A SOCIO-RHETORICAL EXEGESIS OF 1 TIMOTHY 2:8-15

by

Jonathan Jodamus JDMJON 001

A minor dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirement for the award of the
Degree of Master of Social Sciences

Department of Religious Studies
University of Cape Town
2005

Declaration

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. It is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in, this dissertation from the work, or works, of other people has been attributed, and has been cited and referenced.

SIGNATURE Signed by candidate DATE 16/09/05

Contents

Abstract

In this thesis two interrelated tasks are undertaken. First, this thesis is an attempt to gain mastery of an interpretive methodology, namely, socio-rhetorical analysis. Second, by looking at a crucial text that has major implications for the contemporary church, I have applied this method of analysis to a particular Scriptural text, namely, 1 Timothy 2:8-15. In the thesis I demonstrate using socio-rhetorical analysis that the discourse contained in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 constitutes baptised patriarchal cultural practices and traditions from the dominant Greco-Roman culture of the first century. I demonstrate, therefore, that the portrayal of women in the text reflects a cultural imperative, and not a theological imperative, that was co-opted from the "secular" Greco-Roman culture of the day and transposed, using Scriptural texts as authentication, into the Christian community at Ephesus. Thus the text is simply re-enforcing normative Greco-Roman cultural values upon Christian women and camouflaging it as a Christian norm in order to persuade women to conform to patriarchal cultural standards. Such persuasion, however, is hardly required unless one has already accepted cultural assumptions about the subordination and silencing (objectification) of women in an androcentric hegemonic culture.

Chapter One

Introduction

Due to a history of patriarchal leadership structures within the church, church women have been placed on the periphery of ministry by often being–limited and subordinated into quasi-domestic support roles within the church (Pattison, 1994: 253; Nixon, 1994: 44). As Giles (2002: 154-155) has put it:

> Across the centuries, until very recent times, exegetes and theologians have understood the Bible to be teaching that women are a subordinate class or race who are inferior to men and, as such, are to be excluded from leadership in society and the church. They are to keep silent in the public-especially in church-and they are to obey men, whom God has made superior. . . For nineteen centuries this is how the Bible has been interpreted.

Traditionally women's functions in the church and also the Christian home,[1] have ranged from home-maker, child-bearer, looking after the aged, being in charge of fundraising ventures, Sunday school teachers, deaconesses, and members of various church prayer groups (King, 1957: 54; Hayter, 1987: 112-113; Giles, 2002: 200).[2] It should be noted that these functions are in themselves not unimportant and women's participation in them is not demeaning and unimportant in itself. The ideology behind them, however, reflects a false notion and perception of women that is demeaning and marginalising in its impact.

Should only women participate in these functions, and also should these, and ones similar, be the only functions women are allowed to fulfil within the Church (Mosala, 1986: 172)? For women to continue to function only in the above-mentioned functions and ones similar would be to assume that they are merely competent to fulfil quasi-domestic supportive roles in church life (Pattison, 1994: 253). Nixon (1994: 49) supports this claim and argues that centuries of subordination of church women have caused a deep sense of internalised inferiority

[1] Although recognising that women within Christianity have also been subordinated and marginalised within the home, and, with the use of the same justification. For the purpose of this thesis, however, my main focus will be upon how women have been subordinated and marginalised within the church.

[2] For a discussion and explication, particularly of the various prayer groups that women within the African Independent Churches have operated in for many years in South Africa, see, Gaitskell (1982: 338-357;1995: 211-232; 1997: 253-267); Brandel-Syrier (1984: 13-18); West (1975: 51,76, 90); Masondo (2002: 145-166).

within them, causing many women to display characteristics such as: "submissiveness, docility, indecision, and lack of initiative."

In commenting on the role of women in the African Independent churches, Masondo (2002: 162) has said,

> It is clear that women in the churches are treated as second-class citizens. Numerically they are the majority, but the decision-making structures are still male dominated. Women are relegated to minor positions or heads of women's organizations. They are known for their financial contribution but given no platform to make ecclesiastical or theological contributions. They can exercise leadership in a small area, but once it becomes larger it then requires male leadership (2002: 162).

Within the structures of the Independent Churches in South Africa, the small percentage of women who form part of the actual leadership hierarchy is due to a provision found in most African Independent Churches. This provision allows women to hold office because of their husbands' positions (Pretorius and Jafta 1997: 221). But, even in these rare instances, they have male leaders as their superiors, although these superiors themselves often have no gifting for leadership and are totally inadequate in their functions. An Example of this can be seen in the St. Johns Apostolic Faith Mission Church. Its founder and actual leader was a renowned faith healer Mrs. C. Nku. While she was the actual leader of the church her husband was ordained as the archbishop and he was legally seen as the 'head' of the church (West, 1975: 52; Masondo 2002: 160).

The subordination and marginalisation of women is the case not only within African Independent Churches, but can be traced in different nuances and measures across denominational, racial and ethnic boundaries. In fact, it is typical of the many if not most churches in South Africa.[3]

Ackerman (cited in Klein, 2004: 46), commenting on the theological responsiveness of women in South Africa in the last century, asserts that "women's theological responses were as scarce as the proverbial fairies teeth." Speaking particularly about the Dutch Reformed Church she mentions that many women still find it difficult to enter into ordained ministry. She further maintains that, "communities don't easily call women" (Klein, 2004: 49), and adds that this trend

[3] See Denise Ackerman's comments cited in Klein (2004: 49).

illustrates the societal stigma associated with women church ministers allowing women to fulfil certain roles and disallowing them to fulfil others. Evidently some of the disallowed roles fall under the broad heading of church leadership and include such positions as theologian, priest, pastor, and elder (Klein, 2004: 49).

According to Oduyoye (cited in Masondo, 2002: 160), church women in Africa seldom serve on church committees or leadership structures and when they do, more often than not, they are present to represent the concerns of women in the church rather than as leaders in their own right. Pattison (1994: 241) argues that the dearth of attention and interest to the topic of women in the church, and particularly church ministry, is indicative that these things have been so well institutionalised and indoctrinated within people of both sexes in South Africa that they are often not noticed. People have been so accustomed to this way of thinking that women themselves have sat back and accepted their lack of status and exclusion from church leadership roles as normative within the church. Mosala (1986: 131) affirms this when she demonstrates that a patriarchal theology has been prevalent throughout church history and has resulted in the exclusion of women from ministry. She states that "the arguments for this exclusion are identical with the arguments of patriarchal anthropology. Women are denied leadership in the church for the same reasons they are denied leadership in society" (1986: 131). The support for this exclusivistic practice has been derived from theological teaching that asserts male headship and female subordination (Mosala, 1986: 131).

The subordination of women in the church and their absence in church leadership/ministry has been propagated and institutionalised by ordained ministers, pastors, church leaders, theologians, and exegetes, almost all of whom are male, who use certain Scriptural texts as evidence to support their claims as Biblically or Scripturally based and, therefore, authoritative for the church. Bennett (cited in Mosala 1986: 169), in commenting on women in ministry, claims that "only a return to the biblical perspective of women and how Jesus perceived them, can offer contemporary women some ideological artillery to use in a struggle which they are inexorably engaged in." My argument in this thesis follows this trajectory of thinking, but takes it a step further. The motivation for my argument comes from dissatisfaction with the traditional and contemporary use of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 among many church groups to justify the subordination and inferior status of women. I aver that a more

thorough interpretation of this text is needed to liberate those churches and church women from stereotypical, androcentric, and sexist thinking based on this passage.

A further reason for my argument in this thesis is derived from frustration with the many interpretations postulated by scholars using the historical critical method of interpretation, and its adoption by many Christians, inferring from their analyses that women are subordinate to men and are to be marginalised in the church. Giles (2002: 146) has demonstrated that, "in almost every pre-twentieth century commentary or theological text," theologians and exegetes alike have asserted "men are 'superior' and women 'inferior'." Often 1 Timothy 2:8-15 has been used to authorise these claims and place women in a permanent position of subordination in the church (Giles, 2002: 147-155; Johnson, 2001: 208).[4] It is not in the purpose of this thesis to demonstrate this, but many prominent theologians and exegetes of the second century held this interpretive notion of women in the church.[5] Among them were: Irenaeus (second-third century), Tertullian (second-third century), John Chrysostom (third-fourth century), Thomas Aquinas (thirteenth century), Martin Luther (sixteenth century), John Calvin (sixteenth century), Thomas Cartwright (seventeenth century), Jonathan Edwards (eighteenth century), Heinrich Meyer (nineteenth century) and Henry Liddon (nineteenth century) (Giles, 2002: 147-155).[6]

In the latter part of the twentieth century a view developed among Evangelical Christians called the "hierarchical-complementarian" view (Giles, 2002: 157).[7] According to this view 1 Timothy 2:8-15 provides a Biblically based view of the relation between men and women that re-affirms women's subordination under the guise of complementary between the role of men and women. The net effect of this view is the continued marginalisation and subordination of women in the church.

As stated earlier, it is not in the nature of this thesis to expound upon these views. Instead, it has been my aim to tangentially display how 1 Timothy 2:8-15 has been used, both in the past and in contemporary times, to subordinate and marginalise women in the church. The

[4] For further examples of how many commentators have misinterpreted 1Timothy 2:9-15 and used it to authenticate the subordination and marginalisation of women in the church see, among many others, Ryrie (1968: 70-81, 146); King (1957: 48-55); Calvin (1556: 62-73); Hendriksen (1964: 101-113).

[5] See Giles (2002: 147-155) for further delineation of this.

[6] For further explication of how these prominent theologians and exegetes of the pre-twentieth century used 1 Timothy 2:9-15 as authentication to subordinate and marginalise women see Giles (2002: 147-155); Smeeton (1994: 24, 42, 100-101, 147).

[7] See Giles (2002: 157-166; 2000: 151-167) for a critical analysis and argument against this view as well as a brief summary of its basic tenets.

editors of the book, "*Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*" with whom Giles critically argues against in his research, frequently assert that 1 Timothy 2:9-15 "encapsulates the biblical understanding of women" (Giles, 2002: 157).[8] This view upholds the subordination of women in the church, asserting that men and women have different God ordained roles to perform in the church. The fundamental principle behind this theology/ideology is that, "because a woman is a woman, and for no other reason, she is locked into a permanent subordinate role, no matter what her abilities or training might be . . . her sexual identity determines her role" (Giles, 2002: 182).

It is my assertion that these views come from erroneous ideologically committed readings of culturally determined text, interpreted as though the culture of the Bible is God's decreed culture. In this thesis I aim to show that the marginalisation and subordination of women in the church based upon 1 Timothy 2:8-15 needs to be called into question and critically re-evaluated. My rationale for choosing this particular text is due to the importance that has been placed on it by those wishing to maintain the marginalisation and subordination of women in the church (Giles, 2002: 146-157, 165-166). Many Biblical scholars have maintained that the general perception regarding church ministry needs transforming; this includes the persons that are allowed to be ministers and those that are disallowed, and also includes aspects such as church liturgy and theology (Gaitskell, 1995: 228; Pattison, 1994: 254). I maintain that one of the ways to accomplish such transformation in ministry is via thorough exegesis of Scripture. And in particular, thorough exegesis of those Scriptural texts that have been ideologically interpreted and used to marginalise and subordinate women in the church. Together with Robbins (1996a: 41) I believe that a more inclusive and multidisciplinary approach to exegesis, such as Socio-Rhetorical Criticism (SRC),[9] offers interpreters the possibility of a more holistic analysis of any text (Robbins, 1996a: 41).

Though exegesis and particularly the use of SRC are not posited to be the only possible solution, I would argue that it plays an important part in solving the exegetical and interpretive problems associated with the subordination and marginalisation of women in the church. It is

[8] For my analysis of this passage of text I will be including verse 8, and in the chapters to follow, I will demonstrate why this is imperative to a more adequate understanding of this passage.

[9] More recently, the term SRC tends to be used for Socio-Rhetorical Commentary (Robbins, 2004b), and SRA (Socio-Rhetorical Analysis) now stands in place of Socio-Rhetorical Criticism as used in Robbins (1996a; 1996b). For the sake of coherence, however, I have opted to use the term SRC to refer to Socio Rhetorical Criticism so as to avoid any confusion with the bulk of the work cited in this thesis, which is taken from Robbins (1996a; 1996b).

thus my aim to apply Robbins' socio-rhetorical method for analysing texts to 1 Timothy 2:8-15, in an effort to achieve a more holistic exegesis of this text.

I contend, therefore, that a distorted view has been promulgated within the history of the church, and is still rife in different forms within churches today. This distorted view has been propagated on the false assumption that the Bible sanctions a patriarchal, superordinate, church leadership with subordinate, submissive, female congregants. Ruether (1988: 1-2) echoes a similar argument in her assertion that "[c]entral to Christianity is the claim that 'in Christ there is no more male and female', but what does this mean in the Christian tradition? . . . Liberation from sexist oppression in society? If women are equally redeemed by Christ, why has the Christian church continually reinforced sexism in society and in church" (Ruether, 1998: 1)?

My main research aim revolves around what I believe to be a pertinent question regarding the use of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 to authenticate the marginalisation of women in the church. This question asks a two prong, yet, interrelated question, namely, 'does 1 Timothy 2:8-15 reflect first century Greco-Roman culture, and if so, can we today superimpose such secular cultural values into our contemporary church life as normative Christian values?' Second, 'does the many ideological interpretations of this text need to be called into question and re-evaluated?' In this thesis I will demonstrate that 1 Timothy 2:8-15 does indeed reflect idiosyncratic first century Greco-Roman cultural values and traditions and therefore is time bound and cannot be superimposed as normative Christian standards suitable to contemporary times. This implies that the many ideological interpretations posited in many churches and by many people indeed does need to be called into question and critically re-evaluated. I aim to show this using Vernon Robbins' socio-rhetorical approach for analysing texts.

Methodology and Research Design

SRC is an approach that utilises rhetorical hermeneutics, which allows the dynamic and evolving knowledge of social-scientific modes of interpretation to interrelate "into practices of intricate, detailed exegesis of texts" (Robbins, 1996b: 1; 1998: 284). The hyphenated prefix 'socio' is suggestive of the benefits brought to this type of analysis by modern anthropology and sociology. With this in its purview, SRC supplants historical studies and moves into the trajectory of "cultural discourse, social contexts and sociological and anthropological theory" (Robbins, 1998: 288). Alternatively the word, 'rhetorical', identifies the manner in which

language contained in a text is a channel of communication and also focuses on the manner in which a text uses various subjects, themes and issues to communicate. By using the term 'rhetorical' this approach moves past the "limits of literary study to the interrelation of communication, theology, philosophy, and the social sciences" (1996b: 1; 1998: 288).

By placing multifaceted, specialised arenas of investigation in dialogue with each other, this systematic, textually anchored approach, "focuses on literary, social, cultural and ideological issues in texts" (Robbins,1996a: 1). This allows the interpreter to move interactively into various dimensions inherent in a text. Robbins (1996b: 3) identifies these dimensions as "textures," and claims that SRC aims at investigating the manifold "textures" found in texts. He further identifies these "textures" as: "inner texture," "intertexture," "social and cultural texture," "ideological texture" and "sacred texture" (1996a: 3; 1996b: 3; 2004a: 2).[10] For my research purposes, however, I have decided to restrict my investigation to the tools of investigation found in the first four of the previously mentioned 'textures'. The primary reason for this is due to spatial limitations, since the focus of this research serves the purpose of a 'minor' dissertation.

The basic methodology of a socio-rhetorical analysis requires the interpreter to create a conscious plan of reading and rereading a text from different angles, with consideration given to different phenomena implicit to the text. This type of interpretive method is what Robbins (2004a: 1) has termed, an "interpretive analytic." According to him this constitutes ". . . an approach that evaluates and reorients its strategies as it engages in multi-faceted dialogue with the texts and other phenomena that come within its purview" (2004a: 1). The end result of such an "interpretive analytic" is, "a richly textured and deeply reconfigured interpretation" (Robbins, 1996a: 3). The three areas of dialogue that are analysed by this method are, "the world created by the text, the world of the author and the world of the interpreter" (Robbins, 1996a: 40). These three aspects will be expounded upon in the course of this thesis.

My motivation for choosing SRC for doing New Testament exegesis, as opposed to the more traditional, historical critical approach, hinges on a few reasons. Firstly, SRC's multifaceted approach seeks to take seriously the complexity of written documents as social and cultural productions that function as persuasive communications. The widely used historical-critical method, though useful in its own rights, was not formulated to explore the internal

[10] Due to the progressive nature of SRC, sacred texture does not appear in Robbins' first book "the Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse" (Robbins, 1996a), however, it does appear in his second book, "Exploring the Texture of Texts" (Robbins, 1996b).

character of texts as written dialogue. Instead, its primary function was and continues to be the reconstruction of events, customs, traditions, convictions, that answers questions primarily pertaining to the historical epoch and theology of first century Christians, Christianity and Judaism (Robbins, 1996a: 8-9).

Secondly, SRC offers the possibility of a rich and complex analysis and interpretation of texts and given my goals in this thesis, SRC offers a way in which

> to bring the margins and boundaries into view, to invite the interpreter into the discourses that dwell in those marginal spaces, to criticize the dominating interpretive practices that exclude these marginal discourses and to seek discourses of emancipation for marginalized, embodied voices and actions in the text (Robbins,1996a: 11).

Also included in SRC are insights from "socio-linguistics, semiotics, rhetoric, ethnography, literary studies, social sciences, and ideological studies" (Robbins, 2004a: 1). The concluding interpretive analysis, based on this method of interpretation, that juxtaposes and sets various systems of thought into dialogue, results in an interpretation that is more interdisciplinary, broad-based and holistic (2004a).

There are a few implications that come with SRC as an interpretive method. Firstly, "[t]his model presents a 'system' approach to interpretation" (Robbins, 1996a: 41). This implies that deductions, assertions and approaches used in one area of analysis are perpetuated throughout the entire investigative process (1996a: 41). Secondly, "[s]ocio-rhetorical criticism uses a strategy of reading and rereading a text from different angles to produce a 'revalued' or 'revisited' rhetorical interpretation" (1996a: 41). The strength of this approach is that it allows the various research aspects of other disciplines to operate in their own arenas of specialty, while disallowing a single discipline to dominate the dialogue (1996a: 41). As a result "[n]o strategy of reading a text is excluded from the conversation." This does not imply that "anything goes." Instead, it suggests and invites dialogue from other disciplinary modes in an effort to illuminate each other's "insights and ideologies" (Robbins, 1998: 288). The end result is an interpretation that is more interdisciplinary and holistic (Robbins, 1996a: 41). Furthermore, this type of dialogue is based upon an "ethnography of orality, writing, and reading" (Robbins, 1998: 287). This refers to the fact that the primary concern of a socio-rhetorical interpretation is not solely

the text's content, but rather, the dialogue that takes place between the "content and its mode of production" (1998: 2 89).

Thirdly, "[s]ocio rhetorical interpretation uses the same strategies of analysis on other people's interpretations of the text under consideration as the strategies for analyzing the biblical text itself" (Robbins, 1996a: 41). This coincides with the inherent nature of socio-rhetorical analysis, which implies that both texts and interpretations of texts have the ability to "create history, society, culture, and ideology" (1996a: 41). This implication, therefore, disallows one interpretation from dictating and being authoritative in its claims, without itself being subjected to socio-rhetorical scrutiny (1996a: 41, 2004a).

As mentioned previously I will be implementing four of the five "textures" developed by Robbins' socio-rhetorical method. The reason for such a reliance upon Robbins (1996a; 1996b), is the fact that in this thesis two interrelated tasks are undertaken. First, this thesis is an attempt to gain mastery of an interpretive methodology, namely, socio-rhetorical analysis. Second, by looking at a crucial text that has major implications for the contemporary church, I have applied this method of analysis to a particular Scriptural text, namely, 1 Timothy 2:8-15. This being the case, I will, therefore, embark upon this research paper by patterning each main chapter after one of the four "textures" (Robbins, 1996a: 3 & 1996b: 3). Before this is done, however, I will firstly need to provide a rhetorical overview of 1 Timothy in order to locate 1 Timothy 2:8-15 within its proper rhetorical context. This process will comprise chapter two, namely: A Rhetorical Overview and Proposed Rhetorical Construction of 1 Timothy. Thus, this thesis will be comprised of the following main 'textual' chapters: Chapter Three: An Inner Textual Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:8-15; Chapter Four: An Intertextual Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:8-15; Chapter Five: A Social and Cultural Textual Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:8-15; Chapter Six: An Ideological Textual Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. Finally, I will provide a concluding chapter (chapter seven), in which I attempt to accomplish two basic tasks. Firstly, I will explicate and tie together the overall investigative process of this thesis, linking together some of the main aspects highlighted from the various chapters of this thesis. Secondly, I will highlight the fact that 1 Timothy 2:8-15 is culturally embedded in a patriarchal epoch and raise the question of whether contemporary Christians may in fact superimpose culturally bound values and imperatives of the secular Greco-Roman society into contemporary times as though they reflected normative Christian imperatives suitable for all times.

Before any discussion proceeds, however, I first have to mention two preliminary aspects that have a direct bearing upon this thesis. Due to the fact that this thesis endeavours to give a socio-rhetorical analysis of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, the question of authorship is not a primary concern because the text inscribes Paul as the author in the prescript to the letter (1:1-2).[11] Thus when I refer to Paul throughout this thesis I simply mean the Paul that the text describes as the author and am not referring to the historical Paul.[12] Similarly, when I mention the Ephesian church throughout this thesis, I am not referring to the historical Ephesian church, but rather the congregation that the text presents as the general recipients of Paul's instructions through his delegate Timothy (1 Timothy 1:3).[13]

[11] I am aware of the complex arguments pertaining to the authorship of 1 Timothy and am inclined to agree with Johnson (2001) that the letter is Pauline in origin, but from a socio-rhetorical perspective Paul is the author according to the text. The subject of authorship has and remains to be a moot issue among New Testament scholars. For a discussion upon such issues see Johnson (1996: 2-33); Kelly (1983: 30-36); Oden (1989: 14-15); Hanson. (1982: 2-11); Davies (1996: 105-118); Harding (2001: 9-27).

[12] It should also be noted that when I refer to the author of 1 Timothy, I mean Paul, since the text describes him as the author of the letter.

[13] The understanding of Timothy as Paul's delegate is gleaned from Johnson (1996).

Chapter Two

A Rhetorical Overview and Proposed Rhetorical Construction of 1 Timothy

In commenting on the rhetorical reading of a text Classen (1995: 428) depicts rhetorical reading as "reading a text in order to grasp the information it intends to impart, to understand its meaning or its message, that is, to see and appreciate the function of every single part of it as well as of the composition as a whole." This idea of seeing and appreciating the "composition" of a text as a "whole" or complete rhetorical unit, is the motivation and basis of this present chapter. With this in mind, in this chapter, I aim at sketching a rhetorical overview of 1 Timothy in an effort to locate 1Timothy 2:8-15 within its rhetorical context. This will be accomplished mainly with the aid of classical rhetoric and the terms and definitions found in the handbooks or progymnasmata, as well as from insight from current socio-rhetorical analysis. In order to achieve this aim I will first look at the implied narrative of 1 Timothy, which helps provide the rhetorical situation that is being addressed in the letter. I will then turn to an exploration of the rhetorical structure of the text, but in order to achieve this goal, I will first need to look at the type of discourse contained in the text and the rhetorical genre and arrangement with its main features. Once I have done this, I will be able to construct a rhetorical overview of 1 Timothy by which to locate 1Timothy 2:8-15 within its rhetorical purview.

(1) The Implied Narrative of 1 Timothy

Barr (1984: 41) commenting on a statement pertaining to literature made by Northrup Frye has remarked that one has to "begin with the actual experience of the work of literature, accepting for the time being the world it creates." Recently Robbins (2004a: 17-18) has described the way in which narrative texts elaborate "one verbal picture by means of additional pictures in a sequence." calling this rhetography, since the verbal pictures create a "graphic story" or "rhetography." Wanamaker (2003a: 197, 203-207), however, has shown that non-narrative texts also may have implicit narratives within their discourse, that is, they also create in the mind of the reader a rhetographic scenario. Taking into account what these three authors have posited pertaining to the discourse of a text and the worlds and pictures a discourse creates in the mind of the reader or listener, I will attempt to construct the implied narrative in 1 Timothy and its rhetography.

The implied narrative into which 1 Timothy fits can be read out of the discourse of the letter itself and offers insight into the rhetorical situation addressed by the letter. According to 1 Timothy 1:3 when Paul left the Roman province of Asia for a journey to Macedonia he left his coworker Timothy behind in Ephesus, the capital of the Roman province of Asia, to deal with certain doctrinal problems as well as certain tendencies among Christians to engage in speculative thought perhaps around the Jewish law (1 Timothy 1:4-7). At some point Paul writes to Timothy to confirm him in the task that he left him with and to encourage him in this work. But Paul also wrote to give Timothy specific instructions or possibly reminders around a whole range of issues, such as the appointment of overseers and deacons (3:1-13), the treatment of widows (5:3-16), and dealing with doctrinal error (4:1-3). Two people, Hymenaeus and Alexander, are explicitly mentioned as having rejected conscience and thus "suffered shipwreck in their faith" (1:19-20). Paul claims to have handed these two over to Satan in order to teach them not to blaspheme (1:20). This suggests relatively serious problems within the community that have necessitated Paul's intervention but it is unclear when and how this took place. At the time of writing Paul was uncertain about how quickly he would be able to return to Timothy at Ephesus and, therefore, wrote the letter to ensure that Timothy continued in the work that he had been given at the time of Paul's departure as Paul's delegate (3:14-15).[1]

First Timothy shows a great deal of concern regarding proper order in the running of the church as a divine household (3:15). This issue plays a crucial role in understanding the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 and will be clarified further in later chapters. What is important for the moment though is merely highlighting this significance. The letter also reveals a concern about doctrinal orthodoxy and proper practice. As a result Paul offers instructions on a wide range of issues in the life of the church. The following are the key issues: instruction regarding prayer (2:1-2; 8); instructions regarding women in general (2:9-15) and widows in particular (5:3-16); instructions regarding bishops (3:1-7) and elders (5:17-20); instructions regarding deacons (3:8-10,11-13); instructions specifically for Timothy (3:14-5:8, 21-25; 6:2b-21); and instructions regarding slaves (6:1-2a) and the rich (6:17-19). As we shall see, the nature of this material has a bearing on how we understand the rhetoric of the letter.

[1] The notion of Timothy as a delegate of Paul is taken from Johnson (1996: 105-210).

(2) Wisdom Rhetorolect and 1 Timothy

Robbins (2002: 30) has identified six major Christian rhetorolects that occur within New Testament literature and other early Christian writings. He defines a rhetorolect as ". . . a form of language variety or discourse identifiable on the basis of a distinctive configuration of themes, topics, reasonings, and argumentations" (1996a: 356). The six major Christian rhetorolects are, "wisdom, miracle, prophetic, suffering-death, apocalyptic, and pre-creation."[2] These six major rhetorical modes of discourse function in a dialectical process of interaction termed, "centripetal" and "centrifugal" rhetorical movement by Robbins (2002: 27). "Centripetal rhetorical movement" refers to "inner-directed" rhetorical movement, where "at one time and another" any of the six major rhetorical modes of discourse may occur at the center of the discourse (Robbins, 2002: 27). Alternatively, "centrifugal rhetorical movement" occurs when "at one time and another" any of the six major rhetorical modes of discourse may be driven "out into the other five rhetorical modes" (Robbins, 2002: 27). Robbins (2002: 30) mentions that a key task for rhetorical analysis is to explain the "centripetal-centrifugal interaction" of these discourses in the writings of the New Testament. Keeping these aspects in mind I will seek to establish which of the six major rhetorical modes of discourse predominates in the discourse of 1 Timothy in general, and more importantly for my research purpose, 1 Timothy 2:8-15, in particular.

Robbins (2002: 31) mentions that wisdom discourse in the Hellenistic era had a triple focus comprising, "(1) the relation of the created world to God; (2) the relation of humans to God; and (3) the relation of humans to one another as a result of the relation of God to the created world and to humans." He further asserts that the fundamental rule at the foundation of wisdom discourse is that "God is Father and Mother of all created things – which means that God is beneficent and just" (2002: 31). Also, the societal interactions and well-being of people set the basis for the main topics of wisdom discourse, with a particular emphasis upon the relations of "parent/child, patron/client host/guest, friendship, limited goods, honor/shame, life/death" (Robbins, 2002: 31).

[2] The suffering-death rhetorolect is now called "priestly." This change was signalled in a series of papers on priestly rhetorolect presented to the Rhetoric and the New Testament Seminar at the Society of Biblical Literature meeting 20 November, 2004 in San Antonio, TX (cited as Robbins, 2004c in the references section of this thesis). For further discussion of these six major rhetorical modes of discourse, see Robbins (2002: 31-63).

In light of this description of wisdom rhetorolect, it appears that the discourse of 1 Timothy is comprised "centripetally" (Robbins, 2002: 27) of wisdom discourse.[3] The reason for this is the letter's preponderance of aspects associated particularly with wisdom rhetorolect. This may be seen in the letter's emphasis on the societal interactions of people in their respective households (3:4, 5, 12; 6:1-2), the societal interactions of people in the household of God (3:15, 5:2-25), issues of propriety (2:9,15), domestic arrangements (2:15, 5:14), church leadership (3:1-12), the emphasis upon the relations of parent/child (2:15; 3:4, 12; 5:4, 10, 14), and honour/shame (2:9-14) that all play an important role in the letter.

Furthermore, Robbins (2004b) also speaks of wisdom rhetorolects blending human experiences of the household and the created world with the cultural space of God's cosmos. In the space of blending, "God functions as heavenly Father over God's children in the world, who are to produce goodness and righteousness through the medium of God's wisdom (light)" (Robbins, 2004b). Wisdom rhetorolect, therefore, also concerns itself with productivity and reproductivity. And, the main purpose of the conceptual blending functions to form people who produce "good, righteous action, thought, will, and speech with the aid of God's light, which equals God's wisdom which certain people speak on earth" (Robbins, 2004b). First Timothy demonstrates a particular emphasis on people producing good deeds which may be seen by the text's recurrent mentioning of this topic in 2:1; 5:10, 5:25 and 6:18. This aspect too, further attests to the predominance of wisdom rhetorolect within 1 Timothy. Wisdom discourse, however, is not the only major rhetorical discourse present in 1 Timothy since other rhetorolects are present, e.g., 1:17 and 6:15-16 are perhaps prophetic and precreation blended. And, 1 Timothy 4:1 and 6:19 seems to comprise apocalyptic discourse.

First Timothy 2:8-15 in particular also seems to be based primarily upon wisdom discourse, which may be seen in its emphasis on normative household based relations.[4] Three examples of this may be seen in the passage. First, women are to be quiet in the public setting of the church and are to be submissive to the men of the congregation (vv. 11). Second, women are not allowed to teach or to have authority over men, but must be silent (v. 12). Third, women are to be domesticated to the private household sphere of life (v 15).

[3] Robbins (2002: 37) comes to the same conclusion and asserts that wisdom discourse plays a centripetal role in 1-2 Timothy.

[4] See Malina & Neyrey (1996: 177, 179); Balch (1981:52-53) for a discussion of why these aspects may be construed as normative household relations. Also see chapter three and four for further evidence for seeing household tradition within 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

Furthermore the emphasis upon good works in v. 10 also seems to suggest that vv. 8-15 is primarily comprised of wisdom rhetorolect. According to Robbins (2002: 31-32) the main types of argument in wisdom discourse are: "thesis, rationale, contrary, opposite, analogy, example, and authoritative judgment." He mentions further that these types of arguments are so intrinsic to wisdom discourse "that one finds them already in Ancient Near Eastern literature, many centuries before the Hellenistic period" (2002: 32). These types of argumentation too are apparent in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. First, in v. 13-14 a rationale is given for the assertion made in vv. 11-12. Second, contrary statements appear in the passage with the use of six negative references. The first contrary statement prohibits women from dressing in a certain manner and uses three negative references (v. 9). The fourth and fifth negative references appear simultaneously and function to prohibit women from teaching (v. 12a), and having authority over men (v. 12b). And, the sixth negative reference seems to be facilitating a statement defending Adam (as representative male), from real culpability in the first act of human sin (v. 14). From this brief discussion it would seem, therefore, that the discourse of 1 Timothy in general, and 1 Timothy 2:8-15, in particular, is comprised "centripetally" (Robbins, 2002: 27) of wisdom discourse due to its preponderance of features characteristic of this rhetorolect.

(3) The Rhetorical Genre and Arrangement of 1 Timothy

Over the last three decades, scholars have shown renewed interest in the relevance of ancient rhetoric for the analysis of early Christian text, for example Kennedy (1984). This interest reflects the fact that first century Greco-Roman culture was steeped in the use of rhetoric. Various scholars have shown that an understanding of classical rhetoric can assist in the analysis of text like 1 Timothy (Eriksson, 2002a, 2002b; Watson & Hauser, 1994). Going back to Aristotle classical rhetoric recognised three species or genres of rhetoric based on the type of social situations being addressed. These three genres are traditionally called judicial, deliberative and demonstrative or epideictic rhetoric (Harding, 1998: 187-194; Kennedy, 1984: 36).[5] Judicial rhetoric was the rhetoric of the law court where the audience was asked to make a decision about something which was alleged to have happened in the past. Deliberative rhetoric was the rhetoric of the political forum where people were asked to decide on a course of action for the future on the basis of advantage and disadvantage to the

[5] For further delineation of these three species of rhetoric, see Lausberg (1998: 63-111); Mack (1990: 34); Russel & Wilson (1981: xix); Stowers (1986: 51).

city-state or empire, in the case of Rome. Epideictic rhetoric was focused on encouragement of good behaviour through praise and blame during public occasions like funerals (Harding, 1998: 187-188; Kennedy, 1994: 3). Kennedy (1994: 4) mentions that

> The concept of epideictic rhetoric, however, needs to be broadened beyond Aristotle's definition. In later antiquity, some rhetoricians included within it all poetry and prose. Perhaps epideictic rhetoric is best regarded as any discourse that does not aim at a specific action but is intended to influence the values and beliefs of the audience.

Thus, one of the primary aims of epideictic rhetoric was to increase the adherence and assent to certain presently held values and beliefs inherent within both the author and the hearers (Black, 1991: 72; Kennedy, 1984: 19; Watson, 1991: 192).[6]

Most scholars agree that a particular discourse may contain more than one particular species of rhetoric (Stowers, 1986: 23, 51-52; Kennedy, 1984: 19, 74). It is also, however, generally agreed that one species normally predominates in a discourse reflecting the author's primary intention (Kennedy, 1984: 19; Mack, 1990: 34-35; Stowers, 1986: 23).[7] Several features of 1 Timothy suggest that the letter is primarily epideictic in character. First, there is no legal element to the discussion in 1 Timothy, thus ruling out the possibility that it contains primarily judicial rhetoric. Second, no real decisions are required about future courses of action, and thus the discourse cannot be regarded as primarily deliberative rhetoric. Instead, Timothy is asked to re-enforce what the community already knows about what they are to do and how they are to live. Harding (1998: 194) confirms this view when he mentions that what Paul assented to, the audience/ Ephesian community also assented to, and that Paul was appealing for transformation of "behaviour and perceptions on the basis of what is already held in common and affirmed by both writer and audience."[8] Third, good behaviour is encouraged through praise and blame in the letter. Virtue is praised and vices are to be avoided, as for example in respect to the overseers and the deacons in 3:1-13, as well as widows in 5:1-16. It seems, therefore, that the discourse of 1 Timothy is primarily epideictic in nature.

---

[6] Russel and Wilson (1981: xx) mention that, although epideictic rhetoric has as its primary focus the dealings of a present situation, this does not disallow aspects of either the past or future from being mentioned in the discourse.

[7] Harding (1998: 180) differs and suggests that none of the Pastoral Epistles are subject to this sort of rhetorical delineation. In a more recent publication, however, he asserts that the Pastorals are epideictic in mood (Harding, 2001: 86).

[8] This aspect will be described more adequately in the section of enthymemic analysis in the following chapter. For further delineation of this see Harding (1984: 194); Fiore (1986: 15-16).

As demonstrated from the writings of Cicero and Quintilian, classical rhetorical teaching comprised five main parts, two of which will be discussed here.[9] "Invention" forms the first part of classical rhetoric and concerns "thinking out the subject matter: with identifying the question at issue, which is called the stasis of the speech, and the available means of persuading the audience to accept the speaker's position" (Kennedy, 1994: 4). According to Kennedy (1994: 4) the means of persuasion comprises two main aspects. First, "direct evidence," which is made up of "witnesses and contracts" which the speaker utilises but does not "invent" (1994: 4). Second, "artistic" means of persuasion which comprises depiction of the "speaker's character (*ēthos*) as trustworthy, logical argument (*logos*) that may convince the audience" (1994: 4-5). Kennedy (1994: 5) further mentions that the artistic means of persuasion makes use of "topics," which are moral or political tactics, namely, arguing from cause to effect. Also, a speaker can employ topics, "many of which became traditional, to gain the trust or the interest of the audience." And, the "importance of the case can be stressed, not only for the speaker, but as a precedent for further decisions or for its effect on society" (Kennedy, 1994: 5).

The second part of classical rhetoric is "arrangement" (Kennedy, 1994: 5). Kennedy asserts that "arrangement" refers to the construction of a speech into different parts, although the order in which arguments are presented is also discussed at times. He mentions further that rhetoricians often struggled to divide the discussion of arrangement from the discussion of invention and frequently combined the two into "an account of the intentional features of each part of a speech" (1994: 5). The basic divisions represented by the handbooks or progymnasmata are called the: (1) *exordium* or introduction; (2) *narratio* or narrative; (3) *probatio* or proofs and (4) *peroratio* or conclusion (Lausberg, 1998: 102-136, 160, 204; Hester, 1991: 293). What follows is a brief explication of these rhetorical features in order to provide the basis for my analysis of the rhetorical arrangement of 1 Timothy and their application in 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

[9] For a discussion of all five parts of classical rhetoric see Kennedy (1994: 4-10).

As demonstrated from the writings of Cicero and Quintilian, classical rhetorical teaching comprised five main parts, two of which will be discussed here.[9] "Invention" forms the first part of classical rhetoric and concerns "thinking out the subject matter: with identifying the question at issue, which is called the stasis of the speech, and the available means of persuading the audience to accept the speaker's position" (Kennedy, 1994: 4). According to Kennedy (1994: 4) the means of persuasion comprises two main aspects. First, "direct evidence," which is made up of "witnesses and contracts" which the speaker utilises but does not "invent" (1994: 4). Second, "artistic" means of persuasion which comprises depiction of the "speaker's character (*ēthos*) as trustworthy, logical argument (*logos*) that may convince the audience" (1994: 4-5). Kennedy (1994: 5) further mentions that the artistic means of persuasion makes use of "topics," which are moral or political tactics, namely, arguing from cause to effect. Also, a speaker can employ topics, "many of which became traditional, to gain the trust or the interest of the audience." And, the "importance of the case can be stressed, not only for the speaker, but as a precedent for further decisions or for its effect on society" (Kennedy, 1994: 5).

The second part of classical rhetoric is "arrangement" (Kennedy, 1994: 5). Kennedy asserts that "arrangement" refers to the construction of a speech into different parts, although the order in which arguments are presented is also discussed at times. He mentions further that rhetoricians often struggled to divide the discussion of arrangement from the discussion of invention and frequently combined the two into "an account of the intentional features of each part of a speech" (1994: 5). The basic divisions represented by the handbooks or progymnasmata are called the: (1) *exordium* or introduction; (2) *narratio* or narrative; (3) *probatio* or proofs and (4) *peroratio* or conclusion (Lausberg, 1998: 102-136, 160, 204; Hester, 1991: 293). What follows is a brief explication of these rhetorical features in order to provide the basis for my analysis of the rhetorical arrangement of 1 Timothy and their application in 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

[9] For a discussion of all five parts of classical rhetoric see Kennedy (1994: 4-10).

(3.1) *Exordium*

The major purpose of the *exordium* or *prooimion* (the Greek equivalent), as described by the ancient handbooks or progymnasmata, fulfilled three major tasks pertaining to the audience. First, it was used to gain the good will of the hearer by creating attentiveness, receptivity, and, agreement or sympathy to the message of the rhetor. Second, it was used to create the *ethos* or character and credibility of the rhetor, which served to validate the message and create *pathos* (arousal of emotion) from the audience. Third, it was used to suggest the themes to be treated in the *probatio* (Watson, 2003: 283-285; Stowers, 1986: 22; Jewett, 1986: 76). As described by most modern scholars of rhetoric the *exordium* also served to inform the audience of what will be said in the discourse, introduce the main subjects, contest any misrepresentations, signal the social relationships and function of the rhetoric, allude to the focus and objectives of the *probatio*, and also to that which will be reemphasized in the *peroratio* (Watson, 2003: 283-285; Johnson, 1996: 42-43).

Watson (1997: 409) says that within the *exordium* of Pauline letters there resides a "tripartite structure . . . of the documentary letter opening." This mainly comprises of: (1) sender(s), (2) addressee(s), and, (3) greeting, but often this is extended with other descriptions and theological themes to describe Paul and his addressee(s).[10] In 1 Timothy this epistolary feature appears in vv. 1-2 and serves to establish Paul's *ethos* as a divinely appointed apostle of Christ Jesus through the command of God. The prescript describes Paul as the sender of the letter and Timothy as the recipient.

Several aspects of 1 Timothy 1:3-11 seem to suggest that this part of the letter constitutes the rhetorical *exordium*. First, this passage is used to gain the good will of the recipient of the letter (Timothy), by creating agreement or sympathy from Timothy to Paul's message to him. The discourse does this by reminding Timothy of a past instruction given to him by Paul concerning doctrinal problems and certain tendencies among Christians to engage in speculative thought perhaps around the Jewish law (vv. 3-4). Second, this passage serves to create the *ethos* or character and credibility of Paul by describing him as one who is specifically entrusted with correct doctrinal teaching (vv. 10) as well as one specifically endowed with special authority from God (v. 11). Paul's *ethos* subsequently also serves a further purpose, that is, to validate his message and create *pathos* (arousal of emotion) from the audience. Third, this passage points to the themes to be treated in the discourse. From

[10] For further illustration of this see 1 Macc. 10:18, 11:30, 12:6; 2 Macc. 9:19, 11:16.

vv. 3-11, the only apparent themes that appear to be identifiable from the text seem to be that of doctrinal error (vv. 3-4, 7-10), possibly around the Law (torah), and the theme of sound doctrine, entrusted to Paul by God (v. 10-11). Fourth, this passage serves to introduce the main topics of the letter. From the discourse of vv. 3-11, the main topics appear to be: God's work (v. 4), faith (vv. 4-5), love (v. 5), a pure heart (v. 5), and a good conscience (v. 5). From the above discussion, it appears probable, therefore, that vv. 3-11 be regarded as the rhetorical *exordium* of 1 Timothy.

(3.2) *Narratio*

According to Watson (1991: 199) the *narratio* presents the concern for which the *exordium* has "striven to obtain the audience's attention, receptivity, and goodwill." He goes on to mention that it is not an obligatory aspect of epideictic rhetoric except when recalling "a deed which is the subject of the rhetoric" (1991:199). Quintilian emphasises this recollective aspect of the *narratio* and further mentions its persuasive nature by asserting narration to be "the persuasive exposition of that which either has been done, or is supposed to have been done" (Quintilian cited in Hall, 1991: 310). Thus narration served not only to mention or recall a past event, which is why it was almost obligatory in judicial rhetoric, but rather, has the purpose of highlighting, influencing and persuading the audience with regard to something specific intended by the author/rhetor. Lausberg (1998: 137) further posits that the *narratio* is the basis upon which the *probatio* (*argumentatio* or proof) is structured, and may further also function to establish the author's *ethos*.

With regard to the discourse of 1 Timothy, it appears that 1 Timothy 1:12-17 best suits the rhetorical function of the *narratio* as it recalls and describes the past event of Paul's salvation. In this part of the letter Paul narrates his conversion experience, which serves to establish his *ethos,* and then turns to Timothy's position, making an appeal to him through *pathos.*[11]

An often implicit but not mandatory aspect of the *narratio* is the *digressio* or digression. Technically this may refer to all expressions of emotion, amplification, and response to opposition from the audience and when present, this feature may be found at the start, middle, or end of the *narratio* (Lausberg, 1998: 158). The transition from the *narratio*

[11] See Wanamaker (2000: 277) where he comments on Wuellner's analysis of the *narratio* of 1 Thessalonians, and further confirms the rhetorical purpose of the *narratio* as serving to establish the author's *ethos* and appealing to the *pathos* of his audience.

to the *probatio* may occur in two ways, using emotional or rational possibilities. The former uses digression, whereas, the latter uses proposition. An emotional digression that occurs at the ending of the *narratio* either elicits joy (cheer) or anger, depending on the subject of the *narratio* and the audience. A transition using proposition or *propositio* at the end of a *narratio* serves the purpose of summarising the *narratio* (Lausberg, 1998: 160). Within the discourse of 1 Timothy, a possible rhetorical *transitus* using an emotional appeal occurs at 1:18-20, which marks the transition from the *narratio* to the *probatio*, in which Paul prepares for the instruction to be given in 2:1-6:10.

(3.3) *Probatio*

Lausberg (1998: 160-161) asserts that the *probatio* or *argumentatio* is, "the central, decisive part of the speech . . ." formulated by the *exordium* and *narratio*. As a component of the entire discourse the *probatio* comprises of a minimum of one proof, but usually many proofs are evident (Lausberg, 1998: 161). According to Watson (1991: 200) the proofs are normally not "formal proofs, but amplification of *topoi* [topics] and statements advanced as certain." Such amplification is usually concise, orderly and frequent in occurrence; and it deals with the life of the person(s) praised (or blamed) or the qualities of the subject being reflected (Kennedy, 1984: 24; Watson, 1991: 200). Watson (1991: 200) shows that typical *topoi* (topics) of epideictic rhetoric concern aspects such as what is noble or disgraceful and issues pertaining to virtue and vice. He further mentions that when formal proof is used, it usually comprises ethical arguments or enthymemes (1991: 200).

Several factors point to the probability that 1 Timothy 2:1-6:10 should be construed as the *probatio* of the discourse. First, this part of the letter is steeped with specific instructions or possibly reminders around a whole range of key issues or topics and their amplification, given to Timothy from Paul. Some of the topics mentioned in this part of the letter deal with the following issues: prayer (vv. 1-2); gender relations in the public worship setting and possibly also the household (vv. 8-15); the appointment of overseers and deacons (3:1-13); the running of the church as a divine household (3:15); dealing with doctrinal error (4:1-3); the treatment of widows (5:3-16); and instructions regarding slaves (6:1-2a) and the rich (6:17-19). Second, a common feature of a *probatio*, namely, issues related to the life of the person(s) praised (or blamed) or the qualities of the subject being reflected (Kennedy, 1984: 24; Watson, 1991: 200) occur in this part of the letter. This may be seen for example in the delineation of praise and blame to certain people through the encouragement of virtue and the

discouragement of vice. Two examples of this aspect are the instructions pertaining to overseers and deacons in 1 Timothy 3:1-12 and also widows in 5:1-16. From this brief discussion and keeping in mind the previous discussion of the *exordium* and *narratio* it seems appropriate to the general context of the letter that 1 Timothy 2:1-6:10 be considered as the *probatio* of the letter.

(3.4) *Peroratio*

The *peroratio* has two main objectives. Firstly, it functions to revive the memory of the audience through reiteration of the core objectives or propositions of the *probatio*. And secondly, it functions to stir audience emotions (*pathos*) through amplification so as to support the author/rhetor's objectives (Lausberg, 1998: 204; Watson, 1991: 204). Furthermore epideictic rhetoric does not necessitate a *peroratio*, "but, because amplification occurs throughout the discourse, if a *peroratio* is used, a brief summary is all that is needed" (Watson, 1991: 204). In ancient letters the *peroratio* normally comprised "greetings, a health wish, and/or words of farewell" (Watson, 1997: 425). Pauline letters, however, comprise of a slightly different structure replacing the latter two aspects with a doxology and benediction but maintaining the normal greeting aspect (Watson, 1997: 425).[12] The *peroratio* of 1 Timothy appears at 1 Timothy 6:11-21 and functions primarily to further instruct and admonish Timothy to accomplish the ministry which had been entrusted into his care thus reconfirming the message of the *probatio*.

My primary objective in this chapter has been to view 1 Timothy as a complete rhetorical unit, sketching a rhetorical overview of 1 Timothy, in an effort firstly, to locate 1Timothy 2:8-15 within its rhetorical context so as to facilitate a more adequate analysis of this text for future chapters in this thesis. And secondly, to discover Paul's "rhetorical strategies" implemented in this discourse, in order to comprehend more adequately his "persuasive intent" in the letter (Wanamaker, 2000: 273).[13] This has been attempted mainly with the aid of classical rhetoric with a particular focus upon the rhetorical genre and arrangement of 1 Timothy, as well as wisdom rhetorolects in current socio-rhetorical analysis.

[12] The main focus of this chapter is aimed at providing a rhetorical overview of 1 Timothy so as to identify how 2:8-15 fits within its rhetorical context. Due to this purpose I have not expounded extensively upon the rhetorical features contained in this sub-section, but have merely sketched a very brief explication of their main rhetorical tenets and their relation to 1 Timothy. For a more in depth investigation of these rhetorical features see Jewett (1986); Kennedy (1984); Lausberg (1998); Mack (1990); Stowers (1986); Watson, (1991; 1997).

[13] The aspect of the author's 'persuasive intent' or purposive argumentation will be dealt with in the following chapter, under the subheading argumentative texture.

The benefit of examining these rhetorical aspects is that they provide a basic cadre for understanding the letter and allow me to view 1 Timothy 2:8-15 within a more holistic and contextual purview.

One of the most important aspects highlighted by this chapter, in particular for this thesis, is that 1 Timothy 2:8-15 may be located squarely within the *probatio* of the rhetoric, which as Lausberg (1998: 160-161) asserts, is the "the central, decisive part of the speech . . ." Or rather the part of the discourse where the main proofs occur, or in this case where the main topics are discussed. This implies that the discourse in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 plays a central role in Paul's entire rhetorical argumentation in 1 Timothy.

Having now located 1 Timothy 2:8-15 within its rhetorical location, in the next chapter I will investigate the inner texture of this text. By doing this I hope to unravel rhetorical clues, patterns and ideas that will facilitate a more adequate understanding of the message contained within this unit of discourse.

Chapter Three

The Inner Texture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15

The *probatio* begins in 2:1 with a series of instructions. The first instruction concerns prayer in various modes (Johnson, 2001: 189) being made for all people, especially for kings and other ruling officials, with the goal of enabling the Christian community to lead an existence untroubled by outsiders (v. 2). The motivation for this prayer activity is then given in vv. 3-4 where Paul indicates that this is what God wants and expects. Verse 4 implies that the primary goal of an untroubled existence is tied to the fact that God's desire that all humanity be joined to the people of God (v. 4) (Johnson, 2001: 191).[1] The words that follow in vv. 5-6 appear to offer an explanation of what Paul means by the "knowledge of the truth" in v. 4 and leads to Paul's explanation of his own role in the process of leading all people to the truth in v. 7. If 2:1-2 instructs that prayer be made for everyone, v. 8 reconfirms that instruction with specific reference to the manner in which men, but not women, should engage in public prayer during worship. Finally, in 2:9-15 Paul gives a further two instructions regarding women in the worshipping community of the church. The first of the instructions balances the instruction to men in v. 8 and in fact is governed by the main verb of v. 8, βούλομαι ("I desire") (Johnson, 2001: 204). The rest of the discourse, however, which is dedicated to instructing women (vv. 9-15), creates a noticeable imbalance in contrast to the amount of time given to instructing men (v. 8). In v. 8 Paul only tangentially instructs men to pray in an appropriate manner.[2] In the rest of the discourse (vv. 9-15), however, an excessive amount of time is dedicated to instructing women in a way that is intended to reinforce androcentric cultural norms that seek to control women's behaviour, particularly in the public arena of the church meeting, but also in the household.[3] In connection to this Towner (1989: 219) asserts, "[i]t is clear from the amount of

[1] See Johnson (2001: 191) who argues that v. 4 is less about future salvation and more about the "sociological referent" of people belonging to the people of God in the present time.

[2] Gritz (1991: 124) believes that the instruction for men to pray in v. 8, also applies to women.

[3] Biblical scholars are divided in their interpretations of vv. 9-15. Some maintain that vv. 9-15 relates only to public worship with the main topic of the discourse being the behaviour of the sexes at worship (Witherington, 1992: 191-196; Kelly, 1983: 65; Johnson, 1996: 132-141). Other scholars argue, however, that vv. 9-15 addresses women in general, whether in the home or in public worship (Dibelius and Conzelmann, 1977: 44-49; Hanson, 1982: 70-71; Holmes, 2000: 95). It is my view that vv. 9-15 should be regarded as an instruction for women (in general), particularly directed to women and their role in the public arena of the church meeting, but also implicitly their role in the household. This notion will be clarified further in the sub-section of this chapter dealing with argumentative texture.

space given to instructing the women that the more pressing issue was that of the propriety and role of women, particularly in relation to teaching and holding authority over men (or misappropriating it), within the worship assembly."[4]

What follows in this chapter is an analysis of the inner texture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. Robbins (1996b: 7) mentions that

> The inner texture of a text resides in features in the language of the text itself, like repetition of words and use of dialogue between two persons to communicate the information. In other words, inner texture is the texture of the medium of communication. With written texts, the inner texture especially resides in verbal texture—the texture of the language itself.

Inner texture, therefore, occurs and concerns itself with the area of communication between the implied author, narrator and characters in a text. At this stage of analysis, investigation is concerned solely with what happens inside the text between word-phrase and narrational patterns that generate "argumentative and aesthetic patterns in texts" (Robins, 1996a: 29). No thought is given to the real author as communicator or the real audience as recipients of the text.

Inner textual analysis is directed at achieving an intimate understanding of "words, word patterns, voices, structures, devices, and modes in the text, which are the context for meanings and meaning-effects that an interpreter analyzes with the other readings of the text" (Robbins, 1996b: 7).[5] Commensurately, achieving such an intimate understanding of the text is the main reason for embarking upon an inner textual analysis of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. By probing and investigating the inner texture of this rhetorical unit, I hope to unravel rhetorical clues, patterns and ideas that will facilitate a better understanding of the meaning(s) and message(s) contained in this textual unit. Within the broader scope of this paper, an inner textual analysis is, therefore, integral to my research aim, which revolves around extracting a more adequate and holistic exegetical analysis of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. Six subtextures of inner texture have been proposed and developed within SRC, namely: (1) repetitive; (2) progressive; (3) narrational; (4) opening-middle-closing; (5) argumentative and (6) sensory-aesthetic textures (1996a: 46; 1996b: 7).[6]

[4] Also see Fee (1988: 10) who comes to a similar conclusion.
[5] Cf., Robbins (1996c).
[6] In Robbins (1996a: 46) five types of inner texture are identified: repetitive-progressive, opening-middle-closing, narrational, argumentative, and sensory aesthetic. Robbins (1996b: 7) suggests that "repetitive-progressive" texture is actually two separate categories rather than a single category, therefore, creating six and not five types of inner

By programmatically applying these six subtextures to the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, I aim to achieve the above stated inner textual purposes, while extracting the inherent 'meaning and meaning effects' of this rhetorical unit. In so doing I hope to create a framework in which to place 1 Timothy 2:8-15 that will serve to provide a context within which to analyse this text further using the other socio-rhetorical textures in latter chapters. What follows below under each subtexture, therefore, is firstly, a brief definition and clarification of some of the main rhetorical features of each subtexture. And secondly, my application of each subtexture, with their respective main features, as applied to the rhetorical unit of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 including my suggestions and findings.

(1) Repetitive Texture

Repetitive texture occurs when a word or phrase is repeated more than once in a rhetorical unit. Numerous occurrences of several diverse types of "grammatical, syntactical, verbal, or topical phenomena" may result in repetitive texture (Robbins, 1996b: 8). Among the reasons for investigating this inner textual feature is that it frequently offers initial insight into the general rhetorical movement of a text and helps create an initial picture or mental image from the discourse. It also draws attention to important characters and topics that occur within the text (Robbins, 1996b: 8; Combrink, 2003: 2).

Robbins (1996b: 8) mentions that "[p]atterns of repetition appear most clearly when the interpreter first marks the repeated words somehow in the text itself, then exhibits them in some kind of systematic diagram." What follows below is my proposed representation of the repetitive patterns that occur in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. I will be using the Greek New Testament and the New International Version (NIV) of the Bible, to demonstrate the repetition that occurs in this text. To better illustrate the repetition found in 1 Timothy 2:8-15, and to facilitate the reader in identifying it, I will be using different colour fonts together with bold font.[7] This can be seen beneath:

texture. I have opted to follow the latter representation. Watson (2002:143) commenting on this argues that six, rather than five subtextures "seems prudent."

[7] This idea is gleaned and extended from (Robbins, 1996a: 46), were he comments on Tannehill's presentation and discussion of Luke 6:37-38 and asserts that Tannehill's presentation lacks italics and bold print to aid the reader in identifying the results of his investigation.

(8) βούλομαι οὖν προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ. (9) ὡσαύτως [καὶ] γυναῖκας ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς, μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ, (10) ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν, δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν. (11) γυνὴ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μανθανέτω ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ· (12) διδάσκειν δὲ γυναικὶ οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω οὐδὲ αὐθεντεῖν ἀνδρός, ἀλλ' εἶναι ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ. (13) Ἀδὰμ γὰρ πρῶτος ἐπλάσθη, εἶτα Εὔα. (14) καὶ Ἀδὰμ οὐκ ἠπατήθη, ἡ δὲ γυνὴ ἐξαπατηθεῖσα ἐν παραβάσει γέγονεν· (15) σωθήσεται δὲ διὰ τῆς τεκνογονίας, ἐὰν μείνωσιν ἐν πίστει καὶ ἀγάπῃ καὶ ἁγιασμῷ μετὰ σωφποσύνης·

(8) I want men everywhere to lift up holy hands in prayer, without anger or disputing. (9) I also want women to dress modestly, with decency and propriety, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or expensive clothes (10) but with good deeds, appropriate for women who profess to worship God. (11) A woman should learn in quietness and full submission. (12) I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent. (13) For Adam was formed first, then Eve [was formed].[8] (14) And Adam was not the one deceived; it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner. (15) But women [Greek she] will be saved through childbearing, if they continue in faith, love and holiness with propriety [1 Timothy 2:8-15 (NIV)].[9]

With the use of the colour coded repetitive construction of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 depicted above, the main repetitive features occurring in the text may be noted as follows. Firstly, three plural references to the subject of "women" occur in vv. 9, 10 and 15.[10] Secondly, two references to the topic of "propriety" occur in the discourse in vv. 9, 15. Thirdly, six negative references

[8] My parenthesis.
[9] My parenthesis.
[10] The third reference to women in the Greek text uses the nominative pronoun "they" which is contained in the verb "μείνωσιν" and is treated as a feminine pronoun on the basis of the context. A very important exegetical question beginning at v. 9 and that has important interpretive implications for the entire text, is, should the plural references to "women" in vv. 9, 10, 15 and the singular "woman" in vv. 11, 12, 14, 15 be interpreted as "women" in general or "wife?" My stance on this question as well as further delineation on this will be clarified in the section of this chapter dealing with argumentative texture. Until that section is dealt with, however, I will simply view this reference as referring to "women" in general as opposed to "wives" without any further discussion as to my reasons for this stance.

occur in vv. 9, 12, 14. Fifthly, five singular references to the word "woman" or pronouns with the "woman" as their antecedent occur in vv. 11, 12, 14, 15.[11] Two references to the topic of "quietness" occur in vv. 11 and 12. Two references to the character "Adam" in vv.13 and 14, and two parallel references to the character "Eve," explicitly mentioned in v. 13 and implied in v. 14.[12] The last repetitive reference refers to the topic of "deception," in v. 14.

Previously it has been mentioned, that the repetitive texture of a rhetorical unit often signals attention to important characters and topics within the discourse. The only two characters observed from the repetitive texture are Adam and Eve (vv. 13, 14). The main subject identified by the repetitive texture is that of woman/women and is mentioned throughout the discourse (vv. 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15). Three main topics are highlighted by the repetitive texture. Firstly, "propriety" (vv. 9, 15), which forms a rhetorical *inclusio* around the discourse relating to the subject of woman/women and brackets in the instructions given to them.[13] Secondly, the topic of "quietness" is emphasised by the prepositional phrase ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ in vv. 11, 12, and also forms an *inclusio*, which places direct emphasis upon the command given to women in these verses. Also noticeable at the beginning of v. 11 is the lack of a conjunction (asyndeton), which also serves to emphasise the contents of v. 11. Eriksson (1998:91) confirms the notion and significance of *inclusio* and instead of seeing such repetition as merely redundant,[14] he argues

> Such repetition is however a well-known rhetorical figure used "for the purpose of amplification." *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* claims that: "The reiteration of the same word makes a deep impression upon the hearer and inflicts a major wound upon the opposition—as if a weapon should repeatedly pierce the same part of the body" (Ad Her. 4.28.38).[15]

The third main topic to be highlighted by the repetitive texture of the text is "deception" (v. 14). In v. 14 two different words for deception appear in the Greek. Firstly, "ἠπατήθη"

---

[11] The two singular references to woman in the Greek text use the nominative pronoun "she" in vv. 12, 15 which is contained in the verbs εἶναι and σωθήσεται, and is treated as a feminine pronoun on the basis of the context.
[12] The repetitive reference to Eve has been underlined in the text as opposed to colour coded, primarily because this repetition is implied in the reference to woman in v. 14, and has already been colour coded.
[13] See Kennedy (1984: 34) for further clarification regarding an *inclusio*.
[14] See Miller (1997: 73) who sees the phrase ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ simply as a redundancy with no particular significance.
[15] He also cites Quintilian's assertion as evidence against seeing repetition as redundancy, namely, "[w]hat pleasure can an orator hope to produce, or what impression even of the most modest learning, unless he knows how to fix one point in the minds of the audience by repetition?" (*Inst.* 9.1.33, 9.2.4). Also see Mounce (2000: 117, 119, 120), who also notes the *inclusio* in vv. 11-12 and its purpose of providing emphasis or amplification of the topic of "quietness."

which is used in the text to refer to the fact that Adam was not deceived. And secondly, "ἐξαπατηθεῖσα," which is used in the text to refer to the fact that Eve was deceived. The difference between these two Greek words, however, is significant. The latter of the two Greek words is the intensified form of the word. The author, therefore, chooses the intensified form of the word "deception" to describe what happened to Eve, thus intensifying the sense of her deception.

Another aspect that can be observed from the repetitive texture, as intimated above, is the mentioning of six negative references. On three occasions the negative reference, "not" is used, functioning to prohibit women from certain actions. The first occurrence prohibits women from dressing in a certain manner and uses three negative references (v. 9). The fourth and fifth negative references appear simultaneously and function to prohibit women from teaching (v. 12a), and having authority over men (v. 12b). The sixth negative reference seems to be facilitating a statement defending Adam (as representative male), from real culpability in the first act of human sin. In the text it appears as, "Also, Adam was *not* deceived. . ." (v. 14).

(2) Progressive Texture

Progressive Texture resides in sequences of words and phrases throughout a text and appears through repetition. Repetition itself may be construed as a type of progression, since a progression takes place from the initial occurrence of a word or phrase in the discourse to other occurrences of that word or phrase throughout the discourse. Attention to progression within repetition, however, adds more dimensions to the investigation and may lead to three basic observations. Firstly, it may lead to clarification about progressive texture in the entire span of a text. Secondly, it may display phenomena that possibly will lead to analysis of further phenomena in the text, and thirdly, it may reveal sequences of subunits within a rhetorical unit (Robbins, 1996b: 10).

Robbins (1996a: 48) states that at this juncture of socio-rhetorical investigation, the interpreter allocates merely basic lexical significance to the words in the text. The reason being that the interpreter's primary concern here is the exploration of "primary process and form, structured movement that produces meaning process and meaning effect" (1996a: 49).

In vv. 9 and 14 two references of repetitive contrasts occur with the use of the contrastive conjunction "but." This contrastive conjunction can be understood as "progressive texture" since

it moves the argument of the discourse forward through a contrastive statement: "not that but this." In the first instance it appears as, "not with braided hair or gold or pearls or expensive clothes, but with good deeds, appropriate for women who profess to worship God" (vv. 9-10). Thus serving to equate piety and simplicity in appearance and dress. In the second instance, it involves a contrasting statement that defends Adam (the representative of men); by indicating that unlike Adam who was not deceived, Eve (the representative women) was deceived becoming the first transgressor, the first to overstep the boundary of propriety (v. 14).[16] It appears, therefore, that not only are woman/women the main subject of the discourse in vv. 8-15, but they also carry the discourse forward in this regard.[17]

Another important progression occurs in v. 13b with an implied repetition, namely, "then Eve" [was formed]. The expression "Adam was formed first, then Eve" [was formed] is quite important to the progression because the "first-then" of v. 13 provides a rationale (indicated by the "for") to justify the subordination of women to men.[18] When it comes to transgression in v. 14, the roles are reversed, Eve first, though it does not mention that Adam soon followed.

A further progression is observable in the use of repeated topics found in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. The first topic to be mentioned is "σωφροσύνης" ("propriety") in v. 9 and is repeated in v. 15. The second topic is mentioned in the prepositional phrase "ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ" ("in quietness") occurring in v. 11 and is repeated again in v. 12.[19] Then follows the topic of "ἠπατήθη" ("deception"), which is repeated again in the same verse as "ἐξαπατηθεῖσα" ("deceived") (2:14). From this progression a noticeable movement occurs from the mentioning of the first topic, describing outward propriety through to the second, describing quietness in education for women, and third, which deals with the topic of deception, and back to the same topic that started this progression, namely, propriety, but this time with reference to an inward character or disposition of propriety in v. 15.

---

[16] Johnson (2001: 202) confirms the latter assertion when he demonstrates that noun "παραβάσει" (v. 14), literally means "crossing of boundaries" and is often used metaphorically in ancient writings to mean "stepping over limits (Plutarch, *Advice About Keeping Well* 1[Mor. 122E]) and laws (Philo, *On Dreams* 2: 123; Rom 2:23; 4:15; Gal 3:19)."

[17] The progression from plural women in vv. 9-10, to singular woman in vv. 11, 12, 14 and 15 is interesting and deserves further attention. For now though it will merely be pointed to, but we will return to this aspect seeking to clarify it later on in this chapter under the section argumentative texture.

[18] Many commentators interpret this precedence in time, as precedence in status or rank and take it to be suggestive of Adam's (men) superiority and domination over Eve (women). This, therefore, implies Eve (women) to be inferior, and subordinate (Gritz, 1991: 137).

[19] The NIV translates this prepositional phrase as "be silent" in v. 12.

Thus the progressive texture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 reveals a sequence of three stages of progression using repetitive contrasts with the use of the contrastive conjunction "but," the main subject of woman/women, and three main topics. Firstly, the discourse moves from instruction to women concerning desirable dress and outward modesty, which is followed by two supplementary statements, first, a statement from the contrary and second, an assertion depicting Paul's perception of what adornment is "fitting to women" (vv. 9-10). Secondly, the discourse moves to instruction depicting women's passive role in education, presumably within the faith (v. 11), which is followed by a statement of the implied author regarding his customary practice that excludes women from instructing or being in authority over a man/her husband (v. 12).[20] Hereafter are two statements (vv. 13-14) that provides a rationale for vv. 11-12. The first statement asserts Adam's chronological priority in creation and the second statement exculpates Adam from responsibility for being deceived with regard to the first sin by asserting instead that Eve was the one who was deceived and became a sinner (2:14b). The latter assertion implicitly places men in a position of superiority vis-à-vis women. Thirdly, the discourse moves to an instruction depicting the promise of salvation for women under certain restricted conditions (good works, i.e., childbearing) and finally to inward modesty (propriety) in women (v. 15).

(3) Narrational Texture

Narrational texture exists in voices that activate the message in a text. This may take the form of a narrator, characters whose actions are depicted by the narrator or who themselves speak, or written texts. Narrational texture often produces narrational patterns that propel the discourse forward. These may occur in different ways and often signposts of this occur from the alternation between narration and attributed speech, and sometimes from the frequent occurrence of a particular type of speech. Such narrational patterns allow the interpreter a closer view of the units contained in the discourse (Robbins, 1996b: 15). The specific type of speech implemented in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 is argumentative discourse intended to confirm the audience in beliefs that they possibly already held (the discourse is confirmatory since it is epideictic in character) with

[20] A very important exegetical issue has to be noted at v. 12, and has important interpretive implications for the entire text of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. The issue revolves around whether or not the reference to "ἀνδρός" ("man") in v. 12, refers to men in general (all men) or husbands (i.e., the husbands of the wives instructed to be quiet and submissive). My stance to this important issue, as well as further clarification on this discussion, will be clarified in the section of this chapter dealing with argumentative texture. For now, however, it is apposite only to be highlighted as an important issue that cannot be overlooked.

the use of certain instructions given to Timothy, to instruct/enforce in the church at Ephesus, by Paul.

As I have shown in the previous chapter, the implied narrative of 1 Timothy displays a great deal of concern regarding proper order in the running of the church as a divine household. It has also been asserted that this letter concerns the issue of doctrinal orthodoxy and proper practice within the church and therefore it is permeated with instructions of various kinds pertaining to the life of the church. Among these instructions is the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, which contains two personal directives/wishes (vv. 8, 9) based on the verb in v. 8 ("βούλομαι"), while v. 11 gives an actual instruction regarding women as the imperative "μανθανέτω" shows. It does not appear from the cadre of the discourse occurring in this text that a narrative or implied narrative may be found within this rhetorical unit. The passage is more like an argument for women's subordination with a Scriptural rationale. The only narrative alluded to in this text is that of the Genesis creation narrative used by the author to validate his prohibitions and instructions for women in vv. 11-12. The use of the Genesis creation narrative as a Scriptural rationale plays a pertinent role in understanding the rhetoric of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 and will be mentioned again in the next sub-section of this chapter as well as clarified, under the heading of intertexture, in the next chapter of this thesis.

(4) Opening-middle-closing texture

As defined by Robbins (1996b: 19) the opening, middle, and closing of a unit of discourse is formed by the interplay of repetition, progression, and narration of a text. And, may be located at the beginning, middle, and ending of a unit of discourse. The main function for this texture is to detect the persuasive result and purpose of the various parts of a rhetorical unit and also to determine how they operate together in regard to the entire text (1996a: 50-51).

The opening of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 is parallel in form to the opening of the previous unit, 2:1-7, and in fact the "οὖν" in v. 8 may in fact be intended to indicate that Paul is returning to the initial theme of 2:1-7, namely, prayer, after the interruption of 2:5-7. Paul's statement about proper dress for women in vv. 9-10 has no main verb and relies on the main verb of v. 8, "βούλομαι." I propose, therefore, that vv. 8-10 serve as the rhetorical opening to the unit and v.15 the closing since a new topic is raised in 3:1. Robbins (1996a: 51), speaking about the opening-middle-closing texture of Luke 6, mentions that the repetition of a certain pattern in that

text forms "a strong outer frame for the unit." Similarly, the repetition of the topic of propriety in 2:9 and again in 2:15, forms a solid "outer frame" around the discourse about women in 1 Timothy 2:9-15 and seems to form an *inclusio* as I indicated earlier.

It seems probable, keeping in mind the suggested three phase progression alluded to earlier, that vv. 11-12 and vv. 13-14 dealing with the topics of silencing of women and deception respectively, be construed as the middle of this rhetorical unit. Also observable is how vv. 13-14 flows naturally from vv. 11-12. The reason for this is that vv. 13-14 state the rationale for the instruction given in vv.11-12.[21] Another noticeable aspect occurring in the middle of this rhetorical unit and alluded to earlier is the use of asyndeton, which functions to lay stress on the importance of the command in v. 11. From the assertions made above, it appears evident that the opening (vv. 8-10), middle (vv. 11-14) and closing (v. 15) parts of this unit operate systematically and co-dependently with each other; unfolding and building upon each other to create the argument presented by Paul in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

(5) Argumentative Texture

As I have previously indicated, 1 Timothy 2:8-15 is not a narrative discourse. Rather, it takes the form of an argument. What follows is an investigation of the argumentative texture of this unit in an attempt to obtain greater clarity about the nature of the author's argument and argumentative strategy. This investigation will follow the structure uncovered in the previous subtexture where I examined the opening-middle-closing texture. Scholars have shown that the study of a text's argumentative texture, often reveals the social and cultural presuppositions as well as networks of reasoning inherent in a text which depict both the cultural milieu of that epoch and the contribution of Christian discourse in Mediterranean society and culture (Robbins, 1996a: 64; Watson 2002: 143; Debanné, 2002: 481). As I explore this texture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, I will look to discover any glimpses that may reflect the social and cultural presuppositions and networks of reasoning contained in the argumentative texture of this text that may inform my analysis in subsequent chapters (namely, social and cultural texture and ideological texture).

Argumentative texture, as depicted by SRC, refers to the reasoning employed within a text to persuade its reader(s) (audience) about certain actions and conclusions and also to provide

[21] Also see (Robbins, 1996a: 51) where he asserts with reference to Luke 6:37-38, that the word "for" provides the rationale for everything stated previously in that text.

the reasons why events occur as they do in a text. Some of the reasoning may be classified as logical or syllogistic and others, qualitative (Robbins, 1996a: 59; 1996b: 21, 29).[22] A key rhetorical feature found in both 'types' of reasoning is the use of enthymemic argumentation. For my investigation of the argumentative texture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, I will be focusing mainly on this rhetorical feature to interpret the argumentative texture of this text. Aristotle described the importance of enthymemes when he mentioned that, "arguments that depend on examples are not less calculated to persuade, but those which depend upon enthymemes meet with greater approval" (*Rhet.* 1.2.10, cited in Olbricht, 2002: 25). Bloomquist (2002a: 85) has noted the enthymeme to be "the main rhetorical device in the New Testament."

Among New Testament scholars there is an evident uncertainty about the definition of an enthymeme and many propositions have been suggested to date (Debanné 2002: 482-485; Kraus, 2002: 95; Eriksson, 2002a: 245-246; Robbins, 2004: 16).[23] Robbins (1996a; 1996b) in his attempt to supply such a definition has modified Aristotle's hypothesis of the enthymeme with the analytical tools provided by C.S. Peirce and Richard Lanigan, in order to facilitate a better understanding of the function of enthymeme in texts. He has proposed that the enthymeme be described as, an assertion(s) supported by an additional statement(s) or rationale(s) (Robbins, 1998: 191; 2002: 32).[24] This description is seen by Debanné (2002: 487) as one of the best broad based rules of thumb amongst modern New Testament scholarship, which may be used as a "net to identify and gather various specimens of enthymemes in a text." He further mentions, ". . . this approach allows the various samples of enthymemes found in the text to inform us of the diversity of possible logical or non-logical argumentative connections that can exist between statement and rationale" (Debanné, 2002:487). Also, what such an understanding of enthymemes permits, is, that an interpreter may investigate enthymemes from any type of text

[22] Logical /syllogistic reasoning persuades the audience by using logical proof supported by reasons and clarification through opposites and contraries, and also counterarguments as evidence. This type of reasoning often happens in situations where narrators allocate a certain speech or action to particular people (characters) in the text. Qualitative reasoning on the other hand, emerges when the quality of assertions and descriptions persuade the audience to accept the depiction as accurate and authentic. This is often the case when assertions and examples are validated by quotations from ancient testimony [an example of which is the Hebrew Bible or the Septuagint] (Robbins, 1996a: 59; 1996b: 21, 29). For in depth discussion of the chreia, see Robbins (1988: 1-23); Hock and O' Neil (1986: 1-45).

[23] Kraus (2002: 95-111) ably delineates the changing characteristics of the enthymeme as a rhetorical feature during the first century B.C.E and C.E.

[24] For a discussion of how Robbins (1996a: 1996b) has modified Aristotle's hypothesis of the enthymeme see Eriksson (2002a: 246).

and not merely be limited to rational argumentation (Debanné, 2002: 488; Eriksson, 2002a: 246).[25]

As has already been mentioned, Robbins has modified the way analysis of the enthymeme is done, the conclusion is now called the "Result," the evidence is classified as the "Case," and the argumentative link has been termed the "Rule" (Eriksson, 2002a: 246). Robbins (1996a: 59) asserts that an enthymeme may be identified as a statement supported by a rationale and introduced by the words "for," "because," "since," or an "if-then" statement. Eriksson (2002a: 247), however, has shown that an enthymeme is not necessarily represented this way and that sometimes these hypotactic particles or "syntactic markers" (Debanné, 2002: 497) may be present, but not always.[26] Another observation made by scholars is that an assertion or conclusion (result) in an enthymeme often comes prior to a rationale. Eriksson (2002a: 248), however, demonstrates that this is not always the case.

Before exploring the argumentative texture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 using enthymemic analysis as posited by SRC, it is of fundamental importance to note that the argumentation that will be found in this text is mimetic of the reasoning held by at least a majority of the audience to which this discourse was written (Bloomquist, 2002a: 158; 2002b: 338).[27] Eriksson corroborates this likelihood and mentions that "the truth of an enthymeme depends on the audience accepting its premises" (2002a: 253). Also of importance to enthymemic analysis, particularly with inductive reasoning, is the fact that modern readers may find the reasoning employed in an enthymeme to be problematic. This, however, is the very problem with 1 Timothy 2:8-15, we modern readers, find the reasoning flawed because of the cultural distance between ourselves and the original reader(s).[28] What my analysis aims to accomplish, however, is to look at Paul's

[25] For an example and explication of how to analyse enthymemes using socio-rhetorical analysis, see Combrink (2003); Robbins (2002: 32-37). Also see Debanné (2002: 492-503) for an insightful interpretation of Philippians 1 using enthymemic analysis.

[26] See Eriksson (2002a: 247) and also Debanné (2002: 497) for a list of Greek hypotactic particles/syntactic markers that often reveal enthymemic arguments.

[27] In the case of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, the Ephesian congregation serves as the general audience, as the text describes Ephesus as the location for Timothy's ministry (1:3).

[28] It is my assumption that the letter, although addressed to the stated recipient (Timothy), because it spends a noticeable amount of time given instructions for the Ephesian church, it, therefore, has a larger audience in its purview. I agree, therefore, with Guthrie (1957: 73) who regards 1 Timothy as "semi-public." Similarly, Calvin (1556: 13) asserts that 1Timothy, "contains many things which it would have been superfluous to write," if the author had intended it to be for Timothy alone. Also see Fee (1988: 10) and Davies (1996: 103) who support this conclusion.

rhetorical argument along with the cultural logic of the argument in an effort to avoid an ethnocentric and anachronistic reading of the text.

(5.1) Opening Argument (2:8-10)

Having clarified the appropriate scope of prayer (vv. 1-7), the author now moves to the conduct appropriate for prayer (v. 8), that is, men are to pray for all people without anger. His use of "Βούλομαι" ("I desire") does not weaken the authority of the request, because this is not a request that may or may not be followed, for it comes from the authoritative apostle, herald, and teacher, who has just finished affirming his authority in v. 7.(Verner, 1983: 169; Mounce, 2000: 106; Johnson, 2001: 198). The "οὖν" ("then") of v. 8 is a hypotactic particle indicating a result or conclusion. Since the subject and the verb for v. 9 come from v. 8, the first part of v. 9 is a result clause "ὡσαύτως," which serves to link v. 9 with v. 8. Miller (1997: 71) further clarifies that this rhetorical link should not be understood as somehow carrying over to women everything that has been asserted about men in v. 8. It is possible, of course, that "ὡσαύτως" simply marks the transition (as it does in tables of *Haustafeln*) between one group of sayings and another (Miller, 1997: 71). But it may be functioning here as a literary device that serves to link together previously independent materials (Johnson, 2001: 199).[29]

The unstated rule of the enthymeme is based on v. 7 and is something like, "heralds and apostles have divine authority to instruct and direct Christians." The case is "[i] was appointed [by God] a herald and an apostle, and a teacher of the true faith to the Gentiles" (v. 7). Thus the argument of v. 9 is that Paul's apostolic appointment gives him the right to require the behaviour specified in vv. 8 and 9a. The next statement in v. 9b seems to be a statement from the contrary serving to supplement the preceding assertion by giving examples of what Paul (and society in that epoch) considered appropriate for women.[30] Contraries were considered to be enthymemes by Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria,* 5.10. 1-3, cited in Eriksson, 2003b) even when they did not involve a syllogism, or as in vv. 7-9a, an incomplete syllogism. In this case the contrary, offers a clarification of what Paul means by appropriate and modest dress. V. 9b with its contrast may thus be seen as an elaboration on v. 9a, that is, Paul explains what is appropriate by indicating

[29] Also see Fee (1988: 70); Lea & Griffin (1992: 96); Giles (2000: 159) who all note that vv. 9-10 are still controlled by the "I want" of v. 8. Other occurrences of this term may be found in 1 Timothy 3:8, 11; Titus 2:3, 6.
[30] This aspect will be clarified after the result, case, and unexpressed rule construction.

what is not appropriate. V. 10 then offers a contrast to v. 9b, thereby elaborating on v. 9a, by linking piety to dressing appropriately. The final prepositional phrase of v. 10 "δι᾽ ἔργων ἀγαθῶν" relates to the fact that Christian women are to demonstrate their piety "by means of their good deeds," one of which was childbearing (2:15).[31] Using the three rhetorical categories developed by Robbins, the enthymemic argument of vv. 8-10 may thus be depicted as follows.[32]

> **Result:** Paul's apostolic appointment gives him the right to require the behaviour specified in vv. 8-9a.
>
> **Contrastive elaboration:** not with braided hair or gold or pearls or expensive clothes, but with good deeds, appropriate for women who profess to worship God. (vv. 9b-10).
>
> **Case**: "I was appointed [by God] a herald and an apostle, and a teacher of the true faith to the Gentiles" (v. 7).
>
> **[Unexpressed Rule**: "heralds and apostles have divine authority to instruct and direct Christians"].

Within the first century epoch, it was a common topic within Jewish, Christian, and pagan circles for rhetoricians and writers alike, to compare unfavourably the outward ostentation of women in the form of expensive jewellery, clothing, and extravagant hairdos, to inward modesty "σωφροσύνη" (King, 1957: 49; Miller, 1997: 71; Johnson 2001: 199).[33] Paul's instruction against elaborate hairdos and ostentatious clothing thus seems unexceptionable in relation to his cultural milieu. Inward propriety/modesty was often portrayed in the first century in many stereotypical ways such as, being a good mother; a good household manager or homemaker; and by dressing sensibly and not with the sumptuous aspects mentioned in v. 9b,

[31] See last paragraph of progressive texture.
[32] The structure I will follow to depict the enthymeme is patterned after the structure used by Robbins (2002a: 27-65) and Eriksson (2002a: 249-259).
[33] Many scholars noting the wealth indicators of v. 9, "braided hair or gold or pearls or expensive clothes," interpret this verse to be an indication that at least some women in the Ephesian community were relatively wealthy. Among many others see Dunn (2000: 801); Lea & Griffin (1992: 96, 97); Taylor (1993: 73); Hendriksen (1964: 107); Gritz (1991: 127); Johnson (1996: 139); Oden (1989: 95). Contra Davies (1996: 31), who asserts that "the description of the kind of dress to be avoided by women at community worship in terms of 'gold and pearls and costly attire' (1 Tim. 2.9) is surely a rhetorical exaggeration rather than an indication of the affluence of women in the community."

that could and would in that epoch easily be misconstrued as a sign of infidelity and licentiousness mostly attributed to courtesans (ἑταίρη) (Johnson, 2001: 204; Winter, 2003: 72; Mounce, 2000: 104, 109). Fee (1988: 71) mentions that for a married woman to dress in public in the way depicted in v. 9b was synonymous to marital unfaithfulness.[34] Holmes (2000: 69) attempting to clarify any over emphasis on the aspect of sensuality asserts, "The vagaries of πλέγμασιν should not be over-interpreted in this context. Even if the hairstyle characteristic of the courtesan is in view (and this is unclear) the emphasis would appear to be more on its expense and ostentation than its sensuality."[35]

According to Johnson (2001: 200) and Winter (2003: 64, 73) σωφροσύνη (vv. 9, 15) translated as propriety or discretion was regarded as one of the cardinal moral virtues for women in first century Greco-Roman society.[36] Winter (2003: 64, 73) and Pomeroy (1999: 48) further demonstrate the importance of σωφροσύνη within the first century by demonstrating that it is mentioned more often than any other virtue on women's gravestones. According to Phintys this virtue was, "the greatest female virtue, since it enabled her to love and honour her husband" (Winter, 2003: 73).[37]

Two ancient texts analogous to the discourse in v. 9 demonstrate that within the first century CE, it was considered a normative cultural motif common among philosophers and rhetoricians alike to contrast the outward adornment of women to that of their inward modesty, and thus provides logical cultural validation for the enthymemic argument asserted above.[38] This may be seen as follows:

> There is nothing that a woman will not permit herself to do, nothing that she deems shameful, when she encircles her neck with green emeralds and fastens huge pearls to her elongated ears. . .

[34] Also see, e.g., *Sentences of Sextus* 513: "A wife who likes adornment is not faithful" [cited from Fee, (1988:71)].
[35] Cf., however, Winter's (2003: 98-108) cogent study where he argues that the author may have in view in vv. 9-11 the group of women he terms the "new women" who often indulged in sexual infidelity and effusively adorned themselves in the artifacts inveighed against in vv. 9-11. It should be further clarified, however, that the author is not giving a blanket prohibition upon women adorning or beautifying themselves, rather his argument is against the intemperance of such adornment.
[36] For further discussion of this phenomenon see Dunn (2000: 801); Mounce (2000: 114); Verner (1983: 168). Mounce (2000: 114) mentions that σωφροσύνη "is a Hellenistic word, frequent in Philo and stoicism, and is one of Plato's four cardinal virtues."
[37] Also see Winter (2003: 63, 64, 67) for further references to propriety/discretion and its importance in Greco-Roman society.
[38] This aspect (i.e., normative cultural motif), not only in v. 9, but rather throughout vv. 8-15, will be further clarified and investigated in the next chapter of this thesis under social and cultural intertexture.

So important is the business of beautification; so numerous are the tiers and storeys piled one upon another on her head! (Juvenal *Satire* 6, in Fee, 1988: 76).

[The holy woman] must not wear any gold ornament, nor put on rouge, nor white paint, nor wreath, nor braid her hair; nor put on shoes. ([From the mystery inscriptions of Andania]. Cited in Miller, 1997: 71).[39]

Verner (1983: 168) has commented that although the comparison between outward and inward adornment in women is a common Hellenistic *topos*, the particular application to a Christian worship setting is not a standard feature of the *topos*. In vv. 9-10, but also throughout the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, it appears that Paul co-opts normative cultural motifs from the "secular" Greco-Roman society of the day and transposes them in different ways for the Christian community at Ephesus as an expected and legitimate Christian norm. Sometimes he uses Scriptural texts as authentication of those cultural motifs, such as in vv.13-15, which will be clarified in the next chapter, and on other occasions he transforms or recontextualises a standard cultural *topos* and 'Christianises' it, by placing it into a primarily Christian context and claiming divine validity for it, as he does here in vv. 9-10. This aspect too, will be further expounded in the next chapter of this thesis.

(5.2) Middle Argument (2:11-14)

Before embarking upon an enthymemic analysis of this part of the text, a crucial and much debated exegetical question needs to be noted and my position regarding the question clarified. The question revolves around whether or not the word "γυνή" (vv. 11, 12, 14) and "ἀνδρός"(v. 12) mean "woman" or "wife" and "man" or husband" respectively. Scholars have spent a considerable amount of time trying to clarify this issue, and this is evident in most New Testament commentaries (Karris, 1979: 66; Witherington, 1992: 192; Winter, 2003: 97-122).[40]

[39] For other extant examples demonstrating the commonplace cultural motif of outward vs. inward modesty see Seneca, *Ad Helviam*, 16.3-5; Diodorus, XII.21.1; Juvenal, *Satires*, 6.458-59 & 6.501-3; Plutarch, *Advice*, 12, 17, 26, 30-32; 1 Enoch 8:1-2; Testament of Reuben 5:1-5; Perictione 135; Senaca, *To Helvia* 16:3-4; *Sentences of Sextus* 235, *Orac. Syll.* II. 736.22ff; Epictetus, *Encheiridion* 40; Philo, *Special Laws* 1:102 [taken from Winter (2003: 98, 100, 104); Pomeroy (1999: 6, 7, 9, 10); Fee (1988: 75); and Johnson (2001: 199).

[40] For further discussion and a demonstration of the considerable amount of time spent by scholars in an effort to clarify this issue see among others, Johnson (2001: 201); Mounce (2000: 112, 117, 120); Holmes (2000: 44, 75); Towner (1989: 212); Fee (1988: 10, 72); Giles (2000: 156); Dunn (2000: 800); Guthrie (1957: 73); Eriksson (1998: 91-92); Lea & Griffin (1992: 94); Kelly (1983: 69).

The view adopted in this thesis is patterned after what I believe is the emerging consensus in New Testament scholarship, which asserts that vv. 11-12 refers to women and men in general, with the use of generic terms for both, and not solely to a wife/wives and husband/husbands as some scholars maintain.[41]

Among the main reasons for interpreting vv. 11-12 as referring to women and men in general are the following. (1) Would the author instruct that only wives have to dress modestly (vv. 9-10), but exclude single women from this same command? By analogy is the author prohibiting only married women from teaching in v. 12, but by implication allowing single woman to teach? (Mounce, 2000: 112; Towner, 1989: 212). (2) If "γυνή" is interpreted as "wife" in v. 11-12, then in order to be contextually consistent "ἀνήρ" in v 8 should be interpreted as "husband" and not "men." This would, however, result in the same dilemma as above. Should the married men alone pray without anger and disputing, but not the single men? (Mounce, 2000: 112; Holmes, 2000: 75). (3) The absence of a definite article or a possessive pronoun before "ἀνδρός" in v. 12 and "γυνή" in vv. 11-12 illuminates the suggestion that vv. 11, 12 (or vv. 9-10) should be understood as referring to a husband/wife relationship (Fee, 1988: 10; Witherington, 1992: 192; Giles, 2000: 156).[42] (4) "The portion of the Genesis narrative alluded to in v. 13, Gen 2.7-8, and 21-23 . . . view Adam and Eve as 'man' and 'woman' not, as in other passages which discuss marriage and which tend to draw upon Gen 2.24, 'husband' and

[41] For arguments supporting the notion that vv. 11-12 should be interpreted as referring to women and men in general, see among many others: Eriksson (1998: 91-92); Lea & Griffin (1992: 94); Johnson (2001: 201); Holmes (2000: 44,75); Towner (1989: 212); Fee (1988: 10, 72); Witherington (1992: 192); Giles (2000: 156). For arguments supporting the notion that vv. 11-12 should be interpreted as referring to a wife/wives and a husband/husbands, see Dunn (2000: 800); Winter (2003: 97-122); Karris (1979: 66); Guthrie (1957: 73); Gritz (1991: 130). Guthrie (1957: 73) does mention, however, that it would not be "so relevant" to have such a distinction between husband and wife rather than the more general men and women, if "church meetings are in view." The discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 does indeed have the church meeting or worship setting primarily in its purview, and thus it would seem irrelevant to restrict the instructions in vv. 11-12 to that of wife/wives and husband/husband's as opposed to the more general women and men. The primary reasons for some scholars asserting that the references in vv. 11-12 imply a marital relationship(s) are: (1) Due to the allusion to Adam and Eve and childbearing in vv. 13-15; (2) The fact that the woman in v. 15 is married since she has children. (3) This interpretation is the more natural reading of vv. 11-12, since most first century women were married. (4) A strong parallel exists between vv. 11-12 and 1 Pet 3:1-7, therefore, implying a husband wife relationship. According to Mounce (2000: 112, 117, 120) and Gaebelein (1978: 361), the subjection called for in vv. 11-12 is referring to, neither married women to their husbands, nor all women to all men in the Ephesian congregation, but rather, refers to women's submission and obedience to a group of church elders and their leadership.

[42] Mounce (2000: 112) affirms this notion by asserting, "when Paul uses γυνή and ἀνήρ there are indications in the context if he is speaking of husbands and wives (e.g., "married," in Rom 7:2; "own," in 1 Cor 7:2), but here (and in 1 Cor 11:2-16) there are no such qualifications, suggesting that Paul's instructions are general, directed to women and men." Also see Fee (1988: 10) and Lea & Griffin (1992: 94), who make a similar point pertaining to the anarthrous use of women in v. 9 and the generic references to women and men in vv. 8-9.

'wife' (Eph 5.31; Matt 19.5; Mark 10.6-7; cf. 1 Pet 3.5-6)" and therefore it is more likely that women and men in general are in view in vv. 11-12 (Towner, 1989: 212).

In v. 11 the author first instructs women in general regarding what constitutes the appropriate behaviour and attitude to Christian learning. A broad consensus of scholars have demonstrated that the word "quietly" in v. 11, which is repeated in v. 12, should be construed as a particular virtue or demeanour, thus, asserting that the emphasis here is not implying a certain state of silence and less so, absolute silence, but rather should be seen as a particular attitude to learning (Oden, 1989: 96; Witherington, 1992: 193; Gritz, 1991: 129). Mounce (2000: 119) affirms the reputed consensus view and comments, "[t]otal silence is not required either by the context or by the parallel with ὑποταγῇ, 'submissiveness,' or διδασκειν, 'to teach' . . . If the translation "silence" is adopted, then the context limits this silence to the times of teaching." Neither the meaning of this word nor vv 11-12, therefore, imply that women were to be totally silent.

V. 11 is elaborated by a personal prohibition made by Paul in v. 12a, serving to prohibit women from teaching, presumably in the public church context, and once again emphasising that they display the attitude or demeanour of silence in v. 12b. This is followed by a rationale in vv. 13-14, which serves to buttress,[43] using Scripture as authentication, and particularly the creation narrative in Genesis 2 and 3, to support the instructions made in vv. 11 and 12.[44] The second part of the rationale (v. 14) tendentiously places the blame for human transgression squarely on Eve's (the representative women's) shoulders, thereby exculpating Adam (the representative of men) from any responsibility in the matter. In this sub unit of text, therefore, a visible hypotactic or syntactic marker can be observed which, as stated previously, is a possible signpost of an enthymeme and occurs at v. 13 ("γάρ") serving to support and validate the assertions of vv. 11-12. The enthymemic argument may be demonstrated as follows:

Result: "Let a woman learn quietly in complete submission.

[43] See Eriksson (2002a: 247,250); Debanné (2002: 497); Mounce (2000: 131-132) for further proof for interpreting vv. 13-14 as a rationale for vv. 11-12 as opposed to interpreting it as merely illustrative. According to Gritz (1991: 136), the conjunction in v. 13 serves a dual function and provides both reason and illustration for vv. 11-12. Holmes (2000: 249), on the other hand, interprets the word γάρ (for) in v. 13 as neither introducing the reasons for, nor illustration of, the instruction in vv. 11-12, but believes instead that it should be construed as "untranslated" or redundant, due to it being part of a Jewish oral tradition that is being cited. According to him, the "trustworthy saying" of 1 Timothy 3:1a is backward referring to 1 Timothy 2:13-15 and thus γάρ (for), is best left untranslated.

[44] This point will be further discussed in the next chapter under oral scribal intertexture and particularly, the subtexture of recontextualisation.

Elaboration: I do not entrust teaching to a woman, nor authority over a man she is to stay quiet.

Case: For Adam was made first, then Eve. Also, Adam was not deceived, but the woman, once she was deceived, fell into transgression" (1 Timothy 2:11-14).

[**Unexpressed Rule**: Women are inferior to men and must act appropriately.

It has been widely demonstrated that the logic behind the instruction given in vv. 11-12, was part of a mundane first century cultural motif, where even the state sought to subordinate women to men (Winter, 2003: 91-94).[45] And any effort on the part of women to try and circumvent or jettison such basic cultural assumptions and strictures were vehemently resisted by most men (Johnson, 1996: 136; 2001: 207).[46] For women to teach men in the public setting of church worship, would, therefore, be construed as being tantamount to the contravention of the fundamental patriarchal order of things, that is, "males/public" and "women/private" (Malina & Neyrey, 1996: 177, 179; Balch, 1981: 52-53). Furthermore, such contravention would lead to the disparagement of the Ephesian church (Johnson, 2001: 206). Eriksson (1998: 91-92) commenting on the traditional cultural motif of subordinating and marginalising women, in his investigation of 1 Corinthians 14:33-36, mentions that, "[t]his reflects the contemporary view that wives voicing opinions in public would shame their husbands, but due to this κυριος-institution, which made all women subject to a male authority, it is incorrect to limit the application of the regulation to married women."

Within some parts of Judaism women were not even allowed to speak in a synagogue service, nor were they allowed to be educated and even their testimony in court was invalidated on account of their gender (Gritz, 1991: 20-21, 133; Johnson, 1996: 136). Evidence of this may be seen in an ancient Jewish text, *y. Sot.* 3. 19a, 3, which states, "[b]etter to burn the Torah than to teach it to a woman" (cited by Mounce, 2000: 119).[47] Another ancient example demonstrating

[45] For further discussion pertaining to the normative suppression of women in the first century epoch see Johnson (2001: 207); Ryrie (1968: 5-25); Miller (1997: 72); Verner (1983: 168, 170); Eriksson (1998: 89).
[46] Johnson (2001: 207) cites Juvenal, *Satires 6* as an ancient example of how men resisted any attempts by women to inveigh against the normative cultural strictures.
[47] Also see Johnson (2001: 207) who further mentions other ancient Jewish sources that validate the subordinate view of women and the fiat, within certain segments of Judaism, against women's education, i.e., *Pirke Aboth* 1.5; *Aboth de Rabbi Nathan* 2.

the cultural logic of that epoch towards women may be seen in a statement made by Musonius Rufus, regarded as one of the most influential Stoic philosophers of his day. He asserts:

> Women who associate with philosophers are bound to be arrogant for the most part and presumptuous, in that abandoning their own households and turning to the company of men they practice speeches, talk like sophists, and analyze syllogisms, when they ought to be sitting at home spinning (cited by Winter, 2003: 114).[48]

Similarly, Quintilian, in his argument about the choice of a teacher (*Inst.* 1.2.1-31), presupposes "that the teacher is a man, that the student is a boy and that he is to learn the words of famous men" (Eriksson, 1998: 98). Also Philo in *Special Laws* III. 169-171 further demonstrates the general marginalization of women when he asserts, "[t]he women are best suited to the indoor life which never strays from the house . . . A woman then, should not be a busybody, meddling with matters outside her household concerns, but should seek a life of seclusion . . ." (cited by Balch, 1981: 53). The enthymemic argument as depicted above thus makes perfect sense within the cultural logic of the first century.

(5.3) Closing Argument (2:15)

Before embarking upon an investigation of the argumentative texture of this part of the text, a crucial and much debated exegetical aspect firstly needs to be mentioned, and my view in this thesis regarding this aspect indicated. The issue centres around the unexpected shift from the singular, "σωθήσεται" ("she will be saved") to the plural, "ἐὰν μείνωσιν" ("if they continue") in v. 15. Once again a variety of opinions have been offered by New Testament scholars in trying to solve this enigmatic shift (Johnson, 2001: 202; Mounce, 2000: 143).[49] From my survey of the many explanations given by scholars to explain the shifts from plural to singular tenses in reference to both men and women and man and woman, as well as the shifts from past, present and future tenses throughout the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, the explanation given by Mounce (2000:143) seems the most convincing.[50] The position Mounce

[48] Also see Johnson (2001: 207) who comments on Musonius Rufus (*Oration* III: *That Women Too Should Study Philosophy* 10: 2-4, 11-14) and mentions that Musonius, "recognized the equal intellectual and moral gifts of women and advocated their full education in philosophy" so as to equip them to better fulfil their domestic roles.
[49] For further discussion of this seeTowner (1989: 221); Dunn (2000: 802); Gaebelein, 1978: 362).
[50] For another lucid delineation of this issue see Lea & Griffin (1992: 102).

(2000: 143) takes may be summarised as follows. First, Paul begins by addressing the men and women in Ephesus concerning how they are to pray (v 8) and dress (vv 9-10). Second, he states a general principle changing into the singular for woman and man (vv 11-12). In order to verify this principle with Scripture, Paul shifts to talking about the singular Adam and Eve (vv 13-14). Finally, in order that his last assertion not be misconstrued, he shifts back to the present tense in making the required qualifications (v 15). This final shift, however, takes place in two steps. In the first part of the verse Paul is discussing the singular Eve, "σωθήσεται" ("she will be saved"). He is, however, discussing Eve not in isolation but as the representative of the Ephesian women. In the clause, "ἐὰν μείνωσιν" (if they continue), Paul, therefore, moves to the plural in order to clarify his assertion (Mounce, 2000: 143).

Returning to my argumentative textual analysis then, v. 15 may, therefore, be understood as an implied instruction that depicts two different issues. Firstly, it depicts the manner of salvation for Eve, but also for women in general as Eve is, "the representative of the Ephesian women" (Mounce, 2000: 143), by stating, "Yet she will be saved through childbearing . . ." (v. 15a). Secondly, it states the condition for women's salvation, which the text qualifies as, "if they remain in faith and love and holiness with self-control [propriety] . . ." (2:15b). Once again, there is a noticeable hypotactic or syntactic marker, in the form of "if," which serves to indicate that salvation is conditioned on "abiding in faith, love, and holiness with propriety."[51] The enthymemic argument implicit in v. 15, may thus be presented as follows:

Result: "Yet they will be saved through childbearing,[52]

[51] See Eriksson (2002: 247), for a description of "if" as a hypotactic marker.

[52] This aspect of v. 15 (i.e., childbearing) has troubled Biblical scholars for generations, and is worth noting here, as it has implications for my interpretation of this verse, which I will show shortly. Many divergent interpretations have been postulated and from the literature surveyed for this thesis, the ones listed below are the most noted by scholars. The following interpretations thus represent the basic interpretive purview using the historical critical methodology for interpreting v. 15: (1) women are saved by bearing children (Holmes, 2000: 245-245; Dunn, 2000: 80, n. 56; Calvin, 1556: 71; Guthrie, 1957: 78; Lea & Griffin, 1992: 102); (2) women are saved through the midst of the pain suffered in childbearing (Mounce, 2000: 147; Davies, 1996: 84; Holmes, 2000: 245-245); (3) women are saved even though they must bear children (Calvin, 1556: 71; Guthrie, 1957: 78; Holmes, 2000: 245-246); (4) women are saved by working out their salvation in their roles as mothers (Holmes, 2000: 245-246); (5) women are kept safe during childbearing, that is, they are kept safe physically through the childbearing process (Holmes, 2000: 245-246; Mounce, 2000: 144; Towner,1989: 221; Guthrie, 1957: 77; Fee, 1988: 75; Lea & Griffin, 1992: 102; Winter, 2003: 110); (6) women are saved by 'The Childbearing', that is, the birth of Christ (Mounce, 2000: 145; Guthrie, 1957: 78; Fee, 1988: 74; Davies, 1996: 84; Holmes, 2000: 245-246; Lea & Griffin, 1992: 102; Giles, 2000: 162; Baumert, 1996: 255; Kelly, 1983: 69; Hanson, 1982: 74); (7) women are saved from deception by their role of motherhood (Holmes, 2000: 245-246); (8) women are preserved from seizing authoritative roles such as the ones

Case: if they remain in faith and love and holiness with self-control [propriety] (I Timothy 2:15).

[**Unexpressed Rule**: In spite of being inferior to men, women can be saved under certain conditions (i.e., childbearing)].

Dunn (2000: 802) has noted that within the first century, "childbearing was seen as woman's primary function, so that barrenness would be regarded typically as a cause of shame and rebuke (still reflected in the male tendency to blame failure to conceive on the wife)." Malina & Neyrey (1996: 178) too have argued that it was a great social shame for women to be barren in the first century and that the relief of such barrenness meant "social salvation and restoration of honour." Pomeroy (1999: 127) has also noted this same cultural motif and in commenting on Plutarch, "*A Consolation to His Wife*" precept 10, states that "[i]t was a commonplace of funerary epigram to lament a young girl's death partly because she had failed to achieve in life her gender's goals of marriage and having children."[53] Not only was it regarded shameful for women to be barren and repugnant for a young girl to die without fulfilling her "gender's goals," but the state also enforced legislation that coerced women and men to have children or suffer the legal penalties and social vituperation that went with childlessness and disobedience (Winter, 2003: 53).[54] This may further be illustrated by a statement made by Augustus in his address at a public forum, where he declares:

I, now, have increased the penalties for the disobedient, in order that through fear of becoming liable to them you might be brought to your senses; and to the obedient I have offered more

---

prohibited in vv. 11-12 (Lea & Griffin, 1992: 102; Holmes, 2000: 245-247); (9) women are saved in the eschatological sense by accepting the role of motherhood (Lea & Griffin, 1992: 102); (10) women are saved even though they give birth (and, by implication, are sexually active). This view is postulated by scholars who see the false teachers in Ephesus to be comprised of a proto- Gnosticising group (Holmes, 2000: 245-247; Taylor, 1993: 74; Kroeger & Kroeger, 1994: 117-125, 127-177; Gritz, 1991: 143; Witherington, 1992: 192; Karris, 1979: 68); (11) Childbearing as an allegorical metaphor, that is, women are saved by continuing in the virtues of faith, love, holiness with propriety (Waters, 2004: 703-735); (12) Childbearing, referring to the duties of Christian motherhood, that is, women are saved by being good Christian mothers (Hendriksen, 1964: 111-113; Mounce, 2000: 144; King,1957: 54); (14) psychological salvation, that is, women's "sense of worth and well-being" is saved/redeemed (Mounce, 2000: 144).

[53] Also see Ryrie (1968: 2) as he further supports the notion of seeing childbearing as the archetypal representation of a modest or typical Greco-Roman wife (and also what all women were to aspire to), when he cites a statement from Demosthenes, namely, "*Hetairai* we keep for the sake of pleasure, concubines for the ordinary requirements of the body, wives to bear us legitimate children and to be faithful guardians of our households."

[54] See Winter (2003: 39-58) for further delineation on this subject.

> numerous and greater prizes than are given for any other display of excellence, in order that for this reason, if for no other, you might be persuaded to marry and have children (Dio Cassius, 56.6.6 cited in Winter, 2003: 53).

Thus within the first century milieu childbearing was perceived as the archetypal representation of a modest and virtuous Greco-Roman wife and also represented what all women were to aspire to. It has also been demonstrated that both culturally and legislatively an attempt was made to restrict women to the domestic sphere of life.

Lea & Griffin (1992: 102) have convincingly argued that the author used the word "τεκνογονίας" ("childbearing") in v. 15, as a synecdoche to describe women's role in society as a whole.[55] They, therefore, see Paul's words in v. 15, as "a reminder that a woman's deepest satisfaction comes from her accomplishment in a Christian home. Paul was teaching that women prove the reality of their salvation when they become model wives and mothers whose good deeds include marriage and raising children."[56]

By his adoption of normative Greco-Roman cultural practices and values, it seems, therefore, that Paul was totally enculturated within the dominant cultural environment in which he lived. As a result he adopted a normative Greco-Roman cultural motif, that is, the implementation of the perception of mothers as baby making machines and domestic managers of the home/household, and baptized it and tried to make it normative for the household of God in Ephesus. This will be confirmed further by the implicit dyadic personality inherent within the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 and also the subcultural rhetoric that protrudes from the text, which will be discussed in the next chapter.

This kind of adoption of normative cultural motifs and traditions and co-opting it into a new context is what Robbins (1996b: 58-59) terms reference and allusion. According to Robbins (1996b: 58) "[a] *reference* is a word or phrase that points to a personage or tradition known to people on the basis of tradition." And, an "*allusion* is a statement that presupposes a tradition that exists in textual form, but the text being interpreted is not attempting to 'recite' the text."[57] Both aspects, reference and allusion, are embedded in v. 15 and serve to reassert normative

[55] Cf., Towner (1989: 212).
[56] The fact that childbearing was a good deed instructed for by the author has already been mentioned earlier. Also see Winter (2003: 109-110). Although he comes to a different interpretive conclusion (see winter, 2003: 110-112), he also believes that "childbearing" in v. 15 refers to the actual pregnancy of women.
[57] Emphasis his.

Greco-Roman cultural motifs, typical of the Greco-Roman household code tradition. Fulfilment of motherhood, which was a highly honoured role of Greco-Roman society, and the societal expectations that come with this role is not the only requisite laid down by the Paul. Rather, women should continue in faith, love, and holiness with propriety. Here too, the author adopts a normative Greco-Roman socio-cultural motif, namely, that of the priority given to the virtue of σωφροσύνη (propriety) in women, and transposes this motif into a Christian context adding to it other highly valued Christian virtues (faith love and holiness).[58] The addition of which could also be regarded as an attempt by the author to authenticate and 'Christianise' his assertion in v. 15, by adding to his instruction a distinctly Christian tinge.[59]

(6) Sensory-Aesthetic Texture

This subtexture of inner texture focuses on the aesthetic images selected by the discourse in order to present its message(s). Sensory-aesthetic texture progresses beyond the inner reasoning of a text and into the manner in which the human senses are evoked and embodied by a text (Robbins, 1996a: 92).

Robbins (1996b: 30) explains that one way to investigate this subtexture is to identify and categorise together those elements of a text that point to a particular body part, and, those pertaining to the deeds or perception of that particular part. An additional way is to observe what Robbins (1996b: 30) terms "body zones," within the text. These body zones may be categorised into three sub-categories, namely, "the zone of emotion-fused thought, the zone of self-expressive speech, and the zone of purposeful action" (1996b: 30). He then further defines and develops these three subgroups as follows:

> (1). Zone of emotion-fused thought: eyes, heart, eyelids, pupils, and the activities of these organs - to see, know, understand, think, remember, choose, feel, consider, look at. The following representative nouns and adjectives pertain to this zone as well: thought, intelligence, mind,

[58] The importance of σωφροσύνη (propriety) in women has already been identified in the first enthymemic argument.

[59] Fee (1988: 76) commenting on v. 15 mentions that the virtues faith, love and holiness imply that the women are Christian. He states, that the only condition is that they are already "truly Christian" women, which mean that they are women who "continues in faith, love and holiness" (1988: 76). Similarly Johnson (2001:203), in relation to the virtues of faith, love and holiness in v. 15, comments, "[w]omen (or alternatively, their children) are to live as members of the *community defined by these internal norms* of behavior" (my emphasis).

wisdom, folly, intention, plan, will, affection, love, hate, sight, regard, blindness, look; intelligent, loving, wise, foolish, hateful, joyous, sad, and the like.

(2). Zone of self-expressive speech: mouth, ears, tongue, lips, throat, teeth, jaws, and the activities of these organs - to speak, hear, say, call, cry, question, sing, recount, tell, instruct, praise, listen to, blame, curse, swear, disobey, turn a deaf ear to. The following nouns and adjectives pertain to this zone as well: speech, voice, call, cry, clamor, song, sound, hearing; eloquent, dumb, talkative, silent, attentive, distracted, and the like.

(3). Zone of purposeful action: hands, feet, arms, fingers, legs, and the activities of these organs - to do, act, accomplish, execute, intervene, touch, come, go, march, walk, stand, sit, along with specific activities such as to steal, kidnap, commit adultery, build, and the like. The following representative nouns and adjectives pertain to this zone: action, gesture, work, activity, behavior, step, walking, way, course, and any specific activity; active, capable, quick, slow, and so forth.

Once again I will be following the proposed opening-middle-closing structure of this unit of text presented earlier. The first body zone to be employed in the text in vv. 8-10, is that of purposeful action. In v. 8 the text 'liberates' men's zone of purposeful action in two areas of their body. First, the discourse exhorts them to lift up their hands thus serving to free them physically, as opposed to instructing their hands to be bound and therefore physically restricting them from expression. Second, the discourse liberates their mouths, by exhorting them to pray, presumably in an audible manner and thus serving to free them verbally. In v. 9, the body zone of purposeful action is used in the text to 'restrict' women's bodies. Women are prohibited from dressing in the ways described in v. 9b, thus restricting their physical bodies by prescribing to them what is appropriate and inveighing against the type of dress or bodily expression that was regarded as inappropriate. Similarly in v. 10 women are instructed to limit their worship to God and the expression of that worship, to the proper limits of traditional Greco-Roman socio-cultural expectations (i.e., they may only express their worship to God in womanly ways, such as childbearing, domestification).

In vv. 11-14, two body zones are employed in the text. First, in v. 11 the zone of emotion-fused thought is employed. With the use of this feature, women's area of emotion-fused thought is limited to that of displaying a quiet demeanour and being submissive to men in the Ephesian congregation. In v. 12 the text employs the zone of self-expressive speech, ironically

though, instead of liberating women in the area of their speech, as the term self-expressive speech literally implies, women are prohibited from teaching and directed to be quiet. Women are, therefore, verbally imprisoned as opposed to the men in v. 8 who are verbally emancipated. In vv. 13-14 the zone of purposeful action is once again noted in the discourse. Initially this zone is used to lay emphasis upon the fact that Adam was formed first and thus placing him (and men representatively) in a more privileged position of status and honour than Eve (and representatively women) who was created second and thus is inferior to Adam (v. 13). Subsequently, the zone of purposeful-action is used to exculpate Adam from the action of deception and sin (transgression) and place the blame squarely upon Eve (v. 14). In v. 15 the zone of purposeful action is once again employed to restrict women's action to that of childbearing, thus serving to limit and subordinate her purposeful action only to the domestic sphere of the household and tasks appropriate to that sphere. From this representation of the sensory-aesthetic texture contained in 1 Timothy 2:8-15, it seems evident once again, that women in the discourse of the text are tendentiously subordinated and marginalised to fulfil only those roles that were suitable to the normative patriarchal cultural tradition of the first century.

From the discussion of this chapter, it seems noticeably evident that the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 is culturally embedded within the patriarchal milieu of the dominant Greco-Roman culture. Further this chapter has shown, particularly in the section dealing with argumentative texture, how Paul co-opts normative cultural aspects from the "secular" Greco-Roman society of the day and transposes them in different ways for the Christian community at Ephesus as an expected and legitimate Christian norm. In the next chapter of this thesis I aim to expound upon this trajectory and will investigate how Paul legitimates his assertions made in vv. 8-15 using various intertextual methods as authentication, and how he devolves them to the Christian community at Ephesus as an expected and legitimate Christian norm.

Chapter Four

An Intertextual Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:8-15

In the previous chapter, and more particularly in the section dealing with argumentative texture, I demonstrated that the rhetorical argument used by Paul in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 is based upon and exudes noticeable signs from the 'secular' Greco-Roman culture of the first century.[1] These implicit signs may be seen in the shape of normative patriarchal cultural values (e.g., honour and shame) and commonplace cultural motifs (e.g., males/public and women/private) which were used by Paul to restrict women in the Ephesian congregation(s) to their mundane and highly valued (positive shame) cultural role as subordinate householder (Malina, 1981: 46; Malina & Neyrey, 1996: 177, 179). In this chapter I want to continue along this trajectory of thought and aim to demonstrate, using intertextual analysis, how these phenomena (implicit signs) are used by Paul and also possibly why he uses these phenomena in his discourse in 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

Up to this point my analysis has primarily been concerned with issues contained within the text itself and their relationship to the audience. Intertexture now takes this analysis further and serves as a nexus for tracing the relationship between the material within the text to phenomena outside the confines of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. According to Robbins (1996a: 96), "[a]s words stand at all times in relation to other words both inside and outside any particular text, so texts stand at all times in relation to other texts." Robbins (1996b: 40) comments further that texts are involved in processes of configuration and reconfiguration whereby they configure and reconfigure external phenomena within a certain language environment. This language environment has been shown to embody outside phenomena explicitly or without any mention of such phenomena and may occur in two primary ways. First, it may occur by accurately representing outside phenomena and second, it may occur by being an appendage of outside phenomena either directly or indirectly, by constructing material that transmits to phenomena outside the text.

[1] See argumentative texture, and specifically the commonplace cultural logic espoused in Paul's arguments and portrayed in the enthymemic representation in chapter three.

Robbins (1996b: 40) defines intertexture as, "a text's representation of, reference to, and use of phenomena in the 'world' outside the text being interpreted." This world comprises, "'outside' material and physical 'objects', historical events, texts, customs, values, roles, institutions, and systems" (1996b: 40). A primary objective of intertextual analysis then is the delineation of various "processes of configuration and reconfiguration of phenomena in the world outside the text" (1996b: 40). What this brings to my analysis of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, is the opportunity to discover how the text in question functions with the outside 'world' via such processes of configuration and reconfiguration.

Intertexture as formulated by SRC covers a span comprising: "oral-scribal," "cultural," "social" and "historical" intertexture (Robbins, 1996a: 96). For my intertextual analysis I will be implementing only the first two of the above-mentioned types of intertexture and using only a limited amount of the subtextures for my intertextual analysis. The main reason for this is due to the spatial constraints of this thesis and also because I believe these two types of intertexture, with the limited subtextures implemented, will suffice to demonstrate my intertextual aims in this chapter.[2] Namely, to demonstrate how the implicit signs mentioned earlier are used by Paul and also possibly why he uses these phenomena in his discourse in 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

The manner in which I will attempt to demonstrate this may be described as follows. First, I will investigate the cultural intertexture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, this is due to the fact, as asserted in the previous chapter, that Paul uses normative Greco-Roman cultural values and motifs and transposes these phenomena into the Christian setting at Ephesus as though they are common Christian norms. Secondly, I will investigate the oral scribal intertexture of this text, demonstrating that Paul uses outside texts to authenticate his culturally based assertions, but also, that he uses outside texts to devolve his assertions as mundane Christian norms to the Ephesian congregation.

(1) Cultural Intertexture

According to Robbins (1996b: 58), texts share an interactive correlation with other cultures and create what he has termed cultural knowledge or "insider" knowledge. Robbins (1996b: 58) has further commented that this type of knowledge is recognised solely by people

[2] For a full explication of the various textures of intertexture with their respective subtextures and examples of their application see Robbins (1996a: 96-143; 1996b: 40-70).

within a certain cultural context or by those familiar with it through some type of learning or interaction. Cultural intertexture, therefore, allows the interpreter the opportunity to peep into the text and explore some of the illuminative cultural dynamics contained and used within it. This type of intertexture emerges, "in word and concept patterns and configurations; values, scripts, codes, or systems and myths" and comes into view in a text either through reference or allusion and echo (1996b: 58).

In the previous chapter I demonstrated that the rhetorical argument contained in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, has as its matrix normative patriarchal cultural presuppositions and traditional motifs taken from the secular Greco-Roman culture. And particularly, those arguments related to the gender conceptualization of that epoch, which tendentiously sought to maintain the subordinate and marginalised role of women to that of the private and domestic sphere of the household. In this part of the thesis I aim to briefly pick up on this trajectory and further embed this assertion by providing a few more ancient textual references as evidence to support this claim. My purpose for demonstrating the cultural normitivity of Paul's argument in the previous chapter was aimed at providing cultural logic for my enthymemic delineation. In this part of the chapter, however, I aim to show using intertexture that Paul's reliance upon standard cultural motifs and traditions may be viewed as cultural intertexture. This may be seen by his transplanting as a standard Christian norm commonplace hegemonic (i.e., patriarchal) cultural practices of the dominant Greco-Roman society and particularly related to the gender issue, (i.e., marginalisation and subordination of women) to the Christian community. According to Robbins (1996b: 58) "[a] *reference* is a word or phrase that points to a personage or tradition known to people on the basis of tradition." And, an "*allusion* is a statement that presupposes a tradition that exists in textual form, but the text being interpreted is not attempting to 'recite' the text."[3] It is my assertion that these two cultural intertextual aspects (i.e., reference and allusion) may be observed within the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 and particularly in vv. 9-10, 11-12 and plays a pertinent role in illuminating important interpretive nuances within this text.[4]

[3] Emphasis his.
[4] The intertextual aspects of vv. 8, 13-15 will be dealt with in the section of this chapter dealing with oral scribal intertexture.

(1.1) Cultural Intertexture in 1 Timothy 2:9-10

In the previous chapter I demonstrated that within the first century epoch, it was a common topic within Jewish, Christian, and pagan circles for rhetoricians and writers to compare the much inveighed against outward ostentation of women, in the form of expensive jewellery, clothing, and extravagant hairdos, to that of their highly praised inward modesty or "σωφροσύνη" (King, 1957: 49; Miller, 1997: 71; Johnson, 2001: 199). I also demonstrated that Paul's instruction against elaborate hairdos and ostentatious clothing in vv. 8-10 seems unexceptionable in comparison to the dominant patriarchal cultural norms of his milieu. This normative phenomenon may be demonstrated further by parts of a letter from the Pythagorean School of philosophy written by a woman named Melissa to the recipient of the letter named Clearete, in it Melissa highlights the virtues of a modest wife/woman.

> It gives a good indication that you intend to perfect yourself according to virtue. It is necessary then for the free and modest (ἐλεύθεραν καὶ σώφρονα) wife to live with her lawful husband adorned with quietness, white and clean in her dress, plain but not costly, simple but not elaborate or excessive. For she must reject . . . garments shot with purple or gold . . . having on her cheeks the blush of modesty (ὄψεως) rather than of rouge and powder, and a good noble bearing and decency and modesty (καλοκαγαθίαν καί κοσμιότα καί σωφποσύνην) rather than gold and emerald (cited in Winter, 2003:72-73).[5]

It appears, therefore, that Paul engages in what Robbins (1996a: 110; 1996b: 58) has termed "reference" and "allusion." This comes about because Paul adopts a non-Christian model of a virtuous wife/woman from the dominant Greco-Roman culture and transforms it into a statement describing virtuous Christian women in vv. 9-10. This is interesting as it shows that the origins of Paul's rhetoric and also the Christian values he propagates in vv. 9-10 (and also the rest of the discourse, as will be shown shortly), are simply the "best" from the patriarchal culture in which he lives.

[5] For further ancient examples of what constituted respectable adornment for women as opposed to inappropriate adornment see Winter (2003: 103-109) and Pomeroy (1999: 6-11). Pomeroy (1999: 6-11) gives an English translation of Plutarch's "Advice to the Bride and Groom" with critical comments, see especially, advice, 26, 27.

(1.2) Cultural Intertexture in 1 Timothy 2:11-12

In the previous chapter I demonstrated that the logic behind the instruction given in vv. 11-12, was part of normative first century cultural tradition, even legitimated by the state that sought to subordinate and marginalise women to men.[6] Women, therefore, had to behave with a quiet demeanour when being instructed in Christian doctrine (v. 11), were to be submissive to the men of the congregation (v. 11) and were disallowed from teaching in the public assembly (v. 12), because, it was widely held that women's proper role was to be lived out in the private sphere of life and not the public male sphere of life (Malina & Neyrey, 1996: 177, 179; Johnson, 2001: 206). Any deviation by women from such basic cultural assumptions, would lead to the shaming (negative shame) of women and possibly the disparagement of the Ephesian church (Balch, 1981: 52-53).[7]

That the instruction given by Paul in vv. 11-12 is rooted in standard cultural gender assumptions, may further be confirmed by a statement from Plutarch's, "Advice to the Bride and Groom," 31-32, which states:

> [31] Not only the arms but the words of a modest woman must never be public property. She should be shy with her speech as with her body, and guard it against strangers. Feelings, character, and disposition can all be seen in a woman's talk [32] Phidias's statue of Aphrodite at Elis has her foot resting on a turtle, to symbolize homekeeping and silence. A wife should speak only to her husband, and should not feel aggrieved if, like a piper, she makes nobler music through another's tongue (cited in Pomeroy, 1999: 9-10).

Fee (1988: 77) mentions that "Plutarch's view had to do with all women in all public circumstances" and therefore should not be restricted as instructing wives only. It appears, therefore, that Paul once again engages in cultural intertextual "reference" and "allusion" (Robbins, 1996a: 110; 1996b: 58). This occurs by his adoption of standard cultural assumptions and values taken from the dominant patriarchal society in which he lives, and co-opting these cultural norms into a Christian setting (i.e., the Ephesian Christian community) by instructing women to behave as depicted in vv. 11-12.

---

[6] For an adept delineation of how the state sought to subordinate and maintain such subordination, see Winter (2003: 91-94). For further discussion pertaining to the normative suppression of women in the first century epoch see Johnson (2001: 207); Ryrie (1968: 5-25); Miller (1997: 72); Verner (1983: 168, 170); Eriksson (1998: 89).

[7] See chapter 5 below for a discussion of honour and shame in Greco-Roman culture.

(1.3) Cultural Intertexture in the form of Household Code *topoi* and Imagery in 1 Timothy 2: 8-15

Within the Greco-Roman epoch of the first century, the household constituted the fundamental social unit and building block and household codes and household management played a crucial role in ensuring the running and maintenance of Greco-Roman culture and society (Harding, 2001: 47; Verner, 1983: 76; Taylor, 1993: 75). Within that patriachally run era it was believed that, "a well-ordered household would guarantee a well-ordered society" (Davies, 1996: 27). The household comprised a hierarchically formulated, patriarchal structure with the male head, the κυριος [the head of the traditional Greek household] or the *paterfamilias* [the head of the traditional Roman household] at the apex of their respective households with autocratic control. Then followed the wife and matron of the household who was regarded as subordinate. After her and in an analogous manner followed the children and slaves (Verner, 1983: 30, 33; Dunn, 2000: 801; Davies, 1996: 27).[8] Two extant examples from a translation of Arius Didymus' text, Stobaeus Book II, depict the ideology behind this patriarchal and hierarchically ordered structure:

> The relationship of parents to children is monarchic, of husbands to wives aristocratic, of children to one another democratic. For the male is to unite with the female in accordance with a desire for begetting children and for continuing the race (from Stobaeus, book II, chapter 7, p. 148. line 16. cited in Balch, 1988: 41).

> The man has the rule (ἀρχή) of this house by nature. For the deliberative faculty in a woman (τὸ βουλευτικόν) is inferior, in children it does not yet exist, and it is completely foreign to slaves. Rational household management, which is the controlling of a house and of those things related to the house, is fitting for a man. (cp. Pol. I 1260a 9-14; III 1278b 37-38, cited in Balch, 1988: 42).

Many scholars have argued for the presence of household tradition and terminology throughout the Pastoral Epistles, and more importantly for my research purposes, 1 Timothy in

[8] For further discussion of this see Eriksson (1998: 94); Harding (2001: 51, 54, 107); Balch (1988: 45); Taylor, (1993: 72); Johnson (2001: 151). It is also interesting to note that in comparison to the Greek household system, women, children and slaves of the Roman household were given more freedom and privileges.

particular.[9] Even further, these adept scholars have shown the church in the Pastorals to be modelled after the structure of the Greco-Roman household, and have also demonstrated that throughout 1 Timothy, Paul devotes a considerable amount of emphasis in his rhetoric toward traditional household *topoi* (topics) and imagery (Towner, 1989: 170). This may be seen in 1 Timothy 3:15 where the text refers to the church as the household of God, which indicates how the idea of the church community came to be associated with a household.[10] The repeated mentioning and emphasis of the household and household codes greatly attests to this topic's importance as a pertinent motif throughout the discourse of 1 Timothy (i.e., 1 Timothy 3:2, 4, 11-12; 5:1-6: 2). Towner (1989: 170) affirms this statement when he argues that a definite presence of household parenesis in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 may be seen in the "pairing of instructions to men and women, the traditional nature of the teaching about adornment, the subordination directive, and an appeal to OT material."[11]

I agree with Towner and also suggest further that these aspects may be construed through the eyes of cultural intertexture in the form of "reference" and "allusion" (Robbins, 1996a: 110; 1996b: 58). Towner's above cited statement on the household parenesis in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 may, therefore, also be construed as cultural intertextual reference. The reason for this is that normative Greco-Roman household code imagery and terminology is adopted in order to accomplish Paul's rhetorical purpose of restricting women to their mundane cultural role as subordinate, marginalised household keeper (Verner, 1983: 135; Towner, 1989: 170).

Donelson (1986: 178) has cogently demonstrated that certain Greek words "have coinage in discussions of households." Among the words he has singled out, two occur in the span of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. The first word, ὑποταγή (subjection)[12] occurs in 2:11, and the second, διδάσκειν (to teach), in 2:12. These words and their cognates occur regularly in Greco-Roman household tradition. An example of this appears in Plutarch's, "Advice to the Bride and Groom" (142E) which instructs the wife to subordinate (ὑποτάττουσαι) herself to her husband, and for

[9] See Harding (2001: 50); Towner (1989: 133-136); Balch and Osiek (1997: 40); Balch (1988: 26, 35); Verner (1983: 1); Taylor, (1993: 72); Donelson (1986: 178, 179); Fiorenza (1984: 261-266).

[10] Also see 1 Timothy 3:2, 4, 11-12; 5:1-6:2; Titus 2:5. For further delineation concerning the church as God's household particularly in 1 Timothy 3:15, see Towner (1989: 133-136).

[11] Also see Verner (1983: 166) who comments that the pairing of the words "ανδρας" and "γυναῖκας" in vv. 8-15 is a common feature in the household codes, and that Paul "develops it in a new context, namely, the context of the church's worship."

[12] Towner (1989: 40) and Dunn (2000: 801) have also argued that ὑποταγῇ implies the presence and implementation of normative household code tradition.

the husband to rule (ἄρχειν) his wife (Pomeroy, 1999: 10, 24). A further example may be seen in Martial's words to Priscus, where he states, "Let the matron be subject (*inferior...sit*) to her husband, Priscus; in no other way do woman and man become equal (*fiant poles*)" [Ep. 8.12] (cited in Verner, 1983: 69).

I concur, therefore, with Donelson's above statement, and suggest further that these be construed as an indication of cultural intertextual reference, rhetorically pointing to the Greco-Roman household tradition. Only people who were raised in Greco-Roman culture or were educated in it would have known its implicit meaning. These references, therefore, exhibit the use of normative dominant cultural tradition in the form of the household codes that have been co-opted by Paul in order to strengthen his rhetorical argument in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. Further evidence substantiating this assertion occurs with the appearance of ἡσυχίᾳ at 1 Timothy 2:11-12. Verner (1983: 92) affirms that 'silence' was a normative household topic and mentions, "the household management topos held up silence as a desirable trait in women."[13] Further confirmation of 'silence' as a normative household topic may be seen in Aristotle's statement, "silence (σιγή) gives grace to woman" (1260a 30, cited in Verner, 1983: 92).[14]

I argue further that these references may also be construed as an indication of cultural intertextual allusions.[15] Once again I maintain that these cultural allusions, presupposes the Greco-Roman household tradition, and are used rhetorically by Paul to support his prohibitions as demonstrated in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. A significant constituent of the discourse in 1 Timothy 2:8-15, therefore, appears to be based on cultural intertexture, whereby Paul implements arguments that have as their basis, normative Greco-Roman household code tradition and *topoi*. Normative patriarchal cultural values (e.g., honour and shame) and commonplace cultural motifs (e.g., males/public and women/private) are transplanted into the Ephesian congregation(s) as standard Christian norms that have to be adhered to. The next sub-section of this chapter attempts to show how Paul, uses Scriptural texts to authenticate his assertions made in vv. 9-11.

[13] Also see, Advice 31 of Plutarchs, "Advice to the Bride and Groom." In Pomeroy (1999: 9-10).
[14] Ibid.
[15] See Robbins (1996b: 58).

(2) Oral-Scribal Intertexture

One of the primary techniques a text uses to configure and reconfigure phenomena from the world outside itself is by using, either conspicuously or inconspicuously, language from other texts. Such utilisation of exterior texts, both written and oral, have been identified by SRC as oral-scribal intertexture and its main aim is to delineate how those outside texts have been configured and reconfigured (Robbins, 1996a: 121; 1996b: 40). SRC has identified five standard ways in which language in a text employs language from outside texts. They have been identified as: "recitation, recontextualization, reconfiguration, narrative amplification, and thematic elaboration" (1996b: 40).[16] What follows next is an oral-scribal intertextual investigation of 1 Timothy 2:8, 13-15.

(2.1) 1 Timothy 2:8

Many biblical scholars and commentators have noted a distinct similarity between 1 Timothy 2:8-9 and 1 Peter 3:3-4 and have often regarded these texts as parallel passages.[17] None, according to my knowledge, however, have embarked upon an intertextual analysis of these two passages or those dealt with below, or more succinctly, none have used socio-rhetorical terminology as an aid to investigation. Some commentators conjecture that 1 Timothy 2:8, "ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ" (in every place) is a reference to Malachi 1:11: "In every place incense and pure offerings will be brought to my name . . ." (Hanson, 1982: 70; Kelly 1983: 65). Still further and continuing along the same trajectory of seeing an echo of Malachi 1:11 within 1 Timothy 2:8, some have postulated that the early church saw this similarity as an echo of prophecy concerning the Eucharist in *Didache* 14.2 (Verner, 1983: 166; Mounce, 2000: 107-108).[18] Kelly (1983: 65) and Mounce (2000: 107-108), however, have ably corrected this tenuous proposition and further elucidate that the expression is a technical term often used in Pauline writings.[19] There seems, therefore, not to be an apposite oral scribal intertextual

[16] This representation does not depict the full capacity of these five oral scribal subtextures. For full explications of these, as well as their sub types, see Robbins (1996a: 97-108; 1996b: 40-58).
[17] See Mounce (2000: 106); Holmes (2000: 27); Munroe (1983: 103); Davies (1996: 82); Johnson (2001: 199); Dunn (2000: 800). Cf. Gaebelein (1978: 361) who notes the similarities between the two texts, but believes them to be nothing more than mere coincidence.
[18] Cf., Miller (1997: 70), who notes that a possible echo exists at 1 Timothy 2:8 representing a pre-existing Jewish source.
[19] See 1 Corinthians 1:2; 2 Corinthians 2:14; 1 Thessalonians 1:8.

relationship in 1 Timothy 2:8.

(2.2) 1 Timothy 2:13-15

The intertextual relationship that seems relevant within the discourse of vv. 13-15 comprises a form of recitation. Recitation occurs when communication in the form of speech or narrative, either from an oral or written tradition, is transmitted using either verbatim or altered wording from those received (Robbins, 1996b: 41; 1996a: 103). SRC has identified seven types of recitation (1996b: 41-43).[20] The intertextual relationship that seems suitable for vv. 13-15 appears to constitute the form of recitation whereby a text "summarizes a span of text that includes various episodes" (Robbins, 1996b: 43). In this case the span of text is the Genesis creation narrative (Genesis 2-3), which Paul summarises in vv. 13-15 by encapsulating three different elements from the Genesis narrative into the discourse of vv. 13-15 (Mounce, 2000: 130; Fee, 1988: 74).[21] This summary may be set out in the following way. Firstly, woman (Eve) was created from man (Adam) (Genesis 2:18-24),[22] and is therefore secondary and inferior to man (Dunn, 2000: 800; Davies, 1996: 15; Lea & Griffin, 1992: 100).[23] Secondly, the woman was responsible for sin because she was the one deceived by the serpent (Genesis 3:13) (Gaebelein, 1978: 362; Fee, 1988: 73; Munroe, 1983: 96).[24] And thirdly, her punishment was related to childbearing (Genesis 3:16a), even though 1 Timothy 2:15 only alludes to the issue

[20] The seven types of recitation are: "(1). Replication of exact words of another written text. Recitation may present a "photocopy," an exact duplicate of words in another written text. (2). Replication of exact words with one or more differences. Recitation may present almost an exact copy, differing only one or more ways from another written text. (3). Omission of words in such a manner that the word-string has the force of a proverb, maxim, or authoritative judgment. Recitation may leave certain words out to make the statement brief and crisp. (4). Recitation of a saying using words different from the authoritative source. (5). Recitation that uses some of the narrative words in the biblical text plus a saying from the text. (6). Recitation of a narrative in substantially one's own words. (7). Recitation that summarizes a span of text that includes various episodes" (Robins, 1996b: 41-43). See Robbins (1996a: 103-106; 1996b: 41-43) for a detailed discussion of the various kinds of recitation identified to date. In Robbins (1996a: 103-106) only six kinds of recitation are noted. This is due, primarily to the progressive nature of SRC.

[21] The use of texts from Genesis was a normative practice among Jewish expositors (Witherington, 1992: 195). In socio-rhetorical terminology this constitutes an "argument from ancient testimony" and serves the rhetorical purpose of embellishing the rationale (Robbins, 1996b: 57). Also, the rationale appearing in 1 Timothy 2:13 closely resembles that found in 1 Corinthians 11:8-9, and scholars generally regard the latter as the equivalent to 1 Timothy 2:13. See Johnson (2001:208); Kelly (1983: 68).

[22] For further delineation and proof of this based on the etymology of the verb πλασσειν (to make, form, mould) which is the same verb used in Genesis 2:7. See Mounce (2000: 131, 133); Johnson (2001: 201).

[23] Verner (1983: 170) confirms the latter assertions by stating, "but women were created to be subordinate to men, as is indicated by the fact that men were created first."

[24] For a lucid discussion of the pre-fall Adam-Eve relationship in Genesis 1-3, see Hayter (1987: 83-115) and Holmes (2000: 316-330).

without expressing it directly (Kelly, 1983: 68; Miller, 1997: 73).[25]

Two noticeable differences appear in the recitation of the Genesis narrative in vv. 13-15 though. Firstly, only certain sections of the Genesis creation narrative have been recited by Paul and in noticeably different words in comparison to its original source (Genesis 2:18-24 and Gen 3:13, 16a). Secondly, Paul fails to place the Genesis narrative within its proper context, which comprises Genesis 1-3 and not merely Genesis 2-3, and thus deliberately withholds mentioning crucial parts of the narrative that might lead to a different rhetorical picture if included.[26] The result is a selective presentation of the Genesis narrative that seems to be overtly pessimistic toward Eve (Dunn, 2000: 802). This type of hermeneutic was normative in rabbinic commentary whereby Adam's fault was lessened and most of the blame was heaped onto Eve (Ruether, 1998: 40).

It is interesting to note that the recitation at vv. 13-15 tendentiously does not make mention of Adam's presence (Genesis 3:6b) at the time of Eve's 'deception' (Genesis 3:6),[27] which if included would imply that just as Eve committed sin by commission (eating the forbidden fruit), Adam committed sin by omission. The latter assertion is due to Adam's failure to correct or instruct Eve pertaining to the instruction that God had given him (Genesis 2:16), and not her, since Eve was not told by God not to eat the fruit of the knowledge of good and evil, because she was not yet created (she was only created in Genesis 2:18-23) when Adam received the instruction about it. Eve was only told by the serpent about the fruit. Also of interest is the fact that vv. 13-15 fails to state that Adam also was deceived (Genesis 3:6b, 17-19; Romans 5:12) thus implicitly exculpating him from the blame of sin and heaping all the blame upon Eve. Added to this is the failure of vv.13-15 to mention that both Adam and Eve were punished for disobeying God (Gen. 3:14-24). If this had been included it would have implied that Adam was not innocent of sinning after all. The summarised version of the creation narrative depicted in vv. 13-15 seems, therefore, to be a tendentiously biased recitation. It appears this way, firstly in its predilection toward Adam, especially in its depiction of him and its reticence regarding his

[25] See Johnson (2001: 202, 207); Davies (1996: 83); Mounce (2000: 143); Holmes (200: 293) who all argue that Genesis 3:16 be construed as the textual basis for 1 Timothy 2:15.

[26] Genesis 1:26-27 states, "Then God said, 'Let us make man in our image, in our likeness, and let them rule over the fish of the sea and the birds of the air, over the livestock, over all the earth, and over all the creatures that move along the ground'. So God created man in his own image, in the image of God he created him; male and female he created them." Also see Gritz (1991: 137-138) who argues along a similar trajectory and gives further explication.

[27] See Holmes (2000: 321-322) and C. Kroeger & R. Kroeger (1994: 20) for an insightful explication of the Fall and insight into the debate as to whether or not Adam was actually present at the time of Eve's deception.

deception, and secondly, by being overtly misogynistic towards Eve in its inaccurate and selective representation that she alone was deceived.[28] I concur with Johnson (2001: 208), therefore, who comments that Paul "was not in this case engaged in sober exegesis of Genesis, but supporting his culturally conservative position on the basis of texts that in his eyes demonstrate the greater dignity and intelligence of men and, therefore, the need for women to be silent and subordinate to men."

In 1 Timothy 2:13-15, Paul, therefore, constructs a distorted representation of the Genesis creation narrative aimed at buttressing his instructions regarding women in vv. 9-12. As has been mentioned previously, his instructions served to subordinate and marginalise women and in so doing reconfirmed the patriarchal cultural norms and values that that epoch valued. It seems apt to suggest, therefore, that Paul progresses through the Genesis creation narrative by eisegesis. He takes certain snippets from the narrative in Genesis 2-3 in order to buttress his assertions concerning women in vv. 9-10 and particularly vv. 11-12 with Scriptural authentication. This presupposes that his audience was familiar with the Genesis narrative and accepted it as authoritative.

What this chapter has demonstrated, using certain types of cultural and oral and scribal intertextures, is that Paul co-opts normative cultural motifs, *topoi* and values from the "secular" Greco-Roman society of his day and transposes it in different ways, as an expected and legitimate Christian norm, into the Christian community. This implies that Paul accepts those patriarchal cultural norms and values, which then leads him to reinscribe them into the Christian community, calling on women in particular to adhere to those culturally rooted directives.[29] He then embeds his commonplace, patriarchally rooted assertions, by claiming that obedience to them means doing what is appropriate for women who profess Christian piety (v. 10b). By his recitation or summary (vv. 13-15) of the Genesis creation narrative he then goes on and further embeds his assertions (vv. 9-12), by implying that Scripture (Genesis 2-3) demonstrates and warrants the subordination and marginalisation of women in the public worship setting of the church (vv. 9-12), and also implicitly in the home (v.15).

---

[28] Some scholars have asserted that the rationale occurring in 1 Timothy 2:13-14 parallels and is based upon standard rabbinic reasoning of male dominance. Towner (1989: 217, 313, n. 278), however, has cogently shown this assertion to be nothing more than specious conjecturing. Also see Holmes (2000: 266-272), for a further explication as to why seeing such Jewish parallels in 1 Timothy 2:13-15 is tenuous.

[29] Harding (2001: 53) resonates this assertion when he states of the Pastoral Epistles, "the letters stress the necessity of subscribing to the social values of urban Greco-Roman society." Cf., Witherington (1992: 196).

Chapter Five

Social and Cultural Texture

With the aid of some sociological and anthropological theory, an investigation of the social and cultural texture now moves my analysis of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 beyond the parameters of intertextual analysis and into the realm of the social and cultural nature of this text. Malina (1981: 2) maintains that

> if meaning derives from a social system, while wording (e.g., speaking or writing) simply embodies meanings from the social system, then any adequate understanding of the Bible requires some understanding of the social system embodied in the words that make up our sacred Scriptures.

With the help of social and cultural texture serving as an investigative tool to examine the social systems embodied in 1 Timothy 2:8-15, I will endeavour to extract a more "adequate understanding" (Malina, 1981: 2) of this text.

According to Robbins (1996b: 72) one of the main goals of examining the social and cultural texture of a text is the description of the type of social and cultural person that exists within the discourse or within the 'world' of a particular text. Social and cultural textual analysis, therefore, allows me the opportunity of investigating the particular type of social and cultural person(s) portrayed in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, and this in turn will allow me to place the text within its proper social and cultural context. Implicit within this assertion is the probability that Paul may be using the rhetoric of this text ideologically in an attempt to establish his notion of how virtuous Christian women should behave. This too, plays an important interpretive role in placing the text within its proper social and cultural context and prevents a modern interpreter from superimposing his or her own cultural views on to the text (Dunn, 2000: 803; Towner, 1989: 42). Conversely this focus, cautions a modern interpreter against superimposing the socially and culturally bound aspects of the text onto modern day Christianity. This trajectory will be touched on again later in this chapter and explained more clearly in the following chapter.

Examination of the social and cultural texture also allows an interpreter to examine "the social and cultural 'location' of the language and the type of social and cultural world the

language evokes or creates" within a text (Robbins, 1996b: 72). The final stage in my analysis of the social and cultural texture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 will be to examine the kind(s) of social and cultural position(s) and orientation(s) this text motivates its readers to adopt (Robbins,1996a: 144; 1996b: 72).

As delineated by Robbins (1996b: 71-72) the social and cultural texture of a text comprises three interrelated main sections, namely, specific social topics, common social and cultural topics, and final cultural categories. For my discussion of the social and cultural texture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 I will be focussing solely upon the latter two of the above cited main sections. The primary reason for this choice is that it seems forced to try and fit the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 within the cadre of the seven specific social topics outlined by Robbins (1996a: 147-149; 1996b: 72-74).[1] It also does not seem unequivocal to me that the rhetorical unit of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 contains or makes conspicuous use of any specific social and cultural topics. It seems more apposite, however, to suggest that the rhetoric contained in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 makes use of common social and cultural topics, as well as final cultural categories in expressing its social and cultural texture. It is to this probability and proof thereof that I now turn. Before doing so, however, it should be noted that common social and cultural topics, as well as final cultural categories are interrelated concepts and thus cannot be separated from each other or analysed in an interpretive vacuum in reality. Because of the nature of this minor dissertation, which is based on trying to master an interpretive method of exegesis and the fact that my analysis is closely patterned after Robbins (1996a; 1996b), I have, therefore, followed his basic outline (1996a: 159-174; 1996b: 75-89) in examining the common social and cultural topics, and the final cultural categories found in 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

(1) Common Social and Cultural Topics

According to Robbins (1996b: 71), common social and cultural topics in a text display the general "perception in the text of the context in which people live in the world" and "exhibit broad insights about systems of exchange and benefit." Common social and cultural topics, therefore, concern themselves with the social and cultural systems and institutions presented within a text or presupposed by it, as well as the discourse's relationship to those systems and

[1] Also see Wilson (1969: 364-381) upon which Robbins formulates his construction of specific social and cultural topics.

institutions (1996a: 159). Robbins (1996b: 71, 75) further asserts that an elucidation of the common social and cultural topics in a text may take an interpreter into the "social and cultural world of the text" while helping to avoid the errors of anachronism and ethnocentrism.[2]

Eight common social and cultural topics have been described by SRC. They are: (1) "honour, guilt, and rights cultures"; (2) "dyadic and individualistic personalities"; (3) "dyadic and legal contracts and agreements"; (4) "challenge-response (riposte)"; (5) "agriculturally based, industrial, and technological economic exchange systems"; (6) "peasants, labourers, craftspeople, and entrepreneurs"; (7) "limited, insufficient, and overabundant goods"; and (8) "purity codes" (Robbins, 1996b: 76-85). Keeping in mind the nature and length of this minor dissertation, I will be focussing my investigation of common social and cultural topics solely upon analysis of honour, guilt, and rights cultures and dyadic personality contained within the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. The primary reason for this choice is that of the eight common social and cultural topics cited above, it appears that the text most unequivocally utilises these two specific socio-rhetorical features in its discourse.

(1.1) Honour, Guilt, and Rights Cultures

Within the first-century Mediterranean world honour and shame were regarded as perhaps the core cultural values. Honour may be thought of as a claim to worth along with the social recognition of that worth and functions as a social barometer that enables a person or group to interact in particular ways with his or her or their equals, superiors, and subordinates, in response to prescribed, though often implicit cultural cues. There are two types of honour, namely, ascribed honour and, acquired honour. Ascribed honour comes about or happens to a person or group passively through birth, family relations, or endowment by distinguished persons of power. In contrast acquired honour is honour vigorously sought after and acquired mainly at the detriment of one's equals in the social contest of challenge and response (Malina, 1981: 47). Shame, on the other hand, refers to the public rejection or denial of honour and being shamed refers to a loss of honour in the public domain (Plevnik, 1993: 96).

Honour has a male and a female element. From this gendered vantage point, the male component is called honour, whereas, the female component is called shame. This distinction reflects the basic ideology of patriarchy that places emphasis on male honour and female shame

[2] For a similar discussion see Malina & Neyrey (1996: 16).

and as will be described shortly, is an important constituent of what drives the attempt to subordinate Christian women in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. Shame in this regard implies a positive symbol, meaning a person's sensitivity to the perceptions, spoken opinions, and actions of others with regard to his or her honour. Within the first-century Mediterranean world, for an individual to have shame in this regard was regarded as an extremely positive value and implies acceptance and adherence to the demarcated socio-cultural rules of social communication (Malina, 1981: 44, 48; Moxnes, 1996: 20). Malina (1981: 46) demonstrates this well when he mentions

> male honor is symboled in the testicles and covers typically male behavior, running from ethically neutral to the ethically valued: manliness, courage (the willingness to challenge and affront another male), authority, defense of the family's honor, concern for prestige, and social precedence—all this is honorable behavior for the male. Female shame, on the other hand, is symboled in the maidenhead and likewise covers a range running from the ethically neutral to the ethically valued: feelings of sensitivity or 'shame' to reveal nakedness, shyness, blushing, timidity, restraint, sexual exclusiveness—all this is positive shame for the female and makes her honorable.

Thus people obtain honour by personally seeking a particular social status and having that status socially certified. Alternatively, people get shamed when they seek a particular social status and this status is disallowed them by public opinion. At the realisation that a person is being denied status, he or she is shamed, or gets shamed and is dishonoured for seeking an honour not socially his/ hers. Honour evaluation, therefore, shifts from the interior (a person's claim) to the exterior (public validation). And, shame evaluations shift from the exterior (public denial) to the interior (a person's identification of the rejection). To be or get shamed, therefore, is to be hindered in one's personal quest to achieve social worth or status, as well as the identification of loss of status involved in this endeavour (Malina, 1981: 46).

In order to better understand the importance of honour-shame as a pivotal virtue in the first century epoch and its importance to the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, I will briefly turn to the issue of gender specific roles in the Mediterranean society. The prevailing social institution of first-century Mediterranean persons was kinship. Malina and Neyrey (1996: 17) mention that

> Familism, belief in the central role and value of the 'household,' was foremost in people's minds. The primary way they [Mediterranean persons] made sense of their local world was in terms of gender and geography, by viewing spatially situated persons as well a thing as male and female.[3]

The ancient gender distribution of labour was based upon a complex set of gender specific responsibilities and functions. The public, outdoor responsibilities were designated for males only and the private, household tasks were for females only. Males were socialised to partake in public activities such as teaching, trade, commerce, food production and soldiering (Malina & Neyrey, 1996: 179, 180).[4] The social roles for females, on the other hand, entailed childbearing, childraising, food preparation, and household management. All of these 'female tasks' had to be done in "'covered' space, that is, space appropriate to the household and its related tasks" (Malina & Neyrey, 1996: 178). It was, therefore, expected from men and women living in the first-century to fulfil their delineated gender specific tasks. These gender specific roles were further buttressed by the validation of wider society who either awarded praise or honour for people who fulfilled their rightful tasks and shame or dishonour for those who overstepped the conventional patriarchal cultural boundaries (Malina & Neyrey, 1996: 178, 182).[5]

Because women are the primary subject of the rhetoric in 1 Timothy 2:8-15,[6] and the bulk of the discourse is directed to their modesty in appearance, subordination to men in the public sphere, and their virtuous behaviour, it seems appropriate to suggest that female shame is a major issue throughout the text. Indeed honour and shame plays a significant role in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 as is evidenced by the discourse itself being steeped with honour-shame vocabulary. The first instruction in the passage is that women should dress "modestly and decently." The most obvious reason for this is that it would dishonour the men in the congregation if women were seen to dress indecently or ostentatiously in public (v. 9-10). As we shall see, such dress was associated with disreputable women. Because of deeply embedded cultural values, modesty in dress for women served to preserve their shame—a positive virtue.[7]

---

[3] My parenthesis.
[4] See Malina &Neyrey (1996: 179-181) and Moxnes (1996: 19-20) for further discussion of these male roles.
[5] See Malina & Neyrey (1996: 177-182) for further discussion of this phenomena as well as Greek and Jewish primary evidence of these gender specific functions that tendentiously placed females in the private (household) sphere of life and males in the public sphere of life.
[6] See chapter three.
[7] For further discussion of this see chapter three and particularly the discussion on argumentative texture.

Second, women were instructed to maintain a quiet demeanour and be submissive to the men of the congregation when being instructed in Christian doctrine (v. 11).[8] The reason for this directive is that such submissive behaviour reflected positive shame in women who culturally were supposed to be shy and restrained in their behaviour (Malina, 1981: 46). Third, women were disallowed from teaching in the public assembly and from displaying authority over men. Instead they were to be silent (v. 12). The reason for this is that such 'manly' behaviour would be construed as shameful (negative shame) and would dishonour the men of the congregation.[9] Fourth, Adam is described as being formed first (v. 13). This implicitly grants him and also all men, since Adam is the representative of men; a sense of divinely "ascribed honour" (Malina, 1981: 29) and precedence over Eve (and all women) who was created second and thus is inferior to Adam (v. 13).[10] Fifth, Eve (the representative of women) is pictured as the one deceived. She acted shamefully (negative shame) since she was the "original transgressor" (v. 14).[11] Finally, women are relegated to the private sphere of the household to fulfil the domestic function of childbearing (v. 15).[12] This action (i.e., childbearing) fits with their gender's role and would thus afford them positive shame in the eyes of the wider society, because of their acquiescence with the commonplace cultural values and norms guiding the first century epoch (Malina & Neyrey (1996: 178).

Thus, it was widely held that women's proper role was to be lived out in the private (household) sphere of life, fulfilling womanly tasks such as childbearing, food preparation, and household management. On the other hand, the public sphere of life was set aside specifically for the male tasks of teaching, trade and commerce and other similar public activities. For church women to deviate and inveigh against such normative cultural practices and values by dressing ostentatiously (v. 9), teaching men in public (v.12), and having authority over men, would lead to women being shamed (negative shame).[13] Even more importantly, and commensurate with the patriarchal society of the first century, such shameful action by women

[8] Ibid.
[9] See chapter three, argumentative texture.
[10] See Malina (1981: 29) who argues that honour can be ascribed to a person by notable persons of power, such as God, the king, and aristocrats.
[11] See Malina (1981: 49) where he explains that "vengeance, wrath, anger, the vocabulary of sin (transgression, offense, sin, wrong)" are all expressions of shame (negative).
[12] Also see chapter three.
[13] See the previous two chapters for a discussion as to why it was normative for women to be subordinate to men in that epoch and why the instructions and prohibitions of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 is commonplace and commensurate with the cultural conventions of the day.

would lead to the dishonouring of the men of the congregation and also the shaming of the congregation in the eyes of outsiders (Malina, 1981: 46; Malina & Neyrey, 1996: 181; Balch, 1981: 52-53).[14] It appears, therefore, that the subordination and marginalisation of women in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 comes from their subordination in society as a result of patriarchy and the honour-shame valuing system.

(1.2) Dyadic Personality

Also closely related to the honour-shame valuing system is dyadic personality, which provides the environment in which honour-shame functions. A dyadic personality may be construed as a person who constantly is in need of approbation from other people with respect to their honour status in order to ascertain their public standing (Malina, 1981: 55; 1996: 45; Robbins, 1996b: 77).[15] "In other words, dyadic personalities are people whose self-perception and self-image are formed in terms of what others perceive and feed back to them" (Robbins, 1996b: 78). Such people, because of their interconnected worldview and embeddedness in an in-group,[16] internalise and appropriate the perceptions, words, and behaviours of others because they deem it obligatory, for human existence, to live out and abide by the expectations and approval of others, that is, they live by the values of honour and shame. These 'others', may comprise: family, community, city and nation (Malina, 1981: 55; Malina & Neyrey, 1996: 169; Robbins, 1996b: 77). Malina (1981: 55) posits further that, "such persons need to test this interrelatedness, with the focus of attention away from ego, on the demands and expectations of others who can grant or withhold reputation or honor."

The focal objective of a dyadic personality, therefore, is to maintain the corporate and social well-being of the family, community, village or nation. Malina (1981: 58) argues that within the first century Christian community, the idea of dyadic personality, served the

[14] For new religious sects within that epoch (of which Christianity comprised), political imprudence or transgressions against Greco-Roman culture and society was severely punishable, and could lead to disparagement of their beliefs and persecution. For a discussion of this see Harding (2001: 49, 51); Dunn (2000: 803); Davies (1996: 27; 32); Donelson (1986: 177-181); Towner (1989: 42; 172); Balch (1981: 65-80; 1988: 29); Stambaugh and Balch (1986: 124); Munro (1983:103).

[15] For a similar description of first century Mediterranean persons see Malina & Neyrey (1996: 12, 16, 18)

[16] Malina & Neyrey (1996: 168, 169) have demonstrated that first-century Mediterranean persons were group-oriented persons deeply embedded in in-groups. These in-groups took the form of two basic types, namely, kinship and fictive kinship groups.

analogous purpose of maintaining the well-being and harmony of the Christian community. He avers

> The individual as such, our dyadic personality, is expendable . . . Further, the soundness of the group, like the behavior of the dyadic personality individually, is heavily determined by its impact on surrounding groups and by the expectations of outsiders . . . Christians have to be at least as good as the outsiders are, and in this sense outsiders set the norm for the group (Malina, 1981: 58).

From a dyadic cultural perspective, therefore, the primary objective seems to be the fundamental importance of a person as rooted in an in-group and the person's behaviour as predetermined by significant others (Malina, 1981: 60; Mailina & Neyrey, 1996: 184).[17] The end result is a socially minded person who perceives himself or herself as one who is always conscious of the expectations of others, especially significant others, and makes every effort to fulfil those expectations (Malina, 1981: 67; Malina & Neyrey, 1996: 153).

The previous chapter, and in particular, the sub-section dealing with cultural intertexture, has demonstrated that a highly probable cultural intertextual relationship occurs within the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. This comprises the implementation of normative Greco-Roman traditions (i.e., household codes, cultural motifs), through the socio-rhetorical phenomena of "reference" and "allusion." It seems as though a further, social and cultural, relationship exists within this text in the form of rhetoric that presupposes a cultural dyadic personality. It is my assumption that this "dyadism" (Malina, 1981: 54) exists between the members of the "fictive family" (Malina & Neyrey, 1996:158) of God at Ephesus and the dominant Greco-Roman society with its cultural values.

It appears that this dyadic relationship leads to two possible interpretations of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. Either the members of the Christian community perceive themselves as people who are or should be ever conscious of the expectations of the dominant Greco-Roman society or the discourse admonishes them to perceive themselves that way. This perception, therefore, plays a significant role in the directives found in 1 Timothy 2:8-15, leading to the normative cultural prohibitions concerning women in the text, as has been demonstrated in the previous two

[17] Cf., 1 Corinthians 6:6; 10:32-33; 14:23-25; 1 Thessalonians 4:12; 1 Timothy 3:7.

chapters.[18] Thus because of the patriarchal nature of Greco-Roman society, and the overwhelming concern about male honour in a dyadic oriented society, women in 1 Timothy 2:9-15 are subordinated and marginalised according to the conventional cultural practices of that period.

In light of the patriarchal social and cultural environment the text of 1 Timothy tendentiously seeks to subordinate and marginalise women and thus restricts them to the private (household) sphere of life, where they fulfil those domestic roles that were regarded as appropriate for females (i.e., childbearing, food preparation, household management). The dyadic nature of personality that includes ingroup embededdness and the expectation of always living up to the cultural demands of the dominant society was also strongly re-enforced by the text. It seems reasonable, therefore, to view dyadism as a key factor behind the subordination and marginalisation of women in 1 Timothy 2:8-15, and also as a factor in the commonplace cultural practices that Paul proposes should be followed in the church. In fact, through the eyes of a first-century dyadic Mediterranean person it would be construed as anomalous not to measure up to the "social and cultural expectations or stereotypes" of the dominant socio-political and cultural system (Malina & Neyrey, 1996: 156). This assertion, too, confirms seeing dyadism as a key aspect affecting the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

It appears, therefore, that the early Christians were thoroughly inculturated in Greco-Roman culture and therefore accepted the basic androcentric cultural values and knowledge of the wider society.[19] Malina (1981: 58) confirms this when he argues that within the first century Christian community, the idea of dyadic personality, served the purpose of maintaining the well-being and harmony of the Christian community with the surrounding environment. It seems probable, therefore, to assert that a reason for the dyadic stance within the rhetoric of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 is that it served to maintain the well-being and harmony of the Christian community at Ephesus.

That dyadic persons are presupposed in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, ever concerned to fulfil the expectations of the dominant society, may further be demonstrated by Paul's noticeable concern for the opinion of outsiders throughout 1 Timothy (Davies, 1996: 27, 29; Harding, 2001: 49, 51; Balch, 1988: 26). This is reflected in the concerns about the erring

[18] For a discussion of the evidence of normative Greco-Roman cultural tradition within the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 see chapter four.
[19] Cf., MacDonald (1983: 87-88); Dunn (2000: 801); Eriksson (1998: 91-92); Harding (2001: 49).

teachers in 1 Timothy 1:11; the concern to live peaceful and quiet lives in 2:2; the concern for overseers to have a good reputation with outsiders in 3:6; the concern for young widows to marry, have children and manage their homes so as not to give outsiders the opportunity for slander in 5:14; and the concern for slaves to honour their masters, so that God's name and the Christian teaching may not be slandered in 6:1 (Donelson, 1986: 178; Balch, 1988: 29). Munro (1983: 104) asserts that "not only is the motive evidently to create a favourable view of the church among those outside the Christian community, but it seems too that their opinion is accepted as a valid measure of worth and a guide to future behaviour."

As already noted, Malina (1981: 58) mentions that within a dyadic cultural milieu individual concerns are expendable in favour of the well-being of the group or community.[20] This attitude reverberates from Josephus in the following statement:

> Our sacrifices are not occasions for drunken self-indulgence-such practices are abhorrent to God-but for sobriety. At these sacrifices prayers for the welfare of the community must take precedence over those or ourselves; for we are born for fellowship, and he who sets its claims above his private interests is specially acceptable to God. (Josephus, *Against Apion* 2.195-96, Loeb; cited in Malina & Neyrey, 1996: 157).

It seems, therefore, that the social values, like honour and shame, the role of ideologies like patriarchy, that place emphasis on male honour and female shame, and the presence of dyadic personality with its emphasis on group embeddedness and concern for the opinions of outsiders, all play a prominent role in the attempt to subordinate Christian women in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. It seems apposite to suggest, therefore, that Paul, in an attempt to maintain the well-being of the Christian community at Ephesus subscribed to the 'best' cultural traditions of his day and subordinated Christian women and prohibited them in the ways described in the passage.[21] In comparison to the many divergent and tenuous interpretations offered by New Testament scholars, it seems tenable to venture down such an interpretive path (Harding, 2001: 95-109; Kroeger & Kroeger, 1992: 79-181).

[20] Malina & Neyrey, (1996: 200) further demonstrate this by stating, "[a]nd group members put great stock on readiness to cooperate with other in-group members. In the case of extreme collectivism, individuals do not have personal goals, attitudes, beliefs, or values but only reflect those of the in-group. As a matter of fact persons enjoy doing what the in-group expects."

[21] Cf., Harding (2001: 49); Taylor (1993: 88); Donelson (1986: 178).

(2) Final Cultural Categories

Final cultural categories in a text demonstrate the main concerns within a text's discourse. Because of existing dissonance between what is construed as a main concern from people in diverse cultural environments, explication of the main concerns within a given text portrays the cultural location and orientation a text takes in relation to alternative cultures that are represented in the discourse. Investigation into the cultural location and orientation of a particular text also discloses to the interpreter what type of culture the discourse cultivates (Robbins, 1996b: 71-72). Aristotle in his Art of Rhetoric, depicts, final cultural categories of rhetoric as "final topics," namely, those topics that most resolutely recognises one's cultural location. Cultural location, in comparison to social location, deals with the manner in which people depict "their propositions, reasons, and arguments both to themselves and to other people. These topics separate people in terms of dominant culture, subculture, counterculture, contraculture, and liminal culture" (Robbins, 1996a: 86).

In my discussion of final cultural categories I will only employ two of the above topics, namely, dominant culture and subculture.[22] The reason for this choice is that the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 most clearly reflects these two topics. It should also be noted that common social and cultural topics and final cultural topics as delineated by Robbins (1996a: 159-175; 1996b: 75-89) are interrelated and, therefore, some of the aspects that will be mentioned in the discussion below covers some of the aspects discussed previously in this chapter. What these final cultural topics brings to the discussion of this chapter, however, is that it enables me to appropriately classify the evident relationship of normative Greco-Roman cultural aspects found within the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 to that of its source (i.e., the dominant patriarchal Greco-Roman culture).

According to Robbins (1996b: 86), dominant culture rhetoric reveals a system of perceptions, standards, dispositions, and normative customs that the text either assumes or claims are confirmed by societal structures with authority to enforce its goals on people in an extensively large territorial area. It is obvious by now that the dominant culture within 1 Timothy 2:8-15 is that of Greco-Roman culture with its traditions and cultural values. Balch (1988: 29) makes the point well when he says, "[t]he dominant Greco-Roman society exerted

[22] For further discussion of all five final cultural categories see Robbins (1996a: 167-175; 1996b: 86-89).

powerful pressure on the devotees of the foreign, Egyptian Isis, on the worshippers of the Palestinian Yahweh, and on the disciples of the crucified Christ to conform to the Roman 'constitution.'"

Conversely, subculture rhetoric mimics the perceptions, standards, dispositions, and normative customs of dominant culture rhetoric (Robbins, 1996b: 86). It does this by finding "ways of affirming the national culture and the fundamental value orientation of the dominant society" (Robbins, 1996a: 169, quoting Roberts 1978: 112-113). The reason that the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 appears to be comprised of subculture rhetoric, is the text's adoption of normative Greco-Roman cultural traditions (household codes), values (honour-shame) and motifs (inner modesty vs. outward modesty) from the dominant Greco-Roman culture and its transposition of these aspects into the Christian community at Ephesus with some obvious changes to that of the normative culture.[23] Thus the relation of the discourse contained in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 comprises a relationship consisting of dominant cultural rhetoric and subcultural rhetoric whereby the text seems to have a strong subcultural relation to that of the dominant Greco-Roman culture and society.[24]

Wallis has delineated religious groups along a continuum comprising three main categories, namely, "world-affirming, world-accommodating, and world-rejecting" (cited in Taylor, 1993: 88). Taylor (1993: 88) has cogently demonstrated that the Christianity of the Pastoral Epistles should be construed as a world-accommodating religion, since the text strongly suggests that the church conform to the cultural expectations of the dominant culture by adopting attitudes and behaviours consistent with that dominant culture. Balch (1988: 36) reaches a similar conclusion and terms the cultural relationship in 1 Timothy, "selective acculturation" because the discourse represents only selected aspects of the dominant prevailing socio-cultural environment. Both of the above-mentioned authors come to similar conclusions concerning the relationship of the discourse contained in 1 Timothy and the environment in which it was written, namely, that the text strongly suggests that the church conform to the cultural expectations of the dominant culture by co-opting normative attitudes and behaviours consistent

[23] See chapter four for further discussion of how the discourse reflects normative Greco-Roman cultural aspects with some noticeable differences.

[24] Robbins (1996a: 167-175; 1996b: 86-89) besides identifying the final cultural categories does not provide further discussion that would allow one to state the reasons for such classification. What I have done, however, is to use his classification and apply it to what the discourse contained in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 presents.

with the dominant culture. It seems apposite, therefore, to conclude that the discourse contained in 1 Timothy 2:8-15, be construed as subcultural rhetoric.[25]

In the general introduction to this chapter I mentioned that the final conclusion gauged from my analysis of the social and cultural texture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 will be to examine the kind(s) of social and cultural position(s) and orientation(s) this text motivates its readers to adopt. The above explication of social and cultural texture has demonstrated that a probable dyadic social and cultural personality deeply embedded and interrelated within a Christian in-group (household) is reflected in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. Further, this chapter has also demonstrated the probability of construing the type of cultural position cultivated within this text to be made up chiefly of subcultural rhetoric, where, Paul through the text of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 is encouraging, if not insisting that the Christian household at Ephesus mimic these aspects of the dominant Greco-Roman culture.

[25] Many other New Testament scholars have come to similar interpretive conclusions using variegating terminology to describe the social and cultural relationship depicted throughout the Pastoral Epistles and also 1 Timothy 2:8-15. See Taylor (1993: 87, 88); Dunn (2000: 801-803); Donelson (1986: 178); Towner (1989: 42, 172); Davies (1996: 27, 29, 32); Johnson (2001: 150); MacDonald (1983: 87-88, 89); Harding (2001: 51, 53); Balch (1988: 26, 29, 36).

Chapter Six

Ideological Texture

Robbins (1996a: 220) comments, "[w]hile analysis of social and cultural texture yields insight into dialogue among social and cultural systems in the discourse, analysis of ideological texture analyses the nature of the power struggles in the context of these systems." In this chapter I hope to move my investigation of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 toward an analysis of such "power struggles" in an attempt to examine how Paul's rhetoric functions ideologically to assert his power over the Ephesian Christian community. I hope to achieve this, with the aid of the last socio-rhetorical texture to be employed in this minor dissertation, namely, ideological texture.

In order to achieve my aims I have divided this chapter into three main sub-sections each serving a specific and related purpose. First, I will attempt to give a brief description of the understanding of ideology as presented by SRC. This will serve as a means to assess the notion of ideological texture from a socio-rhetorical perspective, as well as serving as a springboard by which to view further developments to this 'texture' that have a direct bearing upon my analysis. Second, I will clarify the understanding of ideology as implemented in this chapter. This is crucial to my analysis, as it supplies the theoretical basis upon which to construct my investigation of the ideological nature of the discourse in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. Third, I will then use this understanding of ideology, to engage in a textually based ideological investigation of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 in an attempt to demonstrate that the power of the text's rhetoric results from its ideological nature, or what Robbins (1996a: 36-40, 192-236; 1996b: 95-119) calls its ideological texture.[1]

(1) Socio-Rhetorical Criticism and Ideological Texture

Robbins (1996a: 200-220; 1996b: 106-115) remarks that the expression "ideology" has a variety of meanings and may be used in a number of different ways with different interpretive

[1] The basic structure of this chapter is closely patterned after the structure and insights observed from Wanamaker (2003a: 194-221; 2003b: 115-137).

conclusions.[2] Relying on Eagleton to compile his definition, Robbins (1996a: 36) defines ideology as

> the ways in which what we say and believe connect with the power-structure and power-relations of the society we live in. . . those modes of feeling, valuing, perceiving and believing which have some kind of relation to the maintenance and reproduction of social power.

He further adds, "[i]deology concerns the particular ways in which our speech and action, in their social and cultural location, relate to and interconnect with resources, structures and institutions of power" (1996a: 36).

According to the description of ideology as asserted by Robbins (1996a: 36-37), the ideological texture of a text occurs within the text between the area of implied reader and narrator and characters. It should be noted, however, that this delineation of ideological texture is most applicable to a narrative text rather than an epistolary text and in fact is discussed in that context in Robbins (1996a: 36-37). Thus ideology in this respect concerns itself with the way in which the narrator and characters represent the message and the way in which the implied reader and real reader/audience obtain it. He mentions further that the

> Reciprocity between the empowerment of the narrator and characters, the verbal signs and the represented world by the implied author and the implied reader represents the ideology in the text. In turn, reciprocity between meanings and meaning effects of the text in its world and meanings and meaning effects in the world of the real reader represents the ideology of the text. In other words, now the emphasis lies on the arena of the text where the implied reader and the real reader/audience receive and empower the message of the text (1996a: 37).[3]

Wanamaker (2003a: 196), however, identifying cases in Paul's letters where little or no explicit narrative is present and where Paul himself is the narrator, such as in the case of epistolary texts (as has been seen in 1 Timothy), has further developed this avenue of socio-rhetorical investigation, and notes that non-narrative texts may imply a narrative that underlies the discourse.

[2] For further discussion of this see Wanamaker (2003a: 195).
[3] Emphasis Robbins'.

Ideological texture as posited by SRC extends beyond the ideology contained in a text itself to include three other subsets, namely, the ideology "in authoritative traditions of interpretation"; "in intellectual discourse" of Scriptural texts; and "in individuals and groups" who interpret Scriptural texts (Robbins, 1996a: 193, 221).[4] The primary concerns for the analysis of ideological texture, from a socio-rhetorical perspective, are the "biases, opinions, preferences, and stereotypes of a particular writer and a particular reader" (Robbins, 1996b: 95). SRC has delineated three ways to analyse the ideological texture of a text, namely, "analyzing the social and cultural location of the implied author of the text; analyzing the ideology of power in the discourse of the text; and analyzing the ideology in the mode of intellectual discourse both in the text and in the interpretation of the text" (1996b: 111).[5]

In order to achieve the analysis of the ideological texture in a text, Robbins (1996a: 195) implements what he terms, five principles "for analyzing power relations in a text." He has adopted these from Castelli (1991: 50, 121).[6] The summarised principles are as follows:

1 Define the *system of differentiations* that allows dominant people to act upon the actions of people in a subordinate position.

2 Articulate the *types of objectives* held by those who act upon the actions of others.

3 Identify the *means* for bringing these relationships into being.

4 Identify the *forms of institutionalization of power.*

5 Analyze the *degree of rationalization* of power relations (Robbins, 1996a: 195).

Commenting on the above principles and Robbins' adoption of it, Wanamaker (2003a: 197) avers that these principles, may more appropriately be termed as "processes of analysis." He further mentions that while they are useful in "understanding the power relations of a text, they are not quite the same thing as analyzing the actual ideology of a text or the mode in which the ideology functions." He posits that at this juncture the insights of Thompson (1990) may better facilitate and "contribute to our understanding and practice of ideological criticism" (2003a: 197-

[4] For further delineation of all four ideological locations with an example of these aspects in 1 Corinthians 9, see, Robbins (1996a: 193-236). Also see Wanamaker (2003a: 197) for a cogent explication of these aspects in relation to 2 Corinthians 10–13, as well as further ideological textual developments in conjunction with Thompson's critical conceptualisation of ideology.

[5] For further elucidation of these three ways to analyse the ideological texture of a text, see Robbins (1996b: 111-115).

[6] Also see Wanamaker (2003a: 197) upon which this paragraph is based.

198). The next section aims at further clarifying this new development of ideological textual analysis.

(2) An Amalgamation of Socio-Rhetorical Criticism's Ideological Texture and Thompson's Critical Conceptualisation of Ideology

Identifying clear parallels between SRC and the alternative conceptualisation of ideology proposed by Thompson (1990: 52-73), Wanamaker (2003a; 2003b) has further developed notions of ideological texture for SRC and in so doing, has displayed the fruitfulness of examining Biblical texts from a socio-rhetorical perspective using ideological texture in conjunction with insights from Thompson. Commenting on the concept of ideology by Thompson (1990: 7) which states that ideology refers "to the ways in which meanings serves, in particular circumstances, to establish and sustain relations of power which are systematically asymmetrical," Wanamaker (2003a: 200) avers,

> In my view this is a useful sharpening of the definition of ideology adopted by Robbins because it makes explicit the way in which discourses and actions, which carry symbolic meaning, function ideologically to mobilize power in order to either create or maintain domination.

In this chapter I pattern my investigation of the ideological texture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 upon this new development, as I believe this trajectory of analysing ideological texture, yields better interpretive results and provides a more "sharpened" ideological textual analysis.

According to Thompson (1990: 53) theories of ideology may be divided into two general "types" of ideological conceptions, namely, "neutral conceptions" and "critical conceptions." Neutral conceptions are those which claim to describe phenomena as ideology or ideological "without implying that these phenomena are necessarily misleading, illusory or aligned with interests of any particular group" (1990: 53). According to a neutral conception of ideology, therefore, ideology may encompass all human interactions, irrespective of its particular aims (1990: 53). Critical ideological conceptions "are those which convey a negative, critical or pejorative sense" (1990: 53-54). In contrast to neutral conceptions, "critical conceptions imply that the phenomena characterized as ideology or ideological are misleading, illusory or one-sided; and the very characterization of phenomena as ideology carries with it an implicit criticism or condemnation of them" (1990: 53-54).

Thompson (1990: 55) asserts that the majority of modern authors who write on ideology utilize one or other form of a neutral conception of ideology. In this way, ideology is perceived in a generalised manner, "as systems of beliefs or symbolic forms and practices" (1990: 55). In his stance to ideology Thompson (1990: 55) develops what he calls an "alternative approach" to the investigation of ideology by his formulation of a critical conception of ideology directed towards the investigation of socio-historic phenomena. Commensurately though, by holding on to one aspect of negativity, namely, the maintenance of domination, he maintains the stance adopted by the critical tradition of ideology (Thompson, 1990: 55-56; Wanamaker, 2003a: 195).

Wanamaker (2003a: 199) argues that because ideology itself is about power according to both SRC and the definitions developed by Thompson (1990), it is essential firstly to have an adequate definition of power in mind prior to defining the notion of ideology. Thompson (1990: 151) defines power along a continuum consisting of two main aspects. First, power as a general capacity may be regarded as, "the ability to act in pursuit of one's aims and interests." This is contingent upon one's location within a particular field of activity or institution. This latter emphasis forms the second main aspect of power and may be defined as:

> a capacity which *enables* or *empowers* some individuals to make decisions, pursue ends or realize interests; it empowers them in such a way that, without the capacity endowed by their position within a field or institution, they would not have been able to carry out the relevant course (Thompson, 1990: 151).

In close proximity to power, domination occurs from asymmetrical power relations (Thompson, 1990: 151; Wanamaker, 2003a: 199). Such "systematically asymmetrical" power relations happens when certain people or groups of people are given or take power in a manner that excludes and remains unattainable to other people or groups of people, regardless of the basis upon which such segregation is founded (Thompson, 1990: 151).

Thompson (1990: 56) defines ideology as ". . . *the ways in which meaning serves to establish and sustain relations of domination.*"[7] His concern is with the ways that meaning is utilised by hegemonic individuals and groups to establish and maintain social relations from which they benefit at the expense of other individuals and groups (1990: 73). Meaning in this context may be construed as the meaning generated by "symbolic forms" (1990: 53). According

[7] Emphasis his.

to Thompson (1990: 59) this comprises a variety of actions and expressions; images and texts; linguistic expressions (verbal or textual) and non-linguistic or quasi-linguistic expressions such as visual images or constructions that merge images and words. He further clarifies that "[i]deological phenomena are meaningful symbolic phenomena" when they continue, particularly with regard to socio-historic conditions, to institute and maintain "relations of domination" (1990: 56). This latter aspect comprises the one "criterion of negativity" that he maintains in his definition of ideology (1990: 56). The difference, however, with his definition and that of the critical tradition, is that he separates his conceptualisation from the "supposition of error and illusion" (1990: 67). Thus Thompson's definition does not attempt to discard the negative sense associated with the term ideology, but rather, preserves it while construing it in a different way that establishes a critical ideological concept (1990: 73).

Thompson (1990: 60) has further identified five basic ways in which ideology functions. They are: "'legitimation', 'dissimulation', 'unification', 'fragmentation', and 'reification'."[8] He does make further clarifications, however, three of which seem relevant for my investigative interests. First, he mentions that these five ways are not the only ways in which ideology functions. Second, these five ways do not constantly function autonomously from each other, but in fact function concurrently. And third, certain strategies are "typically" though not exclusively associated with certain ideological modes.[9] The next sub-section aims at employing Thompson's critical conceptualisation of ideology, as applied to SRC by Wanamaker (2003a; 2003b) in an attempt to explicate the ideological texture of 1 Timothy 2:7 and its implications for 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

(3) An Explication of the Ideological Texture of 1 Timothy 2:7

It has already been noted in chapter three, in the section dealing with enthymemic analysis, that the prohibitions in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 are founded upon Paul's assertions in 2:7. Analogously it seems that the main thrust of ideological texture also proceeds from this verse and reverberates throughout 2:8-15. In order to facilitate seeing the ideological nature of 1

[8] For further delineation of these ideological modes of operation and their respective strategies by which they are expressed, see Thompson (1990: 61-67). Also see Wanamaker (2003a: 194-221; 2003b: 115-137) for a lucid socio rhetorical analysis of 2 Corinthians 10-13 and 1 Corinthians 1-4, using these ideological modes and their respective strategies of construction.

[9] For the other clarifications see Thompson (1990: 60-61).

Timothy 2:8-15, I will turn first to 2:7 as I believe this verse provides the ideological legitimation for the prohibitions and instructions in 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

In 1 Timothy 2:7 the text establishes Paul's power to shape and direct the Ephesian community by claiming divine authority for him from God and Christ, as an appointed herald, apostle, and teacher to the gentiles. His claim to divine authentication from God and Christ is implied by vv. 3-6 where the subject of the discourse in these verses refers to God and Christ. Verse 7 simply carries on the discussion, which may be inferred from the use of the preposition "εἰς," and serves to link Paul's ministry to that of God's purpose of universal salvation through the mediator Christ Jesus (vv. 4-6). That the text claims divine authentication for Paul being an apostle may be clearly demonstrated from v. 1, where the verse asserts, "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus by the command of God our saviour and of Christ Jesus our hope." As has been observed from the enthymemic analysis of chapter three, this claim to authority by Paul, empowers him to direct the community as he sees fit. In what follows I will attempt to demonstrate how he asserts his power to the Ephesian Christian community through the ideological means inherent in his discourse.

In his ideological textual investigation of 2 Corinthians 10-13, Wanamaker (2003a: 209) argues that Paul "has no power and therefore no authority unless it is recognized and acknowledged by the Corinthians, and his only means for achieving this recognition and acknowledgement in the circumstances that prevailed was through his rhetoric." He further clarifies this assertion by stating "apostolic apology is an ideological construction in the service of the very power which Paul claims to hold in reserve but in reality only has when the community acknowledges his power through its acceptance of his authority" (2003a: 209, n. 47).[10] It seems that the same type of rhetorical situation exists in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:7 and is effused throughout the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15. This, therefore, implies that the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:7-15 is an attempt to persuade his Ephesian Christian audience to recognise and acknowledge Paul's power, which as has been pointed out, is contingent on their recognition of it. To the extent that it is successful, it procures Paul the 'right' to lay down prohibitions and instructions according to his will as he does in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15.

[10] For similar insights see Castelli (1991: 123).

The implicit claim of divine commission to exercise power in the rhetoric of 1 Timothy 2:7,[11] instantly takes us to the ideological matrix from which his power over the Ephesian community, as postulated in 2:8-15, develops.[12] From the viewpoint of ideological analysis as demonstrated by Thompson (1990: 52-73), it appears that Paul engages in two different ideological modes in 1 Timothy 2:7, in order to persuade his Ephesian audience to recognise and acknowledge his power. These are the ideological mode of legitimation and the ideological mode of dissimulation through the metaphors that are used.

Firstly, Paul employs what Thompson (1990: 61) refers to as the ideological mode of legitimation, by making use of the ideological strategy of rationalisation. According to Thompson (1990: 61) this strategy occurs when "the producer of a symbolic form constructs a chain of reasoning which seeks to defend or justify a set of social relations or institutions, and thereby to persuade an audience that it is worthy of support." The discourse of v. 7 states, "And for this purpose I was appointed a herald and an apostle—I am telling the truth, I am not lying—and a teacher of the true faith to the Gentiles." In this verse Paul makes a self-claim to delegated authority from God and Christ.[13] His work as preacher (herald), apostle (specially empowered delegate) and teacher authorised by Christ is an attempt to rationalise his authority and power over the Ephesians, but also over Timothy, and the elders and deacons. In the Christian hierarchy he stands one level below God. Since he did not appoint himself to this position, according to his rationalisation in 2:7 his pronouncements, commands, and prohibitions must be respected by Timothy and the Ephesians as ultimately coming from God. This is exactly what ideological legitimation is about, namely, the establishment and sustaining of relations of domination by representation as "legitimate, that is, as just and worthy of support" (Thompson, 1990:61).

Many Biblical scholars noticing the presence of the emphatic pronoun ἐγώ in 2:7 in connection with ἐτέθην posit that this implies the uniqueness of Paul's divine appointment (Calvin, 1556: 63; Kelly, 1983: 64; Taylor, 1993: 63).[14] This is confirmed by 1 Timothy 1:1

[11] This claim to divine commission is not explicitly stated in 2:7, but, is implied from the previous verses (2:3-6).
[12] This thought is taken from Wanamaker (2003a: 209) where he describes the ideology contained in the discourse of 2 Corinthians 10-13 with the analogy of an "ideological web" that Paul spins in his rhetoric.
[13] He does this by linking his ministry to God's will of universal salvation through the mediator Christ Jesus (2: 3-6) which strategically places him in a privileged position as an agent of God to affect universal salvation. See Wanamaker (2005).
[14] Harding (2001: 102) mentions that Paul is the only apostle mentioned in the Pastoral Epistles.

where Paul maintains that he is an apostle, or special envoy, of Jesus Christ by the ἐπιταγήν (command) of God and Jesus Christ, himself. In 1:12 he again refers to his θέμενος (appointment) by Christ who has empowered him for his work of ministry. On three occasions, therefore, Paul lays claim to divine authorisation for himself and his activities. This constitutes a claim to legitimate authority and power over the members of the community that he addresses, and in this way the assertion in 2:7 represents an instance of the ideological mode of legitimation. We may go further in our analysis, however, in that Paul's hierarchically dominate position of authority, with its concomitant power, are rationalised for the Ephesians through this claim to divine authorisation. Others could have this level of appointment as may be seen in 1 Corinthians 15:7-8, which states, "Then he (Christ) appeared to James, then to all the apostles, and last of all he appeared to me also."[15] In the world of 1 Timothy, however, Paul does not allow anyone else, including Timothy, to have access to direct divine appointment to authority and power. In fact, there is a clear hierarchical mediation of power, as Paul receives his authority and power directly from Christ (vv. 1 and 12). Timothy receives his from Paul (1:3, 18). The elders and deacons are to receive theirs from Timothy (3:1-14). Thus forming a direct and "systematically asymmetrical" power relation (Thompson, 1990: 151) between him as God's divinely and uniquely appointed minister and the Ephesian Christian community.

The second ideological mode embedded in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:7 relates to "dissimulation" in the form of "displacement" (Thompson, 1990: 62). In v. 7 the author creates the notion of his own powerfulness with the use of three metaphors, namely: herald, apostle, and teacher, by which he accentuates his divinely appointed ministry. The three metaphoric source domains, herald, apostle, and teacher are mapped on to the target domain 'Paul's appointment by Christ'. These source domains with their respective content drawn from everyday life in antiquity are used to give meaning to Paul's appointment by Christ.[16] According to Thompson (1990: 62)

> Ideology *qua* dissimulation may be expressed in symbolic forms by means of a variety of different strategies. One such strategy is *displacement*: a term customarily used to refer to one

[15] My parenthesis.
[16] See Danesi (2004) for the understanding of metaphor used here.

object or individual is used to refer to another, and thereby the positive or negative connotations of the term are transferred to the other object or individual.[17]

In this case the positive connotations attributed to the functional designations, κῆρυξ (herald), ἀπόστολος (apostle), and διδάσκαλος (teacher) serve the ideological purpose of boosting Paul's status and power and also serve as the basis for the set of commands and prohibitions that he issues in 2:8-15.

All three metaphors, from a Greco-Roman socio-cultural perspective, involve people who have delegated authority that empowers them for their social roles (Lea & Griffin, 1992:92; Dibelius & Conzelmann, 1977:43).[18] This is perfectly obvious for herald and apostle, but teachers also have authority over their pupils and what they are taught. This authority is derived from the father of the child who delegates it to them.[19] Paul's use of these three terms to depict himself, therefore, also plays an ideological role, in that they depict him as someone endowed with authority to speak publicly and assertively as one would expect from a herald, apostle or teacher. In 1 Timothy 2:7, he portrays himself as encompassing all three functions, and thus further accentuates his power in relation to his readers.

In relation to 2 Corinthians 10-13, Wanamaker has shown, "[t]here can be little doubt that Paul's goal here. . . is to restore his position of undisputed leadership in relation to the community, with its concomitant power and authority to shape and control the community." It seems that a similar conclusion may be drawn from 1 Timothy 2:7 in its implicit use of two distinct modes of ideology in its discourse. This ideologically oriented rhetoric sets the foundation for the directives and prohibitions in 1 Timothy 2:8-15. From an ideological perspective, Paul's primary intention in 1 Timothy 2:7 is to promulgate "his position of undisputed leadership in relation to the community, with its concomitant power and authority to shape and control the community." In 1 Timothy 2:8-15 he proceeds to apply the authority that he has sought to legitimate in 2:7.

[17] Emphasis his.
[18] Cf., 1 Clement 5.6; 2 Peter 2:5.
[19] On a father's responsibility for his children's education see Burke (2003: 104-105). On Timothy as an authorised teacher of Paul's "children," the Corinthian Christians see Burke (2003: 111).

(4) An Explication of the Ideological Texture of 1 Timothy 2:8-15

As has been seen from the previous chapters, 1 Timothy 2:8-15 inscribes normative unequal relations of power and authority between men and women from the dominant Greco-Roman culture of the first century, and in so doing is implicitly steeped with ideology. This text is blatantly ideological because throughout its discourse Paul uses his "legitimate" authority to justify the subordination of women to men within the community. For reasons of space I am unable to discuss all the possible modes by which ideology operates in vv. 8-15 or all of the possible strategies suggested by Thompson (1990: 61-67). What I will do, however, is discuss those modes and strategies of ideology that appear to be most ostensible and highlights those aspects of ideology that are pertinent to my thesis.

First, Paul engages in fragmentation by treating men and women as separate categories in terms of the nature of their relation with God. According to Thompson (1990: 65) ideological fragmentation comes about when "[r]elations of domination" are "maintained, not by unifying individuals in a collectivity, but by fragmenting those individuals and groups that might be capable of mounting an effective challenge to the dominant group. . ." (Thompson, 1990: 65). Men and women in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 are clearly fragmented. Men can directly access God through prayer (v. 8), but women only demonstrate reverence through dress and good works (vv. 9-10). Women are not even given space for direct communication with God in this passage. The fragmentation continues to the point where it is implied that men have authority over women, since woman cannot have authority over men, ergo, men must have authority over women (vv. 11-12). Also women are to be silent in the church; men are not (vv. 11-12). All of this institutionalises male domination of women in the church at Ephesus, and in a broader context of the Church Universal, it has for the last 1900 years or so continued to do so through the ideology contained in the authoritative interpretative tradition of the church.[20]

Second, it seems likely that in vv. 13-14 there is "rationalization" (Thompson, 1990: 61) going on to legitimate the domination of women by men. In this particular instance, the legitimacy comes from the authority of Scripture, whereby the Genesis creation narrative is used to legitimate the silencing and subordination of women to men in vv. 11-12. In a more general

[20] See chapter One for a discussion of how women in the church have been subordinated and marginalised to fulfilling domestic support roles within the church, due to a history of patriarchal leadership structures within the church and the use of certain Scriptural texts as evidence to support their claims as Biblically or Scripturally based and, therefore, authoritative for the church.

sense, the whole of the argument in vv. 8-15 may be construed as an ideological "rationalization" for the legitimacy of the subordination of women to men in the church. This occurs throughout the passage by the text's implicit defense and "legitimation" (Thompson, 1990: 61) of normative Greco-Roman patriarchal cultural values, motifs and traditions. In previous chapters of this thesis it has already been demonstrated that this cultural environment tendentiously sought to subordinate women to men. Thus by the text's legitimation of these normative patriarchal cultural practices, it clearly serves to maintain the "systematically asymmetrical" power relation between women and men (Thompson, 1990: 151).[21]

Vv. 13-14 may also be construed through the ideological mode of "dissimulation" by means of the strategy of "displacement" (Thompson, 1990: 62). This is perfectly in keeping with Thompson's delineation of ideology. In fact Thompson (1990: 60) mentions, "I do not want to claim that these five modes. . . always operate independently of one another; on the contrary, these modes may overlap and reinforce one another." According to him

> Ideology *qua* dissimulation may be expressed in symbolic forms by means of a variety of different strategies. One such strategy is *displacement*: a term customarily used to refer to one object or individual is used to refer to another, and thereby the positive or negative connotations of the term are transferred to the other object or individual (Thompson, 1990: 62).[22]

In this particular instance, the discourse represents Adam (the representative of men) as being created first and thus superior, whereas, Eve (the representative of women) is presented as created second and thus is inferior to Adam (v. 13). Also the text asserts that Adam was not the one deceived, but rather, Eve was deceived and became a sinner and thus was the first person to overstep the boundary of propriety.[23] More importantly, from an ideological perspective using the strategy of "displacement," however, is the transferring of positive and negative connotations from one individual to another as previously mentioned. In this instance the positive connotations of Adam's priority in the order of creation and thus his superiority to Eve (and all women representatively) as well as the fact that he was not deceived, is in a sense ideologically transferred to all men in the Ephesian congregation. And the negative connotations for Eve, that she was created second and thus is inferior to Adam (and all men representatively) and was

[21] See particularly chapter three and four.
[22] His emphasis.
[23] See chapters three and four.

deceived, is ideologically transferred to all women in the Ephesian congregation. Thus creating and sustaining a direct and "systematically asymmetrical" power relation (Thompson, 1990: 151), comprising male domination and female subordination, between men and women in the Christian community at Ephesus.

Third, v. 15 may imply a form of "unification" (Thompson, 1990: 64) in which woman are re-integrated into the community (i.e., "But women will be saved"), albeit on disadvantageous terms, because the fragmentation may otherwise have gone too far leading to the question of why woman would be involved in the church if there is no benefit for them. But even so the terms of the benefit are not particularly favourable to women. Clearly vs. 15 offers a second-class membership for them. There is also an ideological choice by the writer to favour Genesis 2 over Genesis 1 since the latter would not have allowed for the kind of temporal superiority for men in the created order that Genesis 2 encourages. Another mode of ideology implicit in v. 15 is what Thompson (1990: 62) describes as "dissimulation" which is expressed using the ideological strategy of "euphemization." This strategy comes about when, "actions, institutions or social relations are described or redescribed in terms which elicit a positive valuation" (1990: 62). In v. 15 the relegation and subordination of women to the private, household sphere of life, to fulfill normative domestic roles such as childbearing is ideologically euphemised as a positive valuation, namely, a means of piety, and more specifically salvation for women.[24] This verse, therefore, serves to maintain the normative patriarchal cultural mores of the dominant Greco-Roman society, marginalising women to the private household sphere of life and subordinating them to men in general, who were free to live out their lives in the public (male) sphere of life.[25]

As has been asserted in chapter one, the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 has tendentiously been used by the interpretative tradition of the church, to ideologically authenticate the subordination of women to men in the Christian community for the last 1900 years. As may be observed from the above discussion, 1 Timothy 2:7-15 is deeply embedded with ideological texture and the discourse tendentiously served to maintain and sustain the normative patriarchal asymmetrical power relations between men and women in the church during the period of the first century, and continues to do so in many churches today.

[24] See chapter three.
[25] See chapter four.

Chapter Seven

Conclusion

The essence of this thesis has revolved around showing the efficacy of a socio-rhetorical approach to doing exegesis of Scriptural texts. My primary aim in this thesis has been to achieve two main goals. First, I have attempted to gain mastery of an interpretive methodology, namely, socio-rhetorical analysis. Second, by looking at a crucial text that has major implications for the contemporary church, I have applied this method of analysis to a particular Scriptural text, namely, 1 Timothy 2:8-15. It is clear from this thesis that Christian culture is being constructed in the discourse of this text. First Timothy 2:8-15, however, confuses cultural imperatives co-opted from the dominant Greco-Roman cultural milieu, with a theological imperative, for which the author of 1 Timothy provides Scriptural justification (vv. 13-14).

In this thesis I have demonstrated that the rhetorical argument contained in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, has as its matrix normative patriarchal cultural presuppositions and traditional motifs taken from the secular Greco-Roman culture. And particularly, those arguments related to the gender conceptualisation of that epoch, which tendentiously sought to maintain the subordinate and marginalised role of women, thereby relegating them to the domestic and private sphere of the household.

Throughout the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, it appears that the author co-opts commonplace patriarchal cultural aspects from the 'secular' Greco-Roman society of the day and transposes them in different ways for the Christian community at Ephesus as an expected and legitimate Christian norm. This implies that author of 1 Timothy and the Christians whom he sought to address were thoroughly inculturated in Greco-Roman culture and therefore unquestioningly accepted the basic androcentric cultural values and knowledge of the wider society. This then leads the author to re-inscribe these cultural directives into the emerging Christian culture, calling on women in particular to adhere to those culturally rooted directives. It seems, therefore, that the type of cultural position cultivated within this text is made up chiefly of subcultural rhetoric, where, the author, through the text of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, is encouraging, if not insisting that the church he addresses conform to the cultural expectations of the dominant Greco-Roman culture by adopting its normative attitudes and behaviours. This is particularly interesting as it shows that the origins of the rhetoric in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 and also the Christian

values it propagates are simply the "best" from the patriarchal culture of the day. This latter aspect plays an important interpretive role in placing the text within its proper social and cultural context and should help prevent a modern interpreter from superimposing his or her own cultural views on to the text (Dunn, 2000: 803; Towner, 1989: 42). Conversely this focus, should caution a modern interpreter against superimposing the socially and culturally bound aspects of the text onto modern day Christianity and calls into question the ideological use of this text to subordinate women in the contemporary church.

Another pertinent aspect that has been discovered in this thesis is that honour and shame play a significant role in the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 as is evidenced by the discourse itself being steeped with honour-shame vocabulary. It appears, therefore, that the subordination and marginalisation of women in 1 Timothy 2:8-15 comes from their subordination in society as a result of patriarchy and the honour-shame valuing system. The social values, like honour and shame, the role of ideologies like patriarchy, that place emphasis on male honour and female shame, and the presence of dyadic personality with its emphasis on group embeddedness and concern for the opinions of outsiders, therefore, all play a prominent role in the attempt to subordinate Christian women in the text. Consequently, because of the patriarchal nature of Greco-Roman society, and the overwhelming concern about male honour in a dyadic oriented society, women in the text are subordinated and marginalised according to the conventional cultural practices of that period.

The fact that the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 inscribes normative unequal relations of power and authority between men and women from the dominant Greco-Roman culture of the first century, demonstrates that it is steeped with ideology. This occurs throughout the passage by the text's implicit defence and "legitimation" (Thompson, 1990: 61) of normative Greco-Roman patriarchal cultural values, motifs and traditions. Thus by the text's legitimation of these things, it clearly serves to maintain the "systematically asymmetrical" power relation between women and men (Thompson, 1990: 151).[1]

This thesis has thus demonstrated that the discourse of 1 Timothy 2:8-15 reflects first and foremost the secular culture of the day, rather than an inherent Christian culture. It does not seem appropriate, therefore, for contemporary Christians to interpret this text in an ideological manner as though it reflects some kind of divine Christian culture, suitable for all times. Rather it seems

[1] See particularly chapter three and four.

more fitting that the ideological interpretations of this text posited in many contemporary churches indeed does need to be called into question and re-evaluated in light of other Biblical texts such as Galatians 3:28, a text that points to the inherent equality of women and men in light of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

Bibliography

Balch, David L. (1981). *Let Wives Be submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter.* Society Of Biblical Literature Monograph Series, 26. MI: Scholars Press.

Barr, David L. (1984). "The Apocalypse as a Symbolic Transformation of the World: A Literary Analysis." *Interpretation, 38*, 39-50.

Baumert, Norbert S. J. (1996). *Woman And Man In Paul: Overcoming a Misunderstanding.* Collegeville, MINN: Liturgical Press.

Black, C. Clifton (1991). "An Oration At Olivet: Some Rhetorical Dimensions Of Mark 13." In Duane F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy.* JSNTsup 50. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 66-92.

Bloomquist, Gregory L. (2002a). "The Role of the Audience in the Determination of Argumentation: The Gospel of Luke and the Acts of the Apostles." In Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Ubelacker (eds.), *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference.* Emory Studies in Early Christianity. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 157-173.

Bloomquist, Gregory L. (2002b). "A Possible Direction for Providing Programmatic Correlation of Textures in Socio-Rhetorical Analysis." In Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (eds.), *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*. JSNTsup 195. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 61-96.

Brandel-Syrier, Mia (1984). "The role of Women in African Independent Churches" *Missionalia*: 12, 1:13-18.

Burke, Trevor J. (2003). "Paul's Role as 'Father' to his Corinthian 'Children'." In Trevor J. Burke and Keith J. Elliot (eds.), *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict*. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 109. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 95-113.

Calvin, John (1556). *Commentaries on The Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and Philemon.* Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society.

Castelli, E. A. (1991). *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power.* Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation. Louisville, KY: Westminster/John Knox Press.

Classen, Joachim C. (1995). "A Rhetorical Reading of the Epistle to Titus." In Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (eds.), *The Rhetorical analysis of Scripture: Essays from the 1995 London Conference*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 427-444.

Combrink, Bernard H. J. (2003). "Shame on the Hypocritical Leaders in the Church: A Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation of the Reproaches in Matthew 23." In David B. Gowler, I. Gregory Bloomquist, and Duane F. Watson (eds.), *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 1-35.

Danesi, Marcel (2004). *Poetic Logic: The Role of Metaphor in Thought, Language, and Culture*. Language and Communication, 1 Madison. WI: Attwood Publishing.

Davies, Margaret (1996). *The Pastoral Epistles*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Debanné, Marc J (2002). "An Enthymematic Reading of Philippians: Towards a Typology of Pauline Arguments." In Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (eds.), *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*. JSNTSup 195. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 481-503.

Dibelius, Martin and Hans Conzelmann (1977). *The Pastoral Epistles: Hermeneia – A Critical and Historical Commentary on the Bible*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Donelson, Lewis R. (1986). *Pseudepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).

Doty, William G (1973). *Letters in Primitive Christianity*. Philadelphia, PA: Fortress Press.

Dunn, James D. G. (2000). "The First and Second Letters to Timothy and the Letter to Titus." In *The New Interpreter's Bible*, volume XI. Nashville, TN: Abingdon Press, 773-880.

Eriksson, Anders (1998). "'Women Tongue Speakers, Be Silent': A Reconstruction Through Paul's Rhetoric." *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches*, volume 6, 80-104.

Eriksson, Anders (2002a). "Enthymemes in Pauline Argumentation: Reading Between the Lines in 1 Corinthians." In Anders Eriksen, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Übelacker (eds.), *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 243-259.

Eriksson, Anders (2002b). "Contrary Arguments in Paul's Letters." In Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (eds.), *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*. JSNTSup 195. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 336-354.

Fee, Gordon D. (1988). *New International Biblical Commentary: 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers.

Fiore, Benjamin (1986). *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles. Analecta Biblica 105.* Rome: Biblical Institute.

Fiorenza, Elizabeth S. (1983). *In Memory of Her.* New York, NY: Crossroad.

Gaebelein, Frank E. (1978). *The Expositor's Bible Commentary,* volume11 (Ephesians-Philemon). Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House.

Gaitskell, Deborah (1982). "Wailing for purity: prayer unions, African mothers and adolescent daughters, 1912-1940." In Shula Marks and Richard Rathbone (eds.), *Industrialization and Social change in South Africa: African Class formation, culture and consciousness, 1870-1930.* New York, NY: Longman, 338-357.

Gaitskell, Deborah (1995). "Praying and preaching: the distinctive spirituality of African Women's church." In Henry Bredekamp and Robert Ross (eds.), *Missions and Christianity in South African History.* Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press, 211-232.

Gaitskell, Deborah (1997). "Power in Prayer and Service: Women's Christian Organisations." In Richard Elphic and Rodney Devenport (eds.), *Christianity in South Africa: A political, social and cultural history.* Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 253-267.

Giles, Kevin (2000). "A Critique of the 'Novel' Contemporary Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 Given in the Book, Women in the church. Part I." *Evangelical Quarterly, 67,* 151-167.

Giles, Kevin (2002). *The Trinity and Subordinationism: The Doctrine of God and the Contemporary Gender Debate.* Downers Grove, IL: Intervarsity Press.

Gritz, Sharon Hodgin (1991). *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A study of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 in Light of the Religious and Cultural Milieu of the First Century.* Lanman, MD: University Press of America.

Guthrie, Donald (1957). *The Pastoral Epistles: An Introduction and Commentary.* London: Tyndale Press.

Hall, Robert G (1991). "Historical Inference and Rhetorical Effect: Another Look At Galatians 1 and 2." In Duane F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy.* JSNTsup 50. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 308-320.

Hanson, A. T. (1982). *The New Century Bible Commentary: The Pastoral Epistles.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Harding, Mark (1998). *Tradition and Rhetoric in the Pastoral Epistles.* Studies in Biblical Literature 3. New York, NY: Peter Lang Publishing.

Harding, Mark (2001). *What Are They Saying About the Pastoral Epistles?* New York: Paulist Press.

Hayter, Mary (1987). *The New Eve In Christ: The Use and Abuse of the Bible in the Debate about Women in the Church.* London: Latimer Trend & Company.

Hendriksen, William (1964). *A Commentary on I & II Timothy and Titus.* Chiltern Street, London: The Banner of Truth Trust.

Hester, James D. (1991). "Placing The Blame: The Presence of Epideictic in Galatians I and 2." In Duane F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy.* JSNTsup 50. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 281-307.

Hock, Ronald F., and Edward N. O'Neil (eds.) (1986), *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric.* Vol. 1: *The Progymnasmata.* SBLTT 24. Greco-Roman Religion Series 9. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Holmes, JM. (2000). *Texts in a Whirlwind: A Critique of Four Exegetical Devices at 1 Timothy 2.9-15.* JSNTsup 196. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Jewett, Robert (1986). *The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety.* Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

Johnson, Luke Timothy (1996). *Letters to Paul's Delegates: I Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus.* Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.

Johnson, Luke Timothy (2001). *The First and Second Letters to Timothy: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary.* The Anchor Bible. New York. Doubleday.

Karris, Robert J. (1979). *The Pastoral Epistles.* Wilmington, DL: Michael Glazier.

Kelly, J. N.D. (1983). *A Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Kennedy, George A. (1984). *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetorical Criticism.* Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press.

Kennedy, George A. (1991). *Aristotle On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kennedy, George A. (1994). *A New History of Classical Rhetoric.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

King, Guy H. (1957). *A Leader Led: A Devotional Study of 1 Timothy.* London: Marshall, Morgan & Scott Ltd.

Klein, Bastienne (2004). "On Becoming and Being a Women Theologian in South Africa: In Conversation with Denise Ackerman." *Journal of Theology for Southern Africa*, 118, 40-52.

Kraus, Manfred (2002). "Theories and Practice of the Enthymeme in the first Centuries B.C.E and C.E." In Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Ubelacker (eds.), *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference.* Emory Studies in Early Christianity. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 95-111.

Kroeger, Richard Clark and Catherine Clark Kroeger (1992). *I Suffer Not a Women: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in the Light of Ancient Evidence.* Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Book House.

Lea, Thomas D., and Hayne P Griffin Jr. (1992). *The New American Commentary: 1,2 Timothy, Titus,* volume 34. Nashville, TN: Broadman Press.

Lausberg, Heinrich (1998). *Handbook of Literary Rhetoric: A Foundation for Literary Study.* Leiden: E. J. Brill.

MacDonald, Dennis Ronald (1983). *The Legend And The Apostle: The Battle for Paul in Story and Canon.* Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press.

Mack, Burton L (1990). *Rhetoric and the New Testament.* Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press.

Malina, Bruce J (1981). *The New Testament World: insights from cultural anthropology.* Louisville, KY: John Knox Press.

Malina, Bruce J (1996). "Understanding New Testament Persons." In Richard Rohrbaugh (ed.), *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 41-61.

Malina, Bruce J., and Jerome H. Neyrey (1996). *Portraits of Paul: An Archeology Of Ancient Personality.* Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox Press.

Masondo, Sibusiso (2002). "Models of change in African Christianity: South African Case Studies." *Journal for the study of Religion,*15, 145-166.

Miller, James D. (1997). *The Pastoral Letters as Composite Documents.* Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series 93. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mosala, Bernadette (1986). "Black Theology and the Struggle of the Black Woman in Southern Africa." In Itumeleng Mosala and Buti Tlhagale (eds.), *The Unquestionable Right To Be Free: Essays in Black Theology.* Johhanesburg: Skotaville Publishers, 129-133.

Mounce, William D. (2000). *Word Biblical Commentary: Pastoral Epistles,* volume 46. Nashville, TN: Thomas Nelson Publishers.

Moxnes Halvor (1996). "Honor and Shame." In Richard L. Rohrbaugh (ed.), *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 19-40.

Munro, Winsome (1983). *Authority in Paul and Peter: The Identification of a Pastoral Stratum in the Pauline Corpus and 1 Peter.* Society for New Testament Monograph Series 45. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Nixon, Marion (1994). *Religion, Identity, and Pastoral Care: Gender Related Perspectives of Reality.* MA Thesis. University of Cape Town. Cape Tow.

Oden, Thomas C. (1989). *Interpretation: First & Second Timothy & Titus.* Louisville, KY: John Knox Press.

Olbricht, Thomas H. (2002). "Greek Rhetoric And The Allegorical Rhetoric Of Philo and Clement Of Alexandria." In Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (eds.), *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible.* JSNTsup 195. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Pattison, Stephen (1994). *"Bringing it all back home Pastoral care with women."* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 240-260.

Plevnick, Joseph (1993). "Honor/Shame." In John J. Pilch and Bruce J. Malina (eds.), *Biblical Social Values and their Meaning: a Handbook.* Peabody, MA: Hendrickson Publishers, 95-104.

Pretorius, Hennie and Lizo, Jafta (1997). "A branch springs out: African initiated Churches." In Richard Elphic and Rodney Devenport (eds.), *Christianity in South Africa: A political, social, and cultural history.* Berkley, CA: University of California Press, 211-226.

Pomeroy, Sarah B (1999). "Reflections on Plutarch, Advice to the Bride and Groom: Something Old, Something New, Something Borrowed." In Sarah B. Pomeroy (ed.), *Plutarch's Advice to the Bride and Groom and A Consolation to His Wife.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Robbins, Vernon K. (1988). "The Chreia." In David E. Aunne (ed.), *Greco-Roman Literature and the New Testament.* Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1-23.

Robbins, Vernon K. (1996a). *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse: rhetoric, society and ideology*. London: Routledge.

Robbins, Vernon K. (1996b). *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.

Robbins, Vernon K. (1996c). "*The Dialectical Nature of Early Christian Discourse*." *Scriptura*, 59, 353–62.

Robbins, Vernon K. (1998). "From Enthymeme to Theology in Luke 11:1-13." In R.P. Thompson and T.E. Phillips (eds.), *Literary Studies in Luke Acts: Essays in Honour of Joseph B. Tyson*. Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 191-214.

Robbins, Vernon K. (2002). "Argumentative Textures in Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation." In Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Ubelacker (eds.), *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts: Essays from the Lund 2000 Conference*. Emory Studies in Early Christianity. Harrisburg, PA.: Trinity Press International, 27-65.

Robbins, Vernon K. (2004a) (Unpublished Paper). "Beginnings and Developments in Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation". Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Robbins, Vernon K (2004b) (Unpublished Paper). *"Six Steps for Writing Socio-Rhetorical Commentary."* Emory University, Atlanta, GA.

Robbins, Vernon K (2004c). (Unpublished Paper). "Priestly Rhetorolect". Presented to the Rhetoric and the New Testament Seminar at the Society of Biblical Literature meeting, 20 November, 2004 in San Antonio, TX.

Ruether, Rosemary Radford (1998). *Women and Redemption: A Theological History*. London: SCM Press Ltd.

Ryrie, Charles Caldwell (1968). *The Place of Women in the Church*. Chicago, IL: Moody Press.

Russel, D. A., and N. G Wilson (1981). *Menander Rhetor*. Oxford: Claredon Press.

Smeeton, Donald D. (1994). *The Church: From the Reformation to the Present.* Columbia: ICI University.

Stambaugh, John E., and David L. Balch (1986). *The New Testament in Its Social Environment*. Philadelphia, PA: The Westminster Press.

Stowers, Stanley K (1986). *Letter Writing in Graeco-Roman Antiquity*. Philadelphia, PA: Westminster Press.

Taylor, Walter F., JR. (1993). "1-2 Timothy, Titus." In Gerhard Krodel (ed.), *The Deutero – Pauline Letters: Ephesians, Colossians, 2 Thessalonians, 1-2 Timothy, Titus*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 62-93.

Towner, Philip H (1989). *The Goal Of Our Instruction: The Structure of Theology and Ethics in the Pastoral Epistles*. JSNTsup 34. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

(2000) The Holy Bible: *New International Version*. Roggebaai,CT: Bible Society of South Africa.

Thompson, John B. (1990). *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Verner, David C. (1983). *The Household of God: The Social World of the Epistles*. Society Biblical Literature Dissertation Series 71. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Wanamaker, Charles A. (2000). "Epistolary vs. Rhetorical Analysis: Is a Synthesis Possible?" In Karl P. Donfried and Johannes Beutler (eds.), *The Thessalonians Debate: Methodological Discord or Methodological Synthesis?* Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 255-286.

Wanamaker, Charles A. (2003a). "'By the Power of God': Rhetoric and Ideology in 2 Corinthians 10–13." In David B. Gowler, L. Gregory Bloomquist, and Duane F. Watson (eds.), *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins*. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press International, 194-221.

Wanamaker, Charles A. (2003b). "A Rhetoric of Power: Ideology and 1 Corinthians 1–4." In T. J. Burke and J. K. Elliot (eds.), *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict*. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, 109. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 115–37.

Wanamaker, Charles A. "The Power of the Absent Father: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Corinthians 4:14-5:13." In Cilliers Breytenbach, Johan Thom, and Jeremy Punt (eds.), *The New Testament Interpreted: Essays in Honour of Bernard C. Lategan*. Leiden: E. J. Brill, Forthcoming November 2005.

Waters, Kenneth L., SR. (2004). "Saved Through Childbearing: Virtues as Children in 1 Timothy 2:11-15." *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 123, 703-735.

Watson, Duane F (1991). "Paul's Speech to the Ephesian Elders (Acts20.17-38)." In Duane F. Watson (ed.), *Persuasive Artistry: Studies in New Testament Rhetoric in Honor of George A. Kennedy.* JSNTsup 50. Sheffield: JSOT Press, 184-208.

Watson, Duane F., and Hauser, Alan J (1994). *Rhetorical Criticism of the Bible: A Comparative Bibliography with Notes on History and Method.* Biblical Interpretation Series 4. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Watson, Duane F (1997). "The Integration of Epistolary and Rhetorical Analysis of Philippians." In Stanley E. Porter and Thomas H. Olbricht (eds.), *The Rhetorical Analysis of Scripture: Essays from the1995 London conference*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 398-426.

Watson, Duane F (2002). "Why we Need Socio-Rhetorical Commentary and What it might Look Like." In Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps (eds.), *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*. JSNTSup 195. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 129-159.

Watson, Duane F (2003). "Keep Yourself from idols: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of the Exordium and Peroratio of 1 John." In David B. Gowler, L. Gregory Bloomquist, and Duane F. Watson (eds.), *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins.* Harrisburg, PA: Trinity Press, 281-302.

West, Martin E. (1975). *Bishops and Prophets in a black City: African Independent Churches in Soweto*. Johannesburg and Cape Town: David Philip.

Wilson, Bryan R. (1969). "A Typology of Sects." In Roland Robertson (ed.), *Sociology of Religion.* Baltimore, MD: Penguin Books, 361-83.

Winter, Bruce W. (2003). *Roman Wives, Roman Widows: The Appearance of New Women and the Pauline Communities.* Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company.

Witherington, Ben III (1992). *Women And The Genesis Of Christianity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.