Gender Passages,” 274–79; and the insightful work of Richard W. Hove, *Equality in Christ? Galatians 3:28 and the Gender Dispute* (Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1999).

¹⁸F. Bruce, *Commentary on Galatians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 190. Judith M. Gundry-Volf would draw different conclusions than I would from Galatians 3:28, but she rightly argues that this verse does not abolish all gender differences. See “Christ and Gender: A Study of Difference and Equality in Galatians 3:28,” in *Jesus Christus als die Mitte der Schrift: Studien zur Hermeneutik des Evangeliums*, eds. C. Landmesser, H. J. Eckstein, and H. Lichtenberger (BZNW 86; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1997), 439–77.

¹⁹I am not saying that the issues of women in ministry and homosexuality are of equal clarity or importance, for I am persuaded that anyone who thinks homosexuality is acceptable is no longer an evangelical. The scriptural teaching on homosexuality is clearer than its teaching on the role of women. Nonetheless, the very principle propounded by F. F. Bruce could logically lead to the result I point out above.

²⁰See, e.g., J. I. Packer (*Keep in Step with the Spirit* [Old Tappan, N.J.: Revell, 1984], 215), who essentially defines prophecy as “preaching.” Packer is a complementarian. For this notion of prophecy, see also David Hill, *New Testament Prophecy* (London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott, 1979), 213; Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 960–61; Craig L. Blomberg, “Neither Hierarchalist nor Egalitarian: Gender Roles in Paul,” in *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, eds. James R. Beck and Craig L. Blomberg (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001), 344–45.

²¹For studies of prophecy that support this basic view, see David E. Aune, *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1983); Wayne A. Grudem, *The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1982); Graham Houston, *Prophecy: A Gift for Today?* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1989), 82–86; Christopher Forbes, *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and Its Hellenistic Environment* (WUNT 2/75; Tübingen: Mohr, 1995), 218–21; Max Turner, *The Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, rev. ed. (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 1996), 185–220.

²²See TDNT, 6:854, s.v. “*prophētēs*”; Heinrich Greeven, “Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus,” ZNW 44 (1952–53): 29–30; Forbes, *Prophecy and Inspired Speech*, 225–29; Turner, *Holy Spirit and Spiritual Gifts*, 187–90, 206–12.

²³For a discussion of this issue, see *Are Miraculous Gifts for Today? Four Views*, ed. Wayne A. Grudem (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1996).

²⁴For development of this argument, see Gordon J. Wenham, “The Ordination of Women: Why Is It So Divisive?” *Chm* 92 (1978): 310–19.

²⁵Previously I argued that women’s gift of prophecy was not exercised as publicly as it was by men (see my “The Valuable Ministries of Women in the Context of Male Leadership: A Survey of Old and New Testament Examples and Teaching,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism*, eds. John Piper and Wayne Grudem [Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 1991], 216). I now have some reservations about the validity of this argument.

²⁶See Grenz, *Women in the Church*, 129.

²⁷In support of a reference to wives, see George W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Epistles* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 170–73.

²⁸I discussed the evidence for elders previously in this essay (pp. 270–71).

²⁹Some people appeal to the NT accounts of Stephen and Philip and argue that their ministries show that deacons functioned as leaders and were not restricted to “service” ministries (Acts 6:1–8:40). Let me make a few brief comments. First, we’re not absolutely sure Stephen and Philip functioned as deacons, for the title is not used of those appointed in Acts 6:1–6, though the noun *diakonia* is used of the need (v. 1) and the verb *diakonein* (v. 2) of the task to be fulfilled. On balance, I think the Seven were deacons, but certainty eludes us. Second, the preaching ministry of Stephen and Philip hardly proves it is part of the ministry of deacons to preach, for the Seven are appointed so that the Twelve will not abandon the ministry of the word (vv. 2, 4). Third, simply because some deacons did more than required (Stephen and Philip served *and* preached), it does not follow that *all* deacons can or should teach and preach. Luke features Stephen and Philip precisely because they were exceptional.

³⁰See Aída B. Spencer, *Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry* (Nashville: Nelson, 1985), 109–12; Tucker and Liefeld, *Daughters of the Church*, 74–75.

³¹See Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 238–40; Spencer, *Beyond the Curse*, 113–17.

³²This appears to be the view of Grenz, *Women in the Church*, 90–91.

³³Contra Grenz (*Women in the Church*, 79), who also supports women as leaders on the basis of Rhoda's telling the others that Peter was at the door of the house (Acts 12:14)!

³⁴For further discussion on Phoebe, including a bibliography citing alternative views, see my *Romans* (BECNT; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 786–88.

³⁵Grenz, *Women in the Church*, 91–92. Grenz admits the evidence is ambiguous, but he fails to inform the reader that virtually all the commentators agree a specific woman is not in view. The sources he mentions (see his p. 242, nn. 95, 96) are a commentator from 1888, another commentary without a date, and Spencer, *Beyond the Curse*. The standard commentaries all stand in agreement against him. See, e.g., Raymond E. Brown, *The Epistles of John* (AB; Garden City, N.J.: Doubleday, 1982), 651–55; Stephen S. Smalley, 1, 2, 3 *John* (WBC; Dallas: Word, 1984), 318; John R. W. Stott, *The Epistles of John* (TNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1964), 200–201.

³⁶For a careful assessment of the evidence, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, "Women in the Pauline Mission," in *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul's Mission*, eds. Peter G. Bolt and Mark Thompson (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2000), 221–47. For further discussion on Junia see John Thorley, "Junia, A Woman Apostle?" *NovT* 39 (1996): 18–21; Richard S. Cervin, "A Note Regarding the Name 'Junia(s)'" in *Romans 16.7*, *NTS* 40 (1994): 464–70; Schreiner, *Romans*, 795–97.

³⁷Michael H. Burer and Daniel B. Wallace, "Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Reexamination of Romans 16:7," *New Testament Studies* 47 (2001): 76–91. See now Richard Bauckham who has raised serious objections about the interpretation of the evidence proposed by Wallace and Burer in his *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 172–80.

³⁸See Wolf-Henning Ollrog, *Paulus und seine Mitarbeiter: Untersuchungen zu Theorie und Praxis der paulinischen Mission* (WMANT 50; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1979), 79–84.

³⁹Rudolf Schnackenburg, "Apostles before and during Paul's Time," in *Apostolic History and the Gospel*, eds. W. W. Gasque and R. P. Martin (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1970), 294; so also E. Earle Ellis, *Pauline Theology: Ministry and Society* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1989), 66.

⁴⁰*Did.* 11:3–6; *Herm. Vis.* 13.1; *Herm. Sim.* 92.4; 93.5; 102.2.

⁴¹Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 413; so also Peter Stuhlmacher, *Paul's Letter to the Romans* (Louisville, Ky.: Westminster, 1994), 249.

⁴²See James B. Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1981), 44–45.

⁴³Grenz (*Women in the Church*, 152) faces the same problem.

⁴⁴So Phyllis Tribble, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978), 80, 98.

⁴⁵I believe the two creation accounts are complementary, not contradictory.

⁴⁶See Robert Alter, *The Art of Biblical Narrative* (New York: Basic Books, 1981).

⁴⁷So Paul Jewett, *Man as Male and Female: A Study of Sexual Relationships from a Theological Point of View* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1975), 126–27.

⁴⁸See Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, 207–8.

⁴⁹So Tribble, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*, 90.

⁵⁰See David J. A. Clines, "What Does Eve Do to Help? and Other Irredeemably Androcentric Orientations in Genesis 1–3," in *What Does Eve Do to Help? and Other Readerly Questions in the Old Testament*, ed. David J. A. Clines (JSOTSup; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1990), 31–32.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, 33–36.

⁵²See Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, 210–12.

⁵³See Tribble, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*, 99–100.

⁵⁴Contra Tribble's view, see Clines, "What Does Eve Do to Help?" 37–40 (esp. 39, n. 3). George W. Ramsey ("Is Name-Giving an Act of Domination in Genesis 2:23 and Elsewhere?" *CBQ* 50 [1988]: 24–35) maintains that naming is linked only with discernment, not domination. But this view ignores the connection between the injunction to rule the world and the act of naming.

⁵⁵Cited in Clines, "What Does Eve Do to Help?" 100.

⁵⁶Incidentally, Tribble's view that the naming of Eve (Gen. 3:20) is an inappropriate act of male dominance (*God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality*, 133–34) is unconvincing, for the text provides no clue that an abuse of power is involved. Instead, this word is linked in the narrative with the promise of life (vv. 20–21). For a critique of Tribble, see Clines, "What Does Eve Do to Help?" 39.

⁵⁷My view here depends on my interpretation of Genesis 3:16, which I do not have space here to explain. See Susan T. Foh, "What Is the Woman's Desire?" *WTJ* 37 (1975): 376–83.

⁵⁸For an illuminating study on the relationship between the church and the family, see Vern S. Poythress, "The Church as Family: Why Male Leadership in the Family Requires Male Leadership in the Church," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 233–47.

⁵⁹See, e.g., Grenz, *Women in the Church*, 115, 178; Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 159, 168–72.

⁶⁰So Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, 158.

⁶¹Keener (*Paul, Women and Wives*, 186–88) acknowledges that mutual submission is not demanded of children, showing his inconsistency, for if this is the case, Ephesians 5:21 does *not* function as the introduction to all of 5:22–6:9. Nor do I find persuasive Keener's view (*Paul, Women and Wives*, 206) that 6:9 teaches submission for masters. The persistent fact is that husbands, parents, and masters are never told to submit to wives, children, and slaves, respectively.

⁶²I am not suggesting, incidentally, that husbands never follow the advice of their wives. Wise husbands do so often. Some complementarians interpret verse 21 to say that only some members of the congregation submit to others (e.g., Wayne Grudem, "The Myth of Mutual Submission as an Interpretation of Ephesians 5:21," in *Biblical Foundations for Manhood and Womanhood*, ed. Wayne Grudem [Wheaton, Ill.: Crossway, 2002], 228–29; cf. also Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, 139–41). Such a reading is possible but unpersuasive, for typically the pronoun *allēlois* refers to all members of the congregation (see Ernest Best, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Ephesians* [ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998], 516). A call to submit to one another as brothers and sisters in the church does not yield the conclusion that husbands should submit to wives or that parents should submit to children. Verse 21 refers to the corporate life, where all members are enjoined to submit to one another. Daniel Doriani's article ("The Historical Novelty of Egalitarian Interpretations of Ephesians

5:21–22,” in *Biblical Foundations for Manhood and Womanhood*, 203–19) indicates that many scholars throughout the history of the church have understood the text in the way I suggest here.

⁶³So Peter O’Brien, *The Letter to the Ephesians* (PNTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999), 400–404, and previous note above.

⁶⁴See, e.g., Gilbert Bilezikian, *Beyond Sex Roles: What the Bible Says About a Woman’s Place in Church and Family*, rev. ed. (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1985), 215–52; Berkeley and Alvera Mickelsen, “What Does *Kephalē* Mean in the New Testament?” in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, 97–110; Catherine Clark Kroeger, “The Classical Concept of *Head* as ‘Source,’” in Hull, *Equal to Serve*, 267–83. For another complementarian view, see Richard S. Cervin, “Does *Kephalē* Mean ‘Source’ or ‘Authority’ in Greek Literature? A Rebuttal,” *TJ* 10 (1989): 85–112. For the weaknesses in Cervin’s view as well, see the second article listed under Grudem in the next note.

⁶⁵See Wayne Grudem, “Does *Kephalē* (‘Head’) Mean ‘Source’ or ‘Authority Over’ in Greek Literature? A Survey of 2,336 Examples,” *TJ* 6 (1985): 38–59; Grudem, “The Meaning of *Kephalē* (‘Head’): A Response to Recent Studies,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 425–68, 534–41; Grudem, “The Meaning of *Kephalē* (‘Head’): An Examination of New Evidence, Real and Alleged,” *JETS* 44 (2001): 25–65; Joseph A. Fitzmyer, “*Kephalē* in 1 Corinthians 11:3,” *Int* 47 (1993): 52–59.

⁶⁶See Clinton E. Arnold, “Jesus Christ: ‘Head’ of the Church (Colossians and Ephesians),” in *Jesus of Nazareth: Lord and Christ. Essays on the Historical Jesus and New Testament Christology*, eds. J. B. Green and M. Turner (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 346–66.

⁶⁷See Hull, *Equal to Serve*, 195.

⁶⁸Most egalitarians deny that there is any sense in which the Son submits eternally to the Father. See, e.g., Gilbert Bilezikian, “Hermeneutical Bungee-Jumping: Subordination in the Godhead,” *JETS* 40 (1997): 57–68. But Craig S. Keener (“Is Subordination within the Trinity Really Heresy? A Study of John 5:18 in Context,” *TJ* 20 [1999]: 39–51), who is himself an egalitarian, properly suggests that the eternal subordination of the Son, rightly understood, is supported biblically.

⁶⁹So Alan Padgett, “The Pauline Rationale for Submission: Biblical Feminism and the *hina* Clauses of Titus 2:1–10,” *EvQ* 59 (1987): 39–52. This view has been advanced further and developed hermeneutically by William J. Webb, *Slaves, Women & Homosexuals: Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis* (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 2001). For my response, see Thomas R. Schreiner, “William J. Webb’s *Slaves, Women & Homosexuals*: A Review Article,” *SBJT* 6 (2002): 46–64.

⁷⁰For this thesis, see Willard M. Swartley, *Slavery, Sabbath, War and Women: Case Issues in Biblical Interpretation* (Scottsdale, Pa.: Herald, 1983); Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 184–224; Kevin Giles, “The Biblical Case for Slavery: Can the Bible Mislead? A Case Study in Hermeneutics,” *EvQ* 66 (1994): 3–17 (unfortunately, Giles [p. 4] relinquishes the Bible’s authority in social relations). See the critique by Yarbrough, “The Hermeneutics of 1 Timothy 2:9–15,” 189. For the ongoing debate, see Giles, “A Critique of the ‘Novel’ Contemporary Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15 Given in the Book, *Women in the Church*. Part I,” *EvQ* 72 (2000): 151–67; Giles, “A Critique of the ‘Novel’ Contemporary Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15 Given in the Book, *Women in the Church*. Part II,” *EvQ* 72 (2000): 195–215; Andreas J. Köstenberger, “Women in the Church: A Response to Kevin Giles,” *EvQ* 73 (2001): 205–24; Giles, “*Women in the Church*: A Rejoinder to Andreas Köstenberger,” *EvQ* 73 (2001): 225–43.

⁷¹Craig Keener (*Paul, Women and Wives*, 208–9) objects that the issue is whether a wife's submission to her husband is *permanently mandated*, not the ordinance of marriage itself. But I would contend Paul's argument in Ephesians 5:22–33 demonstrates that the marriage relationship mirrors Christ's relationship to the church. In addition, Genesis 2–3 indicates that role distinctions between husbands and wives was God's intention in creating man and woman.

⁷²Of course, I am not denying that sin has affected the relationship between parents and children, with the result that no parents raise their children perfectly, and, in fact, some parents do great damage to their children.

⁷³Nor is it clear from Titus 2:3–5 that wives are to submit only in order to avoid cultural scandal in Paul's day. Padgett ("The Pauline Rationale for Submission") provides no clear basis by which we can discern whether the admonitions are culturally dated or transcendent, for in these very verses, Paul also summons wives to love their husbands and children, and to be kind, sensible, and pure. These commands are given for the same reason as the command to submit to husbands, namely, so that the gospel will be honored. But, of course, no one would think these commands no longer apply today.

⁷⁴For an analysis of this theme, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, "The Mystery of Christ and the Church: Head and Body, 'One Flesh,'" *TJ* 12 (1991): 79–94.

⁷⁵Some scholars believe Paul is addressing husbands and wives rather than men and women here. So, e.g., Gordon P. Hugenberger, "Women in Church Office: Hermeneutics or Exegesis? A Survey of Approaches to 1 Timothy 2:8–15," *JETS* 35 (1992): 341–60. Such a view is not contextually convincing. For a refutation, see my essay "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15: A Dialogue with Scholarship," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 115–17.

⁷⁶From the egalitarian point of view, see Richard Clark Kroeger and Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11–15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992); Sharon H. Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:9–15 in Light of the Religious and Cultural Milieu of the First Century* (Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1991).

⁷⁷A new edition is forthcoming, and I have used some of the wording from this new edition in a few of the footnotes below. For a recent attempt to support an egalitarian reading, see J. M. Holmes, "Text in a Whirlwind: A Critique of Four Exegetical Devices at 1 Timothy 2:9–15" (*JSNTSup* 196; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000). For a convincing rebuttal, see Andreas Köstenberger's review (*RBibLit* [www.bookreviews.org/pdf/974_506.pdf] (2001).

⁷⁸So Alvera Mickelsen, "An Egalitarian View: There Is Neither Male nor Female in Christ," in *Women in Ministry: Four Views*, eds. Bonnidell Clouse and Robert G. Clouse (Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1989), 201.

⁷⁹See Steven M. Baugh, "A Foreign World: Ephesus in the First Century," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 47–48; Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 103–7.

⁸⁰For a more detailed discussion of 1 Timothy 2:9–10 see my essay "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," 114–21.

⁸¹See Andreas J. Köstenberger, "A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Timothy 2:12," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 81–103.

⁸²I. Howard Marshall (*A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles* [ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999], 458–60) is unpersuasive in seeing a negative connotation in the terms.

⁸³Catherine Clark Kroeger, "Ancient Heresies and a Strange Greek Verb," *Refj* 29 (1979): 12–15.

⁸⁴See Kroeger and Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman*, 103. Linda L. Belleville proposes a translation similar to the Kroegers in some respects (*Women Leaders and the Church: Three Crucial Questions* [Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000], 177). Philip B. Payne ("The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11–15: A Surrejoinder," in *What Does the Scripture Teach about the Ordination of Women?* [Minneapolis: unpublished paper, 1986], 108–10) lists five different meanings for the infinitive, which does not inspire confidence he has any definite sense of what the infinitive means.

⁸⁵George W. Knight III, "Authenteō in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2:12," *NTS* 30 (1984): 143–57; Leland E. Wilshire, "The TLG Computer and Further Reference to *Authenteō* in 1 Timothy 2:12," *NTS* 34 (1988): 120–34; H. Scott Baldwin, "A Difficult Word: *Authenteō* in 1 Timothy 2:12," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis*, 65–80, 269–305. See my summary and more detailed analysis of this word in my essay "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," 130–33.

⁸⁶See, e.g., Carroll D. Osburn, "*Authenteō* (1 Timothy 2:12)," *ResQ* 25 (1982): 1–12.

⁸⁷Some egalitarians have appealed to the phrase *ouk epitrepō* ("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 *parakalō* ("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.

⁸⁸Egalitarians often understand this verse to be merely an illustration. So Gritz, *Mother Goddess at Ephesus*, 136; Witherington, *Women and the Genesis of Christianity*, 194–95; David M. Scholer, "1 Timothy 2:9–15 and the Place of Women in the Church's Ministry," in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, 208; Alan Padgett, "Wealthy Women at Ephesus: 1 Timothy 2:8–15 in Social Context," *Int* 41 (1987): 25; Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 115–17. In defense of this verse functioning as a reason for the command, see Douglas J. Moo, "The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11–15: A Rejoinder," *TJ* 2 (1981): 202–3.

⁸⁹For documentation of the egalitarian view, see my essay "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," 137.

⁹⁰Royce Gordon Gruenler ("The Mission-Lifestyle Setting of 1 Timothy 2:8–15," *JETS* 41 [1998]: 215–38) argues that the subordination of women is explicable from the missionary situation in 1 Timothy. But he doesn't really engage in an intensive exegesis of the text, nor does he persuasively demonstrate that the prohibition is due to mission. Once again, Paul could have easily communicated such an idea, but he did not clearly do so.

⁹¹See Baugh, "A Foreign World," 45–47.

⁹²See D. A. Carson, "Silent in the Churches': On the Role of Women in 1 Corinthians 14:33b–36," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 147.

⁹³See Steven M. Baugh, "The Apostle among the Amazons," *WTJ* 56 (1994): 153–71; Albert Wolters, "Review: *I Suffer Not a Woman*," *CTJ* 28 (1993): 208–13; Robert W. Yarbrough, "*I Suffer Not a Woman*: A Review Essay," *Presb* 18 (1992): 25–33.

⁹⁴See Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *JBL* 81 (1962): 2–13; John M. G. Barclay, "Mirror-Reading a Polemical Letter: Galatians as a Test Case," *JSNT* 3 (1987): 73–93. See also Jerry L. Sumney, "Identifying Paul's Opponents: The Question of Method in 2 Corinthians" (*JSNTSup* 40; Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1990). For a sensible and cautious description of the opponents in the Pastorals, see Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 140–52; cf. also William D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC; Nashville: Nelson, 2000), lxix–lxxxvi.

⁹⁵See Bruce Barron, "Putting Women in Their Place: 1 Timothy 2 and Evangelical Views of Women in Church Leadership," *JETS* 33 (1990): 451–59.

⁹⁶See my "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," 107–12, for a discussion of the setting of the text.

⁹⁷For documentation, see my "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," 136. Jerome D. Quinn and William C. Wacker (*The First and Second Letters to Timothy* [ECC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000], 227) rightly remark that the brevity of the words in verse 13 demonstrates that the truth presented here was both familiar and intelligible.

⁹⁸For a detailed discussion of this verse, see my "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15," 140–46, though I am less certain about my previous interpretation of this verse.

⁹⁹Craig L. Blomberg ("Not Beyond What Is Written: A Review of Aida Spencer's *Beyond the Curse: Women Called to Ministry*," *CTR* 2 [1988]: 414) intriguingly suggests verse 14 should be read with verse 15 instead of functioning as a second reason for the injunction in verse 12. On this reading, Paul says the woman will be saved, even though Eve was initially deceived. There are at least three weaknesses with this view (cf. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 142): (1) the *kai* in verse 14 naturally links verse 14 with verse 13; (2) the structure of verse 13 nicely matches verse 14, for both verses compare and contrast Adam and Eve in an a-b a-b pattern; and (3) Blomberg's view does not account well for the reference to Adam in verse 14. Any reference to Adam is superfluous if the concern is only the salvation of women. But the reference to both Adam and Eve fits with the specific argument in verse 12 that women are not to teach men. In my view Blomberg does not answer these objections convincingly in his response to Mounce's objections (see his essay, "Neither Hierarchalist nor Egalitarian: Gender Roles in Paul," in *Two Views on Women in Ministry*, eds. James R. Beck and Craig L. Blomberg [Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001], 367).

¹⁰⁰So Paul W. Barnett, "Wives and Women's Ministry (1 Timothy 2:11–15)," *EvQ* 61 (1989): 234.

¹⁰¹See also Gruenler, "The Mission-Lifestyle Setting," 217–18, 20–21.

¹⁰²Due to space limitations, I am bypassing the interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:15. For my view, see “An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15,” 146–53. I do not believe my specific interpretation affects the major teaching of the text in a decisive way (contra Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 118; Scholer, “1 Timothy 2:9–15 and the Place of Women,” 196). For an alternate interpretation, see Andreas J. Köstenberger, “Ascertaining Women’s God-Ordained Roles: An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:15,” *BBR* 7 (1997): 107–43.

¹⁰³For further discussion, see my essay “Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity: 1 Corinthians 11:2–16,” in *Recovering Biblical Manhood and Womanhood*, 124–39.

¹⁰⁴Supporting a shawl or veil is Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 506–12; Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 22–31; Cynthia L. Thompson, “Hairstyles, Head-Coverings, and St. Paul: Portraits from Roman Corinth,” *BA* 51 (1988): 99–115. Supporting hairstyle is Hurley, *Man and Woman in Biblical Perspective*, 254–71; David E. Blattenberger III, *Rethinking 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 through Archaeological and Moral-Rhetorical Analysis* (Lewiston, N.Y.: Mellen, 1997).

¹⁰⁵Bruce W. Winter (*After Paul Left Corinth* [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001], 121–41) argues that the injunction to veil demonstrates that wives and not women in general are in view here, supporting this with evidence from the culture of Paul’s day. Winter’s arguments are quite attractive, but further research and discussion are needed to establish this claim. I have some hesitancy about his view because it is unclear from the text itself that only wives are in view, though perhaps Winter is correct in saying that the reference to veiling indicates such is the case.

¹⁰⁶I am not suggesting *kephalē* means only “source” here; both “authority over” and “source” are probably involved. My judgment on this issue represents a change from my “Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity,” 124–39.

¹⁰⁷See Grenz, *Women in the Church*, 153–54.

¹⁰⁸Scholars often appeal to verse 10 to support the idea that women have independent authority in prophesying. This interpretation was proposed by Morna D. Hooker (“Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Corinthians xi.10,” *NTS* 10 [1964]: 410–16) and has been adopted by most egalitarians (see, e.g., Keener, *Paul, Women and Wives*, 38–42). But there are serious problems with this view (see my “Head Coverings, Prophecies and the Trinity,” 134–37).

¹⁰⁹Judith M. Gundry-Volf (“Gender and Creation in 1 Corinthians 11:2–16: A Study in Paul’s Theological Method,” in *Evangelium Schriftauslegung Kirche*, ed. O. Hofius [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1997], 151–71) argues that Paul integrates creation, culture, and eschatological life in Christ in a complex fashion in these verses so that he, in effect, supports patriarchy and equality simultaneously. On the one hand, I disagree with her claim that verses 11–12 partially mute the patriarchy of the previous verses. On the other hand, her own proposal is overly complex and doesn’t offer a clear way forward in the debate.

¹¹⁰See, e.g., Bruce Waltke, “1 Corinthians 11:2–16: An Interpretation,” *BSac* 135 (1978): 46–57; Robert Culver, “A Traditional View: Let Your Women Keep Silence,” in *Women in Ministry: Four Views*, 29–32, 48.

¹¹¹I am not claiming that taking a husband's last name should always be required. Our culture may change. In some cultures, retaining one's maiden name may show respect for one's father. I am merely suggesting that, in some cases, women are making a statement about their view of gender relations by not taking their husband's last name.

¹¹²See Köstenberger, "Gender Passages," 270. John Stott (*Guard the Truth: The Message of 1 Timothy & Titus* [BST; Downers Grove, Ill.: InterVarsity, 1996], 78–80) argues that submission to authority is transcultural but teaching is a cultural expression of the principle that does not apply the same way in our culture. Köstenberger (*1–2 Timothy and Titus* [EBC, rev. ed.; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, forthcoming]) rightly responds that "v. 13 provides the rationale for vv. 11–12 in their entirety rather than only the submission-authority principle. Moreover, teaching and ruling functions are inseparable from submission-authority, as is made clear in the immediately following context when it is said that the overseer must be 'husband of one wife' (i.e., by implication, male; 3:2) as well as 'able to teach' (3:2)."

¹¹³Craig Keener (*Paul, Women and Wives*, 19) thinks that if one abandons the head covering, then the limitation imposed by 1 Timothy 2:12 must be surrendered as well. But I believe I am following Keener's very principle of trying to discern the principle in each text (see *Paul, Women and Wives*, 46).

¹¹⁴See Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 699–705; Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 141–45; Curt Niccum, "The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Corinthians 14.34–35," *NTS* 43 (1997): 242–55. See also Keener's fine survey of interpretive options (*Paul, Women and Wives*, 70–100). Philip B. Payne ("Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1 Corinthians 14.34–5," *NTS* 41 [1995]: 240–62) argues that evidence from Codex Fuldensis and a "bar-umlaut" siglum in Vaticanus indicate that verses 34–35 are a later interpolation. Niccum demonstrates, however, that the evidence adduced by Payne does not really support an interpolation.

¹¹⁵For a survey of options and the view that the judging of prophecies is forbidden, see Carson, "Silent in the Churches," 145–53. For a survey that reaches another conclusion, see Forbes, *Prophecy and Inspired Speech*, 270–77.

¹¹⁶Keener (*Paul, Women and Wives*, 87) agrees with me that the principle in the text is *submission*, though he would apply the text differently to today.

¹¹⁷I simply could not address the diversity of practical questions in this brief Title: Three Views on Eastern Orthodoxy and Evangelicalism

A RESPONSE TO THOMAS SCHREINER

Linda L. Belleville

Footnotes

¹So Ephesians 5:30 in the Western and Byzantine families of manuscripts and versions and in church fathers from the second century on (see p. 100, n. 150, in my essay in this book).

A RESPONSE TO THOMAS SCHREINER

Craig L. Blomberg

Footnotes

¹See Richard Bauckham, *Gospel Women: Studies of the Named Women in the Gospels* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 172–80.