Teologie.

c8010 – 286.16805 SOU
RequesterNote: COPY please send to interbib@nwu.ac.za
RequestedServiceType: COPY-NON-RETURNABLE

The South African Baptist journal of theology.
Cape Town :; Baptist Union of Southern Africa,,
Volume / Issue: 25 Pagination: 36-49
Article Author: Pohlmann, M.H.
Article Title: A Theological-ethical reflection on the use of the word ???????? within the Pastoral Corpus of Paul for ministry impact within a global context.
Date of Article: 2016
ISSN: 10197990

Lending Unit: 8010 Expiry Date: 20170817
Return Address:
Lender's Request ID:
4465655

Requester's Request ID
4465549

Requesting Unit: 3170
Requested: 20170814 Need Before: 20170914
Delivery Address:
Patron ID: 3170-10302107 Patron Name: Lombard, Hester

A Theological-ethical reflection on the use of the word 'Ανθρωπος' within the Pastoral Corpus of Paul for ministry impact within a global context.

Martin H. Pohlmann. Research professor at North-West University, Potchefstroom/ Principal of the Baptist Theological College of Southern Africa, Randburg.

Abstract

Translations of the Bible, and in particular, the New Testament are popularly used by Christians around the world. A problem sometimes occurs when the 'translation' of a word finds its way into Bibles because of bias within a certain historical context. Similarly, a translation can also govern the way Christians behave and prescribe ministry patterns to the detriment of some people. This has occurred with the word 'anthropos' within the Pastoral Epistles corpus when it has been translated into English consistently using the word 'man'. This article intends to explore the original intention of the author of the Pastoral Epistles and the outcome for the original readers of the text. Once this is done, the final outcome for 'faith and practice' will be considered for the contemporary context. The initial hermeneutical method will be the findings of the 'historico-grammatica' process outcome. Following this will be a theological-ethical investigation into the implications of language use within context and its impact on translation into practical ministry. The outcome will be an outcome proposal for reading the text within the contemporary global context for ministry coaching.

1. Introduction

Writing a letter from an Apostle to a Timothy, Titus or a Philemon has certain elements of personal interest, cultural sensibility, practical demand and theological urgency built into the equation. No book of Scripture was written in an 'eternal vacuum'. The next step is the process of translating Scripture into a specific language at a particular stage of its development. Rawlings (2011:13-249) has demonstrated the 'struggle to get the Bible into English'. "The story of the great struggle to get the Bible to us in our own language should have a special interest for all those who care for its contents" (Rawlings, 2011:18).

The process has not almost been an easy one or an honest one. For example, it need be noted how the name Junia in Romans 16:7 met with various challenges. "In 1927, Erwin Nestle's Greek New Testament replaced the feminine form with the masculine form, and the UBS editions followed suit. In 1998 both editions reversed their decisions" (Cohick, 2006:69). Tom Wright confirms certain sentiments when he says: "I note that there was a

huge fuss in the translation and revision of the New International Version at the suggestion that Junia was a woman, and that not a single historical or exegetical argument was available to those who kept insisting, for obvious reasons, that she was Junias, a man" (2005:5). The issue germane to the research within this article is found in the stinging comment made by Cohick when he gives his take on why this meddling with the translation happened. His thoughts are that "prejudice guided their earlier decisions, namely that women could not be apostles" (2006:69). It is the commitment of this article that the text may not be meddled with but rather the text needs to be wrestled with.

Pohlmann makes the point: "Though most translations are good and sound, every translation has its limitations" (2014:145). Hannah makes the very valid point regarding the Medieval Church: "Many were claiming that errors in the church could be traced to a faulty understanding of the Scriptures" (2001:150). Points of interest are how the words 'penance' versus 'repentance' featured in the translation of Matthew 4:17. 'Penance' became a long historical practice of the Church rather than a preaching of 'repentance' which is altogether different. This is a textual, translation, theological and ethical matter through a very slight twist in translation from Greek to Latin. Another example is translating 'mystery' in Ephesians 5:31-32 with the word *sacramentum!* So the question is very seriously this; is marriage a mystery or a *sacrament*? The answer to this question has very serious doctrinal and then practical ethical consequences.

This leads to the questions raised over the literal, dynamic and theological translation of the word ἀνθρωπος in the Pauline Pastorals. Though it would be true to say that the primary audience would have been men within the male dominated cultures. It was however not exclusively the case. Over time and change within most cultures as the mission of the Church has ventured into global proportions, this is no longer true. This article wishes to explore the word within context using the trusted '*historico-grammatica*' process of hermeneutics. Once the text is unlocked, the next step will be the original context, versus the historical process and then the present context – primarily within the English-speaking world. This then becomes a theological and ethical exercise.

It is simply unethical to limit people's ministry when in fact the text is releasing everyone into ministry through the Gospel (Ac 2:17-18). In my understanding, this is exactly what has occurred through the narrow and limited translation of the word ἀνθρωπος. Piper and Grudem draw a rather definitive position on the subject; which is representative of a model governing many Churches and affecting countless women in ministry: "We are persuaded that the Bible teaches that only men should be pastors and

elders. ... So it is unbiblical, we believe, and therefore detrimental, for women to assume this role" (1992:15).

2. A Word Study of Ανθρωπος Within 1Timothy, 2Timothy and Titus.
The word is used ten times in 1Timothy, six times in 2 Timothy and five times in Titus. The method is then to examine the use of each word in context and to make a call on what is the best intention within the translation process. Does the word always mean 'men' in gender terms? Or are there times when the word is used generically to refer to people in general?

1Timothy 2:1, "I urge, then, first of all, that petitions, prayers, intercession and thanksgiving be made for all ἀνθρώποι". While the mind of the Apostle may have had men in mind because of the dominance of men in ruling positions at the time (1Tm 2:2), the text is clearly generic in intent. We are called to use every possible prayer in praying for each other. Lea and Griffith agree: "Paul was concerned that Ephesian believers pray for everyone" (1992:87). They go on to say on the same page that the same intent applies in 1Timothy 2:4 in terms of "everyone to be saved" and 1 Timothy 2:6 in that Christ "died for all people."

1Timothy 2:4, states that God, "desires all ἀνθρωπους to be saved." Any reading of the New Testament makes it very clear that men and women both have equal access to faith in Jesus Christ and salvation. So the only reasonable reading of this word here is generic; in that, it is referring to *all people* in general and not to the male gender specifically. Yet many translations use the word 'men' for translation purposes.

1Timothy 2:5-6 is very important. "For there is one mediator between God and ἀνθρώπους, a (or the) ἀνθρωπος Christ Jesus." The first use is clearly a reference to 'mankind' in general. The second use is a reference to the historical figure – the human man Christ Jesus. Lea and Hayne correctly make the point that this is not so much a gender reference but a reference to the Saviour: "Christ is thus the head of a new race of people who profess allegiance and likeness to him rather than to Adam (*c.f.* Rm 5:12-21; 1 Cor 15:21-22, 45-49)" (1992:91). There could even be some further support for a 'non-gender' rendering seeing that Jesus the 'man' is recorded here as "Christ Jesus" where the focus is on His exaltation and not the gender of His humanness. Verse 6 immediately links this 'man' Jesus to being a 'ransom' on behalf of 'all people' which would include men and women, Jew and Gentile, slave and free.

1Timothy 4:10 refers to Jesus as "Saviour of all ἀνθρώπους", as a follow-on from 1 Timothy 2:5. The focus of the author is on Christ's role as Saviour of humanity and not on His gender while in His condescension. Verse 11 is very wise to qualify that only "those who believe on Him" will benefit

from salvation. We are not talking about universalism in any way here. Millard Erickson is right in saying: "This is a particularly interesting and significant verse since it seems to indicate a difference in the salvation accomplished for believers and others" (2013:757). This is correct. The former have the potential of salvation achieved through Christ, while Christians enjoy the *effectiveness* of it through faith (Jn 3:16).

1Timothy 5:24. "The sins of some ἀνθρώπων are obvious." In typical throughout 1 Timothy the obvious translation here is 'people'. Though men may have crossed the mind of the Apostle as can be seen in many male dominant societies; the intention here is the general sins of the local people. Paul is simply talking about the 'wages of sin' as in any case where it applies.

1Timothy 6:5. Expanding on people who are unlawful and unsuited to ministry, Paul adds that they experience, "constant friction between ἀνθρώπων of corrupt mind, who have been robbed of the truth and who think that godliness is a means to financial gain." Examples of women who struggled with friction were Euodia and Syntyche in Philippians 4:2. This is a human issue, not just a male issue.

1Timothy 6:9. "Some ἀνθρώπους, eager to get rich, have wandered from the faith." This applies to anyone whether male or female. The point is clear from this survey of 1Timothy that Paul is addressing *people of the faith* within the context of their homes, leadership roles and living their lives. It is not men alone, but people that are being addressed.

1Timothy 6:11. "But you, O ἀνθρωπε of God." Now, in this specific case, Paul addresses his spiritual son Timothy specifically. So obviously the person now being addressed is a man. However, this is derived from the specific instruction and the person involved. Young would even disagree with this generosity: "The 'man of God' addressed in not 'male' but 'human' (*Anthropos*), and time and again it is irrelevant precisely who is being addressed" (1994:154). This is a bold admission prior to the more advanced discussions on this subject from 1998 onwards.

1Timothy 6:16. "He alone is immortal and who lives in unapproachable light, who no ἀνθρώπων has seen or can see." Here is the clearest case of all of 'non-gender' rendering of the understanding. Paul clearly has all people in mind. Lock makes a very fitting comment to Paul's climatic thinking: "The thought of the First and of the second Advent alike suggests a doxology to his mind" (1966:73). The thought process is moving to a crescendo.

2 Timothy 2:2."And the things you have heard me say in the presence of

many witnesses entrust to reliable ἀνθρώποις, who will also be qualified to teach others." Simpson so correctly states: "An era of inspired teaching and apostolic teaching and apostolic surveillance, in itself exceptional, is to be followed by an era of diffusion and consolidation of a more normal type" (1954:130). The questions that are typically raised here concern 'gender specific' translation and the possibility of women teachers. The argument is put like this: if this verse includes women, what happens to the restriction that is apparently placed on women like in 1Timothy 2:12?

It seems quite clear that verse 2 is using the word ἀνθρωπος as it has been used throughout 1Timothy, which suits a generic rendering in translation. The evidence of Scripture supports this. For example, there is no total restriction placed on women teaching the Word or doctrine in 1 Timothy 2:12. The restrictions that are put in place start in verse 11, namely that as *women Believers are taught* in the new era of the Gospel, they should do so in 'quietness' and in submission to God as the source of all good teaching. Verse 12 suggests that there should be caution in over eager teaching by women Believers, and it may be helpful to do so within certain sensitive contexts under leadership counsel! What is further strongly censured is any abusive use of authority (αὐθεντείν) through the process of teaching. So the balance of teaching women (2Tm 2:2) is strongly advocated; but the execution of this 'new era' needs to be carefully monitored. Lock confirms when he says of 'αὐθεντείν': "The earliest known use of the word, common in late Greek ... is 'to lord it over', 'to dictate to'..." (1966:32). This is what Paul is censuring; not good godly, humble teaching of the Word of God and doctrine! Even Paul himself made a 'time specific' statement in the light of some of this unruly misconduct evident to him, "I do not allow....".

If one looks at the modelling and examples of the people Paul entrusted with the Gospel they are primarily men like Timothy, Titus, Barnabus, John Mark; but not exclusively. In Romans 16:1 Paul entrusted the 'Roman Epistle' to "sister Phoebe." Reumann correctly says of Phoebe: "Subsequent male-dominated churches have long blocked giving Phoebe her due... *diakonos* suggests 'minister' or even 'officer in the congregation'" (2003:1310). Romans 16:12 says: "Greet Tryphaena and Tryphosa, those women who work hard in the Lord." It is almost impossible to be a 'διακονος' of the Church together with being entrusted with the Roman letter (Rm 16:1); and yet not also be included as one those referred to 2 Timothy 2:2. It is also almost impossible to be a person who "works hard in the Lord" while doing so in ignorance of what would normally be conveyed to a person 2 Timothy 2:2 has in mind. So the evidence of the text points to a generic translation: "entrust to reliable people."

2 Timothy 3:2. The reference here to people who will become "lovers of

self" is very similar to 1Timothy 6:5 and 9. General failure in ethical and moral living that occurs among all people is clearly in mind.

2 Timothy 3:8. The context of verse 6 is pointing to 'people' who are doing things that only men could do: "...gain control over weak willed women" – so there is admittedly a 'male gender factor' here *within* the generic use of 'άνΘρωπος'. In verse 8, the reference to 'Jannes and Jambres' is a reference to Old Testament people who were men. It is not the gender issue that is highlighted here but a series of rebellious acts committed by men leaders.

2 Timothy 3:13. Again this is a verse much like 1Timothy 6:5 and 9. Warning is given in general about people worsening in their depravity. This is a human failure, not only a male failure.

2 Timothy 3:17, is much like 1 Timothy 6:11 where 'God's person' should be a testimony to the Gospel. This applies to both men and women, to Aquila as much as to Priscilla (Ac 18:2-3).

Titus 1:14 refers to the "...commandments of άνθρώπων.." is a reference to legalistic formulated rules and is not gender sensitive. "Jewish tales" and these 'additional commandments' were used by dissenting groups to control people. In Galatians 3:1 the message is clear: "You foolish Galatians! Who has bewitched you?" There was a prevailing tendency to return to Jewish legalism or 'added' unbefitting rules.

Titus 2:11. "For the grace of God that brings salvation has appeared for all άνθρώποις". See notes on 1 Timothy 4:10 above. The same principles apply. Christ has died *potentially* for all; and effectively for those who are justified through faith (Rm 5:1).

Titus 3:2. Showing humility, "...toward all άνθρώπους..." Like so many of the verses in 1 and 2 Timothy, this is a generic use of the word referring to people in general. The same applies to Titus 3:8.

Titus 3:10. "Warn a divisive άνθρωπον once, and then warn him (the one) a second time." Again, a generic translation is the correct translation. The divisive people noted in Scripture are both men and women. Philippians 4:2 mentions two divisive women by name.

Other than very slight inferences 'towards' men or 'towards' women - the translation of 'άνθρωπος' throughout these three Pastoral Letters should be 'person' or 'people'. There is no 'gender' demand in the use of the word itself. Obviously, references to Jesus would by implication note that Jesus was revealed to us as a man, but that is not the point of the verse or the intention within the use of the word 'άνθρωπος'.

3. Exploring The Translation Process Historically From Carson's Publication In 1998.

From the earliest beginnings of the English translation process, the common translation for the word άνθρωπος in the Pastoral Corpus was 'man' or 'men'. As I understand it, at that time "man" was not gender specific. In terms of 2 Timothy 2:2 for example, Lea and Hayne do not hesitate to give only one option in 1992: "Paul wanted Timothy to pass on gospel truths to reliable men" (Lea and Hayne, 1992:201). There are at least 15 English translations which have followed this tradition, ranging from Young's Literal Translation to the Douay-Rheims translation, to the King James Bible and even as recent as the Holman Christian Standard Bible.

Yet a shift has occurred in more recent days as the 'window' of opportunity has been taken with the global context in mind. Erickson helps us at this point: "The revelation of God is a process even as is redemption, and a process that moved to an ever more complete form" (2013:164). Within the English speaking translation process, it appears that the 'window of opportunity' has arrived to address this formerly culturally bound item.

At least five more recent English translations; not one of which is a Liberational or Feminist effort, have shifted to a more accurate translation of the word 'άνθρωπος' in the Pastoral Corpus. Using 2 Timothy 2:2 as the sample centre, God's Word Translation says: "faithful people", the NET Bible says, "faithful people", the ISV says, "faithful people", the NLT says, "trustworthy people", and the NIV says, "reliable people". "Considering the place women occupied in Paul's day, both in antiquity in general and in Judaism in particular, the first point of view certainly meant nothing less than a revolution for the position of women in the church as well. This equality of man and woman in Christ emerges in a great many ways in his epistles" (Ridderbos, 1977:461).

3.1. Carson's publication in 1998 summarised relevant parts.

In his book, 'The Inclusive Language Debate, A Plea for Realism' (1998) Carson outlines his intentions in the Preface. "In the current debate over inclusive language, all sides have raised important and delicate issues" (1998:10). This tells of a 'window of opportunity' that has been thrown open. Something has happened to create this 'window', and it seems that it has come largely from the global mission of the Church. Carson allays all fears in his clear statement of how he understands Scripture: "I write as a confessional evangelical with a high view of Holy Scripture and have frequently contributed to conferences and books on the subject" (1998:10).

There is no 'feminist agenda' in Carson's writing. "But by and large, this book restricts itself to an in-house discussion within the framework of

evangelicalism" (1998:11). However, Carson admits that we are in a time of 'Bible rage' again (1998:16). Following all the challenges of getting the Bible into English detailed by Rawlings: "The current debate has fired up various degrees of Bible rage once again." This includes at least seven copies of the NIV and NIVI drilled through with a power drill! In terms of this article's discussion around translating ἀνθρωπος Carson suggests that: "If such usage, alternating between the male and the generic, is not concrete evidence of male oppression, it is argued, at very least it is insensitive" (1998:18).

The question regarding the way ahead is a tricky one. Carson provides us with the CBT Policy on Gender-Inclusive Language (1998:41-46). Of particular importance is the ruling on translations of the word ἀνθρωπος and its derivatives: "In many cases, anthrōpoi refers to people in general, and can be translated 'people' rather than 'men'. The singular anthrōpos should ordinarily be translated 'man' when it refers to a male human being" (1998:45).

Carson refers to 1Timothy 2:5 which is germane to this article: "Surely no one is arguing that 1Timothy 2:5 makes Jesus out to be a mediator between God and male human beings. Again, then, the problem is a confusion over the elementary linguistic distinction between meaning and referent" (1998:127). This is a very helpful statement in terms of assisting us to draw a conclusion on this issue. It is not a statement from Liberals or Feminists, but from honest evangelical scholarship and translation within this window of opportunity.

After the discontent demonstrated by Piper and Köstenberger with their concern that the masculinity of Jesus may be downplayed in the NIVI translation of 1 Timothy 2:5, Carson wisely says: "This is not a 'down-playing' of Jesus' masculinity; it is faithfully translating into current English the primary meaning of *anthrōpos*. At no point does the NIVI deny Jesus' masculinity. The fact remains that Jesus was not only a male, he was a human male" (1998:151). We should primarily be faithful to the text and the global population for whom it is intended; rather than reacting out of a particular context and its fears.

3.2. The tide has turned.

When tides turn, there is change and uncertainty. In terms of the inclusion of women in a different role following their equal inclusion through the Gospel needed time, patience and adaptability. Paul often offers caution as seen in his navigating the gender issue in 1 Corinthians 11:1-16 and 14:33-38. All parties were to be given careful consideration – including the marriage relationship, cultural expectations, ministry wishes and Gospel freedom.

See how sensitive Paul is to the status quo of marriage in 1 Corinthians 14:35. While some women, who were now introduced to the Congregation from behind a 'partition' if they were Jewish or subjection if they were Gentile; now they were blurting out publicly asking questions of other men while husbands sat embarrassed: "If they want to enquire about something, *they should ask their husbands at home;* for it is disgraceful (according to standard culture then) for a woman to speak in church" (*italics and brackets mine*). Any abusive, disorderly, disgraceful conduct is censured by the Gospel!

Similarly, Carson offers a pastoral way forward within the *present context* (1998:193-197). The typical cultural norm has changed drastically in most of the English world under discussion. Unfortunately, some Christian groupings have taken their cue for faith and practice from historical literalist English translations of the New Testament regarding 'gender' inclusion or exclusion. This 'cultural pressure' has decidedly influenced some more fundamentalist evangelical scholarship. There is a status quo that has been established over a long time of delivering a message in a certain way. This has become evident in the reactions to the publishing of the 2011 NIV.

First, there is a call for even-handedness. We all now know better than we did before. People in the same camp are not trying to destroy the Scriptures, and others are in some cases acting out of fear and prejudice.

Second, "On complex issues, let us slow down" (1998:194). The issues cannot be resolved to the satisfaction of everyone around the world in a short period. Even the guidelines of the CBT which were worked out by many competent people are somewhat flawed and need revision. There will never be a perfect set of rules. Language translation within a dynamic global missional English context cannot be resolved by even the best set of rules.

Third "Let us avoid impugning the motives of the other side" (1998:195). Attributing 'motives' to people and their views is unfair, and often unsubstantiated. Attributing 'motives' is much like demanding that people choose sides between Egalitarian or Complementarian as though these are the only options. The New Testament demonstrates a third approach, a 'Gospel-centred' approach where the consequences of the Fall (Gn 3:14-19) are remedied through the 'second Adam', Jesus Christ.

Fourth, we should avoid 'demonizing' each other. In our case, within the evangelical world, we are all on the same side!

Fifth, we need to avoid manipulative language. This can be done in using words like: "If you're wrong here, where else are you wrong?" The trump

card most people use is the word "orthodoxy." It's easy to imply that some people whom we differ with are either on one side or the other of this fine line! Strauch strays at this point to 'label' people whom he disagrees with in terminology that is incriminating: "This viewpoint is often called Biblical Feminism or Egalitarianism, meaning that men and women are fully equal and that the New Testament does not teach traditional male-female role distinctions involving headship and submission" (2015:55-56).

This article is not stating anything here, but rather unfolds the fact that Jesus in the Gospel has made a significant difference to people's lives to the point of bringing all of us a lot closer together in Christian service! A 'Gospel centred approach' assumes that men and women are first filled with the Holy Spirit (Eph 5:18). Then this is followed by five participles flowing out of this; ending with the fifth one: "... submitting one to another out of a reverence for Christ" (Eph 5:21). Only once this foundation is laid, is there an injunction given to the 'wives' in this new Gospel transformation (Eph 5:22) and husbands (Eph 5:25). Jesus Christ is the example, the motivation and the model in all of this: "This is a profound mystery – but I am talking about Christ and the church" (Eph 5:32).

4. Ethical Consequences Of Translation And Mistranslation.
This case of translating a word from the Pastoral Corpus with 'male' overtones; can only have ethical consequences for a large sector of the Church for ministry. Many people have been marginalised, and others artificially empowered through the 'using' and 'abusing' of this one word.

4.1. Historical vs. contemporary understanding of some ministry roles.
One of the ministry roles under consideration is that of pastor. Relating this to the Pastoral Corpus, many would say that 'pastors need to be male'. The first problem is that there is no mention of 'pastor' as stereotyped in the English-speaking Christianity. Timothy and/or Titus were apostolic attendants to the Apostle Paul, and fulfilling a specific task for a specific time in a specific place. There is mention of 'overseers' and 'deacons' and 'the women' in 1Timothy 3. The second problem is that the 'pastor role'; which is essentially a 'gift' (Eph 4:11) is part of a broader picture. "The mention of 'women pastors' immediately gets people's attention. The reason for this is because we have created a stereotypical image of a pastor, at least in the Western world" (Pohlmann, 2013:32).

For example, in Romans 16:1 Phoebe is mentioned as one such 'pastor' ('leader', 'carer' for a group), yet she is referred to as a *'diakonos'* (serving one)of this fledgeling Church. Here there is an interplay between 'servant' and 'overseer'! We need to be very careful of imposing our contemporary understanding of Clergyman, Reverend, or Senior Pastor and allow this to

cloud our understanding of the text of the Pastoral Corpus. Exegesis lets the text speak for itself.

4.2. Many have been excluded from ministry roles that they could biblically fulfil.
Part of the ethical, theological consequence of Bible translation is its impact of excluding people from ministry functions fully sanctioned by Scripture but forbidden by translation weakness! This can be seen at least at one level in the forbidding of women to become pastors in the Southern Baptist Convention. "While both men and women are gifted for service in the Church, the office of pastor is limited to men as qualified by Scripture (1 Timothy 2:9-14)" (Ledbetter. 2000:1). Is the stereotypical leading chairman CEO type function the same as that described in the Pastorals?

Many women, gifted by God's Holy Spirit with pastoral ability have not been stopped by the SBC's decision and stand. They have simply moved on to other denominations. However, many other women have been held back from active service on traditional constitutional grounds and respect for their denomination when in fact they have biblical permission! This is the ethical-theological biblical problem that needs to be resolved in this new window of opportunity.

5. Conclusion.
Some measure of guidance has been given by Carson above with regard to managing the translation sensitivities that have arisen. This article wishes to look even further into a way ahead for ministry. There has to be a 'succession plan' which is inherent in the Great Commission (Mt 28:19-20) and the succession of the Church (2Timothy 2:2). The succession is from Christ Himself (Gl 1:12) to the Apostle Paul to Timothy and on to 'others'. Even within a conservative commentary like that written by Mounce, he says: "However, there is nothing in the passage (2Tm 2:2) or elsewhere that limits teaching to elders alone" (2000:506). This raises the question of passing on the message to Overseers, Deacons, formerly marginalised people like women – Gentiles – young people, and the Church in general. While 2 Timothy 2:2 would obviously commence with approved overseers, the question is how far does this verse include gifted teachers.

First, it is the proposal of this article that former limitations that may have been applied to certain sectors of the Church on the basis of a limited translation of ἀνθρωπος be lifted. Uttley wisely says: "My day is just the opposite of Paul's. In my day the gospel might be limited if articulate, trained women are not allowed to share the gospel..." (2013:1).

Second, that the pace of any revision within any cultural or conditioned setting be dealt with carefully, slowly and maturely.

Third, that the pattern of male leadership be constantly noted in Scripture with the possibility of exceptions through the new dispensation of the Gospel.

Fourth, that we do not use contemporary stereotypical models and definitions to confuse our understanding of the biblical intent. For example, the typical Protestant Senior Pastor is probably not entirely what the first verses of 1 Timothy 3 had in mind. 1 Timothy 3 had general 'overseers', recognised 'servers' and a combination of the 'women' (γυνη as in Lk 8:1-3 and Romans 16) who were being recognised for the orderly functioning of the Church.

Fifth, that Scripture is our authority for both faith and practice be correctly understood allowing the possibility of 'windows of opportunity' like there was historically to re-state the Gospel at the time of the Reformation as one example and regain global mission understanding commencing with William Carey as a second example.

Sixth, to recognise that some people may continue within a 'conservative' 'historical' frame of reference. Peter, one of the Apostles, found it difficult to adapt and adjust to new Gospel conditions: "When Peter came to Antioch, I opposed him face to face, for he was clearly in the wrong. Before certain men came from James, he used to eat with the Gentiles. But when they arrived, he began to draw back and separate himself from the Gentiles because he was afraid of those who belonged to the circumcision group" (Gl 2:11-12). On the other hand, Paul found it easy to adopt and adapt.

It is clear from this article that even a slight hesitation on one word in Scripture can result in the censure of many people doing ministry or in the case of the Vulgate 'mistranslation' illustrated above; serious doctrinal deviations can occur. The very least that Paul has in mind in terms of succession in 'passing on the message' is, first of all, deserving male Believers. Second, he implies women Believers who are adequately taught even within a challenging context: "A woman should learn in quietness and full submission" (1Tm 2:11). Third, he could also imply women Believers who had been transformed by the Gospel (Titus 2:4) with sensitivity to the contextual conditions: "I do not permit a woman to (so) teach (as) to have (abusive) authority (Authentein) over a man (ἀνδρός – singular, a male, a husband); she must be 'quiet' (in demeanour)" (1Tm 2:12)(Brackets mine). Finally, women who are: "...worthy of respect, not malicious talkers but temperate and trustworthy in everything" (1Tm 3:11) could be included.

Even if 2 Timothy 2:2 is limited to women Believers being entrusted with what has been formerly 'entrusted' to Timothy for the sake of *taking it to women and children* only (excluding men), ἀνθρώπους includes both men

and women (People of the faith) in the Pastoral Corpus of 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus. Perkins makes an appropriate comment: "2:2 introduces a new note into the description of Timothy's task, providing the next generation of persons who will be able to teach the faith" (2003:1440).

6. Bibliography

Carson DA 1998. *The Inclusive Language Debate: A Plea for Realism.* Grand Rapids: Baker.

Cohick LH 2006. 'Junia, the first woman apostle', by Eldon, J.E., book review in *Themelios,* 32/ 1.

Erickson MJ [1983] 2013. *Christian Theology* (3rd Edition). Grand Rapids: Baker.

Hannah JD 2001. *Charts of Ancient and Medieval Church History.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Lea TD and Hayne PG 1992. *The New American Commentary: An Exegetical and Theological Exposition of Holy Scripture. NIV Text.* Nashville:Broadman.

Ledbetter TR 2000. SBC and Woman Pastors, Comprehensive Report Does not Sustain Inflated Statistics. www.baptist2baptist.net. Accessed 28/03/2016.

Lock W [1924] 1966. *The International Critical Commentary: The Pastoral Epistles.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Mounce WD 2000. *Word Biblical Commentary, 46. Pastoral Epistles.* Nashville: Thomas Nelson.

Perkins P 2003. 2 Timothy. In JDG Dunn (ed), *Commentary on the Bible.* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Piper J and Grudem W 1992. *Fifty Crucial Questions: An Overview of Central Concerns About Manhood and Womanhood.* USA: The Council On Biblical Manhood and Womanhood.

Pohlmann MH 2013. *Ministry for Tomorrow: A Biblical Navigation for the ministry Challenges of Tomorrow.* Benoni: Hebron.

Pohlmann MH [2007] 2014. *Equally Good News: The Gospel I never knew.* Benoni: Hebron.

Rawlings, H [2004] 2011. *Trial by Fire: The Struggle to get the Bible into*

English. USA: The Rawlings Foundation.

Reumann J 2003. Romans. In JDG Dunn (ed.), *Commentary on the Bible*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Ridderbos N [1975] 1977. *Paul: An Outline of his Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.

Simpson EK 1954. *The Pastoral Epistles: The Greek Text Introduction and Commentary*. London: Tyndale.

Strauch A [1995] 2015. *Biblical Eldership: An Urgent Call to Restore Biblical Church Leadership*. USA: Lewis and Roth Publishers.

Uttley B 2013. Special Topics: Women in the Bible. In *Verse-By-Verse Computer Bible Study Library*. Marshall: Bible Lessons International.

Wright NT 2004. 'Women's Service in the Church: The Biblical Basis.' A Conference Paper for the Symposium, 'Men, Women and the Church.' St' John's College, Durham.

Young F 1994. *The Theology of the Pastoral Letters*. Cambridge: University Press.

Author's Declaration

The author declares that there is no financial gain or personal relationship(s) that inappropriately influenced him in the writing of this article.

email: principal@btc.org.za