

Aussie Men, Roman Men, and Fashioning the Evangelical Man from 1 Timothy 2

Lyn M. Kidson

1. Women's Experiences in Australia's Sydney Anglican Diocese

Women are problematic in many evangelical circles.¹ For many women attending evangelical churches in Australia, they are barred from holding leadership positions such as the senior minister or pastor, elder, worship leader, or ministry leader. So women are confined to speaking to other women at women's events and teaching children. When I first heard it said that the Bible was "clear" that women shouldn't teach or lead men, I was a relatively new arrival to the Christian ministry scene. In 1993, I joined the evangelical group, Student Life, and I was ministering on the campus of Macquarie University in Sydney. Student Life at the time was relatively laissez-faire about the gender of its leaders since the focus was on leadership ability. However, over in the Anglican dominated group Christian Union, there was a different story.² And it was from that leadership that I first heard the idea that the "Bible said that women shouldn't teach or lead men." Little did I know that I was a participant in a major cultural and theological shift in evangelicalism in Australia.

It was in 1992 that the Sydney Diocese held a conference to discuss the ordination of women.³ The report given by the committee sets out the contributions of those for and against the ordination of women. It is rather even-handed. However, it was only when I read this document for myself that I discovered that cogent arguments were made for the ordination of women in the diocese. What I had heard up until then was that those who allowed women to teach and lead men were "unbiblical." 1 Timothy 2:12, we were told, clearly said that

1 K. Giles says that it is described as "the woman problem" in the Sydney Anglican diocese, *The Headship of Men and the Abuse of Women: Are they Related in Any Way* (Eugene, OR: Cascade Books, 2020), 17.

2 Australian Fellowship of Evangelical Students.

3 Ordination of Women to the Priesthood, SDS: <https://www.sds.asn.au/1091-ordination-women-priesthood-1993>.

women should not teach men nor have authority over them. I have observed that this stance against women's ordination coloured the reception of women in ministry in many churches and ministries in New South Wales. On at least one occasion I was ruled out of the running for a ministry position at a Baptist church because of my gender. And I suspect that this happened with several positions I applied for over the course of the decade 2002 to 2012. Since then I have shifted my career focus to New Testament studies. The purpose of this current volume, in part, is to demonstrate the "system relevance" of New Testament studies to the church. I will be drawing on my studies on gender and 1 Timothy to engage with the women's ministry debate in evangelical churches in Australia.

There is another side to the discussion about women's role in ministry. Originally in the 1980s/90s, there was an effort made to keep roles and ontology distinct. It was a woman's role to submit.⁴ It was not because of her essential being. However, over time there has been a noticeable shift in this, particularly in the realm of social media. Just as there is a shift to see women as created as submissive beings so there is a shift to see men as created to be active and leaders. This has profound consequences for how men and women relate to one another within the church community, and ultimately how they view the relationships within the Godhead. While it is not my intention to discuss the Trinitarian debate that recently arose at the conference of the Evangelical Theological Society (2016), what we are considering does have implications for how evangelicals view their relationships with each other and with God.⁵ In this essay, I want to propose that the "complementarian" reading of 1 Timothy 2 creates a problem for the evangelical man because complementarians do not take into account the ideal Roman man.⁶ I propose that a reading that lacks this context creates a superficial and weak vision of masculinity. In this essay, I will be briefly looking at a number of Australian evangelicals and their reading of 1 Timothy 2 and analysing them in terms of their implied stance on masculinity. Following this, I will offer a reading of 1 Timothy 2 in the light of Roman masculinity, and then we will consider the similarities and differences between the two readings. Then I will make some comments about the implications of

4 G. Knight III, *The Role Relationship of Men and Women: New Testament Teaching* (Chicago, IL: Moody Press, 1977), passim.

5 Issues dealing with the claims that gender hierarchy relates to a hierarchical ordering within the Trinity are comprehensively dealt with by K. Giles, *The Rise and Fall of the Complementarian Doctrine of the Trinity* (Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2017).

6 For the term "complementarian" see J. Piper and W. Grudem, "Preface," in *Recovering Biblical Manhood Womanhood: A Response to Evangelical Feminism* (eds. J. Piper and W. Grudem; Wheaton, IL: Crossways Books, 1991), xiv.

the complementarian view and the increased risk of domestic violence during the COVID 19 pandemic.

There are three readings of 1 Timothy 2 by complementarians I would like to consider. The first essay is by Glenn Davies, now retired Anglican Archbishop of Sydney, from a book edited by Barry Webb, *Personhood, Sexuality and Christian Ministry* (1987).⁷ The essay was a paper given at Moore College at the height of the debate in the 1980s. The second essay is by Anglican Claire Smith in a book she wrote defending the complementarian view, *God's Good Design* (2012).⁸ Lastly, we will be looking at Baptist Hefin Jones in a paper presented at a symposium at Morling Bible College in Sydney.⁹ I was on the panel at this symposium and our papers and responses can be found in the book, *The Gender Conversation* (2016). All of these works are aimed at the popular level. So an investigation of this literature is an important step to understanding how the complementarian reading has translated into the life of the evangelical church in Australia.

A methodological problem arises in how to analyse these three complementarian readings. My object is to analyse their studies in terms of their conception of an ideal man, which is more assumed than discussed. Since a clearer picture of the ideal man is our objective, then a useful framework can be derived from modern masculinity studies.¹⁰ The study of masculinity came as a response to feminism and women's studies in the 1980s. While it is now recognised that there is no such thing as 'masculinity,' since this concept varies depending on a person's sub-group, ethnicity, sexual orientation, we will stay with the term "masculinity."¹¹ My assumption is that the ideal masculinity that is being

7 G. Davies, "Biblical Study Paper: 1 Timothy 2:8–15," in *Personhood, Sexuality, and Christian Ministry* (ed. B. Webb; Homebush West, N.S.W: Lancer Books, 1987), 83–95.

8 C. Smith, *God's Good Design: What the Bible Really Says about Men and Women* (Kingsford: Matthias Media, 2012).

9 H. Jones, "Women, Teaching, and Authority: A Case for Understanding the Nature of Congregational Oversight as Underlying 1 Timothy 2:11–12," in *The Gender Conversation: Evangelical Perspective on Gender, Scripture, and the Christian Life* (ed. E. Murphy and D. Starling; Macquarie Park; Eugene: Morling Press; Wipf and Stock, 2016), 143–154.

10 K. Clatterbaugh, *Contemporary Perspectives on Masculinity: Men, Women, and Politics in Modern Society*, 2nd ed. (Boulder: Westview Press, 1997), 1–16; G. Olson et al. (eds.), *Masculinity Studies: Contemporary Approaches and Alternative Perspectives* (London; New York: Routledge, 2018), passim.

11 This is assuming that the North American homogeny applies to Australia; R. Connell, "The Study of Masculinities," *Qualitative Research Journal* 14.1 (2014): 5–15; L. Gerber, "Grit, Guts, and Vanilla Beans: Godly Masculinity in the Ex-Gay Movement," *Gender and Society* 29.1 (2015): 26–50.

promoted in Evangelicalism is fairly uniform, even across national borders.¹² One could argue that the masculinity being promoted in many western countries including Australia is a North American variety.¹³ One of the assumptions of masculinity studies that is relevant for our study is “the idea that masculinity had to be made visible, to be brought out as an object of study, and to not be considered an unmarked category.”¹⁴ However, masculinity/ies studies is primarily a field of the social sciences and our object is to analyse literary outputs for their construction of masculinity. Helpfully, the volume edited by Stefan Horlacher, *Configuring Masculinity in Theory and Literary Practice*, has made the case for analysing literary texts to describe representations of masculinity.¹⁵ While our texts are not fictional, the object for the writers is to persuade their readers that their view of masculinity in 1 Timothy is the only correct and ‘biblical’ one. As Horlacher says, quoting Peter Murphy, “literature has played [a role] in reinforcing the assumptions about masculinity and, at times, [in] helping to establish the norm of manhood.”¹⁶ Therefore, our method of analysis will be to describe how each writer presents men in their texts. Words that refer to men in relation to 1 Timothy will be used as keys to note the construction of masculinity by the writer. Further, it will be noted when the writer observes a contrast between men and women in their discussion.

2. Davies: Men Teaching in Public, Women in Private

The first text to be analysed is Davies’ “Biblical Study Paper: 1 Timothy 2:8–15.” Since this paper was offered in the heat of the ordination debate, our analysis will focus primarily on this text. The other two texts by Smith and Jones will be considered in the light of this analysis in terms of repeating conclusions or differences in emphasis. Smith and Jones are offering what they perceive to be a consensus on the interpretation of 1 Timothy 2.

The first thing to note about Davies’ paper is that there is no introduction so that its purpose remains obscure.¹⁷ It is only in the conclusion that the purpose becomes apparent, “the passage under review has been the centre of much

12 Connell, “The Study of Masculinities,” 9.

13 Ibid., 9.

14 T. W. Reeser, “Concepts of Masculinity and Masculinity Studies,” in *Configuring Masculinity in Theory and Literary Practice* (ed. S. Horlacher; Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill, 2015), 11–38 (12–13).

15 Reeser, “Concepts of Masculinity,” 12.

16 S. Horlacher, “Configuring Masculinity,” in *Configuring Masculinity in Theory and Literary Practice*, 1–10 (4).

17 Davies, “Biblical Study Paper,” 83.

debate in the Christian community.”¹⁸ The purpose is to outline Davies’ reasons for why this passage should be read to exclude women from ordination, “there is no role for [women] in the teaching of congregations where men are present.”¹⁹ Thus, this paper is far more than an exegesis of a passage for the benefit of the students at a Bible college. It is a polemical response arguing against a change of practice. The paper is divided into six sections, moving from “the context of the passage” through to overviews of the verses “8–10,” and verses “11–12.” The section “Reasons for Paul’s Prohibition [vv.13–14],” is divided into two subsections “i. Adam was formed first then Eve,” and “ii. Adam was not deceived, but the woman was deceived.” The last section is “Women and the Bearing of Children, 1 Timothy 2:15,” followed by the conclusion. For the sake of brevity, we will focus on the first two sections.²⁰

In the first section Paul and Timothy are described in narrative terms, “Timothy who is resident in Ephesus, Paul expects to come to Ephesus.” There is no mention of the genre or the salutation. There is a discussion of “certain false teachers,” and “these people.” Davies says the opening verses of chapter 2 refer to the prayer offered in the congregation. It is quite striking that Davies uses the more antiquated term “men” (he is not quoting) to refer to humanity in a paper discussing men and women.²¹

In the next section “Paul’s desire for Prayer, vv 8–10,” Davies says that Paul’s “concern is the manner in which men pray.”²² Paul’s use of *βούλομαι*, he says, “carries a strong authoritative tone.”²³ He goes on to say that it is a “strong desire of apostolic authority that he lays upon the men in their prayer life.”²⁴ But then he shifts his focus from the men because “the assumption” (Davies’ assumption?) is that “Paul is still speaking of the life of the congregation, that is, of the public prayer offered when Christians assemble.”²⁵ He then generalizes what the men are to do to the whole congregation, saying “their prayer is to be prayer offered with clean lips or holy hands.” Davies has inserted “clean lips” here, even though this phrase is not used in 1 Timothy. This recalls Isaiah 6:5–7 where Isaiah is made clean for service, but this is unsaid. He says that the raising of “holy hands” is “a metaphor for purity of intention, and is to be paralleled by purity of life.” The implication is that the call to lift “holy hands” is metaphorical

18 Ibid, 93.

19 Ibid, 94.

20 Ibid., 83–88.

21 Ibid., 83.

22 Ibid.

23 Ibid., 84.

24 Ibid.

25 Ibid.

so that the action itself ceases to be the focus. The application is not just to the men but to the whole congregation as a metaphor for the “purity of life,” which is to “be seen especially in the relationships that members have with one another.”²⁶ The instructions to the men become the instructions to the whole congregation and therefore the men are representative of the congregation.

He then moves to discuss the conjunction *ὡσαύτως*, “likewise,” as it “links what follows with what has preceded.”²⁷ This conjunction is problematic, “the exact nature of this link may not be certain.” Davies seems to be signalling that there is doubt as to how *ὡσαύτως* works in connecting the instructions to the men and the instructions to the women. The problem for Davies is not reading from men to women as “at the very least” the “same sphere in verse 9” is in consideration as in “verse 8,” that is “the behaviour of Christians in the congregation.”²⁸ What was an assumption in the previous paragraph is now a certainty, even though nothing is explicitly said about the meeting of believers. He says that “Paul could also be expressing his desire for the way in which women ought to pray when they do so in public assembly” and then points to 1 Corinthians 11:5, which is explicitly addressing the assembly of believers. The problem is how the rubrics that Paul gives for the men and the women are interchangeable (in light of the *ὡσαύτως*). Twice in this sentence, Davis mentions the “public assembly.” Davies says that the instruction not to quarrel or express anger could apply to women: there is no problem carrying the instructions forward. What is odd is that he qualifies this instruction to the men saying the quarrelling and anger could be a particular problem with the men in Ephesus or it may be because the Christians were “following the Jewish custom of allowing only men to pray.”²⁹ How this relates to a command not to quarrel or be angry he does not say. But this ambivalence allows him to move on and rule out the idea that the instructions about apparel do not apply to the men, “it probably would not have occurred to men to wear the kind of apparel which Paul prohibits in verse 9” nor is Paul prohibiting “the men from braiding their hair with gold or pearls or costly attire.”³⁰ Thus the instructions about attire and hair are specific to women but not to men. Further, nothing is mentioned about “good works” in verse 10, which could have general relevance for the whole congregation.

26 Ibid.

27 Ibid.

28 Ibid.

29 Ibid.

30 Ibid.

The next section is “Learning and Teaching” and Davies is primarily focused on the women (1 Tim 2:11–12). He says that “verse 11 is concerned with one particular issue, the manner in which women learn, whereas verse 12 is concerned with the prohibition of women teaching or exercising authority over men.”³¹ There is a shift here in theme from the manner in which something is accomplished to the activity itself. However, nothing is mentioned about Paul shifting focus. After a discussion about ἡσυχία, “silence,” Davies reiterates Paul’s authority saying, he “does not permit (ἐπιτρέπω, which is a word of strong injunction) a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a *man*.”³² Davies shifts from the plural to the singular throughout this section without comment. He says in concluding his discussion on ἀυθεντεῖν, “to have authority over” (or domineer), that “what is pertinent to Paul’s remark is that this authority is not to be exercised over a *man*.”³³ He then adds to this sentence “presumably Paul would be happy for women to exercise authority over women, but what is prohibited for women is their exercise of authority over men.”³⁴ So although Davies emphasizes “man” and “men,” no explanation is given as to why he shifts from the singular as it is in the text of 1 Timothy 2:12 (ἀνδρός) to the plural. Further, he makes no mention of his shift from the singular “woman” to “women.” It would appear that since Davies has assumed that the context of the passage is the meeting of the congregation then Paul must be talking about the men and women who would be in a meeting of believers. Davies is adjusting the language of the text to suit his assumptions.

In the next section of his argument, Davies writes of other “interpreters,” who he does not reference. He says that some want to retain the KJV’s translation of ἀυθεντεῖν as “to usurp authority” so as to remove the difficulty of “Paul’s prohibition of women exercising authority over men.”³⁵ He says however that they embrace a greater difficulty, “for if Paul is denying women the opportunity of usurping authority, surely this injunction would equally apply to men as well as women. Yet the reason that Paul gives is unique to women and indeed could *not* apply to men (vv 13–14).”³⁶ He then makes the argument that if ἀυθεντεῖν is to be read in its negative nuance, to usurp authority or to “domineer” and in this instance is being applied to women but not to men, then the inference is that “men are permitted [to usurp authority] or to domineer.” The same “logical

31 Ibid., 84.

32 Ibid., 85.

33 Ibid.; Davies’ emphasis.

34 Ibid.; again Davies’ emphasis.

35 Ibid.

36 Ibid., 85–86.

inference” applies to those who wish to infer that Paul is prohibiting women from teaching falsely. This argument is not actually logical.³⁷ In terms of our analysis, Paul’s authority is at the forefront. He is the one prohibiting women from teaching and exercising authority over men. He can do this because he is an apostle but subliminally it is because he too is a man with authority. So there is something unique about women which means that the apostle needs to command them not to teach or have authority over men. This implies that there is something unique about men that means that they cannot have a woman teach or exercise authority over them, although this is not stated.

The last part of this section deals with “the exact nature of teaching and the exercise of authority that Paul had in mind.”³⁸ Davies needs to deal with this because his argument has created a problem since “it is obvious that in Paul’s teaching elsewhere that every Christian is able to teach.” A critical problem is in Acts 18 where Priscilla and her husband Aquilla teach Apollos. To deal with this he says that the evidence suggests that “there are two levels of teaching operating in Paul’s mind: the private one-to-one level and the public one-to-many level.”³⁹ He then proceeds with a series of inferences about what Paul is saying the light of this conclusion. First, “it is not permitted for women to take the *role* of a teacher,” and this role is “given only to the few.” This leads to the next inference that “the role of the teacher is part ... of the role of the elder.”⁴⁰ Paul, says Davies, includes “women among those who are eligible for the office of deacon and, by inference, excludes women from the office of elder (or bishop).”⁴¹ The criterion of aptitude to teach for the elder, says Davies, is “not to deny the general permission ... of women in one-to-one situations to teach and admonish any disciple, be they male or female.”⁴² He says that the concern throughout chapter 2 “is the conduct of the congregation and in the congregation the public office of teaching is to be reserved for men and not for women.”⁴³ He goes on to discuss the nature of the role of a teacher without any reference to 1 Timothy. This does seem somewhat contrived, but the point of this section is to demonstrate that “there is an authority invested in the office of teacher,” that teachers are leaders, and leaders “have the authority to admonish.” He is then able to conclude that Paul is prohibiting women from taking the

37 In private communication with Dr Robert Anderson, retired lecturer in logic, Notre Dame University, Sydney. It is an example of an argument from silence.

38 Davies, “Biblical Study Paper,” 86.

39 Ibid.

40 Ibid.

41 Ibid.

42 Ibid., 87.

43 Ibid.

authoritative role as a teacher. The authoritative role would also “include ruling, but it is specifically teaching that Paul has in mind.”⁴⁴

Davies finishes this section of his argument on verses 11 to 12 by dealing with the question of prophesy since it would seem that “prophecy is virtually equivalent to teaching, or preaching.”⁴⁵ Davies makes a distinction between “words given [to the prophet] are directly from God. Whereas the authority of the [teacher] is in the *person* as well as the *words*.”⁴⁶ He is, therefore, able to conclude that teaching in the Old Testament was “given to priests, who were exclusively male,” but the “task of being agents of God’s revelation ... was given to male and female alike” because the words of the prophet are given to them directly from God. He concludes the section by saying, “the existence of prophetesses, therefore, in no way detracts from Paul’s instruction that women ought not to teach or exercise authority over men.”⁴⁷

What can we conclude about Davies’ vision of masculinity that emerges from this analysis? The first thing to note is that masculinity is essentially normative.⁴⁸ The actions prescribed to men, “lifting holy hands” while in prayer, are generalised by describing them as a metaphor for “purity of life” so this action becomes applicable to the whole congregation. The instructions to the women are particular only to the women, as Davies said, he cannot imagine the men of Ephesus or Paul being concerned about dress or hair. In this way, men’s bodies dissolve as an issue and women’s bodies become a special concern, particularly in the public sphere. Paul might want the men of Ephesus to lift holy hands, but this can be laid aside for the contemporary man as it is only a metaphor. The contemporary woman, on the other hand, is obliged by the command of Paul to consider her conduct in terms of her dress. This masculinity is not concerned about the deportment of a man’s body nor his dress or hair.

Further, since verses 9 to 11 concern only women, the good works, which women are instructed to concern themselves with are therefore not normative in this instance. Good works are not even mentioned, thus they do not contribute to the picture of masculinity. This means that women are portrayed as passive and their activity within the congregation is essentially confined to women’s only activity. They are prohibited from “authoritative” activity in the public sphere of the congregation. Men, on the other hand, are permitted to act as authoritative and are not portrayed in the negative. Even when he discusses the

44 Ibid.

45 Ibid., 88.

46 Ibid.; Davies’ emphasis.

47 Ibid.

48 On “normative masculinity” see Gerber, “Grit, Guts, and Vanilla Beans,” 30–31.

injunction to avoid anger or dissension, Davies mitigates this by introducing an ambiguity about the interpretation of this verse. Therefore, nothing hinders the men of Ephesus from taking up the role of teacher or elder. Thus for Davies, masculinity is defined as official role bearing from which women are excluded. Only a man can admonish a man. His masculinity is encompassed by the voices of men in the public sphere of the congregation. He may learn something from a woman in a one-on-one private situation, away from the ears of other men. Overwhelmingly, however, judging by the repetitive use of the words “teaching” and “authority” (or synonyms), a man teaches others with authority in a public role. It is a picture of masculinity that is public, which fulfils a role, which is active, and which exercises authority over others. These things obscure the man’s body and any failing in relation to his anger or propensity for conflict. For Davies, this fades into an ambiguous background.

In summary, the men and women are being sorted into two categories and this perhaps best represented in a table.

Men	Women
Aren’t concerned about their dress or hair	Are concerned about their dress and hair
Are public	Are private
Take up the role of teacher	Are prohibited from the role of teacher
Are elders	Are not elders
Exercise authority	Do not exercise authority
Are leaders	Are not leaders
Admonish	Don’t admonish
Are agents of authoritative interpretation	Passively report words of revelation (prophecy)

Tab. 1: Categorizing Men and Women

This critique forms the basis of the engagement with the next two Australian evangelicals, Smith and Jones. For the sake of brevity, we will discuss where they extensively agree with Davies on verses 8 to 12 and where they depart. Smith (2012) in the second chapter of her book, *God’s Good Design*, aims to give a “plain reading” of chapter 2 of 1 Timothy. Like Davies, she is portraying her approach as an exegetical reading of the text. This is a book for a popular audience and is primarily aimed at women asking questions about feminism and the Bible. Her purpose is to defend a

common English translation of verses 11–12 as a straightforward interpretation of the underlying Greek without any reference to the Greek text.

3. Anger Management and Dress Codes: Claire Smith on “God’s Good Design”

Smith takes “every place” in 1 Timothy 2:8 as inferring that verses 8–15 refer to the corporate meetings of believers.⁴⁹ Like Davies, she focuses on how prayer is offered, but unlike Davies makes an unambiguous acknowledgement that the second part of verse 8 references “male aggression and self-promotion.” Verses 9 to 15 she says addresses the women, but says nothing about the problematic ὡσαύτως, “likewise.” In her reading the women’s issue is different from the men: it is not “anger management.”⁵⁰ Like Davies, her focus is on the women’s dress, but unlike him, she mentions that women are to be “proactive in doing good.”⁵¹ Her theme is that women are to show quiet decorum; they are to learn but “not to teach or to exercise authority over a man.” Smith sums up by saying that “when it comes to teaching the gathered Christian community, women are to keep quiet. They are not to teach. Teaching is someone else’s responsibility, not theirs.”⁵² In other words, it is the responsibility of men, and the emphasis is on the women’s silence.

She then adds a caveat. Women can teach but not in a role that involves being ordained.⁵³ The thrust of her argument is that this is self-explanatory from the English rendition of this passage.⁵⁴ However, no acknowledgement is made that the concept of “ordination” is anachronistic when it comes to reading this text. She goes on to address questions about her “plain reading.” It’s important to her project to address the issue of submission; it “is a common Christian response,” which is not just confined to women.⁵⁵ However, she goes on to argue that “in quietness” used in verses 11 to 12 is the “underlining the main point about the conduct of women.” Although she acknowledges that quietness is a point the writer has already made about the Christian life, she does not generalise the women’s quietness as an example of the Christian life. This quietness is particular to women as they cannot “teach” and “exercise authority.” It’s not that

49 Smith, *God’s Good Design*, 27–28.

50 Ibid., 28.

51 Ibid., 29.

52 Ibid.

53 Ibid., 30.

54 Ibid.

55 Ibid.,

women submit themselves to “all men, all the time” but only when they are “in church, when teaching is happening, to what is taught and those men who are teaching it.”⁵⁶ Again we have a few men to whom women are to submit when they teach. These men “labour in preaching,” so they are active in this public space, while all the gathered women are passive learners.

This brings her to Adam and Eve. She says that there are two reasons for restricting women from “the authoritative teaching role.” The first reason is Adam “was made first,” and as the firstborn has “the responsibilities that go with that.”⁵⁷ Thus “Paul” gives instructions “based on the way things are meant to be; the way God originally created men and women.”⁵⁸ The second reason is “based on what happened when God’s ideal was disobeyed ... She gave some to the man ... and he ate too ... [Adam] disobeyed God by eating the fruit ... and by abdicating his responsibility of leadership to his wife.”⁵⁹ This is the pattern of “male leadership and female submission ... the [Ephesian] women are not to usurp the male leadership God has provided.”⁶⁰ Thus the argument is that men are created to lead, for a woman to lead is disobeying God’s created order. The image of masculinity here is one that is created to have authority and to lead, and there is an expectation that the women in the congregation will submit to what is taught by a few men. It is a masculinity that can be devolved if it obeys a woman’s teaching. How any of this relates to Eve’s deception is difficult to see. There appears to be a lot of interpretative weight brought to bear on the text based on an elaborate reading of Genesis 2.

4. Hefin Jones: Equality of Interdependence between Men and Women

The last writer to be considered is Jones (2016), who takes for granted that his readers are familiar with the argument that 1 Timothy 2:12 “prohibits women from authoritatively teaching men, and thus bars women functioning as overseers.”⁶¹ Like Smith, he sees “in quietness” forming “a wrapper for the instruction for women to learn and the prohibition of them authoritatively teach men.”⁶² “Full submission (2:11),” says Jones, does not apply to men in general

56 Ibid., 35.

57 Ibid., 36.

58 Ibid.

59 Ibid.

60 Ibid., 36–37.

61 Jones, “Women, Teaching, and Authority,” 144.

62 Ibid., 145.

but to whoever is their instructor (which would be a man).⁶³ He argues that the two infinitives are to be understood as “one composite activity” so that “Paul prohibits women from authoritatively teaching men.”⁶⁴ There is then a detailed exegetical discussion where he qualifies Philip B. Payne’s argument that Paul is discussing equality between men and women in 1 Corinthians 11:11, by saying that “this isn’t a symmetrical equality or an equality of equivalence but rather an equality of interdependence.”⁶⁵ In conclusion, he says that “it is the combination of authority with teaching that provides the key contextual indicator that Paul is prohibiting women from functioning as overseers.”⁶⁶ Like Davies and Smith, he repeatedly insists that teaching a congregation from the Scriptures is an authoritative function and this should only be done by men.

In sum, the view of masculinity promoted by these three writers over the course of three decades has changed very little. Masculinity is the normative state for the Christian. In men reside all the attributes that our society takes for granted are positive: a man is active, he is a free agent, he is expected to participate in the public sphere, and in him resides legitimate authority. When he speaks from the Scriptures he does so authoritatively. The exercise of authority is the cornerstone of Christian manhood. But this is a picture of masculinity that is inherently weak as it needs to be defined against womanhood. Further, it can be undermined by the exercise of authority of a woman, even if she is faithfully teaching the Scriptures. One wonders if Davies’ man who is taught by a woman in private would be able to bear the affront to his masculinity.⁶⁷ The image of masculinity that is projected by these writers is frail. There is a sense in which it is constantly in reference to the women and whether they are in public or private contexts if the Scriptures are being spoken about. In summary, the masculinity that these writers are promoting is at its most complete when it is in charge, active in the public sphere, and expounding Scripture. Masculinity is normative and for this reason, the man’s body is dissolved; he teaches by his speech. Women are silent, but men speak and are listened to. The identity of the Christian man is tied to his speech and the response of the women who listen to him. Fundamentally, his identity is inherently unstable as it is tied to the response of those he expects will listen, but these may become deviant and not listen.

63 Ibid.

64 Ibid., 146.

65 Ibid., 151; P. B. Payne, “The Bible Teaches the Equality of Man and Woman,” *Priscilla Papers* 29 (2015): 3–10.

66 Jones, “Women, Teaching, and Authority,” 153.

67 Davies says there is a “private one-to-one level,” “Biblical Study Paper,” 86.

5. Beyond Domination: Masculinity and Femininity in 1 Timothy

Is this really the view of masculinity in 1 Timothy? For the last decade, a lot of scholarship has been done on the Pastoral Epistles. Concentrated efforts have been made on understanding the writer's use of rhetoric to persuade his audience away from the false teaching.⁶⁸ In light of these advances I would like to propose that in 1 Timothy 2, masculinity and femininity are secondary issues to the writer's prime concern. His view of masculinity and femininity is being shaped by his response to the false teaching that is being promoted *within* his Christian community and by the missional demands of the believers' political and social context.⁶⁹

Nearly all commentators see the writer of 1 Timothy as reinforcing traditional, patriarchal expectations about women.⁷⁰ However, I would argue that careful attention to the purpose of the letter and its structure provides coordinates for a reading that takes into account the writer's strategy against his opponents. In my recent book, I argued that the purpose of 1 Timothy is to remove or reduce the threat to the community by the false or "other instruction" (1 Tim 1:3–4),⁷¹ 1 Timothy 1:3–4 forms the purpose statement of the letter; "certain men" (τισιν) and, as it turns out, women (1 Tim 2:12; 5:15), are commanded not "to teach the other instruction" (μη̄ ἐτεροδιδασκαλεῖν) and return to God's "administration" (1 Tim 1:4).⁷² My argument is that all the commands form part of this "instruction" (διδασκαλία), which is sound (1 Tim 1:10) and good (1 Tim 4:6) as opposed to the "instruction" (διδασκαλία) of spirits and demons (1 Tim 4:1). Therefore, any discussion of "church order" is subsidiary to the primary purpose, which is to put an end to the promotion of the "other instruction."⁷³

68 Eg. L. R. Donelson, *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1986); M. Harding, *Tradition and Rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles* (New York: Peter Lang Publishing, 1998).

69 C. T. Hoklotubbe, *Civilized Piety: The Rhetoric of Pietas in the Pastoral Epistles and the Roman Empire* (Waco, TX: Baylor Press, 2017), 103–104; C. R. Hutson, *First and Second Timothy and Titus* (Paideia; Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2019), 62–71. Christianity as an act of political sedition, E. A. Judge, *Paul and the Conflict of Cultures: The Legacy of His Thought Today* (ed. J. R. Harrison; Eugene, OR: Cascade, 2019), 154–155.

70 Hoklotubbe, 103; D. R. MacDonald, *The Legend and the Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon* (Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press, 1983), 59, 100; J. A. Glancy, "Protocols of Masculinity in the Pastoral Epistles," in *New Testament Masculinities* (ed. S. D. Moore et. al.; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 2003), 235–264.

71 On the translation of διδασκαλία as "instruction" see L. M. Kidson, *Persuading Shipwrecked Men: The Rhetorical Strategies of 1 Timothy 1* (WUNT 526; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2020), 112–120.

72 Ibid., 136, 138.

73 Ibid., 1–2; 274–275.

My focus in *Persuading Shipwrecked Men* is on the ethical digression in chapter 1, verses 5 to 20.⁷⁴ Verse 5 is designed to win the goodwill of those listening to the letter since love is the virtue all would agree is praiseworthy.⁷⁵ This is an important step because throughout the digression the writer is exercising frank speech (παρρησία) to stimulate his opponents' consciences (1 Tim 1:5; 19).⁷⁶ He wants to convince them to turn from potential disaster, shipwrecking their faith, to faithfully implementing Paul's instructions. Paul's relationship with Jesus Christ acts as an exemplar of this repentance (1 Tim 1:16).⁷⁷ Paul had been a man of arrogance and ignorance, and like the opponents, a blasphemer (1 Tim 1:13). Hymenaeus and Alexander act as exemplars of shipwrecked men; they have been "turned over to Satan" to learn not to blaspheme (1 Tim 1:20).⁷⁸ These men were once in the community and are now outside of it. However, the opponents or potential opponents that are being addressed in this letter are still within the community. Thus this letter is a warning to those inside the community not to promote the other instruction lest they shipwreck their faith.

It is important to see the connection of chapter 2 to what has proceeded. Only Smith noted the conjunction, (οὖν) "then," and says that "this lets us know that what follows is ... dependent on what went before" and this is that "Paul charged Timothy with the duty of resisting the false teaching."⁷⁹ However, she abandons this insight to focus on prayer conducted in the church meeting. Structurally, the whole chapter (1 Tim 2:1–15) is intimately connected to the ethical digression in chapter 1:

1 Timothy 2:1 Παρακαλῶ οὖν
 1 Timothy 2:5 εἷς γὰρ θεός
 1 Timothy 2:8 Βούλομαι οὖν
 1 Timothy 2:9 ὡσαύτως καὶ γυναῖκας
 1 Timothy 2:10 ἀλλ'
 1 Timothy 2:12 διδάσκειν δὲ
 1 Timothy 2:12 ἀλλ'
 1 Timothy 2:13 Ἀδὰμ γὰρ
 1 Timothy 2:15 σωθήσεται δὲ

Tab. 2: Ethical digression in 1 Timothy 2:1–15

74 Ibid., 180–182.

75 Ibid., 190.

76 Ibid., 263–267.

77 Ibid., 218–220.

78 Ibid., 218–220; 270–271.

79 Smith, *God's Good Design*, 26.

Laid out like this one can see the connectedness and development of this chapter to the preceding digression. As Runge describes each connective brings “its unique constraint to bear in the context.”⁸⁰ The οὖν in particular is significant as it is found on high-level boundaries where “the next major topic is drawn from and builds upon what precedes.”⁸¹ At 1 Timothy 2:1 the οὖν is performing this function: the writer is urging his readers, in the light of Hymenaeus’ and Alexander’s destruction of their faith and their blasphemy, to offer “supplications, prayers, intercessions, and thanksgivings ... be made for everyone” (NRSV). The context is not the public gathering of the church, rather it is thematic. The believers are to offer supplications etc. “so that we may lead a quiet and peaceful life (ἡρεμον καὶ ἡσύχιον βίον) in all godliness (εὐσεβείᾳ) and dignity (σεμνότητι)” (NRSV, 1 Tim 2:2). These character qualities stand in contrast to the character qualities of Hymenaeus and Alexander, who are blasphemous. As examples of Paul’s former life they are also self-promoting and men of hubris.⁸² They belong to the group of “certain men/people” who have turned to meaningless talk and want to be teachers of the law but are ignorant (1 Tim 1:6–7). In contrast, the writer wants the believers to be pious and dignified.

Hoklotubbe describes the relationship of the Greek εὐσεβεία, which “tended to signify both a reverent attitude toward and proper ritual conduct before the gods,” and the Roman *pietas*, which “encompassed an affectionate dutifulness directed also to one’s parents, homeland, and emperor.”⁸³ *Pietas* is summed up by Cicero as “the feeling which renders offices and loving service to one’s kin and country” and arises from “the knowledge of the gods” (*Inv.* 2.53.161; *Nat. d.* 2.61.153).⁸⁴ *Pietas* was the fulfilment of one’s filial, religious, civic, and imperial obligations that sustained reciprocal relationships. As Hoklotubbe argues the prayers for all men and kings was an expression of piety toward the emperor and was supportive of imperial ideology.⁸⁵ In 1 Timothy the basis of this piety is built on the theological basis: “For there is one God” (1 Tim 2:5). Paul’s relation to this foundational basis serves as his call into service (1 Tim 1:12), but adds in 1 Timothy 2:7 that he is “a teacher to the Gentiles.” In other words, he is the Ephesians’ teacher as opposed to Hymenaeus and Alexander. This foundational

80 S. E. Runge, *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament* (Peabody: Hendrickson Pub., 2010), 19.

81 *Ibid.*, 43.

82 Kidson, *Persuading Shipwrecked Men*, 218–220.

83 Hoklotubbe, *Civilized Piety*, 5–6.

84 *Ibid.*; the English word piety is based on the Latin word; as Hoklotubbe persuasively argues both the Greek and Roman aspects are anticipated in the Pastoral Epistles.

85 *Ibid.*, 105–110.

point, however, takes the writer away from his main point: the character and conduct of believers.

The οὐν can resume a main topic of discussion after a digression.⁸⁶ So in 1 Timothy 2:8, the οὐν resumes the topic of piety and dignity. This informs how we should read the instructions to the men. Since the focus is on their character and conduct in opposition to the opponents, then who they are and what they are doing with their bodies comes into focus.⁸⁷ In the first century, a man's deportment was of great significance.⁸⁸ How he walked, talked, gestured indicated his moral rectitude.⁸⁹ For example, Cicero describes what a man did with his hands as a matter of propriety (Latin *decorum*),

And they [Cynics] assail modesty with a great many other arguments to the same purport. But as for us, let us follow Nature and shun everything that is offensive to our eyes or our ears. So, in standing or walking, in sitting or reclining, in our expression, our eyes, or the movements of our hands, let us preserve what we have called "propriety" (*Off.* 1.35.128).⁹⁰

Thus as Dugan explains, Cicero attests "to the traditional Graeco-Roman view that the orator's bodily self and his words are connected."⁹¹ In the oration *Against Timarchus*, Aeschines describes Solon, Pericles, Themistocles, and Aristides as models of *decorum* (σώφρονας) because they addressed the assembly with restrained gestures and kept one arm inside the cloak (1.25). Gesturing signals other important virtues, including piety. Outstretched hands are the right attitude for prayer. Plutarch describes Marius washing his hands and both he

86 Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 44–45.

87 See A. Corbeill's criticism of those scholars, "who valorize language over bodily movement ... an anachronism for early Rome," "Gesture in early Roman law: empty forms for essential formalities," in *Body Language in the Greek and Roman Worlds* (ed. D. Cains: Swansea, Wales: The Classical Press of Wales, 2005), 157–174 (159).

88 Glancy, "Protocols," 235–264.

89 A. J. Malherbe, "The *Virtus Feminarum* in 1 Timothy 2:9–15," in *Renewing Tradition: Studies in Texts and Contexts in Honor of James W. Thompson* (ed. M. W. Hamilton, et al.: Eugene, OR: Pickwick Publications, 2007), 45–65 (58).

90 *De Officiis: With An English Translation* (trans. W. Miller. LCL 30; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913); H. North describes how Greek σωφροσύνη relates to the concept of propriety, *Sophrosyne: Self-Knowledge and Self-Restraint in Greek Literature* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1966), 222. She comments on Cicero's use of σωφροσύνη, "In the *Tusculans* Cicero observes that the Greeks apply the term σωφροσύνη to the virtue that he calls *temperantia* or *moderatio*, occasionally *modestia*, or even *frugalitas*," 268–285; Malherbe, "The *Virtus Feminarum*," 56–59.

91 In commenting about Cicero's *De oratore*, J. Dugan, *Making the New Man: Ciceronian Self-Fashioning in the Rhetorical Works* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 157.

and Catulus, “lifting them up towards Heaven” while making vows to the gods.⁹² A Christian example is Clement of Rome, who urges the Corinthians:

Let us, therefore, approach him in holiness of soul, lifting up to him pure and undefiled hands, loving our gentle and compassionate Father who made us his own chosen portion (29:1).⁹³

Here there is a close connection between the lifting up of pure and undefiled hands and what could be considered a pious attitude towards God. Not only does appropriate reverent conduct need to be directed towards him because he is the divine, but also “loving service,” as Cicero says, because God is the Christian’s true father.

In 1 Timothy the lifting up of “holy hands” is “without wrath (ὀργῆς) and dissension (διαλογισμοῦ)” (NSAB). Therefore, the man of verse 8 is to demonstrate his piety through his bodily deportment.⁹⁴ On the other hand, conflict demonstrates the contrasting vice of hubris.⁹⁵ Such men not only lack piety but moderation (σωφροσύνη), demonstrated by their willingness to be angry and cause dissension between believers.⁹⁶ And internally they are deformed because they have seared their consciences (1 Tim 4:1–2). Their seared consciences allow them to promote the “other instruction” while ignoring Paul’s commands.⁹⁷ The writer describes this as a sickness; these people are sick for controversy and disputes about words (1 Tim 6:4). Thus the writer views the masculinity of these men as ill.⁹⁸

But it is not just the men who are infected with this disease and need to be urged to be pious. The ὡσαύτως is pointing forward to describe the degree with which an action is done.⁹⁹ This explains the somewhat redundant exhortation to the men in verse 8. Since the writer has spent all of the digression discussing the behaviour of the men, among who are Hymenaeus and Alexander, then there seems little point in repeating the need for the men to be pious (1 Tim

92 Plutarch, *Marius*, 26.3.2–4; cf. 22.2.2–3; cf. Dio Chrysostom, *Discourse* 32.82 & 12.61.

93 *First Clement*, in *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations* (trans. Michael W. Holmes; 3rd ed. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2007).

94 Deportment signals “a certain aptitude” including “a high-minded nature free from anger,” M. W. Gleason, *Making Men: Sophists and Self-Presentation in Ancient Rome* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1995), 60–61.

95 North, *Sophrosyne*, 41–42.

96 *Ibid.*, 64–65, 114; Glancy, “Protocols,” 240–241.

97 Kidson, *Persuading Shipwrecked Men*, 264–266.

98 A. J. Malherbe, “Medical Imagery in the Pastoral Epistles,” in *Light from the Gentiles: Hellenistic Philosophy and Early Christianity: Collected Essays, 1959–2012* (ed. C. R. Holladay et al.; Leiden; Boston, MA: Brill, 2014), 117–134; Gleason, “Protocols,” 260.

99 Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 68.

1:4b–5; 2:1–2) and refrain from anger and dissension (1 Tim 1:6–7; 13, 19–20). The ὡσαύτως, however, connects the women’s attitude and behaviour to the men through the careful use of conjunctions. The women are to demonstrate the same pious and reverent behaviour through their deportment as do the men.¹⁰⁰ Singled out is their clothing, hair, and accessories as these are indicators of a woman’s moderation (σωφροσύνη), which is closely linked to their piety.¹⁰¹ Indeed, the writer makes this explicit by using “but” (ἀλλά) to contrast and highlight the object of these instructions, which is “proper for a woman making a claim to godliness (θεοσέβειαν)” (NASB; 1 Tim 2:10).¹⁰² This highlight strengthens our argument that the theme of verse 8 is piety and dignity. This would mean that the women’s pious behaviour acts as a general principle: both the men and women are to make “a claim to godliness by [their] good works” (NASB). The following sentence, verse 11, belongs to this contrast and sums up the women’s quiet deportment, or dignity, and is an expression of her pious good works.¹⁰³ Through the connection to the digression, the women are to be like the men, submissive to Paul’s command (1 Tim 1:3–4).

The δέ in verse 12 is related to the οὖν in verse 8 and marks a new development. There is therefore a break in thought between verse 11 and verse 12, which our commentators gloss over, even arguing for a chiasm.¹⁰⁴ However, our writer is indicating a close connection between this new section and the previous focus on piety and dignity. The repetition of “a woman” and “quietness” in verses 11 and 12 is an example of the writer’s use of “hooked keywords”; it is a structural device used to link units of argument together.¹⁰⁵ As a development of his previous argument, the writer has shifted from the plural “women” and

100 Anger is comparable to self-indulgence in men, “to be arrayed in purple, to be roofed in gold,” Seneca, *Ira* 1.21.1; Glancy, “Protocols,” 241.

101 North, *Sophrosyne*, 42–43, 62, 64, 95, 323; Malherbe, “The *Virtus Feminarum*,” 48–63.

102 Runge, 55–56; this word is an intensification of εὐσεβεία inferring “real godliness,” J. D. Quinn and W. C. Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (vol. 1. ECC; reprint; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 220–221.

103 Lyn M. Kidson, “‘Teaching’ and Other Persuasions: The Interpretation of *Didaskein* ‘to Teach’ in 1 Timothy 2:2,” in *The Gender Conversation: Evangelical Perspective on Gender, Scripture and the Christian Life* (eds. E. Murphy and D. Starling; Macquarie Park; Eugene, OR: Morling Press; Wipf and Stock Publishers, 2016), 125–137 (131–133).

104 Smith, *God’s Good Design*, 29 and Jones, “wrapper,” “Women, Teaching, and Authority,” 145.

105 Kidson, *Persuading Shipwrecked Men*, 188–189; B. Longenecker, “‘Linked Like a Chain’: Rev 22.6–9 in Light of an Ancient Transition Technique,” *NTS* 47 (2001): 105–17; H. van Dyke Parunak, “Transitional Techniques in the Bible,” *JBL* 102 (1983): 525–48; applied to 1 Timothy see R. van Neste, “Cohesion and Structure in the Pastoral Epistles,” in *Entrusted with the Gospel: Paul’s Theology in the Pastoral Epistles* (eds. A. J. Köstenberger and T. L. Wilder; Nashville, TN: B&H Academic, 2010), 84–104.

“men” to the singular “woman” and “man.” Our commentators barely mention this transition, but it marks a change in view. While the men and women/woman of verses 8 to 11 are in the public view making a claim to godliness, we now turn to the husband and wife and a private viewpoint in verses 12–15.¹⁰⁶

This section is on what the writer does not want and stands in contrast to what he wants in verse 8. However, the indicative verb and its negation “I do not want” are displaced by the infinitive “to teach” (διδάσκειν). Since the Greek word order is not as constrained as in English, this infinitive at the beginning of the sentence marks it out as the focus.¹⁰⁷ This infinitive belongs to a hendiadys normally translated as “to teach nor have authority over” (NRSV). However, in this marked position, διδάσκειν is indicating a resumption of a theme or argument in the earlier part of the letter. The command “let a woman learn in quietness in all submission,” indicates a submission to Paul’s command at the beginning of the letter. But the infinitive “to teach” (διδάσκειν) reiterates this command in 1 Timothy 1:3 that “certain people” are not to “teach the other instruction.” The second part of the hendiadys refines the unwanted behaviour, “and not to domineer her husband.”¹⁰⁸ The word “man” (ἄνδρος) rightfully belongs to the ἀθηνεῖν and not to the word διδάσκειν.¹⁰⁹ This is a reiteration of the “some” in 1 Timothy 1:7 who are “without understanding either what they are saying or things about which they make assertions.” This behaviour is leading to anger, verbal wrangling, and disputes. Thus if the wife were to do the same it would lead to a similar breakdown in her marriage. And this is the finale that the writer has been moving towards since the οὖν in verse 8. There is something particular that the wife is potentially doing that is not covered by the first command at 1 Timothy 1:3–4. The answer to this is found in 1 Timothy 4:1–3. “Certain people” are paying attention to spirits and demons and are forbidding marriage and requiring a certain diet.¹¹⁰ In other words, this is an ascetic program (1 Tim 4:1), which is the “other instruction” of 1 Timothy 1:3–4. The writer perceives a threat that the wife could persuade her husband to take up this ascetic program, which he opposes.

106 The transition signalling a change in topic to husband and wife, Quinn and Wacker, *The First and Second Letters to Timothy*, 221.

107 Runge, 190.

108 ἀθηνεῖν = to domineer, Philip B. Payne, *Man and Woman, One in Christ: An Exegetical and Theological Study of Paul’s Letters* (Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 2009), 380–394; Cynthia Westfall, *Paul and Gender: Reclaiming the Apostle’s Vision for Men and Women* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker, 2016), 305–311.

109 Payne, *Man and Woman*, 353–356.

110 L. M. Kidson, “Fasting, Bodily Care, and the Widows of 1 Timothy 5:3–15,” *EC* 11.2 (2020): 191–205.

This anxiety on the part of the writer gives us a rare insight into the Christian marriage at this time. While he has provided Hymenaeus and Alexander as examples of men who have shipwrecked their faith, he provides Eve, the first wife, as an example for the wives who are tempted by the other instruction.¹¹¹ They are not to become like Eve and be deceived and sin. Our commentators see the sequence that Adam was formed first then Eve as indicating a hierarchy of relationship. I would like to suggest, however, that the emphasis is on the “was formed,” which is taken directly from the Septuagint (Gen 2:7). Adam was formed (ἐπλάσθη) then the woman, Eve, was taken from him so that Adam could cling to her (Gen 2:24).¹¹² This pictures the intimacy of husband and wife in fulfilling the command of God in Genesis 1:28 “to be fruitful and multiply.”¹¹³ In refuting the ascetics in 1 Timothy 4:4–5, the writer calls God the good creator, who created marriage and food to be “received with thanksgiving.”¹¹⁴ Thus Adam and Eve are the basis for the writer’s command to the wife not to teach the ascetic program to her husband. The wife and her husband were created for marriage; in other words, sexual relations. The reiteration of the command to the wife to be in quietness in verse 12, stands in contrast to a wife who is trying to persuade and pressure her husband into taking up the other instruction. The contrastive ἀλλά in verse 12 repeats the contrast in verse 10. She is to conduct herself with a quiet deportment both in public and in the bedroom.¹¹⁵ This woman is a model Roman matron, who conducts herself with piety toward the divine and her husband.

Therefore, the writer foresees a danger within the married relationship because traditionally wives advised husbands.¹¹⁶ A man could be saved from dishonour by the sage advice from his wife.¹¹⁷ Men relied on their wives for sound advice and were thought to be particularly vulnerable to a wife’s persuasive words, thus the strong injunction by the writer to the wife of verse

111 For examples of Eve as Adam’s wife see LXX: Genesis 4:1, 25; Tobias 8:6; Josephus, *Antiquity of the Jews*, 1:40; Jubilees 3:4–7. That γάρ can be used to introduce an example Plato, *Republic*, 551C.

112 This phrase implies sexual union, G. W. Wenham, *Genesis 1–15* (Word; Waco: Word, 1987), 70–71.

113 Wenham, *Genesis*, 33.

114 On the relationship between diet and control of sexual desire, Kidson, “Fasting, Bodily Care,” 196–202.

115 P. Brown, *The Body and Society: Men, Women, & Sexual Renunciation in Early Christianity* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2008), 21–24.

116 Proverbs 31; for Roman wives, Brown, *The Body and Society*, 15.

117 Ajax might have saved himself by listening to his wife’s counsel, Sophocles, *Ajax*; North, *Sophrosyne*, 59–60.

12 not to teach/persuade and domineer her husband to take up the ascetic program.¹¹⁸

The vision of masculinity in 1 Timothy is one that is far more robust than many modern commentators. The man might be in danger of being persuaded by his wife to take up the other instruction, but this is because of their unique relationship. The writer is not thinking that all men are somehow weakened in their masculinity by hearing a woman teaching in the gathering of believers. Nor are they constantly anxious about the spoken words of the women in the congregation. The command at the beginning to “certain people” (1 Tim 1:3) is primarily directed at the men as the example of Hymenaeus and Alexander demonstrates.¹¹⁹ Logically the men of the congregation are in danger of being deceived into taking up their ascetic program, which is why some men must be warned or commanded not to be engaged in teaching it. Equally, there are some women who are trying to win their husbands over to the ascetic program, and these are singled out in verses 12–15. There is an even-handedness to the writer’s instruction, first to the men, then to the women. He sees them both in danger of seduction by the “certain men,” but both are equally able to heed his command. Both the men and women are to be submissive to Paul as he instructs both to give attention to God’s administration. This is the implementation of Paul’s sound and good instruction.¹²⁰ In 1 Timothy there is an assumed equality between the men and women in their relationship to Jesus Christ; Paul’s relationship is the model for all believers. And this model assumes all are called into service (1 Tim 1:12), although this service is tempered by cultural restraints.¹²¹ Men and women exhibit their service in a culturally appropriate manner. But this does not imply that a man should be fundamentally anxious about his masculinity in the face of a woman’s service.

6. Implications for the Complementarian Interpreters: the Risk of Domestic Violence

The goal of this present volume is to raise awareness of new directions in New Testament studies and draw connections to current socio-political debates. We have drawn upon the emergent gender studies to focus on the masculinity constructed by certain evangelicals in Australia. The commentators we have

118 L. McClure, *Spoken Like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1999), 62, 70–71; North, *Sophrosyne*, 62.

119 Kidson, *Persuading Shipwrecked Men*, 108–110.

120 *Ibid.*, 132–136.

121 Hutson, *First and Second Timothy*, 62–71; 80–85.

examined have crafted a masculinity that is inherently unstable as it must continually examine itself in relation to the women in the congregation. The vision of masculinity in 1 Timothy, however, is one that is crafted as a response to the “other instruction” (1 Tim 1:3; 4:1; 6:3). So while the writer may view the errant men as diseased, it is a far more robust view of masculinity than the present-day commentators. The men’s masculinity is not diminished by their relationship to the women in the congregation, but by their submission to the “other instruction.”

This analysis raises serious concerns about relationship between men and women in the home during the COVID-19 pandemic in Australia. In recent years, journalist Julia Baird has been highlighting the connections between complementarianism and domestic abuse in Sydney Anglican churches.¹²² She highlights research conducted by the Australian Institute of Family Studies, which concluded that “the gender norms and beliefs surrounding male dominance and male superiority, created by power hierarchies ... accord men greater status.” In our analysis, we have observed the idea that men are inherently “designed” to be leaders and to be obeyed. Not to do this is deviant on the part of the woman. Although our writers are at pains to say that women and men are interdependent and women can teach in private, this subtle message could be missed by men who irregularly attend church.¹²³ In this time of social disconnection because of the pandemic, the rates of domestic abuse appear to have increased.¹²⁴ It could be surmised that a reduction in church attendance and a faulty view of masculinity could put evangelical wives at risk of abuse by their husbands. Baird’s call for more attention to the increased risks that complementarian women face is even more salutary. The inherent weakness in the complementarian view of masculinity means that any conflict in the home could result in husbands feeling that their masculine identity is challenged.

122 J. Baird, “Is Your Pastor Sexist,” *New York Times*, April 19, 2017, 25; “Domestic Violence in the Church: When women are Believed, Change will Happen,” ABC report posted 23 May 2018, <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-05-23/when-women-are-believed-the-church-will-change/9782184>. J. Baird and H. Gleeson, “Submit to your husbands”: Women told to endure domestic violence in the name of God,” ABC report posted October 2018: <https://www.abc.net.au/news/2017-07-18/domestic-violence-church-submit-to-husbands/8652028?nw=0>; cf. Giles, *The Headship of Men and the Abuse of Women*, 5–17, 32–38, 41–42.

123 Baird and Gleeson, “Submit to your husbands,” based on the finding that men who attend church on an irregular basis are more likely to commit domestic abuse.

124 A. Galloway, “Domestic violence on the rise during pandemic,” *SMH* July 13, 2020: <https://www.smh.com.au/politics/federal/domestic-violence-on-the-rise-during-pandemic-20200712-p55b8q.html>.

However, a renewed vision of the masculinity of 1 Timothy would secure the contemporary man's identity to his relationship with Jesus Christ.