1 Tim 2.12 and the Use of οὐδέ to Combine Two Elements to Express a Single Idea

PHILIP B. PAYNE

PO Box 580, Edmonds, WA 98020–0580, USA

Paul typically uses οὐδέ **to convey a single idea, as do the two closest syntactical parallels to 1 Tim 2.12. In the overwhelming majority of Paul's and the NT's** οὐκ + οὐδέ + ἀλλά **syntactical constructions,** οὐδέ **joins two expressions to convey a single idea in sharp contrast to the following** ἀλλά **statement. Furthermore, the earliest known commentary on 1 Tim 2.12, Origen's, treats it as a single prohibition. Accordingly, the most natural reading of 1 Tim 2.12 conveys, 'I am not permitting a woman to teach and [in combination with this] to assume authority over a man'.**

Keywords: οὐδέ, 1 Tim 2.12, Hendiadys, Conjunction, Woman, αὐθεντεῖν

Introduction

This study applies analysis of grammatical constructions using the conjunction οὐδέ to the theologically significant question of the meaning of the prohibition regarding women in 1 Tim 2.12. It demonstrates that the overwhelming majority of the uses of οὐδέ[1] in the undisputed letters of Paul combine two elements to express a single idea.[2] Using only the epistles that scholarly consensus assigns to Paul,[3] hereafter called Paul's accepted letters, this study establishes four categories of usage where οὐδέ connects two elements. Next it identifies the categories of Luke's use of οὐδέ and compares these to Paul's. Then it analyzes the four instances of οὐδέ in disputed Pauline letters, three in 1 Timothy.

Since 1 Tim 2.12 is the only NT verse that might explicitly prohibit women from teaching or having authority over men, this study focuses on it, noting relevant parallels to it throughout. Key to its meaning are οὐδέ and αὐθεντεῖν. Since lexical and contextual evidence favors the meaning BDAG gives for αὐθεντεῖν, 'to

---

1 Μηδέ is not included here since Paul tends to use it differently, to list separate items.

2 Hendiadys combines two expressions to convey 'one by means of two', ἓν διὰ δυοῖν, but this article avoids this useful term because of disputes over its definition.

3 As listed, for example, by K. J. Neumann, *The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990) 130.

235

assume a stance of independent authority',[4] this article translates αὐθεντεῖν 'to assume authority'. This study shows that the two closest syntactical parallels to 1 Tim 2.12 both join two elements to convey a single idea. It also shows that Paul's and the NT's overwhelmingly dominant use of the οὐκ + οὐδέ + ἀλλά syntactical construction is for the οὐκ + οὐδέ statements to convey a single idea that sharply contrasts with the following ἀλλά statement. It argues that this is the most natural way to interpret 1 Tim 2.12 within its context and identifies many instances where οὐδέ joins an infinitive with positive connotations to an infinitive with negative connotations.

The accepted letters of Paul contain thirty-one occurrences of οὐδέ, thirty-two including the second οὐδέ in many early manuscripts of Gal 1.12. Eight of these οὐδέ are not coordinating conjunctions and so are not analogous to 1 Tim 2.12; seven express the idiom 'not even': 1 Cor 11.14; 14.21; 15.13, 16; Gal 2.3, 5; 6.13. Each of these and the eighth, Rom 4.15, introduce an idea that is meaningful by itself. This article argues that, excluding the ambiguous case of 1 Thess 2.3, seventeen of the twenty-one οὐδέ coordinating conjunctions in the accepted letters of Paul make best sense conveying a single idea. The four exceptions each convey naturally paired ideas that focus on the same verb.

A. The Use of οὐδέ in the Accepted Letters of Paul

Paul typically uses οὐδέ to join together expressions that reinforce or make more specific a single idea.[5] Appropriately, *BDF* §445 calls οὐδέ a 'correlative' and a 'connective' indicating 'correlation' of members and contrasts its use with 'independent continuation'. When 'not' (οὐ or οὐκ) occurs in the first expression,

---

4 BDAG 150. Cf. the detailed analysis in P. B. Payne, *Man & Woman: One in Christ* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2009). The first clear instance of αὐθεντέω meaning 'exercise authority' is ca. 370 CE, Saint Basil, *The Letters* #69, line 45, Roy J. Deferrari, trans., *Saint Basil* (LCL) 2:40–3. G. W. Knight III, 'ΑΥΘΕΝΤΕΩ in Reference to Women in 1 Timothy 2.12', *NTS* 30 (1984) 143–57, 154 correctly identifies BGU 1208 as the crux, but pp. 145, 150, and 155 n. 13 falsely attribute to J. R. Werner's letter of March 18, 1980 the translation: 'I exercised authority over him'. Werner made carbon copies of his letter to Knight for the I Timothy files of the Wycliffe Bible Translators Translation Department and for himself, and provided copies of it and later correspondence with Knight to the current author, who provided a copy of this letter to NTS. Werner convincingly argues that αὐθεντέω in BGU 1208 and in 1 Tim 2.12 means, 'assume authority to oneself'.

5 Non-Pauline examples of οὐδέ joining two infinitives in order to convey a single idea include LXX Isa 42.24b; Polybius *Hist.* 30.5.8.4–6; 30.24.2.3–4; 31.12.5–6; Diodorus Siculus *Bibl. hist.* 3.37.9.1–4; Josephus *Ant.* 6.20.3–5; 7.127.1–3; Plutarch *De defectu oraculorum* 426.B.1; *De tranquillitate animi* 474.A.12; 475.D.3. A. J. Köstenberger, 'A Complex Sentence: The Syntax of 1 Timothy 2:12', *Women in the Church: An Analysis and Application of 1 Timothy 2:9–12* (ed. A. J. Köstenberger and T. R. Schreiner; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005) 53–84, 63–71 cites these.

this negation encompasses the entire single idea. The οὐ in οὐδέ underscores the continuing negation.

Paul's use of οὐδέ as a coordinating conjunction fits into four categories:

1. οὐδέ joining two equivalent or synonymous expressions to convey a single idea,
2. οὐδέ joining naturally paired expressions to convey a single idea,
3. οὐδέ joining conceptually different expressions to convey a single idea, and
4. οὐδέ joining naturally paired ideas focusing on the same verb.

1. *Οὐδέ Joins Equivalent Expressions to Convey a Single Idea*

In seven instances (eight including the textual variant in Gal 1.12), οὐδέ joins two expressions that are equivalent in meaning. In each of these cases οὐδέ joins expressions to convey a single idea. This article italicizes all English translations of οὐδέ.

1) Rom 2.28: 'For the true Jew is not the man who is outwardly a Jew, *and* true circumcision is *not* that which is outward and bodily' (Weymouth; cf. Goodspeed, Williams,[6] also translating οὐδέ '*and . . . not*'). The equivalence in meaning is clearly conveyed by the TEV: 'After all, who is a real Jew, truly circumcised? Not the man who is a Jew on the outside, *whose* circumcision is a physical thing'.

2) Rom 9.6–7: 'For not all Israelites truly belong to Israel, *and not* all of Abraham's children are his true descendants . . .' (NRSV, RSV).

3) 1 Cor 15.50: 'flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God: *and* the perishable can*not* inherit what lasts for ever' (JB; cf. Goodspeed, NAB, TEV).

4) Gal 1.1: 'Paul an apostle – not from men *nor* through man, . . .' (RSV). The equivalence in meaning is conveyed by PHILLIPS: 'Paul, who am appointed *and* commissioned a messenger not by man but by Jesus Christ . . .'

5) Gal 1.12: 'the gospel I preached is not of human origin. (οὐδέ) I did *not* receive it from any human source' (TNIV; cf. JB). Οὔτε (οὐδέ in ℵ A D*.c F G P Ψ 0278. 33. 81. 104. 365. 1175. 1241^S. 1739. 1881. 2464 *al*) emphasizes this with a third equivalent expression, '*nor* was I taught it' (NRSV, TNIV, NIV).

6) Gal 4.14: 'what must have tried you in my physical condition, you did not scorn *and* despise, but you welcomed me like an angel of God' (Goodspeed).

7) Phil 2.16: 'I had not run in the race *and* exhausted myself for nothing' (JB; cf. Goodspeed, TEV).

---

6 R. F. Weymouth, *The New Testament in Modern Speech: An Idiomatic Translation into Everyday English from the Text of the Resultant Greek Testament* (5th ed.; London: James Clarke, 1943); E. J. Goodspeed, *An American Translation* (Chicago: University of Chicago, 1939); C. B. Williams, *The New Testament: A Translation in the Language of the People* (Chicago: Moody, 1937). These will be cited by author's surname.

In all seven (or eight), οὐδέ joins two expressions having equivalent meanings. The second expression in each case reinforces the single idea and introduces no separate idea.

2. *Οὐδέ Joins Naturally Paired Expressions to Convey a Single Idea*

In four instances, οὐδέ constructions convey a single idea by joining naturally paired expressions, couplets that by their very nature are closely associated with each other:

1) Rom 11.21: 'For if God did not spare the natural branches, he will *not* spare you [engrafted branches] *either*' (NIV). Verse 24 confirms the 'how much more' logic of this single, internally cohering idea.

2, 3) Gal 3.28: 'There is no such thing as Jew *and* Greek, slave *and* freeman, male and (καί) female . . .' (NEB; cf. Fenton,[7] Goodspeed, JB, TEV, Way,[8] Weymouth, also translating οὐδέ '*and*'). Here οὐδέ parallels καί ('and'), and in the same couplets in Col 3.11 and Rom 10.12, καί replaces οὐδέ. These must not be separate statements, 'there is no Jew in Christ' and 'there is no Greek in Christ', since both statements are obviously false. The context of discrimination against Greeks (Gal 2.11–3.14; 3.23–25) confirms that Paul means: 'there is no Jew–Greek dichotomy in Christ'. The antagonistic barrier represented by each pair is overcome in Christ. Each pair functions together to convey a single idea. Paul's meaning is: there is no 'Jew–Greek' dichotomy in Christ, no 'slave–free' dichotomy in Christ, and no 'male–female' dichotomy in Christ.

4) 1 Thess 5.5: 'We have nothing to do with night *and* darkness' (Beck[9]; cf. LB). Οὐδέ joins night with darkness to specify the single, internally cohering idea of night viewed as darkness, a metaphor for evil as separation from the light of God.

In all four, οὐδέ joins naturally paired expressions to convey a single idea. In each case, the second expression specifies the meaning and is essential to convey the single idea.

3. *Οὐδέ Joins Conceptually Different Expressions to Convey a Single Idea*

In six passages in the accepted letters of Paul, οὐδέ joins conceptually different expressions to convey a single idea. Each passage makes better sense in its context if it conveys one idea rather than two.

1) Rom 3.10: 'There is no one who is righteous, *not even* one' (NRSV, NIV). 'Not even one' gives an emphatic clarification that 'no one' is without exception. The two elements are intrinsically intertwined; they are not two separate ideas.

---

7 F. Fenton, *The Holy Bible in Modern English: Translated into English Direct from the Original Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek* (New York: Oxford University, 1903).
8 A. S. Way, *The Letters of St. Paul* (London: MacMillan, 1935).
9 W. F. Beck, *The New Testament in the Language of Today* (St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia, 1963).

2) Rom 9.16: 'It does not, therefore, depend on man's desire *and* effort, but on God's mercy'. Grammatically this could convey two separate ideas, namely that mercy does not depend on desire, nor does it depend on effort. The context, however, shows that Paul objects to mercy being dependent on the combination of desire and effort, continuing the concern of v. 12, 'not by works' (cf. v. 11). 'Desire and effort' in v. 16 conceptually parallels 'pursued by works' in vv. 31–32: 'the people of Israel, who pursued the law as the way of righteousness, have not attained it. Why not? Because they pursued it not by faith but as if it were by works' (TNIV). Since Paul affirms 'pursuit by faith' but opposes 'pursuit by works', he must not oppose desire for righteousness itself, but rather, desire for righteousness achieved by works. Therefore, the single idea 'desire *combined with* effort' in 9.16 fits the context better than 'desire or effort' understood as two separate ideas.

3) 1 Cor 2.6: 'wisdom not of this age, *and specifically not* of the rulers of this age' (cf. JB). Paul's use of 'wisdom' and 'the wise' interchangeably (1.19–20; 3.19–20) and 2.8's continuing focus on the misunderstanding of 'the rulers of this age' (τῶν ἀρχόντων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου, repeated exactly from 2.6) support understanding 2.6's οὐδέ construction as focusing specifically on the rulers of this age.

4) 1 Cor 5.1: 'there is sexual immorality among you, and of a kind that is *not found even* (ἥτις οὐδέ) among pagans; for a man is living with his father's wife' (NRSV). The relative pronominal adjective ἥτις ('which') makes it explicit that οὐδέ introduces a qualifying description. MS 2147 omits ἥτις,[10] showing that, with or without ἥτις, οὐδέ introduces this qualifying description. The text following οὐδέ narrows down what sort of illicit sex Paul has in mind, just as the text following οὐδέ in 1 Tim 2.12 may narrow down what sort of teaching is prohibited, 'teaching *combined with* assuming authority over a man'.

5) 1 Cor 11.16: 'We *and* the churches of God' (PHILLIPS; cf. LB) 'have no such custom' (ASV, KJV). Paul's consistent identification with the churches elsewhere supports this understanding, e.g. 1 Cor 4.17; 7.17. Nowhere else does Paul categorize himself as separate from the churches, which would be required if οὐδέ separates 'we' from 'the churches of God'. The two elements joined by οὐδέ (we . . . the churches of God), as in 1 Tim 2.12 (to teach . . . to assume authority over a man), are at opposite ends of their clause separated in the same order by: 1. the complement of the main verb (τοιαύτην συνήθειαν/γυναικί), 2. οὐκ, 3. the main verb (ἔχομεν/ἐπιτρέπω), and 4. οὐδέ. In both cases, the main verb (have/permit) is first person, present, active, indicative. These structural parallels support interpreting οὐδέ in 1 Tim 2.12 similarly, to join together a single idea.

10 R. J. Swanson, *New Testament Greek Manuscripts: 1 Corinthians* (Carol Stream, Ill.: Tyndale, 2003) 58 also notes that MSS 6 104 460 1241ˢ 1243 1874* 1891* omit 'and of a kind' (καὶ τοιαύη). This shows that even without καὶ τοιαύτη, οὐδέ still introduces this qualifying description.

6) Gal 1.16–17: 'without consulting any human being, *without* going up to Jerusalem to see those who were apostles before me, I went off at once to Arabia . . .' (NEB; cf. NIV). Paul's testimony described in Acts 22.12–16 affirms Ananias's consultation with Paul specifically regarding Paul's mission. Furthermore, according to Acts 9.15–19 (cf. Acts 26.12–20), Paul met with Ananias and the disciples in Damascus for several days after his divine commission to the Gentiles. This testimony from Paul's 'fellow worker' (Phlm 24), who was surely familiar with the most formative event in Paul's life, affirms that Paul did consult at least with Ananias. If Gal 1.16 denies any human consultation, it contradicts Luke's record of Paul's consultation with Ananias and other disciples in Damascus. There is no contradiction, however, if οὐδέ combines elements to specify a particular meaning. This and Paul's typical use of οὐδέ support its specifying function here, too.

In every case in this third category, οὐδέ conjoins conceptually different expressions to convey a single idea. In each case, adding the second expression specifies the meaning: case 1 intensifies, cases 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 combine elements to focus on a particular meaning. Similarly, each case in the second category (joining naturally paired expressions to convey a single idea) also specifies the meaning. Thus, within Paul's dominant use of οὐδέ to convey a single idea, his most common use of οὐδέ is to specify meaning.[11] The fundamental function of οὐδέ in these cases is not to subordinate one expression to another, but simply to merge them together to convey a single more specific idea. In each case, the context and the expressions conjoined adequately elucidate the nature of their interrelationship.

4. *Οὐδέ Joins Naturally Paired Ideas Focusing on the Same Verb*

Four occurrences of οὐδέ in Paul's accepted letters join naturally paired but clearly-distinguishable ideas focusing on the same verb:

1) Rom 8.7: 'the flesh . . . does not submit to God's Law – *indeed* it cannot' (NRSV).

2) 1 Cor 3.2: 'I gave you milk, not solid food, for you were not yet ready for it. Indeed, you are *still not* ready' (NIV).

3) 1 Cor 4.3: 'I care very little if I am judged by you or by any human court; indeed, I do *not even* judge myself' (NIV; cf. NRSV).

4) 2 Cor 7.12: 'So although I wrote to you, it was not on account of the one who did the wrong *nor* on account of the one who was wronged, but in order that your zeal for us might be made known to you before God' (NRSV).

---

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

In all four cases, οὐδέ joins statements that together form a natural pair focusing on the same verb: does not submit/cannot submit,[12] you were not yet ready/you are still not ready, judged by you/judge myself, and the one who did wrong/the one who was wronged. None of these parallels 1 Tim 2.12, since 'to teach' and 'to assume authority' are unrelated verbs and are not a natural pair.

    1 Thess 2.3, the one remaining verse containing οὐδέ in the accepted letters of Paul, is hard to classify: 'For our appeal does not spring from deceit, *or* impure motives, *or* trickery' (NRSV). Both the first (πλάνη) and third (δόλος) nouns οὐδέ joins commonly mean 'deceit' (BDAG 822, 256), which fits this context perfectly. The second (ἀκαθαρσία) identifies impure motives (BDAG 34), so each points to impure intent. It is ambiguous whether they are closely interrelated, equivalent expressions (category 1), conceptually different expressions that convey a single, internally-cohering idea (category 3), or three distinct ideas.

Conclusions: *οὐδέ* **in the Accepted Letters of Paul**

Paul's overwhelmingly dominant use of οὐδέ to combine two elements is to express a single idea.[13] Paul's seventeen uses of οὐδέ to conjoin expressions that together convey a single idea fit into three categories:

1. seven join equivalent or synonymous expressions,
2. four join naturally paired expressions, and
3. six join conceptually different expressions.

Paul uses οὐδέ unambiguously to convey separate ideas in only four cases, and in each case οὐδέ joins a natural pair focusing on the same verb. Strikingly, there is not a single unambiguous case where Paul joins two conceptually distinct verbs with οὐδέ to convey two separate ideas.

B. Paul's and Luke's Use of οὐδέ Contrasted

The occurrences of οὐδέ in Luke–Acts exhibit a significantly different pattern of uses than those in the accepted letters of Paul. Eight of Paul's thirty-one uses of οὐδέ are not coordinating conjunctions but introduce an idea that is meaningful in itself. A higher proportion (14 of 38) of Luke's uses of οὐδέ are not coordinating conjunctions. Roughly three-fourths (17 or 19[14]) of Paul's 23 uses of οὐδέ to conjoin two elements express a single idea. In contrast, roughly half

---

12 Although not explicit, the context supplies 'submit', which is the necessary complement of 'cannot', as BDAG 262 confirms.

13 Paul's use of οὐδέ parallels in many respects the English oral idiom 'n, as in 'hit 'n run', 'eat 'n run', 'night 'n day' and 'black 'n white'. Both typically convey a single idea.

14 Including two ambiguous uses in 1 Thess 2.3.

(10 of 19) of Luke's uses of οὐδέ to conjoin two elements express a single idea, and in all but three of these, οὐδέ conjoins equivalent expressions. Paul's accepted letters contain six instances where οὐδέ joins two conceptually distinct expressions that are not a natural pair to convey one idea, but Luke–Acts contains only one. Paul uses οὐδέ four times to focus on the same verb; Luke never does this. There is not even one unambiguous case where Paul uses οὐδέ to join conceptually distinct concepts to convey two separate ideas, but Luke uses οὐδέ nine times to do this.[15] The following table itemizes these differences.

Categories of οὐδέ in the Accepted Letters of Paul and in Luke–Acts

not joining	joining separate expressions together					
	to express one idea joining:			to express two ideas that:		
	equivalents	natural pairs	two[16]	focus on the same verb	are separate	total
Paul 8	7	4	6	4	0	31[17]
Luke 14[18]	7[19]	2[20]	1[21]	0	9[22]	33

C. The Use of οὐδέ in the Disputed Letters of Paul

Each of the four instances of οὐδέ in the disputed Pauline epistles fits one of the patterns identified above in the accepted letters of Paul. Three of these make best sense understood as joining conceptually different expressions to convey a single idea. The first is 2 Thess 3.7–8: 'we were not idle when we were with you, *and* we did not eat anyone's bread without paying for it; but with toil and labor we worked night and day, so that we might not burden any of you' (NRSV). At first glance this may appear to be a denial of two separate issues, idleness and eating free food. The conclusion of the sentence, however, that Paul and his com-

---

15 Luke 12.27, 33; 18.4; 23.15; Acts 9.9; 16.21; 17.25; 24.13, 18.

16 Cases where οὐδέ joins two conceptually different expressions together to convey a single idea.

17 The two ambiguous instances in 1 Thess 2.3 are in the total but not assigned to a category.

18 Luke 6.3; 7.7, 9; 12.26, 27b; 16.31; 18.13; 20.8, 36; 23.40; Acts 4.12, 32, 34; 19.2.

19 Luke 6.44; 8.17; 11.33; 12.24b; 17.21; Acts 2.27; 8.21.

20 Luke 6.43; 12.24a.

21 Acts 7.5.

22 Luke 12.27 work/spin, 12.33 thief comes near/moth destroys, 18.4 fear God/care about men, 23.15 I (Pilate)/Herod, Acts 9.9 ate/drank, 16.21 accept/do, 17.25 does not live in hand-made temples/is not served by human hands, 24.13 they did not find me arguing or stirring up a crowd/they cannot prove these charges, 24.18 crowd/disturbance.

panions worked hard for their food, clearly stands in opposition to the combination of both elements joined by οὐδέ. This idea is reiterated in vv. 10–12, which explicitly prohibits freeloading, the combination of idleness and taking free meals from others. To eat food given as a gift (δωρεάν) has positive connotations unless it is joined with the negative idea of idleness. Cultural convention supports that Paul would have shared meals without financially reimbursing each host. Furthermore, 1 Cor 9.3–14 argues that Paul should have this right; Phil 4.16–19 praises the Philippians for sending him aid; Rom 12.13 commands hospitality; and 1 Cor 10.27 commands acceptance of hospitality. Thus, the interpretation that Paul never accepted free meals stands in tension with the explication of vv. 7–8a in 8b–12, with cultural conventions, and with Paul's teachings. All this supports interpreting οὐδέ in 2 Thess 3.7–8 as merging two concepts, one negative and one positive, to specify the single idea, freeloading.

The second is 1 Tim 2.12. The next section of this article argues that its οὐδέ makes best sense in context conjoining two concepts to specify a single prohibition: the combination of a woman teaching and assuming authority over a man.

The third is 1 Tim 6.16: 'whom no man has seen *and* no man is able to see . . .' (JB). Every line of this poem praises God's nature: his authority, lordship, immortality, light-filled life, and invisibility. 'No man has seen God', however, conveys only human experience, not God's nature, unless οὐδέ joins it to 'no man is able to see' to specify God's invisibility. 1 Tim 1.17 supports this specific sense by affirming that God is invisible (ἀόρατος). In both 1 Tim 2.12 and 6.16, οὐδέ immediately precedes an infinitive, and in both verses the verbs οὐδέ joins are about as far removed from each other in their clauses as possible. Thus, the distance between the two infinitives in 1 Tim 2.12 does not militate against its οὐδέ joining together a single, internally cohering idea.

Each of these three, like the six instances of category 3 of οὐδέ usage in the accepted letters of Paul, makes best sense understood as conjoining two elements to express a single, more specific idea.

The one remaining occurrence of οὐδέ in a disputed letter in the Pauline corpus is 1 Tim 6.7: 'we have brought nothing into (εἰσφέρω) the world, *and* we can bring *no*thing out (ἐκφέρω) of it'. This highlights two derivatives of the same verb, φέρω ('bring'), that form a natural pair: 'bring in' and 'bring out'. Like the four instances of category 4 of οὐδέ usage in the accepted letters of Paul, its conjoined elements focus on the same verb and express a natural pair.

Thus, each instance of οὐδέ in the disputed Pauline epistles fits one of the distinctive categories in Paul's accepted letters, a category that occurs only once (category 3) or is absent (category 4) in Luke–Acts. Furthermore, each is either attributed in the first person to Paul (1 Tim 2.12: 'I am not permitting[23] a woman to

---

23 The present tense of this verb fits a current prohibition better than a permanent one.

teach . . .' and 2 Thess 3.7–8: 'we were not idle when we were with you, *and* we did not eat anyone's bread without paying for it') or is a memorable aphorism (1 Tim 6.16: '[God,] whom no one has seen *or* can see' and 1 Tim 6.7: 'we brought nothing into the world, *and* we can take *no*thing out of it').[24] This fits the amanuensis hypothesis. Alternatively, if a pseudepigrapher wrote 1 Timothy, that person apparently borrowed vocabulary extensively from Paul's letters. In order to account for so much distinctively Pauline word usage, either hypothesis should appreciate the value of considering Paul's use of οὐδέ in evaluating its use in 1 Tim 2.12.

D. 1 Timothy 2.12

Because 1 Tim 2.12 is often assumed to prohibit women both from teaching and having authority over men, it is widely regarded as the prime example of a statement in the Pastorals that is incompatible with authorship by Paul. As shown above, however, Paul typically uses οὐδέ not to convey two separate ideas, but to join two expressions together in order to convey a single idea. Consequently, to interpret οὐδέ in 1 Tim 2.12 as separating two different prohibitions for women, one against teaching and the other against having authority over a man, does not conform to Paul's typical use of οὐδέ. Nor does it fit any of Paul's categories of οὐδέ usage established above. The correspondence of each of the other occurrences of οὐδέ in 1 Timothy to one of the categories of Paul's οὐδέ usage and the amount of distinctive Pauline vocabulary in the Pastoral Epistles favor an interpretation of 1 Tim 2.12 in harmony with Paul's typical use of οὐδέ, namely to convey a single idea.

The closest parallels to 1 Tim 2.12's distinctive οὐδέ syntactical structure both convey a single idea, not two separate ideas. Of the passages in Köstenberger's IBYCUS search of ancient Greek literature, only one other passage perfectly replicates 1 Tim 2.12's syntactical structure: (1) a negated finite verb + (2) infinitive + (3) οὐδέ + (4) infinitive + (5) ἀλλά + (6) infinitive.[25] This passage, Polybius *Hist.* 30.5.8, states, 'As they wished none of the kings and princes to despair of gaining their help and alliance, (1) they did not desire (2) to run in harness with Rome (3) and (4) engage themselves by oaths and treaties, (5) but preferred to remain unembarrassed and able (6) to reap profit from any quarter'.[26] The content after

---

24 These are the very kinds of statements that even a secretary with considerable freedom would be most likely to reproduce in Paul's wording. The amanuensis thesis helps explain both the significant differences and the extensive similarities in expression between Paul's accepted letters and the Pastoral Epistles. According to I. H. Marshall, 'Review of *Luke and the Pastoral Epistles*, by Stephen G. Wilson', *JSNT* 10 (1981) 69–74, 72, there are 55 words that occur in the NT only in the Pastorals and the other ten epistles in Paul's name, and the Pastorals share 574 words with these ten letters.

25 Köstenberger, 'A Complex Sentence', 55, 63–71.

26 All classical translations are from the LCL.

οὐδέ clarifies that 'to run in harness' is to 'engage themselves by oaths and treaties [to Rome]'. Together these express the one idea of alliance with Rome. This one idea stands in contrast to the statement following ἀλλά, which affirms their openness to other alliances. This parallels the statement preceding the οὐδέ construction, which also affirms other alliances. Thus, an inclusio of parallel bracketing statements surround this οὐδέ construction. Similarly, in 1 Tim 2.12, the statement introduced by ἀλλά, 'but to be in quietness (ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ)', parallels and reiterates the statement immediately preceding its οὐδέ construction, 'Let women learn in quietness (ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ) in all subjection'. Just as in the Polybius example, this inclusio construction brackets the two infinitives joined by οὐδέ. Thus, Polybius's syntax is completely parallel to 1 Tim 2.11–12's, including the inclusio + (1) negated finite verb + (2) infinitive + (3) οὐδέ + (4) infinitive + (5) ἀλλά + (6) infinitive reiterating the inclusio. Since the two infinitives joined by the οὐδέ in Polybius convey a single idea, this closest structural parallel to 1 Tim 2.12 favors interpreting its οὐδέ construction as conveying a single idea, too.

The next closest parallel to 1 Tim 2.12's six-part structure also uses οὐδέ to join two infinitives to convey a single idea that stands in opposition to the statement introduced by ἀλλά. This passage is Josephus *Ant.* 7.127, 'This defeat (1) did not persuade the Ammanites (2) to remain quiet (3) or (4) to keep the peace in the knowledge that their enemy was superior. (5) Instead they (6) sent [a participle, not an infinitive] to Chalamas . . .' 'To keep the peace in the knowledge that their enemy was superior' reiterates 'to remain quiet'. It is not a separate idea. It contrasts with: 'Instead they sent to Chalamas'. Thus, both close structural parallels to 1 Tim 2.12 support interpreting its οὐδέ construction as communicating a single idea.

The οὐκ + οὐδέ + ἀλλά syntactical construction contrasts the content of both the οὐκ statement and the οὐδέ statement to the following ἀλλά statement. The central core of this complex construction is a contrast between two ideas: 'not this, but that' (οὐκ . . . , ἀλλά . . .). In nine[27] of the instances analyzed above, Paul uses οὐδέ to combine two elements in order to specify a single idea, then uses ἀλλά to introduce an idea in sharp contrast to this single idea: Rom 2.28–29; 9.6–7, 16; 1 Cor 2.6–7; Gal 1.1, 11–12, 16–17; 4.14; Phil 2.16–17. There is only one clear instance in Paul's letters where an οὐδέ construction conveys two separate ideas that contrast with the following ἀλλά statement, 2 Cor 7.12. Yet even its two ideas form a single natural pair that united together contrasts with the ἀλλά clause: 'I wrote not for the sake of the one who did the wrong or the one wronged but to manifest your zeal . . .'

---

27 Eleven if 1 Thess 2.3–4 is included, but even if it conveys two or three ideas, they are closely interrelated and stand together, not as independent ideas, in direct contrast to the immediately following ἀλλά statement. See above, p. 241.

There is only one[28] occurrence in the entire rest of the NT outside the Pauline letters of this οὐκ + οὐδέ + ἀλλά construction, John 1.13. Here, οὐκ + οὐδέ + οὐδέ join three elements that all express human birth, and ἀλλά contrasts all of these virtually equivalent expressions to divine spiritual birth. In light of its rareness elsewhere in the NT, it is striking that this characteristically Pauline οὐκ + οὐδέ + ἀλλά syntactical construction occurs twice in letters whose Pauline authorship is disputed: 2 Thess 3.7–8 and 1 Tim 2.12. The statements joined by οὐδέ in both these passages make best sense understood as together conveying a single idea. The contrasting 'but' increases the probability that the οὐκ + οὐδέ portion of the construction conveys a single idea, since 'not this, but that' most naturally applies to two contrasting ideas. To summarize, both Paul's and the NT's overwhelmingly dominant use in οὐκ + οὐδέ + ἀλλά syntactical constructions, for the οὐκ + οὐδέ statements to convey a single idea that sharply contrasts with the following ἀλλά statement, supports this same understanding of 1 Tim 2.12.

In what Baldwin says 'may be the earliest commentary on 1 Tim 2:12',[29] Origen explains this οὐδέ construction as a single prohibition. After quoting 2.12, Origen describes it as 'concerning woman not becoming a ruler over man in speaking' (περὶ τοῦ μὴ τὴν γυναῖκα ἡγεμόνα γίνεσθαι τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ ἀνδρός).[30] This expresses 'to teach' and 'to assume authority over a man' as a single prohibition. Origen's use of 'to become' (γίνεσθαι) implies entry into a position of authority over man. This may suggest a woman assuming this authority for herself, especially since Origen in this context affirms Priscilla, Maximilla, the four daughters of Philip, Deborah, Miriam, Hulda, and Anna.

Blomberg interprets the οὐδέ construction in v. 12 in light of 'Paul's more informal pattern throughout 1 Timothy 2 of using pairs of partly synonymous words or expressions to make his main points',[31] citing vv. 1, 2a, 2b, 3, 4, 5, 7a, 7b, 8, 9a, and 9b. He concludes 'that in every instance they are closely related and together help to define one single concept. This makes it overwhelmingly likely that in 1 Tim 2:12 Paul is referring to one specific kind of . . . teaching rather than two . . . activities'.[32]

28 Luke 11.33 uses οὐδείς instead of οὐκ, and its οὐδέ phrase is a textual variant. In Matt 5.14–15 and 9.16–17 (which also uses οὐδείς instead of οὐκ) the ἀλλά statement does not respond to the οὐκ statement, only to the οὐδέ statement.
29 H. S. Baldwin, 'An Important Word: Αὐθεντέω in 1 Timothy 2:12', *Women in the Church* (ed. Köstenberger and Schreiner) 39–51, 199 n. 30.
30 C. Jenkins, 'Documents: Origen on 1 Corinthians. IV', *JTS* 10 (1909) 29–51, 42.
31 C. L. Blomberg, 'Neither Hierarchicalist nor Egalitarian: Gender Roles in Paul', *Two Views on Women in Ministry* (ed. J. R. Beck and C. L. Blomberg; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 2001) 329–72, 363.
32 Blomberg, 'Hierarchicalist', 364, omitting 'independent' before 'activities' to avoid excluding legitimate conceptual overlap.

Interpreting 1 Tim 2.12 as a single prohibition of women teaching combined with assuming authority over men fits its context perfectly. This prohibition fits the central concern of 1 Timothy, false teaching. Teaching combined with assuming authority is by definition not authorized. This is exactly what false teachers were doing in Ephesus. This single prohibition is particularly appropriate to the theme of this chapter, peace without self-assertiveness. Calls to quietness bracket this prohibition and counteract the aggressiveness inherent in women assuming authority for themselves over men. The immediately following two-fold explanation fits this interpretation well. 1 Tim 2.13's 'Adam was formed first, then Eve' implies that woman should respect man as her source, just as the parallels in 1 Cor 11.8 and 12 do. Assuming authority for themselves over men disrespects men. Furthermore, 1 Tim 2.14 specifically states that Eve was deceived. Eve's deception is relevant only if women's deception is a reason for the prohibition of v. 12.

The false teaching described in 1 Tim 4.7 as 'old wives' tales' (NRSV) deceived women in particular (cf. 2 Tim 3.6–7). Mounce states that the text 'explicitly pictures only women as being influenced by the heresy'.[33] Some widows were 'going about from house to house [house churches? and] . . . talk nonsense [φλύαροι = rubbish philosophy,[34] characteristic of the false teachers[35]], saying things they ought not . . . Some have in fact already turned away to follow Satan' (1 Tim 5.13–15 TNIV).

To prevent further deception and the potential fall of the church, 1 Tim 2.11–12 addresses both the reception and the teaching of the error. To prevent the reception of false teaching by more 'Eves in Ephesus', 1 Tim 2.11 commands women to learn in quietness[36] and full submission. This submission applies most naturally to its closest referent, what they are 'to learn', namely submission to authorized church doctrine. Healthy doctrine will inoculate or cure these women from false teachings. 1 Tim 1.3 states that Paul had earlier instructed Timothy to command the instigators 'not to teach any false doctrine'. Now, to prevent the group 1 Timothy specifically identifies as influenced by the false teaching from advocating it to the assembled church, 1 Tim 2.12 prohibits women from teaching combined with assuming authority for themselves over a man.

The specification 'man' prohibits women from seizing authority to teach men since the greatest risk of women spreading the false teaching and causing con-

---

33 W. D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2000) 120, though its instigators were men: 1 Tim 1.20; 2 Tim 2.17; 4.14.

34 Cf. G. D. Fee, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus* (GNC; San Francisco: Harper & Row, 1984) 83.

35 Cf. 1.4–7; 6.20; 2 Tim 2.23.

36 1 Cor 14.34–5 is weak support for the meaning 'silence' since 1 Cor 14.34–5 uses a different word and may well be an interpolation; cf. E. J. Epp, *Junia* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2006) 15–20; P. B. Payne and P. Canart, 'The Originality of Text-Critical Symbols in Codex Vaticanus', *NovT* 42 (2000) 105–13.

tention was in the assembled church where men were present. The specification 'man' is essential, since without this limitation, 1 Tim 2.12 would also prohibit women from assuming authority to teach other women or children, contrary to Titus 2.3–5, 2 Tim 1.5, and 3.14–17. The specification 'man' also has the practical advantage that it avoids ambiguity. It is obvious when a man is present, but if 1 Tim 2.12 had read not 'man', but 'in the assemblies', there might be disagreement as to which assemblies should exclude women assuming authority to teach. The specification 'man' focuses on the primary threat of unauthorized women teaching when a man is present, without in any way undermining women's freedom to assume authority to teach other women and children.[37]

If Tim 2.12's οὐδέ construction is a single specific prohibition of women assuming authority to teach men, it does not contradict Paul's statements that approve women teaching. 1 Cor 14.26 affirms, 'each one [ἕκαστος encompasses men and women] has a psalm, a teaching (διδαχή), a revelation . . .' Col 3.16 commands, 'Let the word of Christ dwell in you richly as you [plural, addressing the whole church, including women] teach (διδάσκω) and counsel one another with all wisdom . . .' 1 Cor 11.5–13; 14.5, 24, 31, and 39 (cf. Acts 21.9) affirm women prophesying, which often entails teaching.

Affirmations of women teaching are particularly prominent in the Pastoral Epistles. 1 Tim 3.1–2 affirms, 'whoever [τις encompasses men and women] desires the office of overseer desires a good thing . . . [overseers must be[38]] able to teach (διδακτικός) . . .'. 2 Tim 1.5 and 3.14–17 state that Timothy learned the Holy Scriptures, 'which are useful for teaching (διδασκαλία)', from his grandmother Lois and his mother Eunice. 2 Tim 2.2 commands Timothy to 'entrust [Paul's message] to faithful persons (ἄνθρωποι encompasses men and women), who will be able to teach (διδάξαι) others also'. Titus 2.3 commands Titus to teach older women to be 'teachers of what is excellent (καλοδιδασκάλους, a word the author apparently coined specifically for women)'.[39] Thus, interpreting 1 Tim 2.12a as an unqualified prohibition of women teaching makes it prohibit what the Pastoral

---

37 'Man' contrasts both with 'woman' and 'child/boy', e.g. 1 Cor 13.11; Eph 4.13; BDAG 79.

38 'One woman man' clearly excludes polygamists and probably adulterers. It must be an exclusion only, not a requirement that all overseers be married, since that would exclude unmarried men like Paul (1 Cor 7.8). It is unwarranted to extract the single word 'man' from what is clearly an exclusion and turn it into a positive requirement that all overseers must be male. Similarly, 'having children in subjection' must be an exclusion only, not a requirement that overseers have at least two children. Unlike most translations (the CEV is an exception), neither list of qualifications for overseers, deacons, or elders (1 Tim 3.1–13 and Titus 1.5–9) contains a single masculine pronoun.

39 The following, 'Then they can train the younger women to love their husbands and children . . .' lists one of the groups (younger women) they are to teach and some of the things they are to teach, but neither is exhaustive, as 2 Tim 1.5 and 3.14–17 show.

Epistles repeatedly affirm. Interpreting this οὐδέ construction to convey the single idea of women assuming authority to teach men, however, perfectly fits the theological context of the Pastoral Epistles and the Pauline corpus.

1 Tim 2.12's 'but to be in quietness' further supports that 'to teach and to assume authority over a man' refers to a single idea. V. 11 describes 'to be in quietness' as 'to be in full submission', the opposite of assuming authority for oneself. It is possible, even desirable, to teach 'in quietness', but it is not possible for a woman 'in quietness' to teach while seizing authority over a man. Therefore, 'to teach', understood as a separate idea, does not contrast with 'but to be in quietness' nearly as well as does the single idea, 'to teach and assume authority over a man'.

Is 'a Man' the Object of a Separate Prohibition of Women Teaching?

Some attempt to reconcile 1 Tim 2.12 with women teaching other women by proposing that οὐδέ in 1 Tim 2.12 separates two conceptually different prohibitions and that the first prohibition is not of women teaching, but rather of women teaching men. They assert that the final word of the second prohibition, 'man', in isolation from the phrase in which it occurs, limits the first prohibition. Moo argues for this since 'in Greek, objects and qualifiers of words which occur only with the second in a series must often be taken with the first also (cf. Acts 8:21)'.[40] Acts 8.21, however, uses οὐδέ to join synonyms to make one point, not two: 'You have no part or (οὐδέ) share in this ministry' (NIV). Acts 8.21 does not transfer only the qualifier but merges the two elements to convey one idea. Moo, however, alleges that 1 Tim 2.12 expresses two separate prohibitions. This removes the syntactical justification for requiring that their verbs have the same object. If Acts 8.21's use of οὐδέ to join two elements to express one idea parallels 1 Tim 2.12, then 1 Tim 2.12 also joins two elements to express one idea. Thus, Acts 8.21 supports understanding 1 Tim 2.12's οὐδέ construction as single prohibition. Unless 1 Tim 2.12 is the one exception, none of Paul's οὐδέ constructions selectively transfers only a qualifier from the second element to the first. Whenever Paul does use text following οὐδέ to qualify the element before οὐδέ, the entire construction expresses this by combining the two elements to express one idea. Furthermore, Acts 8.21 and 1 Tim 2.12 differ in five ways that highlight crucial evidence against interpreting 'man' in isolation from the rest of its phrase as the object of 'to teach':

1. 'You have no part' in Acts 8.21 requires the additional 'in this ministry' to make sense. 'I am not permitting a woman to teach' in 1 Tim 2.12, however, makes sense without any addition and, indeed, corresponds with conventional wisdom at that time. So a typical reader would feel no need to look for a personal object for

---

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

'to teach'.[41] Furthermore, nowhere else in 1 Timothy does 'to teach' (4.11; 6.2) or 'to teach a different doctrine' (6.3) have a personal object. Consequently, neither cultural convention nor the use of 'to teach' elsewhere in 1 Timothy supports importing 'man' in isolation as its personal object here.

2. It is only because 'part' and 'share' in Acts 8.21 are synonyms that the object of 'share' must also apply to 'part'. Since the infinitives in 1 Tim 2.12 are not synonyms, there is no need for them to share the same object, unless they together convey one idea.

3. In Acts 8.21 the qualifier, 'in this ministry', is as close as possible to both synonyms, 'part or share in this ministry', but the Greek word order of 1 Tim 2.12 separates 'to teach' and 'man' to the maximum: '*To teach*, however, by a woman I am not permitting οὐδέ to assume authority over *a man*'. This reduces the likelihood that a reader would make this conceptual transfer.

4. The grammatical form of the transferred element in Acts 8.21 perfectly fits the first element, but 'a man' is genitive, the wrong case for 'to teach'.[42] A. T. Robertson states, 'We have no right to assume in the N. T. that one case is used for another. That is to say, that you have a genitive, but it is to be understood as an accusative'.[43] This is exactly the incongruity in case ἀνδρός is taken as the object of 'to teach'.

5. The transference in Acts 8.21 does not teach anything in conflict with other NT statements, but to say a woman must not teach a man conflicts with Priscilla's instruction of Apollos and Paul's affirmations of women teaching.[44]

Thus, the evidence is overwhelming against interpreting 1 Tim 2.12a as a separate prohibition of women teaching men.

E. Can οὐδέ Connect a Positive Concept with a Negative Concept?

When οὐδέ joins two synonymous expressions, it is natural that both will be either positive or negative. There is, however, no grammatical or syntactical

---

41 Moo, 'Rejoinder', 202 n. 5 appeals to H. W. Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* (New York: American Book, 1920) 364–5, §1634–5, but in all Smyth's examples, in order for the first statement to make sense, the object of the second verb *must* also apply to the first verb.

42 'To teach' can take either accusative (cf. Rom 2.21; 1 Cor 11.14; Col 1.28; 3.16) or dative (cf. Rev 2.14).

43 Robertson, *Grammar*, 454 (b). R. Y. K. Fung, 'Ministry in the New Testament', *The Church in the Bible and the World* (ed. D. A. Carson; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1987) 154–212, 198–9 also argues that 'man' does not modify 'to teach'.

44 Acts 18.26; cf. above, pp. 246, and below, p. 253 and n. 55. Paul repeatedly affirms Priscilla (e.g. Rom 16.3–4 'my fellow worker . . .') and always does so using her more dignified name, Prisca. Following convention, Acts 18.2, 1 Cor 16.19, and 2 Tim 4.19 list Aquilla's name before his wife's, but when citing their ministry, both Paul and Luke always list her name before her husband's, implying her prominence in ministry.

rule that keeps οὐδέ from conjoining a positive activity with a negative activity. BDF § 445 states that the use of οὐδέ in the 'correlation of negative and positive members is, of course, admissible'.[45] Köstenberger, however, alleges that 'the construction negated finite verb + infinitive + οὐδέ + infinitive . . . in *every instance* yield[s] the pattern positive/positive or negative/negative . . . I found *no evidence* [against this . . . This] should now be considered as an *assured result* of biblical scholarship'.[46] Even though many of the passages Köstenberger quotes contradict his allegations, a few scholars have uncritically accepted his assertions as proving that οὐδέ cannot join a positive activity with a negative activity.[47] In each of the following nine passages Köstenberger cites,[48] seven joining two infinitives, οὐδέ joins a verb with positive connotations to a verb with negative connotations.

1) 2 Cor 7.12: 'it was not on account of the one who did the wrong *nor* (οὐδέ) on account of the one who was wronged' (NRSV). Here, one of the two parts joined by οὐδέ elicits sympathy (the innocent, 'wronged' party), the other antipathy ('the one who did the wrong').

2) 2 Thess 3.7–8: 'we were not idle when we were with you, *and* we did not eat anyone's bread without paying for it' (NRSV; this passage is analyzed above, pp. 242–3).

3) LXX Sir 18.6: 'Who can fully recount God's mercies? It is not possible to diminish *or* (οὐδέ) increase them'. To diminish God's mercies in any way is negative, even if impossible in an absolute sense. Scripture, however, encourages prayer to increase God's mercies, e.g. Ps 40.11; 51.1; 79.8; 119.77, so their increase is positive even though people cannot control or fully recount them.

4) Diodorus Siculus *Bibl. hist.* 3.30.2.8: 'Nor is there any occasion to be surprised at this statement *or* (οὐδέ) to distrust it, since we have learned throughout trustworthy history of many things more astonishing than this which have taken place throughout all the inhabited world'. Surprise is normally positive, and the immediately following statement identifies 'astonishing things' as 'trustworthy history'. Distrust, however, is negative.

5) Josephus *Ant.* 15.165.3–4: 'Hyrcanus because of his mild character did not choose either then or at any other time to take part in public affairs[49] *or* (οὐδέ) start a revolution'.

---

45 BDF § 445 continues, 'though it is not common in the NT. E.g. Jn 4:11 . . . (οὐδέ D syˢ, which seems to be better Greek)'. The passage BDF cites, 'You have nothing to draw with and the well is deep', is a rare case of negated and non-negated correlatives used together. If 'negative and positive' refers, instead, to expressions with negative or positive connotations, as this study does, examples are much more common.

46 Köstenberger, 'A Complex Sentence', 78, 77, 84 (emphases added).

47 E.g. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 129–30; Blomberg, 'Hierarchicalist', 363.

48 Köstenberger, 'A Complex Sentence', 59, 59, 63–71.

49 This translates πολυπραγμονεῖν. Köstenberger, 'A Complex Sentence', 205 n. 13 cites LSJ 1442, 'mostly in a bad sense', but LSJ cites this not for the verb πολυπραγμονέω in general,

6) Plutarch *Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata* 185.A.1, depicts Themistocles as saying, 'the trophy of Miltiades does not allow me to sleep *or* (οὐδέ) to be indolent'. The positive description of dreams in Plutarch *Themistocles* 26.2–3 evidences Themistocles' positive view of sleep, as does sleep's positive connotations. Indolence, however, is negative.

7) Plutarch *Aetia Romana et Graeca* 269.D: 'we must not follow out (διώκειν 'to pursue, seek', a positive verb) the most exact calculation of the number of days *nor* (οὐδέ) cast aspersions (συκοφαντεῖν,[50] a negative verb) on approximate reckoning; since even now, when astronomy has made so much progress, the irregularity of the moon's movements is still beyond the skill of mathematicians, and continues to elude their calculations'. Plutarch's explanation praising the progress of astronomy shows that he regards the pursuit of exact calculations positively. He opposes exact calculation here only because it is *in combination with* casting aspersions on approximate reckoning.

8) Plutarch *Quaestiones convivales* 711.E.3: 'the wine seems not to be harming us (ἀδικεῖν *or* (οὐδέ) getting the best of us (κρατεῖν[51])'. This combines negative and positive verbs to convey a single idea: the harm wine causes when it gets the best of someone.

9) Plutarch *Bruta animalia ratione uti* 990.A.11: 'our sense of smell . . . admits what is proper, rejects what is alien, and will not let it touch[52] *or* (οὐδέ) give pain[53] to the taste, but informs on and denounces what is bad before any harm is done'. Smell prevents harm by warning against touching what is alien and thereby experiencing pain. Οὐδέ does not convey two alternatives: touch or give pain. It combines positive and negative verbs to convey the single idea that smell prevents touch that would cause pain.

These nine examples show that οὐδέ can connect two verbs, one conveying a positive concept, the other a negative concept. Οὐδέ can also join positive and negative nouns, such as Gal 3.28's 'slave *and* free'. Gal 4.7–9 and 5.1 confirm that Paul regards slavery negatively but freedom positively. If οὐδέ joins expressions to describe the abuse of something positive, like teaching, the most natural way to express this is to associate it with something negative. What 1 Tim 2.12 prohibits, it must regard as negative: a woman teaching combined with assuming authority over a man.

---

but just for the second of three meanings. LSJ's first and third meanings are positive, as is the translation Köstenberger cites.

50 All the meanings LSJ 1671 lists are all decidedly negative.

51   The many meanings LSJ 991 lists are clearly positive.

52 Θιγεῖν is almost always a positive concept, LSJ 801.

Conclusion

Paul typically uses οὐδέ to convey a single idea, as do the two closest syntactical parallels to 1 Tim 2.12. In the overwhelming majority of Paul's and the NT's οὐκ + οὐδέ + ἀλλά syntactical constructions, οὐδέ joins two expressions to convey a single idea in sharp contrast to the following ἀλλά statement. Furthermore, the earliest known commentary on 1 Tim 2.12, Origen's, treats it as a single prohibition. Blomberg supports this by identifying eleven other instances in this chapter where pairs of complementary expressions convey main points. Understood as a single prohibition, 1 Tim 2.12 conveys, 'I am not permitting a woman to teach and [in combination with this] to assume authority over a man'. The only established category of οὐδέ usage in the entire Pauline corpus that makes sense of this passage joins conceptually different expressions to convey a single idea.[54] There is not a single undisputed parallel in any of the letters attributed to Paul that supports treating 1 Tim 2.12 as two separate prohibitions, of women teaching (or of women teaching men) and of women having authority over men. Consequently, this οὐδέ construction makes best sense as a single prohibition of women teaching with self-assumed authority over a man.

This understanding fits the text and its context lexically, syntactically, grammatically, stylistically, and theologically. This single specific restriction perfectly fits the danger of false teaching by women in Ephesus. It does not contradict Paul's and the Pastoral Epistles' affirmations of women teaching nor does it prohibit women such as Priscilla (who instructed Apollos in Ephesus according to Acts 18.24–8 and later was evidently still in Ephesus[55]) from teaching men, as long as their authority is properly delegated, not self-assumed. It simply prohibits women from assuming for themselves authority to teach men.

---

53 Every meaning for λυπεῖν in LSJ 1065 is decidedly negative.

54 The expressions οὐδέ joins in 1 Tim 2.12 are not equivalent in meaning (category 1) or a natural pair (category 2), nor do they convey naturally paired ideas focusing on the same verb (category 4); cf. above, pp. 3–10.

55 1 Timothy addresses Timothy in Ephesus (1.3). Evidence that 2 Timothy was also written to Ephesus includes: 2 Tim 1.18; 2.17; 4.12, 14; cf. 1 Tim 1.20. 2 Tim 4.19 greets Prisca and Aquila; cf. Acts 18.19; 1 Cor 16.19; BDAG 143; H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975) 299.