

The Proper Translation of **ανηρ** and **γυνή** in the New Testament

[Presented to The Manitowoc Pastoral Conference : St. John's, Newtonburg : April 19, 1993]
by Pastor Michael R. Riley

Introduction

There is an inherent tension whenever we translate a specific portion of Scripture. On the one hand, we desire to render our translation in the best idiomatic English possible, and on the other hand we desire to say no more and no less than what the original Greek or Hebrew says. At times this is merely difficult, at other times it is nearly impossible. Sometimes we are forced to paraphrase the original in order to get the full thought expressed there into the English. At other times we consciously or unconsciously make interpretations in our translations.

This last has become a problem in our fellowship with regard to the translation of the Greek words **ανηρ** and **γυνή**. The fact is that these two words may be rendered either “man-woman” or “husband-wife” in English. That in itself would not be a problem, as long as everyone translated them properly in every instance. The problem is, however, that not only are those words translated inconsistently, they are mistranslated in very important sections of Scripture that deal with a topic vital in today's culture.

The issue of male and female roles is that topic. Many in the WELS felt, perhaps naively so, that once the document *Scriptural Principles of Man and Woman Roles*¹ was adopted by the Synod convention, that all argument would be at an end. After all, the theses presented in that document correctly proclaim the Word of truth. And yet that document did not end controversy; instead it fanned controversy's flames. That document correctly exposes the falsehood the liberal theologians are teaching. It makes clear that the passages dealing with male and female roles were not merely customs of that day, but are, in fact, part of God's revealed will. The door seemed to be closed to those who wanted to restrict or nullify the meaning of passages such as those in 1 Corinthians 11 and 14, and that in 1 Timothy 2. Still, controversy rages on, based mainly upon the translation of these two simple words.

The problem in translating **ανηρ** and **γυνή** has been that up until now no objective method for determining their proper translation has been put into thorough use. That being the case, those who disagree with the statements made in *Scriptural Principles* have felt justified in their opinion that their translation was just as valid as any other. This has been made clear by such papers as *Passages Which Seem To Limit The Role Of Women/Wives*² and *Heirs Together Of The Gracious Gift Of Life*.³ In both of these papers the authors have tried to convince us that since **γυνή** and **ανηρ** can mean “wife” and “husband” respectively, they *do* mean such in those passages dealing with male and female roles. However, we are not without an objective method for determining the meanings of these words. A thorough and careful application of the Historical-Grammatical method of exegesis clearly provides us with an objective method to answer such questions. This paper will show that there are objective rules to be used in translating the words **ανηρ** and **γυνή**, and that these objective principles of hermeneutics lead us to the conclusions drawn in *Scriptural Principles*. I also hope that this paper will help strengthen each of us in our knowledge and understanding of God's Word just as the Lord has strengthened me through this study. It is with these goals in mind that I present this paper.

¹ Hereafter, this document will be referred to simply as *Scriptural Principles*.

² Hereafter, this document will be referred to simply as *Passages*.

³ Hereafter, this document will be referred to simply as *Heirs*.

I. THE PRINCIPLES BEHIND THIS STUDY

All the conclusion drawn in *Passages* and *Heirs* are based, essentially, upon word meanings. The words they have called into question are **gunh/ aōhr** and **kefal h/**⁴

The author of *Passages* states in his paper, “The Greek word **aōhr** can be translated as ‘male human’ or ‘husband,’ and the Greek word **gunh/** can be translated as ‘female human’ or ‘wife.’”⁵ This is true enough and we have no problems with that statement. But later he says, “Without ... demonstrating a specific and exclusive definition of the term here, the normal, accepted principles of Bible interpretation (hermeneutics) would require us to allow either definition to stand.”⁶ What this author says here is true only in part. Lutherans believe Scripture has just one literal sense, which is demanded by word meaning, grammar, and context. Accepted principles of hermeneutics simply admit that we are unwilling or unable to establish beyond doubt the one literal sense in some passages. Good hermeneutics never says two different interpretations of one passage are both intended by the author. The implication the author of *Passages* makes is that there is no proof, found in any of the passages dealing with the role relationships to demand one translation over another. Thus he makes his case for allowing **aōhr** and **gunh/** to be translated “husband” and “wife” in the passages mentioned. Unfortunately this argument really calls into question the clarity of Scripture. When good hermeneutics says that we must leave more than one possibility open in a passage, our own stupidity, blindness and lack of linguistic competence is at fault *not the words used by the inspired authors*. If the author of *Passages* were correct in his interpretation, he would have to demand the translation “husband/wife” in these passages instead of merely leaving that possibility open as an option as he does.

The men who wrote *Heirs* take the same position:

In English we are accustomed to distinguish between the words “man” and “husband” and between the words “woman” and “wife.” But in Greek the word *anér* can be used to mean either “man” or “husband” and the word *gyné* can mean either “woman” or “wife.” The translator must therefore make a choice on the basis of his understanding of the context. In a number of passages where the NIV has “man” and “woman” we prefer the translation “husband” and “wife”—as do a number of Bible translations.⁷

These men, apparently, have made the criteria for making a decision on the translation of **aōhr** and **gunh/** even less demanding than the author of *Passages*. That decision is left up to the translator’s understanding of the context. The way they have stated it makes the decision a matter of personal preference based on the translator’s opinion, since they seem to believe that no objective evidence needs to be given. Perhaps they have in mind the same criteria that the author of *Passages* uses, but they do not mention them. They ignore the fact that a translator’s understanding of the context may be flawed and incomplete, or even entirely wrong. They ignore the fact that a translator’s understanding may be so colored by what he wants (or doesn’t want) to see in the text that he ignores the context altogether. The translator’s understanding of the context must be subject to certain rules of grammar, or else he can make the passage say whatever he wants it to say.

⁴ This paper will deal only with the translation of **gunh/** and **aōhr**. It will not deal with **kefal h/** since that word falls outside its scope. For a good study on **kefal h/** see Professor David Kuske’s “Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:3-16” found in the *Wisconsin Lutheran Quarterly* either volume 78 or 82, and also found in *The Role of Man and Woman in God’s Order of Creation*, found at the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Bookstore. The salient section begins on the second page of the *Quarterly* edition and on page 24 in the Bookstore compilation.

⁵ Diener, *Passages*, p. 1.

⁶ Diener, *Passages*, p. 2.

⁷ Stadler, Albrecht, & Johnson, *Heirs*, p. 4.

Thankfully, the disagreement in our synod about this question is not due to mere differing judgments for which we can expect no defining statement from Scripture. Rather, there are objective rules of hermeneutics that guide us here, not just our own subjective judgment, or our own understanding of the traditional historical interpretation of these passages. There are several sound hermeneutical principles, then, that need to be taken into account:

- 1 — The wider and narrower meanings must be determined. The wider meaning must be understood as the author’s intention unless he himself gives us valid and objective reasons for understanding the narrower meaning.
- 2 — The meanings most commonly and least commonly used must also be determined. The more commonly used meaning must be understood as the author’s intention rather than the less common meaning. Again this is true unless there are valid and objective reasons in the text itself for taking the less commonly used meaning.⁸
- 3 — In each case it must be determined whether there are direct modifiers, indirect modifiers or context that show a clear restriction to the narrower and less common meaning. In such cases the word must be translated with that meaning. In this case there is also support for treating following verses in the same way especially if the writer indicates a continuation of thought by the use of conjunctions or particles which tie the verses together as a unit.
- 4 — It must be determined whether there is a clear restriction to the wider meaning in each occurrence. This can often be determined by attempting to substitute the narrower meaning, as well as by looking at direct modifiers. If there is a clear restriction to the wider meaning there is support for treating surrounding verses in the same way, especially if the writer indicates a continuation of thought by the use of particles or conjunctions which tie the verses together as a unit.
- 5 — The translator also needs to determine if there are other passages in Scripture that support the doctrine in question or refute it. If there are passages that refute the doctrine the translator must not use the translation that would contradict Scripture. If there are parallel passages (i.e. passages that speak about the same thing in the same or similar words) that do support the doctrine, these become additional witnesses to the fact that the translation is correct.⁹

These five principles take into account the grammatical reasons for choosing one meaning for a word over another. They also take into account the Scriptural context. It is on the basis of these five principles that every determination of a word’s meaning should be made. Various shadings that do not change the basic meaning of a word can be made on the basis of the translator’s preference. For example “last will and testament,” “covenant,” and “testament” are all valid shadings of **diaqkh**. These shadings, however, do not change the basic meaning of the word. The translation choice between man and husband or woman and wife, however, is a different case. In this instance there is a fundamental difference in the scope of the words which would yield two differing views of this Biblical doctrine. This choice is not merely a shading. Thus, the translation choice for **awh** and

⁸ While it may seem here that principles 1 and 2 are very similar, there is a distinct difference. With some words the wider meaning may have fallen into disuse and thus it is not the most commonly used. In such cases the second principle should be given more weight than the first. In cases where a word meets both of these criteria there must be good evidence if a secondary *and* less common meaning is to be used.

⁹ This criteria is the least conclusive for those trying to disprove the doctrine, since the opponents of the doctrine could call into question every passage of Scripture dealing with that doctrine, thus effectively leaving no others to support it. For those attempting to prove the doctrine this is a significant point since other passages that support the doctrine remove from the opponents the argument that this doctrine is foreign to Scripture.

gunh/ must be based upon these principles and objective evidence in the text, not merely upon the translator's preference.

Principle One: Wider and Narrower Meaning¹⁰

Determining the wider and narrower meaning with regard to the nouns **ανθρω** and **gunh/** is a rather easy matter. The wider meaning for these words in Greek is the same as in English. With each it is obvious that the translation indicating marital status (i.e. "husband", "wife") is the narrower since all husbands are males, and all wives are females, but not all males are husbands nor are all females wives. Thus, our first reaction when coming into contact with either of these words should be to assume that they say nothing in regard to marital status unless there is objective evidence to the contrary based on one of the following principles.

Principle Two: Common Usage

The principle of common usage, as we would reasonably expect, again points to the wider meanings for **ανθρω** and **gunh/**. Appendices A-C detail the study of each occurrence of **ανθρω** and **gunh/** in both the Septuagint¹¹ and the New Testament. Appendix C shows the figures regarding the usage of **ανθρω** and **gunh/**. It is clear that "man" and "woman" are the most basic and common meanings for these words. **ανθρω** was used with the meaning "man" 1658 times out of 1836 occurrences, or 90% of the time and **gunh/** was used with the meaning "woman" 565 times out of 1148 occurrences, or 49% of the time.¹² With **ανθρω**, then, the principle would clearly tell us that the most common usage does not refer to marital status. With **gunh/** however, the percentages are equally divided, and the case is not as clear.¹³ The following principles will be of great value, then, in determining how **gunh/** ought to be translated.

As we examine these first two principles, we need to recognize an important truth. While we can translate the Greek **ανθρω** and **gunh/** as "man" and "woman" or "husband" and "wife," this is an English translational assumption made to aid readers in the interpretation of a passage. Those who spoke Greek did not think "Paul here is talking about wives not women, or husbands not men." In the Greek mind there was no difference between the **gunh/** in a passage where we attach the meaning "woman," and the **gunh/** where we attach the meaning "wife." The same is true of **ανθρω**. These words always refer to gender even when spoken of within the context of marriage, and any idea of marital status that we add to them comes not from within the vocable itself but from the surrounding context. The Greeks didn't have two different words commonly used to distinguish between a "wife" and a "woman" or a "man" and a "husband." It is only when we attempt to translate these

¹⁰ In our discussion of these principles the three passages questioned (1 Corinthians 11 and 14, and 1 Timothy 2) are not taken into consideration since the meaning of **ανθρω** and **gunh/** in these passages is being disputed. A thorough application of these five principles will be made with those passages later in this paper.

¹¹ Hereafter, the Septuagint will be referred to as the LXX.

In reference to the usage of **ανθρω** and **gunh/** in the LXX, this author does not intend to say anything about the accuracy or reliability of that translation. Instead, he is merely taking into account how these words are used in that translation.

There may be those who contend that the usage of **ανθρω** and **gunh/** in the LXX has nothing to do with the usage of those same words in the NT, because the LXX comes from an earlier period in history and thus the language may not be exactly parallel to that used in the NT, and also because the language in the LXX may have been influenced by constructions peculiar to the Hebrew. On the other hand, the writers of the NT had intimate knowledge of the LXX, and it likely had an influence on the writing they did in the NT. Also the writers of the NT used Aramaic as their first language, and so hebraisms in their writings should not surprise us. This then would result in a high correlation between the way the NT used **ανθρω** and **gunh/** and how the LXX used them. Since that high correlation does exist, this author felt that including the patterns of usage from the LXX was both legitimate and useful.

¹² Totals of all occurrences in Greek New Testament, and Septuagint (including Apocrypha).

¹³ It should be noted, however, that in the Greek New Testament alone the figures for **gunh/** indicate "woman" as the intended meaning 59% of the time. The lower incidence of this meaning in the LXX is easily accounted for since Old Testament history focuses most of its attention on the ancestors of Christ. Thus most of the women specifically mentioned are wives. Nevertheless, the clear indications of how **gunh/** is used overall would lead us to understand it as referring to gender and not marital status.

words that we attach one or the other meaning to the words. Paul's readers did not have to do that. In short, translating **gunh/** and **anhr** as anything other than "woman" and "man" is not so much translation as it is interpretation.

We see similar usage in our own language. If a woman speaks of "a man," or "the man," there is no linguistic reason for us to assume anything about that person's relationship to the woman. If, on the other hand, she says "my man" there is clearly an indication of a relationship. If she says "my old man," the relationship is made even clearer. When she says, "the man I married" there can be absolutely no doubt as to her relationship to the man. However, unless she chooses to use modifying words like these, it is a twisting of her words to claim that "the man" she talked about is her husband.

Clearly then, in Greek as in English, modifiers (both direct and indirect) make it obvious what the man or woman's status is. Thus "your man" is typically, though not necessarily, translated "husband" and "your woman" is typically translated "wife." Without these modifiers (direct and/or indirect) we have no grammatical or Scriptural basis to translate **anhr** or **gunh/** in any fashion that indicates marital status. In fact, it would be perfectly understandable *in English* if we were to translate every occurrence of **gunh/** in the New Testament as "woman" and every occurrence of **anhr** in the New Testament as "man." No confusion would result, no meaning would be lost except in one instance where Paul uses a construction that is unfamiliar to the English ear.

Professor David Kuske says much the same thing regarding the meaning of **gunh/** in his exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:11:

Perhaps the **obvious** should also be stated, namely, the basic meaning of **gunh/** points simply to the female sex and so "woman" is the basic meaning of the word. Unless the context **compels** the meaning "wife," **gunh/** is to be understood as "woman."¹⁴

In his paper on the order of creation he also includes **anhr** in his discussion:

In Greek, **anhr** and **gunh/** normally refer to male and female. Therefore, the syntax and the context of any given passage must combine to show **clearly** that the meaning is husband and wife; otherwise the meaning male and female is the sense.¹⁵

So then, unless there is clear and convincing proof from direct or indirect modifiers, or from overwhelming context, there is absolutely no reason to add the idea "married" to the basic meanings of **anhr** and **gunh/**. In fact, if we look at all occurrences of **anhr** and **gunh/** in the LXX and Greek New Testament and look at the number of times that context alone adds the idea of marital status to the basic meaning of these words, the common usage becomes extremely clear. Out of 1836 occurrences of **anhr**, only 17 are translated "husband" on the basis of context alone. That equals less than 1% of all occurrences. The totals for **gunh/** are nearly as striking. Out of 1148 occurrences, only 40 or 3% are translated "wife" on the basis of context alone.

Principle Three: Clear Restrictions to the Narrower Meaning

Perhaps at this point we should discuss just exactly what is meant by the terms: "direct modifier," "indirect modifier" and "context." The term "direct modifier" indicates any word that directly alters the meaning of another. This group includes possessive pronouns or genitives, adjectives, attributive participles, and the like.

¹⁴ Kuske, *Exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:11-15*, p. 44. Emphasis mine.

¹⁵ Kuske, *The Order of Creation*, p. 69. Emphasis mine.

The term “indirect modifier” means any word that does not directly modify the word in question, but still has an impact on its meaning. This is really a subset of what has typically been called “context.” We treat indirect modifiers separately from context because there is a definite difference between “context,” that is, the general topic that is being discussed (for example, the family), and the other surrounding words that have an impact on the meaning of a vocable (for example, the verb **εἶπω** definitely alters the meaning of **gunh/** in the phrase **εἰ τι ἰδὲ ἀδελφοῦ γυναικᾶ εἶσι** “if some brother has a woman/wife”). An indirect modifier may also be a previous reference to the same person that is directly modified (e.g. “Sam’s wife is a great musician. The woman is a concert pianist.”)

“Context” simply means the general topic at hand. If the distinction between context and indirect modifier is difficult to understand, or you don’t find it useful you may simply replace the phrase “indirect modifier,” wherever it occurs, with the word “context” and there should be no lack of understanding, nor would that decision alter the results of this study. Generally, the order of importance for these three, from greatest to least, would be direct modifiers, indirect modifiers and finally general context.

Direct Modifiers

Generally speaking this is the easiest type of modifier to analyze. It is also the most common method used in the Greek to add the idea of marital status to **ἀνὴρ** and **γυνή/**. Out of 1836 occurrences of **ἀνὴρ**, 120 or 6% have a direct modifier which adds the idea of marital status and allows the translation “husband.” For **γυνή/** the figure is 394 out of 1148 or 34%. The most common direct modifier—the LXX rarely uses anything else—is the possessive. But, especially in the New Testament, there are also other words which directly add the idea of marital status to these words. The adjective **υἰανδροῦ** (“married”) is one obvious example.¹⁶

One caution regarding such direct modifiers, however, is that possessives do not always indicate a marriage relationship. If a woman is told to speak to “her man” it is very likely that this is a reference to her husband, but the phrase could refer to her father or brother. Other times the direct modifier is an adjective like **υἰανδροῦ**, which makes the translation “wife” redundant in the English, (e.g. “the married wife”). In cases such as these the meaning is clear without our interpreting in our translation, and, in fact, cases like these help to prove that the primary meaning of **ἀνὴρ** and **γυνή/** is “man” and “woman.” Nevertheless, direct modifiers, including possessives, are very good for determining when the idea of marital status is being added to **ἀνὴρ** and **γυνή/**. Such direct modifiers allow us to translate “husband” and “wife” if such a translation is needed to express the meaning of the original clearly in English.

Indirect Modifiers

Most indirect modifiers are verbs. We have mentioned **εἶπω**. The others used in the NT are: **γινομαι**, **γαμέω**, **δέω**, **χωρίζω**, **καταλαμβάνω**, **ἀγαθμι**, **ἀπολαμβάνω**, **λαμβάνω**, **ἀνομομαί**, **συνοικέω**, and the phrase **ζάω μετὰ**. Obviously, to be considered indirect modifiers of **ἀνὴρ** or **γυνή/** these verbs must be grammatically connected to one or the other. They are not always indirect modifiers just by virtue of their presence. Typically, **ἀνὴρ** or **γυνή/** or both are the subject or the direct object of the verb.

εἶπω is often used to identify a marriage relationship between a man and woman. Paul uses it this way in 1 Corinthians 7. The idiom in English is little different when a person asks “do you *have* a wife?” A good example is found in 1 Corinthians 7:12.

¹⁶ Since there shouldn’t be any question as to the meaning or intent of direct modifiers I am not going to give a comprehensive list here of all the direct modifiers that are used in the NT. Such a list may be found in Appendix B.

Gihomai, perhaps more than any other verb here, may seem to be out of place in a list of words that would force the meaning of “husband” or “wife.” However, Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich-Danker says this of **gihomai**: “3. w. dat. of the pers. *belong to someone ... of a woman* **αὐτῆς** | Ro 7:3f.”¹⁷ In fact, in Romans 7:3 the NIV translates the verb **gehntai** “marries.”

Gameiw, **delw** and **αὐτοζομαι** are much more straightforward. With the meanings “to marry,” “to be married” and “to promise or give in marriage” respectively, no one can miss the point. Examples are found in Matthew 19:10, 1 Corinthians 7:27, and 2 Corinthians 11:2, respectively.

Xwriw, **απολυω** and **αὐχιμι** are likewise clear, all three can mean “to divorce.” Again these verbs clearly modify both subject and direct object. Examples are found in 1 Corinthians 7:10; Matthew 5:31; and 1 Corinthians 7:11, respectively.

Lambahw means “to take.” When used in reference to a man “taking” a woman, it means “to marry” or in the English idiom “to take a wife.” One example of this usage is found in Mark 12:19.

Katallassw should be familiar as meaning “to reconcile.” With regard to the relationship between a man and woman it is used with reference to the ending of a separation or divorce. That is the way Paul uses this term when speaking of men and women in 1 Corinthians 7:11.

Sunoikelw and the phrase **zaw meta** both mean the same thing, “to live together or with.” When speaking of this happening between men and women *in an approving way*, there can be no other conclusion other than that this also refers to marriage, and thus must influence our translation of **αὐτῆς** and **gunh/** Examples are found in 1 Peter 3:7, and Luke 2:36 respectively.

There are also other indirect modifiers that will have an impact on the translation of **αὐτῆς** and **gunh/** Among them are situations where one or the other is the antecedent to a possessive. In Ephesians 5:22 Paul writes, “**Αἱ γυναῖκες τοῖς ὡς ἑαυτῶν ὡς ὁ κύριος**” In this situation **Αἱ γυναῖκες** is the antecedent of **τοῖς ὡς ἑαυτῶν**, the possessive that makes it clear that **ὡς ὁ κύριος** refers more specifically to husbands. As the antecedent, then, **Αἱ γυναῖκες** is also influenced in its meaning to include the designation of marital status.

Finally there is the phrase pattern **μία γυναίκα ἀνδρα**, used four times by Paul. Now while a person may argue that there really is nothing here to indicate an indirect modification, I believe that the pattern itself leaves no room for understanding this as referring to anything other than marriage. If you wish not to put this phrase pattern under the heading of indirect modifiers, you may feel free to translate it literally: “a one woman man.”

The statistics for such indirect modifiers and their use in the LXX and the New Testament are as follows: **αὐτῆς** is influenced by indirect modifiers to mean “husband” 41 times out of 1836 occurrences or 2% of the time. **gunh/** is influenced by indirect modifiers to mean “wife” 149 times out of 1148 occurrences, or about 13% of the time. Even if a person wanted to classify these indirect modifiers as simply context, the overwhelming majority of all occurrences of **αὐτῆς** and **gunh/** would still either clearly demand the translation of “man” and “woman” or would clearly demand the translation of “husband” and “wife” because of direct modifiers. Well over 90% of the time we have absolutely no discretion whatsoever in translating these words. Statements like, “these Greek words may be translated either man/woman or husband/wife,” imply that the translation of these words is often uncertain. Such statements tend to lead people with no linguistic training to believe that choosing one translation or the other lies in the realm of “artistic license.” This implication is not borne out by the facts.

¹⁷ Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, Danker, *A Greek-English Lexicon Of The New Testament*, p. 160.

Rather, the objective facts compel us to conclude: unless a direct or indirect modifier, or general context clearly demands it, a translation which adds the concept of marital status to the simple meanings of **אִשׁוֹר** and **גִּנְהִי** clearly violates sound hermeneutical principles.

Context

Context alone, as has been mentioned before, accounts for a very small percentage of the times **אִשׁוֹר** and **גִּנְהִי** are translated “husband” and “wife” overall (1% for **אִשׁוֹר** and 3% for **גִּנְהִי**). However, it is more common for this to happen in the New Testament than in the LXX. About 7% of the occurrences of **אִשׁוֹר** in the New Testament are decided on context alone, and the figure is about 10% for **גִּנְהִי**. There is a very logical reason for the discrepancy between the LXX and the New Testament. In the New Testament there are rather long discourses on marriage and the family not found in the LXX. In such cases it would only seem natural that once it has been firmly established that marriage or the family is the topic, the context alone would determine the meaning of **אִשׁוֹר** and **גִּנְהִי**. In fact, if one looks only at the times when **אִשׁוֹר** and **גִּנְהִי** do not have overwhelming context to point to a translation of “husband” or “wife,” the percentages where context alone determines the translation drop down to a level much closer to the rate found in the LXX.

There are 14 times in the New Testament that **אִשׁוֹר** can be translated husband on the basis of context alone. Of these 14, eight are in 1 Corinthians 7. All forty verses of this chapter deal with the marriage relationship and Paul’s instructions regarding marriage. There are nine other occurrences of **אִשׁוֹר** in this chapter. Three of them are directly modified by possessives; the other six are indirectly modified by verbs. It is interesting to note that despite the fact that Paul is clearly speaking of the marriage relationship, he still feels the need to make that fact crystal clear by adding all of these modifiers. Paul does the same for the occurrences of **גִּנְהִי** in this chapter as well. Out of the 17 occurrences of **גִּנְהִי**, ten refer to marital status on the basis of context alone, while seven have modifiers added. The context in this chapter, in fact, is so overwhelming that it would be impossible to misunderstand Paul even if you never once translated **גִּנְהִי** “wife” or **אִשׁוֹר**, “husband.”

The same overwhelming context pervades the discussion of marriage that Paul has with the Ephesians in chapter 5. In verses 22-33 Paul uses **אִשׁוֹר** six times and **גִּנְהִי** nine times. Here there are two direct modifiers attached to **אִשׁוֹר**, and five attached to **גִּנְהִי**. Again the topic at hand would have been enough to tell us that Paul is speaking of husbands and wives and yet he feels compelled by the Holy Spirit to make that clear to us by using these modifiers.

In Colossians the context is not as strong as in the two previous examples, however it is very clear that Paul is speaking of the household and the members of that household. He begins with husbands and wives and then moves on to children, slaves and the rest. Again, the context is strong enough to force a translation indicating marital status.

Outside of these three passages there are no occurrences where the translation “husband” is forced by context alone.

For **גִּנְהִי** there are 5 more occurrences where context forces a translation of “wife.” The first is from Mark 12:19. In this passage the context is the levirate law. That in itself is context enough to force the translation of “wife” in this passage. In Luke 18:29 it says, “‘I tell you the truth,’ Jesus said to them, ‘no one who has left home or *wife* or brothers or parents or children for the sake of the kingdom of God’”¹⁸ Here again the context revolves around the family (Jesus lists off the various members), and wife is a valid translation of **גִּנְהִי** based on this context. 1 Corinthians 9:5 is the only place in the New Testament where an unmodified **גִּנְהִי** is

¹⁸ All quotations of Scripture are taken from the NIV.

translated “wife” without the strong or overwhelming type of context already noted. In this passage Paul says, “**μη̄ υ̅ου δε̅ξι̅μεν ε̅κου̅σι̅αν α̅δελ̅φη̅ν̅ γ̅υ̅ναι̅κα̅ περι̅αγει̅ν, ω̅ς̅ και̅ οι̅ ἄποστολοι̅ και̅ οι̅ ἄδελ̅φοι̅ το̅υ̅ κυ̅ρι̅ου̅ και̅ κ̅η̅φ̅αι̅;**” The NIV translates this “Don’t we have the right to take a believing wife along with us, as do the other apostles and the Lord’s brothers and Cephas?” In this passage **gunh/** is translated “wife” to avoid redundancy between **α̅δελ̅φη̅ν̅** and **γ̅υ̅ναι̅κα̅** (one who is a “sister” is, by definition, already a female), and also because of our knowledge that Peter was married.

The final occurrence of **gunh/** determined by context alone is in 1 Peter 3:1. The **gunh/** that we are concerned with here is the second occurrence in this passage. “**Ἐμοι̅/ω̅ς̅ αι̅ γ̅υ̅ναι̅κε̅ς̅ ὑ̅ποτασσο̅με̅ναι̅ το̅ι̅ς̅ ἰ̅δ̅ι̅ο̅ι̅ς̅ α̅ν̅δ̅ρα̅ς̅ιν, ὡ̅ς̅ και̅ οι̅̅ τ̅ι̅νε̅ς̅ ἀ̅πει̅κου̅σιν̅ τω̅ ἰ̅σ̅τ̅ω̅/δι̅α̅ τ̅η̅ς̅ τ̅ω̅ν̅ γ̅υ̅ναι̅κ̅ω̅ν̅ ἀ̅σ̅τ̅ρο̅φ̅η̅ς̅ ἀ̅νε̅υ̅ λό̅γου̅ κ̅ερ̅δ̅η̅σ̅ον̅ται̅.**” Here the first occurrence of **gunh/(gunaikēj)** is the antecedent of **το̅ι̅ς̅ ἰ̅δ̅ι̅ο̅ι̅ς̅**, which directly modifies **α̅ν̅δ̅ρα̅ς̅ιν** to mean “husbands.” Thus the first occurrence, of necessity, refers to wives. The second occurrence, however, also must mean wives since it is referring to the exact same group of people as the first **gunh/** and since the first must be translated wives, the second must also, seeing that they refer to the same group. Also if we look at the topic Peter is discussing, we see that it is very similar in tone to the context of 1 Corinthians 7 and Ephesians 5.

Thus, if we look at only those occurrences that are determined by something less than an overwhelming context, there is only one instance in the entire New Testament (1 Corinthians 9:5) where a rather weak context demands a translation indicating marital status. The only logical conclusion, then, would be that unless there are direct or indirect modifiers, or an overwhelming context demanding the translation of “husband” or “wife,” **αν̅η̅ρ** and **gunh/** ought not be translated as anything other than “man” and “woman.” This is the pattern we will use when looking at the passages called into question.

Finally, the translator needs to remember that when using context to determine word meanings, the preceding context is much more meaningful and compelling than the subsequent context. It would be rare, not to mention confusing, for a writer to intend a specific meaning for a word, and not make that clear until the mid-point or end of his argument. This general rule is consistently observed in all of the above situations regarding context with the one exception of 1 Corinthians 9:5. As a result, we may properly assume that if a writer does not make it crystal clear at the beginning of his argument that he is speaking specifically of the marriage relationship, his intent in the following verses is to speak of male and female as opposed to husband and wife, even if in his discussion of male and female roles he makes a specific application to husbands and wives.

Principle Four: Clear Restrictions to the Wider Meaning

This principle has essentially the same options available to it as were available for the last principle. Direct and indirect modifiers as well as context could all serve to clearly restrict the meaning of **αν̅η̅ρ** or **gunh/** to the wider meaning. It is interesting to note, however, that while there were numerous different words and phrases that regularly restricted these two words to their narrower meaning, we have no such examples in the New Testament or the LXX restricting them to the wider meaning. There can be only one logical explanation: they were not needed as the force of **αν̅η̅ρ** and **gunh/** alone are enough to compel a translation of “man” or “woman” without added modifiers.

If a word has two different meanings there are two options as to how a language would differentiate between them: 1) both word meanings would be used equally and thus some sort of modifier would be needed no matter which meaning was intended; or 2) one of the word meanings would be so dominant that it needed no modifier, while the other meaning would almost always need one to distinguish it from the dominant meaning. This last option is the situation we have with **αν̅η̅ρ** and **gunh/**. Therefore any occurrence of **αν̅η̅ρ** or **gunh/** in the absence of such modifiers (or very strong context) must be translated “man” or “woman.”

This principle, however, does not merely provide us with a reiteration of the conclusions we drew from principle three. It also gives us a very reliable test to determine whether the translation of “husband” or “wife” is likely, or even possible, in a given passage. The test, simply put, is to substitute the translation “husband” and “wife” for every occurrence of **αἰνή** and **γυνή**/in the passage in question. If this results in impossible statements, then there is strong evidence that surrounding occurrences of **αἰνή** and **γυνή**/are not referring to husbands and wives.¹⁹ And if the passage in question is used to prove others, then they cannot refer to husbands and wives either. This test will prove valuable in at least one of the passages in question.

Principle Five: Other Passages That Support the Doctrine

This principle, although sound, is easily skirted by those who would wish to change the teachings of the Scriptures. It is a rather easy matter to call into question every prescriptive passage in the Bible with regard to a specific doctrine, and thus effectively remove those passages from the category of supporting passages, and into the main argument. This is exactly what has happened in *Passages* and *Heirs*.

The author of *Passages*, in his comments on 1 Corinthians 11, says:

I am unaware of any other passage in God’s Word that speaks expressly of “male humans” ruling over, having authority over, or being the head of “female humans.” (I would . be happy to be directed to other examples, if they exist.)

In all the passages I have studied in this regard (including **1 Corinthians 14** and **1 Timothy 2**, cited in detail below, used in the document “*Scriptural Principles of Man and Woman Roles*”), there seems to be clear internal evidence suggesting and sometimes limiting the interpretation of the Greek or Hebrew words to “husband and wife.”²⁰

This is also done in the paper *Heirs*:

In a number of passages where the NIV has “man” and “woman” we prefer the translation “husband” and “wife”—as do a number of Bible translations.”²¹

We do not believe that 1 Corinthians 11:3 prescribes a general headship of men over women. This is one of the passages where we believe the scriptural context indicates the words **αἰνή** and **γυνή**/are to be translated “husband” and “wife” as explained in the final paragraph of the Preamble.²²

We do not believe that 1 Timothy 2:12 prohibits all women from any exercise of authority over men because St. Paul refers to the sin of Adam and Eve (1 Timothy 2:14) who are identified as husband and wife in Genesis 3:17. The reference to childbearing (1 Timothy 2:15) also indicates that he is discussing the relationships between husbands and wives.”²³

¹⁹ By “impossible statements” is not meant situations where this translation would merely result in redundancies, or where the translation would be rendered wooden, but rather situations where it is not possible because it would contradict other clear words of Scripture.

²⁰ Diener, *Passages*, p. 2.

²¹ Stadler, Albrecht, & Johnson, *Heirs*, p. 4.

²² Stadler, Albrecht, & Johnson, *Heirs*, p. 18.

²³ Stadler, Albrecht, & Johnson, *Heirs*, p. 18.

These two papers have called into question every prescriptive passage dealing with the role relationship, and thus effectively removed them from the discussion of this fifth hermeneutical principle and into the main discussion of the doctrine regarding male and female roles.

We do, however, have some descriptive passages that, while they can never be the basis of a doctrine, can be used to support the teachings presented in the passages called into question. Two such passages include:

Isaiah 3:11-12 — Woe to the wicked! Disaster is upon them! They will be paid back for what their hands have done. Youths oppress my people, *women rule over them*. O my people, your guides lead you astray; they turn you from the path.

Numbers 8:16-19 — They are the Israelites who are to be given wholly to me. I have taken them as my own in place of the firstborn, the first *male* offspring from every Israelite woman. Every firstborn *male* in Israel, whether man or animal, is mine. When I struck down all the firstborn in Egypt, I set them apart for myself. And I have taken the Levites in place of all the firstborn *sons* in Israel. Of all the Israelites, I have given the Levites as gifts to Aaron and his *sons* to do the work at the Tent of Meeting on behalf of the Israelites and to make atonement for them so that no plague will strike the Israelites when they go near the sanctuary.

Notice that in the first passage quoted above God speaks of having women rule over his people in terms of judgement and disaster. Now God would certainly not say such things if he did not mean them. To say otherwise is to call into question the clarity of Scripture and the truthfulness of God. To say that this is just a judgement that would merely be *perceived* as bad by the people of that society, is to do the same. When God metes out his judgements he does not merely do something the people perceive as a judgement or a disaster. His judgements and the disasters that he brings are real in every sense. We also note that this judgement is not dealing with the family or the church per se, but with Israelite society as a whole.

In the second passage we see God's restrictions regarding the Old Testament ministry. Of all the Israelites, it was the firstborn sons who were chosen as belonging to God. Also notice that the priesthood was not given to women, but instead to "Aaron and his sons." So here we have a descriptive passage regarding male and female roles in the church. And so that no one misunderstands what is being said by those who object to the document *Scriptural Principles*, let me quote the author of *Passages*, in the April-June, 1992 edition of University Lutheran Chapel Update:

I hope now you can see why I question aspects of "Scriptural Principles"—and the pages of *Update* are open to responses to these concerns! The issues are just too important, as they touch on the unity and clarity of the Scriptures and the **potential ministry of more than half our church's members—ministry that Joel and Peter affirm is open to women.**²⁴

One has to wonder just what the intent of this statement is since the author of *Passages* does not make himself clear. Taken *at face value* there can be no doubt from this statement that the "ministry" referred to here is the pastoral ministry. The teaching ministry has been and always will be open to women; the pastoral ministry has not. Even if the statement were to be referring to such positions as holding offices on church council, to then claim that the pastoral office was excluded would be an artificial division. If either of these are the meaning of the author of *Passages* then his goal must be the establishment of a female clergy. His citing Joel and Peter would seem to indicate this as his intent since the reference points to women "prophesying," and yet no where does he specifically exclude the type of prophesying peculiar to the pastoral ministry. This understanding would

²⁴ Diener, *We Simply Must Be Sure*, p. 3. Emphasis mine.

also be supported by the fact that such positions are the only ones that are universally restricted to men in the WELS. On the other hand, there is the possibility that the author of this statement is referring to the few isolated cases where women are not allowed to direct choirs or serve on committees. If that is the case then he is not stating fact in this statement, but rather is setting up a straw-man and fighting against a caricature, since it is clear that such activities of service are not generally withheld from “half our church’s members.”

Assumptions Based on These Principles

As we now go on to deal with the passages that have been called into question it would be good for us to review the basic translational assumptions that will be used in dealing with the meaning of **aōhr** and **gunh/** in these passages.

If **aōhr** and **gunh/** are to be translated “husband” and “wife”:

There **must** be other words in the passage that directly add the concept of marital status to the basic meanings “man” and “woman.”

-or-

If there are not words that directly modify **aōhr** and **gunh/** to add the concept of marital status, there **must** be other words or phrases that indirectly add this to their meanings.

-or-

If there are no direct or indirect modifiers, there **must** be *overwhelming* contextual evidence in the immediate area to add the dimension of marital status to **aōhr** and **gunh/**. The only contextual evidence that fits this description is the discussion of either the family in general or marriage specifically.

If none of these conditions is met, then it is a twisting of Scripture to add anything, including the idea of marital status, to the simple meaning of **aōhr** and **gunh/**.²⁵

With these assumptions in mind, let us then move on to a discussion of the passages called into question. Please keep in mind, however, that what follows will not be a detailed exegesis of the passages in question. Such a treatment would be far too lengthy, not to mention outside the scope of this paper. What follows, therefore, will be focused on what the proper translation for each occurrence of **aōhr** and **gunh/** ought to be. This, of necessity must also include some exegesis, but not of the scope that these passages deserve. If you are interested in a very fine group of exegetical studies on these passages one is available from the Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Book Store entitled, *The Role of Man and Woman in God’s Order of Creation*.

II. THE PASSAGES IN QUESTION

1 Corinthians 11:2-16

² **Epainw de uaj oēi pahta mou memhsqe kai, kaqw, paredwka uōn, ta, paradoseij katekete.**

² I praise you for remembering me in everything and for holding to the teachings, just as I passed them onto you.

²⁵ Some may criticize not including the article in this discussion, since in some cases the article does have an impact, either because it is specifically referring back to another occurrence of the noun, or because it carries with it an idea of possession. There are two reasons a discussion of the article has not been included. First of all, while the article is sometimes used in a possessive sense and is regularly used to specify a previous reference, these designations are made more or less on the basis of the translator’s view of the text, and thus can be argued since they are often not based on objective evidence. Also when the article is used in a possessive sense, this is always in a context where one of the principles mentioned above has already been satisfied. The second reason the article has been left out of this discussion is based on the fact that there is no evidence to suggest that the Greek, either in the LXX or the New Testament, makes a distinction with regard to marital status on the basis of whether the words are articularized or not.

It is good for us to realize the importance of the term **paradoseij** here. In its strictest sense **paradosij** refers to that which is passed down. While it is sometimes used negatively to refer to the traditions of the Pharisees, that, however, cannot be the sense here. Here this term must refer to the teachings that were passed down from Paul to the Corinthians. There is no sense of “tradition” in this. Rather Paul is pointing to the word of God which he had taught in Corinth. The point is that what Paul taught in Corinth, and what follows is God’s holy, immutable will for all people of all time, not just some “tradition.”²⁶

³ **Qel w deVnauj eidojai oxi pantoj aDroij h'kefal h'Xristoj estin, kefal h'de'gunaikoj o'QDhr, kefal h'de'tou Xristou o'Qeoij .**

³Now I want you to realize that the head of every man is Christ, and the head of the woman is man, and the head of Christ is God.²⁷

Here, at the very beginning of this section, Paul treats the overriding principle that will govern everything that follows. If we understand this correctly, we cannot misunderstand what follows. If, however, we miss his point here, we cannot properly understand the rest of his argument. Thus this verse is vital to the translation of **aDhr** and **gunh**/in this section.

Paul begins by saying that Christ is the head of every **aDhr**. (The NIV translates this passage poorly since the article on **Xristoj** designates him as the subject not the predicate). There are no direct modifiers to alter the meaning of **aDhr**, there are no indirect modifiers that would give it an idea of marital status, and there is no contextual evidence whatsoever, either before or after this verse, that would make us think that Paul is speaking in any terms other than that of a human male. In fact, the one word that does directly modify **aDhr**, **pantoj**, leads us in the opposite direction. Furthermore, when we look at the context in verses 8, 12, and 14 of this chapter, we find that the context is very clearly speaking not of “husbands” but of male human beings.²⁸ Paul is speaking about every male, not just the married ones but the unmarried as well: “Christ is the head of every man.”

He then goes on to expand this statement and says **kefal h'de'gunaikoj o'QDhr**. The **deV** here indicates that Paul is continuing his point with a coordinating clause. In this phrase Paul does not use **pauj**, but it certainly must be inferred from the previous statement. The continuation indicated by **deV** assures us of that. The lack of an article on **gunaikoj** indicates that it is either indefinite, or it draws attention to the specific qualities of a female. In either case the lack of an article gives no evidence that the women spoken of here are only wives. Furthermore, taking **gunh**/as “wives” militates against the **pauj** that must be understood here. Why would Paul talk about the head of every man, single or married, and then speak only about the head of married women? Is it his intention, is it the Holy Spirit’s intention, to leave out an entire class of people? Since there are no direct or indirect modifiers attached to **gunh**/that add the idea of marital status to the word, and since the context says nothing at all about marriage, Paul is not speaking here only of wives. That fact then gives us a clearer understanding of how to handle the article on **aDhr**. Since Paul is not speaking only about wives, it would be illegitimate for us to translate the article on **aDhr** with possessive force, which would make the translation read, “and the head of every woman is her husband.” Instead, the article designates **aDhr** as the subject of its clause, just as the article on **Xristoj** does in the first clause. David Kuske says the same thing in his exegesis of this passage:

²⁶ One of the more disturbing aspects of what was written in *Heirs* is the seeming tendency to embrace the Historical-Critical attitude toward Scripture. The authors of that paper effectively say that since Ephesians appears to have been a circular letter it is more likely to “express general principles that deserve wide application.” They go on to state that letters like Timothy (written to one man) or Corinthians (written to one congregation) are more likely to “apply such general principles to a particular time, place, and situation.” The effect is that we can largely ignore what is said in these letters since they weren’t written to or for us.

²⁷ The NIV would have done better to translate **gunh**/without the definite article here, since it does not occur in the Greek.

²⁸ Kuske, *Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:3-16*, p. 25.

The translation “her husband” is precluded for four reasons, therefore: 1) The usage in this triad of clauses indicates that the article here is used to designate the subject over against the predicate nominative; 2) The development of this whole section, especially verses 8, 12, and 14, shows the vocable meaning of **ανθρω** in this context to be “male human being”; 3) While on occasion some Hellenistic Greek writers did use the article with the subject to designate a connection with another noun in the sentence, this usage is normally limited to the object in a sentence to designate a connection of the object with the subject (Moulton, III, p 173); and 4) A switch in the meaning of **ανθρω** from “man” in the first clause to “husband” in the second clause which by construction (cf. **δε**) is a parallel would be highly unusual.²⁹

Paul concludes his statement on headship by saying “and the head of Christ is God.”³⁰ It would also be good for us to remember that the headship of man as stated in this passage is always to be viewed in the light of the headship of Christ over men and the headship of God over Christ. These must be the examples men are to follow in the exercise of their headship.

⁴ **πα**ν ανθρωσιν προσευχομενος η κεφαλη ης εστιν κατασκευη της κεφαλης αυτου = ⁵ **π**ασα δε γυνη προσευχομενη η κεφαλη αυτης κατασκευη της κεφαλης αυτης: **ε**μ γαρ εστιν και το αυθ της κυρης ης ⁶ **ε**ις ο ακουω κατακυριου της γυναικος, και κειρασκει: εις δε αυθ της κυρης ης **ε**ις ο ακουω κατακυριου της γυναικος, και κειρασκει η κυρις αυτης, κατακυριου της γυναικος.

⁴Every man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head. ⁵And every woman who prays or prophesies with her head uncovered dishonors her head—it is just as though her head were shaved. ⁶If a woman does not cover her head, she should have her hair cut off; and if it is a disgrace for a woman to have her hair cut or shaved off, she should cover her head.

Paul now moves from the overriding principle to the specific applications the Corinthians should draw from it. The application of this principle strikes a chord in the customs of Corinth in that day. In Corinth the wearing of a head covering said something about headship and submission in the relationship between the sexes. Paul here is telling the Corinthians that they ought not disregard this custom in Corinth and thus give others the wrong impression or even cause them to fall into sin.

With regard to this custom Tertullian writes,

As, then, in the masculine sex, under the name of “man” even the youth is forbidden to be veiled, so, too, in the feminine, under the name of “woman” even the virgin is bidden to be veiled. Equally in each sex let the younger follow the discipline of the elder Wear the full garb of woman to preserve the standing of virgin.³¹

According to Tertullian, this custom applied not only to married men and women, but to males and females in general. Again this objective evidence indicates that Paul in speaking to the Corinthians is speaking of male and female not of husbands and wives.

Furthermore, since there still is clearly no evidence whatsoever that **ανθρω** and **γυνη** ought to be translated with any indication toward marital status, it becomes clear that Paul cannot be speaking of husbands and wives. There are no direct modifiers to indicate marital status, no indirect modifiers to move the translator in that direction and a context that clearly militates *against* (vv. 8, 12, 14) understanding these occurrences in any way

²⁹ Kuske, *Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:3-16*, p. 25.

³⁰ For a brief discussion on the force of **κεφαλη** see Kuske’s paper noted in footnote 4.

³¹ *Theological Quarterly*, Vol. 24, 1920, p 107; quoted by D. Kuske in *Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:3-16*, p 27.

other than as “male human beings” and “female human beings.” Furthermore, if Paul is speaking of “husbands” and “wives” here, how does what he says make any sense at all? In v. 10 Paul himself indicates that wearing a head covering is a “sign of authority.” Does Paul mean to say that unmarried men, (like himself), ought to have a sign of authority on their heads? Is he saying that unmarried women ought not to have a sign of authority on their heads? At best, a translation of this sort would lead to confusion since it would make the wearing of a head covering merely a designation of marital status, which Tertullian makes clear it was not, rather than one of authority, which again Paul himself calls this head covering in v. 10. The only possible reason to translate any of the occurrences of **aōhr** or **gunh/** in this section as “husband” and “wife” do not come from the text, but from the bias of the translator.

⁷ **Ōnhk meh gak ouōōēil ei katakal uptesqai thh kefal hh eiōwh kai\doča qeou=ūparxwn: hōgunh\de\ doča aōhroj estin.**

⁷A man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of man.

The causal **gak** indicates that Paul is now explaining why this custom is to be observed by the men and women of Corinth. Again in this verse there is a total lack of any cogent reasons for translating **aōhr** and **gunh/** here with any reference to marital status. In fact, the proof Paul cites shows that they do not refer to the marriage relationship. If these occurrences refer to husbands and wives how would what follows make any sense at all? Normally we might consider a wife to be the glory of her husband for several reasons. Perhaps she would be his glory by her having agreed to marry him. Perhaps she would be his glory by bearing him children. Perhaps she would be his glory by being the type of wife described in Proverbs 31. And yet none of these is cited by Paul as the proof that she is his glory. Instead his proof rests firmly on an argument that can only be applied to men and women in general, not to husbands and wives specifically.

⁸**ouōgar estin aōhk eōgunaikoj aōi a\gunh\ēōaōhroj :**

⁸For man did not come from woman, but woman from man;

Notice carefully the **gar**. Paul is proving from Scripture that woman is the glory of man. The creation account says that woman was made from man, not the other way around. So how does that make this statement so compelling with regard to the translation of **aōhr** and **gunh/**? If one tries to substitute “husband” and “wife” here for “man” and “woman” the statement becomes absurd: “For husband did not come from wife, but wife from husband.” This certainly cannot be said to be generally true, neither does it work in the specific with Adam and Eve, because at this point in creation Adam and Eve were not yet married. On the other hand it is very accurate to say that woman came from man, since Adam and Eve served as representatives for the entire human race. Furthermore, the context, especially in v. 12, has an impact here.

Before going to v. 9, we should again take up the meaning of **aōhr** and **gunh/** Is it “husband-wife” or “man-woman”? Verse 12 answers the question for us when the very same thought presented here in v. 9 is called to mind again by the particle **w#per**, and then this truth about the origin of woman from man (v. 8 and v. 12a) is compared to another truth by **ouōwj** (v. 12b). In 12b the meaning cannot be any other than “man-woman.” This in turn dictates the meaning of v. 12a and thus in turn of v. 8.³²

⁹**kai\gak ouōēktisqh aōhr dia\thh gunaika aōi a\gunh\dia\ton aōdra.**

⁹Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man.

³² Kuske, *Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:3-16*, p. 29.

Here Paul adds a second proof to the first, as indicated by the **kai'gak**. Again there is no modifier to alter the meaning of **aōhr** or **gunh/**. Again the context runs to affirming that these occurrences refer to male and female as opposed to husband and wife. And if these proofs do not refer specifically and solely to the marriage relationship, then neither can any of the other occurrences in this section of Scripture. Do those who would like to restrict this section of Scripture to the realm of marriage really intend to say that the position of husband carries with it no obligations toward the wife? That would be the meaning if you were to translate these occurrences with the words “husband” and “wife”: “neither was husband created for wife, but wife for husband.” If this were to be the correct translation the reference to “husband” and “wife” could mean nothing other than the position of “husband” and the position of “wife.” Thus this statement would contradict the clear teaching of Scripture in Ephesians 5 and elsewhere. There can be no doubt, **aōhr** and **gunh/** here must be translated “man” and “woman,” and thus everything that is proven by this statement, must also refer to men and women, and so on down the line.

The authors of *Heirs* restrict these verses solely to the marriage relationship: “St. Paul refers to God’s purpose in creation (1 Corinthians 11:8-9) which was clearly marriage (Genesis 2:18) and then stresses the interdependence of Christian husbands and wives. (1 Corinthians 11:11-12).”³³ And yet, as we have seen, such is impossible if we are to retain the unity of Scripture.

¹⁰ **dia'touto o'ceil ei h'gunh'e'ousian exein epi'thj= kefal hj= dia'touj aggel ouj . ¹¹ pl hk oute gunh\ xwrij aōroj oute aōhk xwrij gunaikoj eōkuriw|**

¹⁰“For this reason, and because of the angels, the woman ought to have a sign of authority on her head. ¹¹In the Lord, however, woman is not independent of man, nor is man independent of woman.

In these verses again we find a lack of any modifiers whatsoever to shift the translation of **aōhr** and **gunh/** into the realm of marriage, and this doesn’t even take into consideration the surrounding and overwhelming contextual evidence that forces the occurrences here to be translated “man” and “woman.” Still there are those who claim that these verses, especially 11, apply exclusively to husbands and wives. When we look at v. 12, however, it becomes impossible to understand these references as dealing with the marriage relationship. Instead, Paul now returns to v. 7b to complete his thought there regarding the obligation that woman in general has toward man: she ought to have a sign of authority on her head. Then, to make sure that men do not abuse this relationship, Paul immediately speaks of the interdependence between men and women. This interdependence cannot refer to the interdependence of husbands and wives as the authors of *Heirs* state above, for reasons that Paul makes clear in v. 12. Rather, Paul’s point here is to emphasize the loving concern with which Christian men will treat all women. They will not disrespect them, but instead will treat them as the wonderful gift of God that they are.

¹² **wšper gak h'gunh'e'ōtou-aōroj , oušwj kai'ōhk dia'thj= gunaikoj : ta'de'panta e'ōtou-ēou=**

¹²For as woman came from man, so also man is born of woman. But everything comes from God.

It is extremely important to note the **gak** here. It makes it clear that what Paul is about to say is proof for the preceding statements in v. 8 and v. 11, and thus for the rest of his argument. It is just as impossible to translate any of the occurrences here “husband” and “wife,” as it is to say that the husband is born of the wife. It would be absurd to think that this verse is referring to the marriage relationship, and yet this verse is Paul’s explanation of how man and woman are interdependent. The **wšper** here clearly refers back to v. 8 and Paul’s assertion there that woman came from man, and then he adds the statement that in the exact same way (**oušwj**), man is born of woman. If it impossible for husbands in general to be born of their wives, then it is equally impossible

³³ Stadler, Albrecht, & Johnson, *Heirs*, p. 18.

for the first part of this verse to be taken as referring to the marriage relationship, and if it is impossible for the first part of this verse to be taken as referring to marriage, then v. 8 cannot be referring to marriage, and neither can anything that v. 8 is used to prove. Thus the idea that this section of Scripture refers only to the roles of males and females within marriage, is false.

¹³ **En uññ auðaij krihate: prepon estih gunaika aðatakal upton tw|qew|proseukesqai;** ¹⁴ **ouðh9 fusij auðhidaskai uññaj oñi aðñk meh eññ komaðoñia auðw|estih,** ¹⁵ **gunh|de|eññ komaðoñia auðh|estih;** **oñi h|romhanti|peribol aibu deðotai [auðh|** ¹⁶ **Eiðe|tij dokei=fil oheikoj eiñai, hññij=toiauthn sunhñeian ouðexomen ouðe|ai|ññ|hsia| tou=geou=**

¹³Judge for yourselves: Is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered? ¹⁴Does not the very nature of things teach you that if a man has long hair, it is a disgrace to him, ¹⁵but that if a woman has long hair, it is her glory? For long hair is given to her as a covering. ¹⁶If anyone wants to be contentious about this, we have no other practice—nor do the churches of God.³⁴

Verses 13-16 again contain no valid arguments for translating **aðñr** and **gunh/** with anything other than “man” and “woman.” There are no direct modifiers, there are no indirect modifiers, and the context, as we have seen, clearly prohibits any other translation.

Thus it is impossible to view any portion of this entire section of Scripture as referring to anything other than the relationship of men and women in general. While there are definitely applications to marriage that can and must be made on the basis of the principle stated here, in the final analysis 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 refers to the role relationship between men and women in general and not to the role relationship in marriage. This having been proven, the teachings presented in *Scriptural Principles* must remain intact. Nevertheless, it would not do for us to allow the other passages teaching this truth to remain in question and so we must look at them as well.

1 Corinthians 14:34-35

With regard to the statements Paul makes in 1 Corinthians 14:34-35, it would be of benefit if we were to look more closely at the context that precedes these verses. In v. 26 Paul writes, “What then shall we say, brothers? When you come together, everyone has a hymn, or a word of instruction, a revelation, a tongue or an interpretation. All of these must be done for the strengthening of the church.” He here makes it very clear that he is speaking of a worship service, and that context continues through verses 34 and 35 and on to the end of the chapter. Except in these two verses chapter 14 makes no mention at all of husbands and wives, or even of men and women. There is no discussion of the family, and no mention of marriage. Thus the context, by itself, would suggest that occurrences of **aðñr** and **gunh/** in these two verses ought to be translated “man” and “woman.” But we do have other factors to take into consideration.

³⁴ **ai|gunaikej eðtaij=ek|ññ|hsia|ij sigatwsan: ouðak epitrepetai auðaij= |al eiñ, að|a| uðotasse|sqwsan, kaqwj kai|ññ|moj |egei.**

³⁴women should remain silent in the churches. They are not allowed to speak, but must be in submission, as the Law says.

In this verse Paul uses no modifiers, either direct or indirect, to add the idea of marital status to **aðñr** and **gunh/**. Here he places the application before the principle, unlike in chapter 11. The application is that women are to remain silent. They are not allowed to even utter a sound (**|al eiñ**). The principle is that they are to be in submission “as the Law says.”

³⁴ Unfortunately, the NIV really massacred this translation: verse 16 should read “we have no such practice (or custom)—nor do the churches of God.”

The silence that Paul speaks of here, however, is not without qualifications. It is clear from other portions of Scripture that women did speak in the church service. The kind of speaking that Paul is referring to, then, must be of such a kind that it would violate the principle of submission that Paul refers to. In his exegesis of these verses Dr. Becker writes:

If a man is standing to deliver a prophecy, a revelation, and a woman would insist that she has received a revelation which she wanted to proclaim, the rule that Paul had just laid down would mean that her rising to speak would in effect be a command to the man who was speaking to be silent (**sigatw**). That sort of speaking would very clearly conflict with the subordinate position of women in the order of creation, which calls upon them to be in subjection.³⁵

and

If a woman in that situation were to pronounce a judgement on a male prophet, this again would put her in a position where she would violate the legal principle, “Let them be in subjection.” In this activity of judging, therefore, the women were also not to participate by speaking but “to keep silence in the churches.”³⁶

There is also another type of speaking that Paul is obviously restricting in v. 35 where he says, “if they want to inquire about something, they should ask their own men at home.” Dr. Becker writes:

In contrast to the two previous examples, it is a little more difficult to see how the desire to learn could violate the principle that women should be subject to men. However, every teacher knows that there is a way of questioning that can easily give evidence of a rebellious and undisciplined attitude. The questioning can easily become judgmental and this application of the basic principle might be viewed as an application to an aspect of the activity which Paul had called for when he said, “Let the others judge.”³⁷

All of this has a specific bearing upon the translation of **gunh/in** v. 34 and **aohr** and **gunh/in** v. 35.

³⁵ **eiDe/ti maqeiḡ qel ousin, eDoikw|touj iḡbuj aḡdraj eḡerwtatwsan: aiḡxroh gar eSt in gunaikiḡ al eiḡ eDeḡl hsiḡ.**

³⁵ If they want to inquire about something, they should ask their own husbands at home; for it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in the church.

You will note that in this passage there is a direct modifier attached to **aohr**. Paul says: **touj iḡbuj aḡdraj**. Here it would seem that Paul is restricting these verses to wives since the **gunh/in** v. 34 is the antecedent to **iḡbuj**. That interpretation, however, cannot be. If Paul were telling wives alone to remain silent in church because these things violated the Scriptural principle of a wife’s submission to her husband, then his instruction to them to ask their husbands at home would be granting them permission to violate that same Scriptural principle as long as it was done at home. That certainly cannot be the case. Another option would be that Paul intended this principle to apply only in church and not anywhere else, but in that case he would have been setting up a new ceremonial law which he assures us elsewhere we are no longer subject to.

The only possible explanation is that Paul is instructing females in the church to remain in submission, and not to challenge the general authority that God has given men over women. Instead, if their desire is indeed to learn,

³⁵ Becker, *An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36*, p. 36

³⁶ Becker, *An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36*, p. 37.

³⁷ Becker, *An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36*, p. 37.

they may ask their own men at home, where they would not be challenging the authority of any man, but instead would be affirming not only the authority of the men in church but also of their own men in the home.

You may also note that in the preceding, **andraj** has been translated “men” rather than “husbands,” despite the fact that there is a direct modifier attached to it. This certainly is a valid translation, especially given the fact that the rest of the occurrences in this context have nothing to do with marriage. As was stated in the discussion on principle number three, even a direct modifier may not force a translation that includes the idea of marital status, since that would make it impossible to speak of a woman’s father, brother, or son as her man, which in the Greek way of thinking would be possible for the unmarried or widowed woman. Dr. Becker says this in regard to the translation of **andraj** here:

As we have already noted, the translation “their own husbands,” may be too restrictive, even though the possessive pronoun would be an argument in favor of that translation. While it may be preferable to translate instead, “their own men,” the decision on that point is not crucial, for there are, as we have seen, other alternatives available for the unmarried if Paul in this case had in mind only those women who had living husbands.³⁸

No matter how we handle **andraj** here, the point is made that this passage is most definitely not speaking of the marriage relationship and the roles of husbands and wives, but, in fact, the roles of men and women in general.³⁹

1 Timothy 2:8-15

As we begin looking at these verses from 1 Timothy 2, we note that Paul begins this chapter with instructions on prayer. Those instructions continue through v. 8. Now there are some who would contend that these instructions restrict the discussion to that which takes place in the church service, but there really is no strong evidence for that here as there was in 1 Corinthians 14. We are to pray continually, so Paul’s instructions apply just as well outside the church service as inside. That Paul is not speaking solely of the church service also becomes evident in v. 9 where he instructs women to dress modestly. Again this instruction applies equally as well outside the church service as inside. In the end, however, it really doesn’t matter whether Paul is speaking of the church service or not. There are no ceremonial laws in the New Testament. What is good, right and proper for a Christian within the worship service is good, right and proper for him outside it as well.

When we look at this context we also note the complete lack of any evidence that would lead us to designate the occurrences of **andhr** and **gunh**/as referring to “husbands” and “wives.” Again, there is no discussion of marriage, no discussion of the family, in fact, no occurrence of **andhr** or **gunh**/in the verses that precede v. 8.

⁸**Boul omai ouh proseukesqai touj andraj eopanti\topw|epairontaj oSibuj xeiraj xwrij oQghj= kai\ dial ogismou=**

⁸I want men everywhere to lift up holy hands in prayer, without anger or disputing.

Here in v. 8 we see that there are no modifiers, either direct or indirect that would move us to translate this occurrence of **andhr** in any way other than as referring to male human beings. Certainly Paul is not restricting

³⁸ Becker, *An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 14: 33b-36*, p. 37.

³⁹ Personally I am divided as to how **andraj** ought to be handled here. On the one hand I like the translation “husbands,” simply because every other occurrence of **andhr** and **gunh**/that is modified in this way, in both the LXX and the New Testament, designates marital status. On the other hand, I understand that with language there are no hard and fast rules that do not also have exceptions to them. I also respect Dr. Becker and his opinion. The result is that if I were pressed to make a decision, I would translate **andraj** as “husbands” here. That, however, does not change anything said in the main body of this paper.

his instructions for men everywhere to pray without anger or disputing to married men. This is something that applies to all men. The fact that Paul makes this instruction to men and not to women might point us to the idea that Paul has in mind the worship service here. While that may be true, Paul's instructions do not rule out that he also intends for them to pray outside the service as well. In fact, those who see this as evidence that Paul is speaking only of the worship service are adding support to the application of headship and submission that Paul made in 1 Corinthians 14. There is, however, good evidence that Paul, while he may have in mind the worship service, is not restricting his instructions only to that sphere. We see that evidence in verses 9 and 10.

⁹ **W\$autwj** [kai\gunaikaj eDkatasolhkosmiw|meta\aiDuj kai\swfrosuhj kosmein eDutaj , mh'eD plemasin kai\krusiwhDargaritaj hDmatismw|polutelei¹⁰ aD Oprepei gunaich ePaggel lomehaj qessebeian, di Ofgwn aQaqwA.

⁹I also want women to dress modestly, with decency and propriety, not with braided hair or gold or pearls or expensive clothes, ¹⁰but with good deeds, appropriate for women who profess to worship God.

The **w\$autwj** at the beginning of this verse indicates that the following command for women is parallel to the previous command to men. Thus if the men mentioned in v. 8 are men in general, not just husbands then the women mentioned here are women in general, not just not wives. That would only make sense, since every Christian woman ought to “dress modestly, with decency and propriety.” Again there are no direct or indirect modifiers to suggest a translation of wife, and we see that Paul is clearly speaking to all women. Thus it is clear that these verses refer to men and women in general, not just husbands and wives.

That same **w\$autwj** also indicates that Paul does not have in mind the worship service alone, but general conduct in mind in both verses 8 and 9. If the command for men to pray in v. 8 refers to the worship service alone, then verses 9 and 10 “likewise” apply only to the worship service. But it is clear that decent and modest dress are not just things for church but are attitudes that go beyond the narrow scope of a church service and into the everyday life of a Christian woman. The fact that Paul mentions worshipping God (**qessebeian**) in connection with women, indicates that worship in the church service is most definitely included in his instructions, but it does not preclude that such instruction also apply to the life of worship outside the church service. In fact, common sense would tell us that even if these verses do apply specifically to the worship service, a Christian woman's understanding of the male-female relationship will also be a part of her daily life, just as her attitude about modesty is. Since there are no ceremonial laws in the New Testament, the moral law that Paul speaks of here holds true in all aspects of life, regardless of how wide or narrow this particular application is.⁴⁰

¹¹ **Gunh'eDhsuxia |manqanetw eDpash|uPotagh-**

¹¹A woman should learn in quietness and full submission.

Now Paul moves on to the instructions that we are most concerned with. Again there is no internal evidence whatsoever that we should understand this as referring to wives and not to all women. No direct modifiers are present to give **gunh**/the meaning “wife.” No indirect modifiers alter its meaning either. The context is speaking about men and women in general, not about husbands and wives. Nothing at all, except a translator's bias, would even suggest that we take **gunh**/as referring to wives here. We also take into consideration that what Paul says here is nearly identical to his argument in 1 Corinthians 14 which, as we have seen, refers to women and not to wives.

¹² **didaskain de\gunaiki\ouDe pitrepw ouDe\auQentein aDroj , aD Oihai eDhsuxia|**

⁴⁰ The questions raised by the author of *Passages* and those of *Heirs* indicate that at best they see the principles given us by Paul to apply to the church alone and not to society. Because of that tendency the question of whether this passage refers to the church service has been dealt with briefly here.

¹²I do not permit a woman to teach or to have authority over a man; she must be silent.

The meaning of **gunh**/in this context has already been established in our discussion of the preceding verses, and there is nothing here that compels us to understand this occurrence any differently. Again no direct or indirect modifiers are present to alter that meaning already established. The same holds true for the occurrence of **awhr** here. Paul is clearly making a general statement that applies to all women with regard to all men. That fact becomes even more clear when we look at Paul's reasoning as found in the following verses.

¹³ **Adam gak prwtōj epl asqh, eipta Eu3.** ¹⁴ **kai Adam ouDhpathqh, hde gunh Capathqēisa eD parabāsei gegonen:**

¹³For Adam was formed first, then Eve. ¹⁴And Adam was not the one deceived, it was the woman who was deceived and became a sinner.

Here we have the first of two proofs from Paul (**gak**), as to why women are not allowed to have authority over a man. Those who claim that this passage deals exclusively with husbands and wives claim that mentioning Adam and Eve here is contextual evidence for translating the previous occurrences of **awhr** and **gunh**/as "husband" and "wife." They claim that since God's purpose in creating them was for marriage any reference to them must be within the context of marriage. The author of *Passages* states:

Because of Paul's stress on the singular "woman," and the reference to the intimate relationship between Adam and Eve—a married couple—I take the expression here also to refer to a married woman. Admittedly, here is not as strong a case as in others, and there can be disagreements among people who regard the Bible as God's holy Word.⁴¹

The authors of *Heirs* state:

We do not believe that 1 Timothy 2:12 prohibits all women from any exercise of authority over men because St. Paul refers to the sin of Adam and Eve (1 Timothy 2:14) who are identified as husband and wife in Genesis 3:17. The reference to childbearing (1 Timothy 2:15) also indicates that he is discussing the relationships between husbands and wives.⁴²

One is at a loss, however, to see the logical connection Adam and Eve's creation and the fall into sin (v. 14), have with marriage. Would these men have us believe that whenever Adam and Eve are spoken of in the same context, that context must then be referring to marriage? That is the entire basis of their argument here. Would they claim that since David and Bathsheba were married that whenever they are mentioned together in the same context that the author must be speaking of marriage? If not there, then why should they do it here? One fails to see the difference between these two married couples. Also consider that Adam and Eve were not considered married until God joined them together. If God joined them together, it is only logical to understand that they were separate before this point, and so the conclusion that when Paul refers to them he refers to the marriage relationship, is flawed.

Paul's argument is much more logical. In referring to Adam and Eve, he highlights only the time and circumstances of their creation, not the marriage relationship. His argument should sound very familiar; Paul also used it in 1 Corinthians 11:8,9. To claim that this verse speaks of marriage is anachronistic since at the time of Adam's creation he was not married, nor were Adam and Eve married at the time of Eve's creation. Certainly this was one of the purposes God had in creating them, but as of the time of creation that purpose had not been

⁴¹ Diener, *Passages*, p. 4.

⁴² Stadler, Albrecht, & Johnson. *Heirs*, p. 18.

fulfilled. Paul's point here, his proof for the fact that a woman ought not have authority over a man, is that God set up a very definite order in creation. And that order was not just a matter of time, but was also a matter of position. Man was given the leadership role and woman was given a role of submissiveness (not inferiority).

For this reason Paul's jump to the fall into sin is supremely logical. For when Adam and Eve fell into sin, they both stepped out of their God-assigned roles. The woman took the leadership position and the man submitted to that leadership. And his point is that it is not good for either man or woman when either of them steps outside of the roles that God gave them in the creation. Note well that Paul places the blame for the fall into sin on Adam, not Eve, in Romans 5 where he says,

Nevertheless, death reigned from the time of Adam to the time of Moses, even over those who did not sin by breaking a command, as did Adam, who was a pattern of the one to come. But the gift is not like the trespass. For if the many died by the trespass of the one man, how much more did God's grace and the gift that came by the grace of the one man, Jesus Christ, overflow to the many! Again, the gift of God is not like the result of the one man's sin: The judgment followed one sin and brought condemnation, but the gift followed many trespasses and brought justification. For if, by the trespass of the one man, death reigned through that one man, how much more will those who receive God's abundant provision of grace and of the gift of righteousness reign in life through the one man, Jesus Christ. Consequently, just as the result of one trespass was condemnation for all men, so also the result of one act of righteousness was justification that brings life for all men. For just as through the disobedience of the one man the many were made sinners, so also through the obedience of the one man the many will be made righteous (Romans 5:14-19).

Adam was held responsible for the fall into sin, not simply because he was the head of the household, but because he was the male, created first. He was held responsible for Eve's actions just as surely as any leader is held responsible for the misdeeds of his followers. Thus the total lack of any reference to marriage is made clear and we see that these verses must refer to men and women in general, and not merely to the marriage relationship.

¹⁵swqhsetai de\dia\thj= teknogoniāj, ean meihwsin e\pistei kai\agaph|kai\agiasmw\me ta\swfrosuhj :

¹⁵But women will be saved through childbearing—if they continue in faith, love and holiness with propriety.

Finally in v. 15 Paul concludes his argument. Neither **anhr** nor **gunh/** occur here, so the subject of the main verb of v. 15 is understood from the preceding. If the preceding refers to women in general, as we have proven it does, then so must the subject of this verb. The reference to childbearing (**teknogoniāj**), however, seems to suggest a marriage relationship as the authors of *Passages* and *Heirs* state. That, however, does not need to be the case. Professor Kuske in his paper *Exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:11-15* says,

Childbearing, more than any other characteristic of woman, sets her apart from man. This is the unique task for which God created her. If a woman recognizes this and treasures children as the gift from God that they are, and if she willingly and gladly serves God in this unique function, even though it be with pain, in no clearer way can she show her submission to God's will in the matter of her role as woman. This is apparently what the article with **teknogoniāj** is intended to emphasize, namely, the well-known kind of childbearing God spoke to Eve as the representative

of her class. Or else the article may just mean “her” childbearing, that is, the way each woman conducts herself in this activity.⁴³

Thus Paul wraps up his argument and everything fits neatly together. That fact, and the fact that nowhere do the grammar, words or context ever add the idea of marriage or family to **aṁhr** or **gunh/** make it clear that Paul’s comments here refer to men and women and their relationship in general, not merely to husbands and wives.

Conclusion

From the foregoing it should be obvious that the attempts on the part of some to relegate the Biblical teaching on the role relationships between men and women, to a mere discussion of the relationship between husbands and wives, are totally devoid of any Scriptural, syntactical or grammatical support. In none of these passages is there any valid reason for translating **aṁhr** or **gunh/** in any other way than their basic, native sense. In fact, as has been stated earlier, there is absolutely no need to ever translate either of these words so that they indicate marital status. Marital status is consistently made clear in other words used by the writer, and those words are not found in the questioned passages. *Scriptural Principles of Man and Woman Roles* is based on the only interpretation that is possible using objective hermeneutical principles. As Lutherans, we believe that there is only one, simple, literal sense intended by the inspired writers in all of Scripture, and especially in the *sedes doctrinae*.⁴⁴ In Luther’s day those who opposed the Bible’s teaching about the Lord’s Supper had to appeal to complex, subjective methods of interpretation to justify their teaching that “is” does not mean “is.” Pure doctrine came from the plain simple sense of the inspired words of Scripture—that “is” means what it plainly and simply says. The doctrine expounded in *Scriptural Principles* is similar. It relies on the plain, simple sense of **aṁhr** and **gunh/**

It would not be right, however, to just leave the issue there. Concerns with this issue are to a large degree a result of sins of commission and omission committed by every man in this world. The primary reason this teaching is so difficult and so unpalatable to the people of today’s world is that we men have used this doctrine as an excuse for treating women poorly, which makes the doctrine appear to condone such sins. We are responsible because of our cavalier attitude to the needs of women. The problem is not primarily that the women of this world are not following our lead, it is that we are leading poorly at best and pontificating at worst. Perhaps we should remove the plank from our own eye before we condemn the speck of sawdust apparent in the eyes of some women. If we as Christian men would lead in the same manner that Christ himself leads the Church, there would be little difficulty on the part of any Christian with this teaching of Scripture. May the Lord forgive us for our sin in this matter, and may he give us the strength, and the willingness to be the kind of leaders he intended us to be from the beginning of creation.

⁴³ Kuske, *Exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:11-15*, p. 51.

⁴⁴ See Formula of Concord, Thorough Declaration, VII, 45-47, Triglot pp. 987-989.

APPENDIX A⁴⁵
OCCURRENCES OF *ανθρω* AND *gunh*/IN THE LXX
SORTED BY CATEGORY⁴⁶

Passages Where *ανθρω* Must Be Translated “Man/Men”
(LXX)

GEN 2:23	EXO 18:21a	NUM 13:16	JOS 2:3	JDG 6:16	JDG 9:20a
GEN 4:23	EXO 18:21b	NUM 13:32	JOS 2:4a	JDG 6:27a	JDG 9:20b
GEN 12:20	EXO 18:25	NUM 14:22	JOS 2:4b	JDG 6:27b	JDG 9:23a
GEN 14:21	EXO 21:18	NUM 15:32	JOS 2:5	JDG 6:28	JDG 9:23b
GEN 14:24	EXO 21:22a	NUM 16:2a	JOS 2:7	JDG 6:29	JDG 9:24
GEN 17:23	EXO 21:28	NUM 16:2b	JOS 2:14	JDG 6:30	JDG 9:25
GEN 17:27	EXO 21:29	NUM 16:7	JOS 2:17	JDG 6:31	JDG 9:26
GEN 18:2	EXO 22:30	NUM 16:35	JOS 3:12	JDG 7:6	JDG 9:28
GEN 18:16	EXO 32:28	NUM 19:18	JOS 4:2	JDG 7:7a	JDG 9:36
GEN 18:22	EXO 35:22	NUM 31:3	JOS 4:4	JDG 7:7b	JDG 9:39
GEN 19:4	EXO 35:29	NUM 31:21	JOS 6:21	JDG 7:8a	JDG 9:46
GEN 19:5	EXO 36:6	NUM 31:32	JOS 7:2	JDG 7:8b	JDG 9:47
GEN 19:8a	EXO 38:22	NUM 31:35	JOS 7:3	JDG 7:8g	JDG 9:49a
GEN 19:8b	EXO 39:2	NUM 31:42	JOS 7:4a	JDG 7:13	JDG 9:49b
GEN 19:9		NUM 31:49	JOS 7:4b	JDG 7:14	JDG 9:49g
GEN 19:10	LEV 13:29	NUM 31:50	JOS 7:5	JDG 7:16	JDG 9:49d
GEN 19:11	LEV 13:38	NUM 31:53	JOS 7:14	JDG 7:19	JDG 9:51
GEN 19:12	LEV 15:2a	NUM 34:17	JOS 7:17	JDG 7:21	JDG 9:55a
GEN 20:2	LEV 15:2b	NUM 34:19	JOS 8:1	JDG 7:22	JDG 9:55b
GEN 20:3	LEV 15:18		JOS 8:3	JDG 7:23	JDG 9:57
GEN 24:16	LEV 15:33	DEU 1:13	JOS 8:21	JDG 7:24	JDG 10:1
GEN 24:32	LEV 20:10	DEU 1:15	JOS 8:25	JDG 8:1	JDG 10:18
GEN 24:54	LEV 20:18	DEU 1:16	JOS 9:2f	JDG 8:4	JDG 11:3
GEN 26:7a	LEV 20:27	DEU 1:22	JOS 10:2	JDG 8:5	JDG 11:39
GEN 26:7b	LEV 22:12	DEU 1:23a	JOS 10:18	JDG 8:8a	JDG 12:1
GEN 27:11a		DEU 1:23b	JOS 18:4	JDG 8:8b	JDG 12:2
GEN 27:11b	NUM 1:5	DEU 1:35	JOS 18:8	JDG 8:9	JDG 12:4a
GEN 29:19	NUM 1:17	DEU 2:14		JDG 8:10	JDG 12:4b
GEN 29:22	NUM 1:44	UEU 2:16	JDG 1:4	JDG 8:14a	JDG 12:5
GEN 32:7	NUM 1:52a	DEU 3:11	JDG 1:24	JDG 8:14b	JDG 13:2
GEN 33:1	NUM 1:52b	DEU 13:14	JDG 1:25	JDG 8:15	JDG 13:11b
GEN 34:7	NUM 4:49a	DEU 17:2	JDG 1:26	JDG 8:16	JDG 14:18
GEN 34:20	NUM 4:49b	DEU 21:20	JDG 2:6	JDG 8:17	JDG 14:19
GEN 38:21	NUM 5:6	DEU 21:21	JDG 2:21	JDG 8:18	JDG 15:10
GEN 39:1	NUM 5:10	DEU 22:5a	JDG 3:15	JDG 8:21	JDG 15:11
GEN 39:2	NUM 5:12a	DEU 22:5b	JDG 3:17	JDG 8:22	JDG 15:15
GEN 43:15	NUM 5:12b	DEU 22:21	JDG 3:28	JDG 8:24	JDG 15:16
GEN 46:32a	NUM 5:20a	DEU 22:22b	JDG 3:29a	JDG 8:25	JDG 16:5
GEN 46:32b	NUM 6:2	DEU 22:23	JDG 3:29b	JDG 9:2a	JDG 16:19
GEN 46:34	NUM 9:6	DEU 24:2	JDG 3:31	JDG 9:2b	JDG 16:27a
GEN 47:2	NUM 9:7	DEU 25:5a	JDG 4:6	JDG 9:3	JDG 16:27b
GEN 47:5	NUM 11:16	DEU 28:30	JDG 4:10	JDG 9:4	JDG 17:1
GEN 49:15	NUM 11:24	DEU 29:9	JDG 4:14	JDG 9:5	JDG 17:5
	NUM 11:25	DEU 29:17	JDG 4:20a	JDG 9:6	JDG 17:8
EXO 2:13	NUM 11:26	DEU 31:12	JDG 4:20b	JDG 9:7	JDG 17:11
EXO 10:11	NUM 13:2a	DEU 33:8	JDG 4:22	JDG 9:9	JDG 18:2
EXO 12:37	NUM 13:2b		JDG 5:30	JDG 9:18a	JDG 18:7
EXO 17:9	NUM 13:3	JOS 2:2	JDG 6:8	JDG 9:18b	JDG 18:8

⁴⁵ The division of the passages given in each of the appendices that follow is the result of my personal study of each passage listed. While there may be a few passages where someone might not agree with my assessment, in the end that does not matter since the overwhelming evidence of Scripture is unarguably clear in this matter. I hope that this listing of passages will help you in your personal study of this matter.

⁴⁶ In passages where a English letter follows, the letter indicates a verse found in the LXX that is not found in the original. In passages where a Greek letter follows, the letter indicates which occurrence of the word is meant.

JDG 18:11	JDG 21:8	1SA 11:8a	1SA 26:15	2SA 11:23	2SA 19:44b
JDG 18:14	JDG 21:9	1SA 11:8b	1SA 27:2	2SA 12:1	2SA 19:44g
JDG 18:16	JDG 21:10	1SA 11:9a	1SA 27:3	2SA 12:4	2SA 19:44d
JDG 18:17	JDG 21:12	1SA 11:9b	1SA 27:8	2SA 12:5a	2SA 20:1
JDG 18:19	JDG 21:21	1SA 11:10a	1SA 27:9	2SA 12:5b	2SA 20:2a
JDG 18:22	JDG 21:22	1SA 11:10b	1SA 27:11	2SA 12:7	2SA 20:2b
JDG 18:25	JDG 21:24a	1SA 11:12	1SA 28:1	2SA 13:3	2SA 20:4
JDG 19:1	JDG 21:24b	1SA 12:1	1SA 28:4	2SA 13:9a	2SA 20:7
JDG 19:6	JDG 21:25	1SA 13:2a	1SA 28:8	2SA 13:9b	2SA 20:11
JDG 19:7		1SA 13:2b	1SA 28:14	2SA 13:29	2SA 20:12
JDG 19:9	RTH 1:1	1SA 13:6	1SA 29:2	2SA 13:34	2SA 20:13
JDG 19:10	RTH 1:2	1SA 13:15	1SA 29:4a	2SA 14:16	2SA 20:21
JDG 19:15	RTH 2:1b	1SA 14:2	1SA 29:4b	2SA 14:25	2SA 20:22
JDG 19:16a	RTH 2:11	1SA 14:8	1SA 29:11	2SA 15:1	2SA 21:4
JDG 19:16b	RTH 2:19	1SA 14:12	1SA 30:1	2SA 15:2a	2SA 21:5
JDG 19:17a	RTH 2:20	1SA 14:14	1SA 30:2	2SA 15:2b	2SA 21:6
JDG 19:17b	RTH 3:3	1SA 14:20	1SA 30:3	2SA 15:4	2SA 21:12
JDG 19:18	RTH 3:8	1SA 14:23	1SA 30:4	2SA 15:5	2SA 21:17
JDG 19:20	RTH 3:14	1SA 14:36	1SA 30:9	2SA 15:6	2SA 21:20
JDG 19:22a	RTH 3:16	1SA 14:52a	1SA 30:10a	2SA 15:11	2SA 22:26
JDG 19:22b	RTH 3:18	1SA 14:52b	1SA 30:10b	2SA 15:13	2SA 22:49
JDG 19:22g	RTH 4:2	1SA 15:3	1SA 30:11	2SA 15:18a	2SA 23:1
JDG 19:23	RTH 4:7	1SA 16:16	1SA 30:13	2SA 15:18b	2SA 23:7
JDG 19:24		1SA 16:17	1SA 30:17	2SA 15:30	2SA 23:9
JDG 19:25a	1SA 1:11	1SA 16:18a	1SA 30:21	2SA 16:5	2SA 23:17
JDG 19:25b	1SA 2:9	1SA 16:18b	1SA 30:22a	2SA 16:7a	2SA 23:20
JDG 19:26	1SA 2:15	1SA 16:18g	1SA 30:22b	2SA 16:7b	2SA 23:21a
JDG 19:27	1SA 2:16	1SA 17:2	1SA 30:31	2SA 16:8	2SA 23:21b
JDG 20:1	1SA 2:25a	1SA 17:4	1SA 31:1	2SA 16:13	2SA 24:9a
JDG 20:2	1SA 2:25b	1SA 17:8	1SA 31:3	2SA 16:15	2SA 24:9b
JDG 20:4a	1SA 2:33	1SA 17:10	1SA 31:7a	2SA 16:18	2SA 24:9g
JDG 20:5	1SA 2:33	1SA 17:33	1SA 31:7b	2SA 17:1	2SA 24:15
JDG 20:8a	1SA 4:2a	1SA 17:40	1SA 31:12	2SA 17:3b	
JDG 20:8b	1SA 4:2b	1SA 17:52		2SA 17:8a	1KI 1:5
JDG 20:8g	1SA 4:9a	1SA 17:53	2SA 1:2	2SA 17:8b	1KI 1:42
JDG 20:10	1SA 4:9b	1SA 18:23	2SA 1:11	2SA 17:12	1KI 1:49
JDG 20:11a	1SA 4:10	1SA 18:27a	2SA 1:13	2SA 17:14	1KI 2:2
JDG 20:11b	1SA 4:12	1SA 18:27b	2SA 2:3	2SA 17:18	1KI 2:4
JDG 20:12	1SA 4:15	1SA 21:15	2SA 2:4a	2SA 17:24	1KI 2:9
JDG 20:13	1SA 4:16	1SA 22:2	2SA 2:4b	2SA 17:25	1KI 2:26
JDG 20:15a	1SA 4:17	1SA 22:6	2SA 2:17	2SA 18:7	1KI 2:35o
JDG 20:15b	1SA 5:7	1SA 22:18	2SA 2:29	2SA 18:10	1KI 3:13
JDG 20:17a	1SA 5:9	1SA 22:19	2SA 2:30	2SA 18:11	1KI 4:11
JDG 20:17b	1SA 6:15	1SA 23:3	2SA 2:31a	2SA 18:12	1KI 5:27
JDG 20:17g	1SA 6:19a	1SA 23:5	2SA 2:31b	2SA 18:17	1KI 7:2
JDG 20:20	1SA 6:19b	1SA 23:8	2SA 2:32	2SA 18:20	1KI 8:25
JDG 20:21	1SA 6:19g	1SA 23:13	2SA 3:20a	2SA 18:24	1KI 8:39
JDG 20:22	1SA 6:20	1SA 23:24	2SA 3:20b	2SA 18:26	1KI 9:5
JDG 20:25	1SA 7:1	1SA 23:25	2SA 3:39	2SA 18:27	1KI 9:27
JDG 20:31	1SA 7:11	1SA 23:26a	2SA 4:1	2SA 18:28	1KI 10:22c
JDG 20:33	1SA 8:4	1SA 23:26b	2SA 4:2	2SA 19:8	1KI 11:14
JDG 20:34	1SA 8:22	1SA 23:26g	2SA 4:11a	2SA 19:9	1KI 11:17
JDG 20:35	1SA 9:1a	1SA 23:26d	2SA 4:11b	2SA 19:15a	1KI 11:18a
JDG 20:36	1SA 9:1b	1SA 24:3a	2SA 5:6	2SA 19:15b	1KI 11:18b
JDG 20:39a	1SA 9:2	1SA 24:3b	2SA 5:21	2SA 19:16	1KI 11:28
JDG 20:39b	1SA 9:16	1SA 24:4	2SA 6:19	2SA 19:17	1KI 12:24t
JDG 20:41a	1SA 9:21	1SA 24:5	2SA 7:14	2SA 19:18	1KI 13:25
JDG 20:41b	1SA 9:22	1SA 24:7	2SA 8:4	2SA 19:23	1KI 18:4
JDG 20:44a	1SA 10:2	1SA 24:8	2SA 8:5	2SA 19:29	1KI 18:13
JDG 20:44b	1SA 10:3	1SA 24:23	2SA 9:3	2SA 19:33a	1KI 18:22
JDG 20:45a	1SA 10:6	1SA 25:11	2SA 10:5a	2SA 19:33b	1KI 18:44
JDG 20:45b	1SA 10:21	1SA 25:13a	2SA 10:5b	2SA 19:42a	1KI 19:18

JDG 20:46a	ISA 10:22	ISA 25:13b	2SA 10:6a	2SA 19:42b	1KI 20:10
JDG 20:46b	ISA 11:1	ISA 25:15	2SA 10:6b	2SA 19:43a	1KI 20:11
JDG 20:47	ISA 11:3	ISA 25:20	2SA 11:16	2SA 19:43b	1KI 20:13
JDG 21:1	ISA 11:7	ISA 26:2	2SA 11:17	2SA 19:44a	1KI 21:9
1KI 21:17	2KI 17:30a	2CH 2:13	NEH 7:2	PSA 111:1	PRO 18:4
1KI 21:30	2KI 17:30b	2CH 2:16	NEH 7:3a	PSA 111:5	PRO 18:11
1KI 21:33	2KI 17:30g	2CH 5:3	NEH 7:3b	PSA 138:19	PRO 18:12
1KI 21:39a	2KI 18:21	2CH 6:5	NEH 7:6	PSA 139:2	PRO 18:14a
1KI 21:39b	2KI 18:27	2CH 6:16	NEH 7:7	PSA 139:12	PRO 18:14b
1KI 21:39g	2KI 18:31a	2CH 6:22	NEH 7:28	PSA 146:10	PRO 18:20
1KI 21:42	2KI 18:31b	2CH 6:30	NEH 7:29		PRO 19:3
1KI 22:6	2KI 20:14	2CH 7:18	NEH 7:30	PRO 1:10	PRO 19:6
1KI 22:8	2KI 22:15	2CH 8:9	NEH 7:31	PRO 1:11	PRO 19:7
1KI 22:10	2KI 23:2	2CH 9:7	NEH 7:32	PRO 1:18	PRO 19:11
	2KI 23:8	2CH 9:14	NEH 7:33	PRO 2:12	PRO 19:14
2KI 1:6	2KI 23:10a	2CH 10:17	NEH 7:34	PRO 3:31	PRO 19:19
2KI 1:7	2KI 23:10b	2CH 13:3	NEH 8:1	PRO 5:21	PRO 19:21
2KI 1:8	2KI 23:17	2CH 13:7	NEH 8:2	PRO 5:22	PRO 19:22
2KI 2:7	2KI 23:18	2CH 13:15a	NEH 8:3	PRO 6:2	PRO 19:23
2KI 2:16	2KI 23:35	2CH 13:15b	NEH 8:16	PRO 6:12	PRO 19:25
2KI 2:17	2KI 24:16	2CH 13:17	NEH 11:2	PRO 6:26	PRO 20:3
2KI 2:19	2KI 25:4	2CH 15:13	NEH 11:3	PRO 6:34	PRO 20:5
2KI 3:23	2KI 25:19a	2CH 17:13	NEH 11:6	PRO 8:34	PRO 20:6
2KI 3:25	2KI 25:19b	2CH 18:5	NEH 12:44	PRO 10:4	PRO 20:24
2KI 3:26	2KI 25:19g	2CH 18:7	NEH 13:10	PRO 10:10	PRO 20:25
2KI 4:29a	2KI 25:23a	2CH 18:33	NEH 13:25	PRO 10:13	PRO 21:2
2KI 4:29b	2KI 25:23b	2CH 19:10	NEH 13:30	PRO 10:23	PRO 21:16
2KI 4:40	2KI 25:24	2CH 20:27		PRO 10:32	PRO 21:17
2KI 4:42	2KI 25:25	2CH 23:7	EST 9:6	PRO 11:6	PRO 21:20
2KI 4:43		2CH 23:8	EST 9:12	PRO 11:7	PRO 21:28
2KI 5:1a	1CH 4:12	2CH 24:24	EST 9:15	PRO 11:12	PRO 21:29
2KI 5:1b	1CH 4:22	2CH 28:6		PRO 11:13	PRO 22:14a
2KI 5:7	1CH 4:42	2CH 28:15	JOB 3:23	PRO 11:16	PRO 22:24
2KI 5:24	1CH 5:18	2CH 31:19	JOB 4:17	PRO 11:17	PRO 22:29
2KI 5:26	1CH 5:21	2CH 34:12	JOB 10:5	PRO 11:25	PRO 23:6
2KI 6:2	1CH 5:24a	2CH 34:23	JOB 12:4	PRO 12:2	PRO 24:1
2KI 6:19	1CH 5:24b		JOB 14:10	PRO 12:8	PRO 24:5
2KI 6:32	1CH 7:21	EZR 1:4	JOB 15:16	PRO 12:9	PRO 24:9
2KI 7:3	1CH 7:40	EZR 2:1	JOB 16:21	PRO 12:14	PRO 24:30
2KI 7:5	1CH 8:40	EZR 2:2	JOB 22:15	PRO 12:23	PRO 25:18
2KI 7:6	1CH 9:9	EZR 2:27	JOB 30:25	PRO 12:25	PRO 25:20a
2KI 7:9	1CH 10:7	EZR 2:28	JOB 31:9	PRO 12:27	PRO 25:28
2KI 7:10	1CH 10:12	EZR 3:1	JOB 31:11	PRO 13:8	PRO 26:12
2KI 9:11	1CH 11:4	EZR 4:11	JOB 32:5	PRO 13:22	PRO 26:21
2KI 9:16	1CH 11:19	EZR 4:21	JOB 33:29	PRO 14:7	PRO 27:17
2KI 9:21	1CH 11:22	EZR 5:4	JOB 34:7	PRO 14:10	PRO 27:21
2KI 10:5	1CH 11:23	EZR 5:10	JOB 34:9	PRO 14:14	PRO 27:24
2KI 10:6	1CH 12:9	EZR 6:8	JOB 34:11	PRO 14:17	PRO 28:2
2KI 10:7	1CH 12:20	EZR 8:16	JOB 34:20	PRO 14:29	PRO 28:5
2KI 10:14a	1CH 12:31	EZR 8:18	JOB 34:23	PRO 14:30	PRO 28:11
2KI 10:14b	1CH 12:39	EZR 10:1	JOB 34:34	PRO 14:33	PRO 28:14
2KI 10:19	1CH 16:3a	EZR 10:9	JOB 36:24	PRO 15:18	PRO 28:17
2KI 10:21	1CH 16:3b	EZR 10:16	JOB 38:3	PRO 15:18a	PRO 28:20
2KI 10:24a	1CH 16:3g	EZR 10:17	JOB 38:26	PRO 15:21	PRO 28:21
2KI 10:24b	1CH 16:21		JOB 40:7	PRO 15:29b	PRO 28:22
2KI 10:24g	1CH 18:4	NEH 1:2		PRO 16:14	PRO 28:24
2KI 10:25	1CH 18:5	NEH 1:11	PSA 1:1	PRQ 16:25	PRO 28:25
2KI 11:8	1CH 18:10	NEH 2:12	PSA 5:7	PRO 16:26	PRO 29:1
2KI 11:9a	1CH 19:5	NEH 3:2	PSA 17:26	PRO 16:27	PRO 29:2
2KI 11:9b	1CH 20:6	NEH 3:22	PSA 17:49	PRO 16:28	PRO 29:3
2KI 11:11	1CH 21:5a	NEH 3:28	PSA 25:9	PRO 16:29	PRO 29:4
2KI 12:5	1CH 21:5b	NEH 4:9	PSA 31:2	PRO 16:32	PRO 29:6
2KI 12:6	1CH 21:14	NEH 4:12	PSA 33:9	PRO 17:12	PRO 29:8
2KI 12:10	1CH 22:9	NEH 4:13	PSA 39:5	PRO 17:18	PRO 29:9a

2KI 12:16	1CH 23:3	NEH 4:17 a	PSA 54:24	PRO 17:20	PRO 29:9 b
2KI 13:21 a	1CH 26:31	NEH 4:17 b	PSA 58:3	PRO 17:22	PRO 29:10
2KI 13:21 b		NEH 5:7	PSA 75:6	PRO 17:24	PRO 29:20
2KI 14:12	2CH 2:1	NEH 5:13	PSA 79:18	PRO 17:26	PRO 29:22 a
2KI 15:20	2CH 2:6	NEH 5:17	PSA 83:6	PRO 17:27	PRO 29:22 b
2KI 15:25	2CH 2:12	NEH 6:11	PSA 91:7	PRO 18:1	PRO 29:23

PRO 29:25	JER 31:31	EZE 24:22	ZEC 7:2	JDT 14:11	SIR 42:14
PRO 29:26	JER 33:17	EZE 27:10	ZEC 8:23	JDT 15:3	SIR 44:1
PRO 29:27	JER 33:22	EZE 27:27	ZEC 13:7	JDT 15:13	SIR 44:3
PRO 30:1	JER 36:6	EZE 39:14			SIR 44:6
PRO 30:19	JER 39:32a	EZE 39:20	1ES 3:18	GES 1:18	SIR 44:10
	JER 39:32b	EZE 40:3	1ES 3:24	GES 9:6	SIR 45:1
ECC 1:8	JER 41:9	EZE 40:4	1ES 4:2	GES 9:12	SIR 45:18
ECC 4:4	JER 41:18	EZE 40:5	1ES 4:12	GES 9:15	SIR 49:15
ECC 6:2a	JER 42:19	EZE 43:6	1ES 4:14		
ECC 6:2b	JER 45:22	EZE 44:25	1ES 4:32	WIS 7:2	SUS 1:28
ECC 6:3	JER 47:7	EZE 47:3	1ES 4:34	WIS 18:21	SUS 1:37
ECC 7:5	JER 47:8		1ES 5:4		
ECC 9:14	JER 47:9	DAN 3:8	1ES 8:27	SIR 4:2	BEL 1:20
ECC 9:15a	JER 48:1	DAN 3:12	1ES 8:30	SIR 7:25	
ECC 9:15b	JER 48:2	DAN 3:20	1ES 8:31	SIR 9:16	IMC 1:34
ECC 12:3	JER 48:5a	DAN 3:21	1ES 8:32a	SIR 9:18	IMC 2:8
	JER 48:5b	DAN 3:22	1ES 8:32b	SIR 10:5	IMC 2:18
SON 3:8	JER 48:8	DAN 3:23	1ES 8:33	SIR 10:23	IMC 2:23
SON 8:7	JER 48:16	DAN 3:25	1ES 8:34	SIR 10:25	IMC 2:25
SON 8:11	JER 50:2	DAN 3:26	1ES 8:35	SIR 11:2	IMC 2:31a
	JER 50:6	DAN 4:37c	1ES 8:36	SIR 11:28	IMC 2:31b
ISA 2:9	JER 50:9	DAN 5:7	1ES 8:37	SIR 12:9	IMC 2:40
ISA 5:15	JER 51:15	DAN 6:3a	1ES 8:38	SIR 12:14	IMC 2:44
ISA 14:30	JER 51:19	DAN 6:3b	1ES 8:39	SIR 13:16	IMC 2:62
ISA 22:17	JER 52:7	DAN 6:4	1ES 8:40	SIR 14:1	IMC 2:65
ISA 28:14	JER 52:25a	DAN 8:25	1ES 8:46	SIR 14:3	IMC 3:24
ISA 31:8	JER 52:25b	DAN 9:21	1ES 8:47	SIR 14:20	IMC 3:38
ISA 41:7		DAN 11:20	1ES 8:54	SIR 15:7	IMC 3:39
ISA 44:13	LAM 3:1		1ES 8:88	SIR 15:8	IMC 4:1
ISA 45:14	LAM 3:27	HOS 3:3	1ES 9:16	SIR 15:12	IMC 4:6
ISA 55:7	LAM 3:33	HOS 6:9	1ES 9:17	SIR 16:12	IMC 4:8
ISA 56:2	LAM 3:35		1ES 9:41	SIR 16:23	IMC 4:15
ISA 57:1	LAM 3:39	JOE 2:7		SIR 17:22	IMC 4:28
ISA 59:16		JOE 4:9	TOB 1:9	SIR 18:17	IMC 4:29
ISA 63:3	EZE 3:26		TOB 3:14	SIR 19:29	IMC 4:34
	EZE 8:2	AMO 1:5		SIR 19:30	IMC 4:41
JER 3:1	EZE 8:11	AMO 6:9	JDT 1:11	SIR 20:9	IMC 5:13
JER 4:3	EZE 8:16	AMO 7:7	JDT 1:16	SIR 21:20	IMC 5:17
JER 4:4	EZE 9:2a		JDT 2:5	SIR 21:23	IMC 5:20a
JER 5:1	EZE 9:2b	OBA 1:7a	JDT 2:15	SIR 23:11	IMC 5:20b
JER 5:26	EZE 9:3	OBA 1:7b	JDT 2:18	SIR 23:23b	IMC 5:22
JER 6:11	EZE 9:4	OBA 1:21	JDT 3:5	SIR 26:28a	IMC 5:32
JER 7:5	EZE 9:6		JDT 3:6	SIR 26:28b	IMC 5:34
JER 10:23	EZE 9:11	JON 1:10a	JDT 4:7	SIR 27:7	IMC 5:50
JER 11:2	EZE 10:2	JON 1:10b	JDT 4:9	SIR 27:30	IMC 5:59
JER 11:9	EZE 10:3	JON 1:13	JDT 4:11	SIR 28:9	IMC 5:60
JER 11:21	EZE 10:6	JON 1:16	JDT 6:1	SIR 29:14	IMC 5:62
JER 12:11	EZE 11:1	JON 3:5	JDT 6:12a	SIR 29:18	IMC 5:63
JER 13:14	EZE 11:2		JDT 6:12b	SIR 30:22	IMC 6:35
JER 14:9	EZE 11:15	MIC 2:2a	JDT 7:2a	SIR 31:20	IMC 6:37
JER 15:10	EZE 12:16	MIC 2:2b	JDT 7:2b	SIR 32:18	IMC 6:42
JER 17:25	EZE 14:1	MIC 7:6a	JDT 7:2g	SIR 33:2	IMC 6:54
JER 18:11	EZE 14:3	MIC 7:6b	JDT 7:7	SIR 34:1	IMC 6:57
JER 18:21	EZE 14:14		JDT 7:11	SIR 34:9	IMC 7:1
JER 19:3	EZE 14:16	NAH 2:4	JDT 7:12	SIR 35:6	IMC 7:5
JER 19:10	EZE 14:18		JDT 7:13	SIR 37:12	IMC 7:7
JER 20:10	EZE 18:8	HAB 2:5	JDT 10:4	SIR 37:14	IMC 7:16
JER 22:7	EZE 20:1		JDT 10:10	SIR 37:19	IMC 7:19
JER 22:18	EZE 21:36	ZEP 1:12	JDT 10:13	SIR 37:23	IMC 7:24
JER 22:30a	EZE 22:9	ZEP 3:4	JDT 10:14	SIR 37:24	IMC 7:28
JER 22:30b	EZE 22:30		JDT 10:17	SIR 37:25	IMC 7:32
JER 23:9	EZE 23:14	ZEC 1:8	JDT 10:19	SIR 38:4	IMC 7:40
JER 27:30	EZE 23:40	ZEC 1:10	JDT 11:9	SIR 39:2	IMC 9:4
JER 28:22	EZE 23:42	ZEC 2:5	JDT 13:12	SIR 40:29	IMC 9:5
JER 28:32	EZE 23:45	ZEC 3:8	JDT 14:2	SIR 41:1	IMC 9:6

JER 30:32

EZE 24:17

ZEC 6:12

JDT 14:6

SIR 41:8

1MC 9:25

1MC 9:29	1MC 11:43	1MC 13:53	2MC 3:11	2MC 12:19	4MC 1:10
1MC 9:49	1MC 11:44	1MC 14:23	2MC 3:17	2MC 12:23	4MC 4:1
1MC 9:61	1MC 11:45	1MC 14:32	2MC 3:32	2MC 12:35	4MC 4:15
1MC 9:69	1MC 11:74	1MC 14:33	2MC 4:35	2MC 13:15	4MC 6:30
1MC 10:16	1MC 12:1	1MC 14:37	2MC 4:44	2MC 14:24	4MC 7:16
1MC 10:19	1MC 12:8	1MC 15:13	2MC 6:18	2MC 14:31	4MC 8:19
1MC 10:32	1MC 12:41	1MC 15:26	2MC 6:21	2MC 14:37	4MC 10:5
1MC 10:36	1MC 12:45	1MC 16:4	2MC 8:8	2MC 15:12	4MC 14:11
1MC 10:61	1MC 12:47	1MC 16:6	2MC 8:9	2MC 15:13	4MC 15:30
1MC 10:74	1MC 13:10	1MC 16:10	2MC 8:32		4MC 16:2
1MC 10:85	1MC 13:34	1MC 16:15	2MC 10:29	3MC 6:1	4MC 16:14
1MC 11:21	1MC 13:48	1MC 16:22	2MC 12:5	3MC 7:15	

**Passages Where *anhr* Must Be Translated “Husband/Husbands”
Because of Direct Modifiers
(LXX)**

GEN 3:6	NUM 30:9a	JDG 13:10	2SA 3:15	PRO 31:22	JDT 16:22
GEN 3:16	NUM 30:9b	JDG 13:11a	2SA 3:16	PRO 31:23	JDT 16:23
GEN 16:3	NUM 30:11	JDG 14:15	2SA 11:26	PRO 31:28	JDT 16:24
GEN 29:32	NUM 30:12	JDG 19:3	2SA 14:5	PRO 31:31	
GEN 29:34	NUM 30:13a	JDG 20:4b	2SA 14:7		GES 1:20
GEN 30:15	NUM 30:13b		2SA 17:3a	EZE 16:32	
GEN 30:18	NUM 30:14a	RTH 1:3		EZE 16:45a	SIR 4:10
GEN 30:20	NUM 30:14b	RTH 1:5	2KI 4:1	EZE 16:45b	SIR 22:4
	NUM 30:17	RTH 1:9	2KI 4:9		SIR 23:23a
EXO 21:22b		RTH 2:1a	2KI 4:14	HOS 2:4	SIR 25:18
	DEU 22:22a		2KI 4:22	HOS 2:9	SIR 25:20
LEV 21:7	DEU 24:4	ISA 1:8	2KI 4:26	HOS 2:18	SIR 25:22
	DEU 25:5b	ISA 1:18			SIR 25:23
NUM 5:13	DEU 25:7a	ISA 1:22	EST 1:18	JOE 1:8	SIR 26:1
NUM 5:19	DEU 25:7b	ISA 1:23	EST 1:20		SIR 26:2
NUM 5:20b	DEU 25:11	ISA 2:19		TOB 3:8b	SIR 26:13
NUM 5:27	DEU 28:56	ISA 4:19	PRO 7:19		SIR 36:23
NUM 5:29		ISA 4:21	PRO 12:4a	JDT 8:2	SIR 40:23
NUM 30:7	JDG 13:6	ISA 25:19	PRO 31:11	JDT 8:7	
NUM 30:8	JDG 13:9		PRO 31:21	JDT 10:3	SUS 1:36
					4MC 18:9

**Passages Where *anhr* Must Be Translated “Husband/Husbands”
Because of Indirect Modifiers
(LXX)**

LEV 21:3	RTH 1:11	PRO 30:23	TOB 6:13	TOB 7:11	SIR 25:1
DEU 24:3a	RTH 1:12	ISA 54:1	TOB 6:14	SIR 23:22	SIR 42:10
DEU 24:3b	RTH 1:13	TOB 3:8a			

**Passages Where *anhr* Must Be Translated “Husband/Husbands”
Because of Context Alone
(LXX)**

PRO 12:4b PRO 31:12 SIR 22:5

**Passages Where *gunh*/Must Be Translated “Woman/Women”
(LXX)**

GEN 2:22	LEV 26:26	JDG 13:24	2SA 14:9	EZR 10:3	ISA 27:11
GEN 2:23		JDG 14:1	2SA 14:12	EZR 10:10	ISA 32:9
GEN 3:1	NUM 5:6	JDG 14:2a	2SA 14:13	EZR 10:11	ISA 49:15
GEN 3:2	NUM 5:18a	JDG 14:3a	2SA 14:17	EZR 10:14	
GEN 3:4	NUM 5:18b	JDG 14:7	2SA 14:18a	EZR 10:17	JER 3:1b
GEN 3:6	NUM 5:19	JDG 14:10	2SA 14:18b	EZR 10:18	JER 3:20
GEN 3:12	NUM 5:21a	JDG 16:1	2SA 14:19		JER 6:11
GEN 3:13a	NUM 5:21b	JDG 16:4	2SA 14:27	NEH 8:2	JER 9:19
GEN 3:13b	NUM 5:22	JDG 16:27a	2SA 15:16	NEH 8:3	JER 13:21
GEN 3:15	NUM 5:24	JDG 16:27b	2SA 17:19	NEH 13:23	JER 27:37
GEN 3:16	NUM 5:25	JDG 19:1	2SA 17:20a	NEH 13:26	JER 28:22
GEN 12:11b	NUM 5:26	JDG 19:26	2SA 17:20b	NEH 13:27	JER 28:30
GEN 12:14	NUM 5:27	JDG 19:27	2SA 20:3		JER 30:16
GEN 14:16	NUM 5:28	JDG 20:4	2SA 20:16	EST 1:19	JER 45:22
GEN 20:3	NUM 5:31	JDG 21:11	2SA 20:17	EST 1:20	JER 48:16
GEN 24:5	NUM 6:2	JDG 21:14	2SA 20:21	EST 2:3a	JER 50:6
GEN 24:8	NUM 21:30	JDG 21:16b	2SA 20:22	EST 2:3b	JER 51:7
GEN 24:39	NUM 25:8			EST 2:4	JER 51:15b
GEN 24:44	NUM 25:15	RTH 1:5	1KI 3:16	EST 2:7	JER 51:25
GEN 30:13	NUM 30:4	RTH 3:8	1KI 3:17a	EST 2:8	
GEN 31:35	NUM 31:9	RTH 3:11	1KI 3:17b	EST 2:12	LAM 2:20
GEN 33:5	NUM 31:17	RTH 3:14	1KI 3:18	EST 2:14	LAM 4:10
GEN 38:20	NUM 31:18	RTH 4:5	1KI 3:19	EST 2:15	LAM 5:11
	NUM 31:35	RTH 4:14	1KI 3:22	EST 4:11	
EXO 1:19			1KI 3:26		EZE 8:14
EXO 2:7	DEU 2:34	ISA 1:15	1KI 7:2	JOB 2:10	EZE 9:6
EXO 2:9	DEU 3:6	ISA 1:18	1KI 11:26	JOB 11:2	EZE 16:30
EXO 3:22	DEU 13:7	ISA 1:26	1KI 12:24b	JOB 11:12	EZE 16:34
EXO 11:2	DEU 17:2	ISA 2:20b	1KI 12:24i	JOB 14:1	EZE 16:41
EXO 15:20	DEU 17:5	ISA 4:20	1KI 12:24n	JOB 15:14	EZE 18:60
EXO 19:15	DEU 20:7	ISA 15:3	1KI 17:9	JOB 25:4	EZE 23:2
EXO 21:4b	DEU 20:14	ISA 15:33a	1KI 17:10	JOB 31:11	EZE 23:10
EXO 21:22a	DEU 21:11a	ISA 15:33b	1KI 17:12		EZE 23:44
EXO 21:22b	DEU 22:5	ISA 18:7	1KI 17:15	PRO 5:3a	EZE 23:48
EXO 21:28	DEU 22:22b	ISA 21:5	1KI 17:17	PRO 5:3b	EZE 30:17
EXO 21:29	DEU 22:22g	ISA 21:6	1KI 17:19	PRO 6:24	
EXO 35:22	DEU 25:7	ISA 22:19	1KI 17:24	PRO 6:26	DAN 11:37
EXO 35:25	DEU 29:17	ISA 27:9		PRO 7:5	
EXO 35:26	DEU 31:12	ISA 27:11	2KI 4:8	PRO 7:10	HOS 3:1
EXO 35:29		ISA 28:7	2KI 4:9	PRO 9:13	HOS 12:13
EXO 36:6	JOS 2:1	ISA 28:8	2KI 4:17	PRO 11:16a	
	JOS 2:4	ISA 28:9	2KI 4:37	PRO 11:16b	NAH 3:13
LEV 12:2	JOS 6:21	ISA 28:11	2KI 6:26	PRO 11:22	
LEV 13:29	JOS 6:22	ISA 28:12	2KI 6:28	PRO 14:1	ZEC 5:7
LEV 13:38	JOS 6:23	ISA 28:21	2KI 6:30	PRO 18:22	ZEC 5:9
LEV 15:18	JOS 8:25	ISA 28:23	2KI 8:1	PRO 18:22a	ZEC 14:2
LEV 15:19		ISA 28:24	2KI 8:2	PRO 21:19	
LEV 15:25	JDG 4:9	ISA 30:2	2KI 8:3	PRO 25:24	IES 3:12
LEV 18:17	JDG 5:24a		2KI 8:5a	PRO 27:15	IES 4:13
LEV 18:19	JDG 5:24g	2SA 1:26	2KI 8:5b	PRO 30:16	IES 4:14
LEV 18:22	JDG 9:49	2SA 3:8	2KI 8:6	PRO 30:20	IES 4:15
LEV 18:23	JDG 9:51	2SA 6:19	2KI 23:7	PRO 30:23	IES 4:17
LEV 19:20	JDG 9:53	2SA 11:2a		PRO 31:3	IES 4:18
LEV 20:13	JDG 9:54	2SA 11:2b	1CH 7:4	PRO 31:30a	IES 4:22a
LEV 20:16	JDG 11:1	2SA 11:3a	1CH 16:3	PRO 31:30b	IES 4:22b
LEV 20:19	JDG 11:2b	2SA 11:5			IES 4:26
LEV 20:27	JDG 13:3	2SA 11:21	2CH 15:13	ECC 7:26	IES 4:27
LEV 21:7a	JDG 13:6	2SA 11:22	2CH 20:13	ECC 7:28	IES 4:32
LEV 21:7b	JDG 13:9	2SA 14:2a	2CH 28:8		IES 4:34
LEV 24:10a	JDG 13:10	2SA 14:2b		ISA 4:1	IES 4:37
LEV 24:10b	JDG 13:11b	2SA 14:4	EZR 10:1	ISA 13:8	IES 8:88

LEV 24:11

JDG 13:13

2SA 14:5

EZR 10:2

ISA 19:16

IES 9:40

IES 9:41	JDT 15:12a	SIR 9:2	SIR 26:9	EPJ 1:29	2MC 5:24
	JDT 15:12b	SIR 9:3	SIR 26:14	EPJ 1:42	2MC 6:4
TOB 6:8	JDT 15:13	SIR 9:8a	SIR 26:15		2MC 6:10
		SIR 9:8b	SIR 26:16	SUS 1:7a	2MC 12:21
JDT 4:11	GES 1:19	SIR 10:18	SIR 28:15	SUS 1:10	2MC 15:18
JDT 4:12	GES 2:3a	SIR 19:2	SIR 33:20	SUS 1:30	
JDT 6:16	GES 2:3b	SIR 25:13	SIR 36:21	SUS 1:31	3MC 3:25
JDT 7:22	GES 2:4	SIR 25:17	SIR 36:22		
JDT 7:23	GES 2:7	SIR 25:19	SIR 37:11	BEL 1:9	4MC 4:9
JDT 7:27	GES 2:8	SIR 25:21a	SIR 40:19	BEL 1:20	4MC 4:25
JDT 7:32	GES 2:12	SIR 25:21b	SIR 41:22		4MC 14:11
JDT 8:31	GES 2:14	SIR 25:24	SIR 42:6	IMC 1:26	4MC 16:1
JDT 10:19	GES 2:15	SIR 25:25	SIR 42:12	IMC 1:32	4MC 16:2
JDT 11:21	GES 3:13f	SIR 26:3	SIR 42:13a	IMC 1:60	4MC 16:5
JDT 12:11	GES 4:11	SIR 26:6a	SIR 42:13b	IMC 3:56	4MC 16:10
JDT 12:12	GES 7:8	SIR 26:6b	SIR 42:14a		4MC 17:9
JDT 13:18		SIR 26:7	SIR 42:14b	2MC 3:19	
JDT 14:18	SIR 7:19	SIR 26:8		2MC 5:13	

**Passages Where gunh/Must Be Translated “Wife/Wives”
Because of Direct Modifiers
(LXX)**

GEN 2:24	GEN 19:15	GEN 34:12	LEV 18:16	JDG 4:4	1SA 25:37
GEN 2:25	GEN 19:16	GEN 34:29	LEV 18:20	JDG 4:17	1SA 25:44
GEN 3:8	GEN 19:26	GEN 36:2	LEV 20:10a	JDG 4:21	1SA 27:3a
GEN 3:17	GEN 20:2a	GEN 36:6	LEV 20:10b	JDG 5:24b	1SA 27:3b
GEN 3:20	GEN 20:2b	GEN 36:10	LEV 20:11	JDG 8:30	1SA 30:3
GEN 3:21	GEN 20:7	GEN 36:12	LEV 20:21	JDG 11:2a	1SA 30:5
GEN 4:1	GEN 20:11	GEN 36:13		JDG 13:2	1SA 30:18
GEN 4:17	GEN 20:12	GEN 36:14	NUM 5:12	JDG 13:11a	1SA 30:22
GEN 4:23	GEN 20:14	GEN 36:17	NUM 5:14a	JDG 13:19	
GEN 4:25	GEN 20:17	GEN 36:18	NUM 5:14b	JDG 13:20	2SA 2:2
GEN 6:18a	GEN 20:18	GEN 36:39	NUM 5:15	JDG 13:21	2SA 3:5
GEN 6:18b	GEN 23:19	GEN 37:2	NUM 5:30	JDG 13:22	2SA 3:14
GEN 7:7a	GEN 24:15	GEN 38:8	NUM 14:3	JDG 13:23	2SA 11:3b
GEN 7:7b	GEN 24:36	GEN 38:9	NUM 16:27	JDG 14:15	2SA 11:11
GEN 7:13a	GEN 24:51	GEN 38:12	NUM 26:59	JDG 14:16	2SA 11:26
GEN 7:13b	GEN 24:67	GEN 38:14	NUM 30:17	JDG 14:20	2SA 12:8
GEN 8:16a	GEN 25:10	GEN 39:7	NUM 32:26	JDG 15:1a	2SA 12:9a
GEN 8:16b	GEN 25:20	GEN 39:8	NUM 36:3a	JDG 15:1b	2SA 12:10a
GEN 8:18a	GEN 25:21a	GEN 39:9	NUM 36:12	JDG 15:6	2SA 12:11a
GEN 8:18b	GEN 25:21b	GEN 39:19		JDG 21:7a	2SA 12:11b
GEN 11:29b	GEN 26:7a	GEN 41:45	DEU 3:19	JDG 21:16a	2SA 12:15
GEN 11:29g	GEN 26:7b	GEN 46:5	DEU 5:21	JDG 21:21	2SA 12:24
GEN 11:31	GEN 26:8	GEN 46:19	DEU 17:17	JDG 21:22	2SA 19:6
GEN 12:5	GEN 26:9	GEN 46:26	DEU 21:13		
GEN 12:11a	GEN 26:10	GEN 49:31a	DEU 22:19	RTH 1:1	1KI 5:14b
GEN 12:12	GEN 26:11	GEN 49:31b	DEU 22:22a	RTH 1:2	1KI 10:8
GEN 12:17	GEN 26:34		DEU 22:24	RTH 4:10	1KI 12:24a
GEN 12:18	GEN 28:6a	EXO 18:2	DEU 22:29	RTH 4:11	1KI 12:24g
GEN 12:19a	GEN 28:9a	EXO 18:6	DEU 23:1		1KI 12:24h
GEN 12:19b	GEN 29:21	EXO 20:17	DEU 24:5	1SA 1:2	1KI 12:24k
GEN 12:20	GEN 29:28	EXO 21:5	DEU 25:5a	1SA 1:4	1KI 19:1
GEN 13:1	GEN 30:4	EXO 22:15	DEU 25:9	1SA 1:19	1KI 20:5
GEN 16:1	GEN 30:9	EXO 22:23	DEU 25:11	1SA 2:20a	1KI 20:7
GEN 16:3a	GEN 30:26	EXO 32:2	DEU 27:20	1SA 4:19	1KI 20:25
GEN 16:3b	GEN 31:17		DEU 27:23	1SA 14:50	1KI 21:3
GEN 17:15	GEN 31:32	LEV 18:8	DEU 29:10	1SA 19:11	1KI 21:5
GEN 17:19	GEN 32:23	LEV 18:11		1SA 25:3a	1KI 21:7
GEN 18:9	GEN 34:4	LEV 18:14	JOS 1:14	1SA 25:3b	
GEN 18:10	GEN 34:8	LEV 18:15	JOS 15:17	1SA 25:14	2KI 4:1

2KI 5:2	EZR 10:19	PRO 6:29	EZE 22:11	TOB 7:2	SIR 9:9
2KI 22:14		PRO 12:4	EZE 24:18	TOB 7:7	SIR 25:1
2KI 24:15	NEH 4:8	PRO 19:14		TOB 7:14	SIR 25:20
	NEH 5:1	PRO 31:10	DAN 6:25	TOB 7:15	SIR 25:22
1CH 2:24	NEH 10:29			TOB 8:6	SIR 25:23a
1CH 2:26	NEH 12:43	ISA 13:16	HOS 2:4	TOB 8:12	SIR 25:23b
1CH 2:29				TOB 8:21	SIR 26:1
1CH 3:3	EST 5:10	JER 3:1a	AMO 7:17	TOB 9:6	SIR 26:2
1CH 4:5	EST 5:14	JER 5:8		TOB 10:10	SIR 26:13
1CH 4:18		JER 6:12	ZEC 12:12	TOB 10:14	SIR 40:23
1CH 4:19	JOB 2:9	JER 7:18	ZEC 12:13	TOB 11:3	SIR 41:23
1CH 7:16	JOB 19:17	JER 8:10	ZEC 12:14	TOB 12:3	
1CH 7:23	JOB 31:9	JER 14:16		TOB 14:12	EPJ 1:27
1CH 8:8	JOB 31:10	JER 18:21	MAL 2:14		EPJ 1:32
1CH 8:9	JOB 42:17	JER 36:6b	MAL 2:15	JDT 4:10	
1CH 8:29	JOB 42:17a	JER 36:23		JDT 7:14	SUS 1:29
1CH 9:35	JOB 42:17b	JER 42:8	1ES 4:20	JDT 9:4	SUS 1:7b
	JOB 42:17c	JER 45:23	1ES 4:25		
2CH 8:11	JOB 42:17d	JER 47:7	1ES 5:1	GES 1:20	1MC 2:30
2CH 11:21a	JOB 42:17e	JER 51:9	1ES 8:90	GES 5:10	1MC 2:38
2CH 13:21		JER 51:15a	1ES 9:20	GES 5:14	1MC 3:20
2CH 21:6	PSA 108:9				1MC 5:13
2CH 22:11	PSA 127:3	EZE 18:6a	TOB 1:20	WIS 3:12	1MC 5:45
2CH 29:9		EZE 18:11	TOB 2:1		1MC 8:10
2CH 34:22	PRO 5:18	EZE 18:15	TOB 2:11	SIR 7:26	1MC 13:6
			TOB 3:15	SIR 9:1	
					4MC 2:5

**Passages Where gunh/Must Be Translated “Wife/Wives”
Because of Indirect Modifiers
(LXX)**

GEN 4:19	EXO 6:20	DEU 24:1	ISA 25:40	1CH 7:15	1ES 8:89
GEN 6:2	EXO 6:23	DEU 24:3	ISA 25:42	1CH 14:3	1ES 9:7
GEN 11:29a	EXO 6:25	DEU 24:4	ISA 25:43		1ES 9:12
GEN 21:21	EXO 21:4a	DEU 25:50		2CH 11:18	1ES 9:17
GEN 24:3	EXO 22:16	DEU 28:30	2SA 5:13	2CH 11:21b	1ES 9:18
GEN 24:4			2SA 11:27	2CH 11:23	1ES 9:36
GEN 24:7	LEV 18:18	JOS 15:16	2SA 12:9b	2CH 24:3	
GEN 24:37	LEV 20:14		2SA 12:10b	2CH 25:18	TOB 1:9
GEN 24:38	LEV 21:13	JDG 1:12			TOB 3:17
GEN 24:40	LEV 21:14	JDG 1:13	1KI 2:17	EZR 2:61	TOB 4:12a
GEN 25:1		JDG 3:6	1KI 2:21	EZR 10:44	TOB 4:12b
GEN 27:46	NUM 12:1a	JDG 14:2b	1KI 4:11		TOB 4:12g
GEN 28:1	NUM 12:1b	JDG 14:3b	1KI 4:15	NEH 6:18	TOB 4:13
GEN 28:2	NUM 32:30	JDG 21:1	1KI 5:14a	NEH 7:63	TOB 6:12
GEN 28:6a	NUM 36:3b	JDG 21:7b	1KI 11:1		TOB 6:16a
GEN 28:9b	NUM 36:4	JDG 21:18a	1KI 11:19	JER 16:1	TOB 6:16b
GEN 31:50	NUM 36:6a	JDG 21:18b	1KI 12:24eb	JER 36:6a	TOB 6:16g
GEN 34:16	NUM 36:6b	JDG 21:23	1KI 16:31		TOB 7:13
GEN 34:21	NUM 36:8			EZE 16:32	
GEN 38:6	DEU 21:11b	RTH 1:4	2KI 8:18	EZE 44:22	SIR 23:22
GEN 44:27	DEU 21:15	RTH 4:13	2KI 14:9		SIR 25:8
	DEU 22:13			HOS 1:2	SIR 25:16
EXO 2:21	DEU 22:14	ISA 18:27	1CH 2:18		SIR 36:24
EXO 2:22	DEU 22:16	ISA 25:39	1CH 2:35	1ES 5:38	SIR 36:25
					1MC 10:54

**Passages Where *gunh*/Must Be Translated “Wife/Wives”
Because of Context Alone
(LXX)**

EXO 4:20	NUM 5:29	1KI 11:4	ECC 9:9	IES 4:21	GES 6:13a
EXO 18:5	DEU 28:54	EST 6:13	ISA 54:6a	IES 9:9	GES 6:13b
EXO 21:3a	ISA 1:23	EST 7:8	ISA 54:6b	TOB 10:4	SIR 15:2
EXO 21:30					

**APPENDIX B
OCCURRENCES OF *anhr* AND *gunh*/IN THE NEW TESTAMENT
SORTED BY CATEGORY⁴⁷**

**Passages Where *anhr* Must Be Translated “Man/Men”
(Greek New Testament)**

MAT 6:44	LUK 19:7	ACT 5:36	ACT 11:12	ACT 19:37	1CO 11:3
MAT 7:24	LUK 22:63	ACT 6:3	ACT 11:20	ACT 20:30	1CO 11:4
MAT 7:26	LUK 23:50a	ACT 6:5	ACT 11:24	ACT 21:11	1CO 11:7a
MAT 12:41	LUK 23:50	ACT 6:11	ACT 13:6	ACT 21:23	1CO 11:7b
MAT 14:21	LUK 24:4	ACT 7:2	ACT 13:7	ACT 21:26	1CO 11:8a
MAT 14:35	LUK 24:19	ACT 7:26	ACT 13:15	ACT 21:28	1CO 11:8b
MAT 15:38		ACT 8:2	ACT 13:16	ACT 21:38	1CO 11:9a
	JOH 1:13	ACT 8:3	ACT 13:21	ACT 22:1	1CO 11:9b
MAR 6:20	JOH 1:30	ACT 8:9	ACT 13:22	ACT 22:3	1CO 11:11a
	JOH 6:10	ACT 8:12	ACT 13:26	ACT 22:4	1CO 11:11b
LUK 1:27		ACT 8:27	ACT 13:38	ACT 22:12	1CO 11:12a
LUK 1:34	ACT 1:10	ACT 9:2	ACT 14:8	ACT 23:1	1CO 11:12b
LUK 5:8	ACT 1:11	ACT 9:7	ACT 14:15	ACT 23:6	1CO 11:14
LUK 5:12	ACT 1:16	ACT 9:12	ACT 15:7	ACT 23:21	1CO 13:11
LUK 5:18	ACT 1:21	ACT 9:13	ACT 15:13	ACT 23:27	
LUK 6:8	ACT 2:5	ACT 9:38	ACT 15:22	ACT 23:30	EPH 4:13
LUK 7:20	ACT 2:14	ACT 10:1	ACT 15:25	ACT 24:5	
LUK 8:27	ACT 2:22a	ACT 10:5	ACT 16:9	ACT 25:5	1TI 2:8
LUK 8:38	ACT 2:22b	ACT 10:17	ACT 17:5	ACT 25:14	1TI 2:12
LUK 8:41	ACT 2:29	ACT 10:19	ACT 17:12	ACT 25:23	
LUK 9:14	ACT 2:37	ACT 10:21	ACT 17:22	ACT 25:24	JAM 1:8
LUK 9:30	ACT 3:2	ACT 10:22	ACT 17:31	ACT 27:10	JAM 1:12
LUK 9:32	ACT 3:12	ACT 10:28	ACT 17:34	ACT 27:21	JAM 1:20
LUK 9:38	ACT 3:14	ACT 10:30	ACT 18:24	ACT 27:25	JAM 1:23
LUK 11:31	ACT 4:4	ACT 11:3	ACT 19:7	ACT 28:17	JAM 2:2
LUK 11:32	ACT 5:1	ACT 11:11	ACT 19:25		JAM 3:2
LUK 14:24	ACT 5:14		ACT 19:35	ROM 4:8	
LUK 17:12	ACT 5:25			ROM 11:4	
LUK 19:2	ACT 5:35				

⁴⁷ None of the questioned passages are included in Appendix B.

**Passages Where $\alpha\eta\eta$ Must Be Translated “Husband/Husbands”
Because of Direct or Indirect Modifiers
(Greek New Testament)**

	<u>Direct Modifier</u>	<u>Indirect modifier</u>
MAT 1:16	Mariaj	
MAT 1:19	auChj	$\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\ \upsilon\lambda\omega$ ($\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\ \upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$)
MAR 10:2		$\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\ \upsilon\lambda\omega$ ($\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\ \upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$)
MAR 10:12	auChj	$\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\ \upsilon\lambda\omega$ ($\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\ \upsilon\sigma\alpha\sigma\alpha$)
LUK 2:36		$z\alpha\iota\omega\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \backslash\ \zeta\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\alpha\ \mu\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \backslash$
LUK 16:18		$\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\ \upsilon\lambda\omega$ ($\alpha\beta\omicron\lambda\ \epsilon\lambda\ \upsilon\mu\eta\eta\eta$)
JOH 4:16	sou	
JOH 4:17a		$\epsilon\lambda\omega$
JOH 4:17b		$\epsilon\lambda\omega$
JOH 4:18a		$\epsilon\lambda\omega$ ($\epsilon\lambda\chi\epsilon\iota$)
JOH 4:18b	sou	$\epsilon\lambda\omega$ ($\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota\iota$)
ACT 5:9	sou	
ACT 5:10	auChj	
ROM 7:2a		$\upsilon\beta\alpha\eta\delta\omicron\lambda\ \upsilon\lambda\omega$ w/gunh\
ROM 7:2b		$\upsilon\beta\alpha\eta\delta\omicron\lambda\ \upsilon\lambda\omega$ w/gunh\
ROM 7:2g		$\upsilon\beta\alpha\eta\delta\omicron\lambda\ \upsilon\lambda\omega$ w/gunh\
ROM 7:3a	moixal ij	
ROM 7:3b		$g\eta\eta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ($g\epsilon\eta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$)
ROM 7:3g	moixal ij (moixal ida)	
ROM 7:3d		$g\eta\eta\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ($g\epsilon\eta\eta\mu\epsilon\eta\eta$)
1CO 7:2	idion	$\epsilon\lambda\omega$ ($\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\tau\omega$)
1CO 7:10		$g\alpha\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega$ ($g\epsilon\gamma\alpha\mu\eta\kappa\omicron\sigma\iota\eta$) & $\chi\omega\upsilon\eta\lambda\omega$ ($\chi\omega\upsilon\eta\eta\eta\mu\alpha\iota$) & $\chi\omega\upsilon\eta\lambda\omega$ ($\chi\omega\upsilon\eta\eta\eta$) & $k\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\sigma\omega$ ($k\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\lambda\alpha\eta\tau\omega$)
1CO 7:11a	agamoj	$\alpha\theta\eta\mu\iota$ ($\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$)
1CO 7:11b		$\epsilon\lambda\omega$ ($\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\iota$)
1CO 7:13a		$\alpha\theta\eta\mu\iota$ ($\alpha\theta\eta\tau\alpha\iota$)
1CO 7:13b		$g\alpha\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega$ ($g\alpha\mu\eta\varsigma\ \sigma\alpha\sigma\alpha$)
1CO 7:34		
1CO 7:39a	authj	
1CO 7:39b		$g\alpha\mu\epsilon\lambda\omega$ ($g\alpha\mu\eta\eta\eta\mu\alpha\iota$)
1CO 14:35	idibuj	
2CO 11:2		$\alpha\theta\eta\eta\omicron\lambda\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$ ($\eta\theta\eta\eta\sigma\alpha\mu\eta\eta$)
GAL 4:27		$\epsilon\lambda\omega$ ($\epsilon\theta\upsilon\sigma\eta\eta$)
EPH 5:22	idibij	
EPH 5:28		antecedent of possessive: $\epsilon\theta\upsilon\tau\omega\eta$
1TI 3:2		$\mu\eta\alpha\eta\ \gamma\upsilon\eta\alpha\iota\kappa\omicron\lambda\ \alpha\eta\delta\tau\alpha$
1TI 3:12		$\mu\eta\alpha\eta\ \gamma\upsilon\eta\alpha\iota\kappa\omicron\lambda\ \alpha\eta\delta\tau\epsilon\eta$
1TI 5:9		$\epsilon\theta\eta\lambda\ \alpha\eta\delta\tau\omicron\lambda\ \gamma\upsilon\eta\eta$ / $\mu\eta\alpha\eta\ \gamma\upsilon\eta\alpha\iota\kappa\omicron\lambda\ \alpha\eta\eta$
TIT 1:6		
TIT 2:5	idibij	
1PE 3:1	idibij	
1PE 3:5	idibij	
1PE 3:7		$\sigma\upsilon\eta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\lambda\omega$ ($\sigma\upsilon\eta\omicron\kappa\omicron\upsilon\eta\tau\epsilon\eta$)
REV 21:2	auChj	

**Passages Where $\alpha\eta\eta$ Must Be Translated “Husband/Husbands”
Because of Context Alone
(Greek New Testament)**

1CO 7:3a	1CO 7:14b	EPH 5:25
1CO 7:3b	1CO 7:16a	EPH 5:33
1CO 7:4a	1CO 7:16b	COL 3:18
1CO 7:4b	EPH 5:23	COL 3:19
1CO 7:14a	EPH 5:24	

**Passages Where gunh/Must Be Translated “Woman/Women”
(Greek New Testament)**

MAT 5:28	LUK 1:42	LUK 23:55	JOH 20:13	1CO 11:5	1TI 2:14
MAT 9:20	LUK 4:26	LUK 24:22	JOH 20:15	1CO 11:6a	1TI 3:11
MAT 9:22	LUK 7:28	LUK 24:24		1CO 11:6b	
MAT 11:11	LUK 7:37		ACT 1:14	1CO 11:7	HEB 11:35
MAT 13:33	LUK 7:39	JOH 2:4	ACT 5:14	1CO 11:8a	
MAT 14:21	LUK 7:44a	JOH 4:7	ACT 8:3	1CO 11:8b	1PE 3:5
MAT 15:22	LUK 7:44b	JOH 4:9	ACT 8:12	1CO 11:9a	
MAT 15:28	LUK 7:50	JOH 4:11	ACT 9:2	1CO 11:9b	REV 2:20
MAT 15:38	LUK 8:2	JOH 4:15	ACT 13:50	1CO 11:10	REV 9:8
MAT 22:27	LUK 8:43	JOH 4:17	ACT 16:1	1CO 11:11	REV 12:1
MAT 26:7	LUK 8:47	JOH 4:19	ACT 16:13	1CO 11:12a	REV 12:4
MAT 26:10	LUK 10:38	JOH 4:25	ACT 16:14	1CO 11:12b	REV 12:6
MAT 27:55	LUK 11:27	JOH 4:27	ACT 17:4	1CO 11:13	REV 12:13
MAT 28:5	LUK 13:11	JOH 4:28	ACT 17:12	1CO 11:15	REV 12:14
	LUK 13:12	JOH 4:39	ACT 17:34	1CO 14:34	REV 12:15
MAR 5:25	LUK 13:21	JOH 4:42	ACT 21:5	1CO 14:35	REV 12:16
MAR 5:33	LUK 15:8	JOH 8:3	ACT 22:4	GAL 4:4	REV 12:17
MAR 7:25	LUK 20:32	JOH 8:4			REV 14:4
MAR 7:26	LUK 20:33a	JOH 8:9	1CO 7:1	1TI 2:9	REV 17:3
MAR 12:22	LUK 22:57	JOH 8:10	1CO 7:13	1TI 2:10	REV 17:4
MAR 14:3	LUK 23:27	JOH 16:21	1CO 7:34	1TI 2:11	REV 17:6
MAR 15:40	LUK 23:49	JOH 19:26	1CO 11:3	1TI 2:12	REV 17:7
					REV 17:9
					REV 17:18

**Passages Where gunh/Must Be Translated “Wife/Wives”
Because of Direct or Indirect Modifiers
(Greek New Testament)**

	<u>Direct Modifiers</u>	<u>Indirect Modifiers</u>
MAT 1:20	sou	
MAT 1:24	auŋu=	
MAT 5:31	auŋu=	aŋol uŋw (aŋol uŋh)
MAT 5:32	auŋu=	aŋol uŋw (aŋol uŋwn)
MAT 14:3	Fil iŋpou	
MAT 18:25		eŋw (indirectly: eŋei)
MAT 19:3	auŋu=	aŋol uŋw (aŋol usai)
MAT 19:5	auŋu=	
MAT 19:8	uŋwn	aŋol uŋw (aŋol usai)
MAT 19:9	auŋu=	aŋol uŋw (aŋol uŋh)
MAT 19:10		gameŋw (gamhsai)
MAT 22:24	auŋu=	
MAT 22:25	auŋu=	
MAT 22:28	tiŋoj	
MAT 27:19	auŋu=	antecedent of the D.O. of eŋw (eŋxon)
MAR 6:17	Fil iŋpou	
MAR 6:18	tou-aŋol fou=	
MAR 10:2		aŋol uŋw (aŋol usai)
MAR 10:7	auŋu=	
MAR 10:11	auŋu=	aŋol uŋw (aŋol uŋh)
MAR 12:19b		lambaŋw (l abh)
MAR 12:20		lambaŋw (ellaben)
MAR 12:23a	tiŋoj	
MAR 12:23b		eŋw (eŋxon)
LUK 1:5	auŋw (dat. of possession)	
LUK 1:13	sou	

LUK 1:18	mou	
LUK 1:24	auou=	
	<u>Direct Modifiers</u>	<u>Indirect Modifiers</u>
LUK 3:19	tou-aou fou=	
LUK 8:3	Xouca (gen.)	
LUK 14:20		gamew (eghma)
LUK 14:26	eoutou=	
LUK 16:18	auou=	apou ulw (apou ulwn)
LUK 17:32	Lwt (gen.)	
LUK 20:28a		exw (exwn)
LUK 20:28b		I ambahw (I abh)
LUK 20:29		I ambahw (I abwh)
LUK 20:33b	tihoj	
LUK 20:33g		exw (exon)
ACT 5:1	auou=	
ACT 5:7	auou=	
ACT 18:2	auou=	
ACT 24:24	iwa	
ROM 7:2	uβandroj	
1CO 5:1	tou-patroj	
1CO 7:2	eoutou=	exw (eetw)
1CO 7:10		gamew (gegamhkosin) & xwrihw (xwrisqhmai)
1CO 7:11		aohmi (aohmai)
1CO 7:12		exw (eetw)
1CO 7:27a		dew (dedesai)
1CO 7:29		exw (exontej)
1CO 7:33		gamhsaj
1CO 7:39		antecedent of auhj , dew (dedetai)
EPH 5:22		antecedent of iwbj
EPH 5:28a	eoutwn	
EPH 5:28b	eoutou=	
EPH 5:31	auou=	
EPH 5:33a	eoutou=	
1TI 3:2		miaj gunaikoj andra
1TI 3:12		miaj gunaikoj andrej
1TI 5:9		ejj androj gunh\
TIT 1:6		miaj gunaikoj andr
1PE 3:1a		antecedent of iwbij
REV 19:7	auou=	
REV 21:9	tou-aoubu	

**Passages Where gunh/Must Be Translated “Wife/Wives”
by Context Alone
(Greek New Testament)**

MAR 12:19a	1CO 7:14a	EPH 5:23
LUK 18:29	1CO 7:14b	EPH 5:24
ACT 5:2	1CO 7:16a	EPH 5:25
1CO 7:3a	1CO 7:16b	EPH 5:33b
1CO 7:3b	1CO 7:27b	COL 3:18
1CO 7:4a	1CO 7:27g	COL 3:19
1CO 7:4b	1CO 9:5	1PE 3:1b

APPENDIX C STATISTICAL USAGE FIGURES

Figures for the LXX

TOTAL OCCURRENCES OF αὐτὸς IN THE LXX:	1621	
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “MAN/MEN”:	1501	92.6%
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “HUSBAND/HUSBANDS” (DIRECT MODIFIERS):	102	6.3%
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “HUSBAND/HUSBANDS” (INDIRECT MODIFIERS):	15	0.9%
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “HUSBAND/HUSBANDS” (CONTEXT ALONE):	3	0.2%
TOTAL OCCURRENCES OF γυνή /IN THE LXX:	936	
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WOMAN/WOMEN”:	439	46.9%
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WIFE/WIVES” (DIRECT MODIFIERS):	353	37.7%
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WIFE/WIVES” (INDIRECT MODIFIERS):	125	13.4%
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WIFE/WIVES” (CONTEXT ALONE):	19	2.0%

Figures for the Greek New Testament

TOTAL OCCURRENCES OF αὐτὸς IN THE GNT:	215	
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “MAN/MEN”:	157	73.0%
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “HUSBAND/HUSBANDS” (DIRECT MODIFIERS):	18	8.4%
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “HUSBAND/HUSBANDS” (INDIRECT MODIFIERS):	26	12.1%
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “HUSBAND/HUSBANDS” (CONTEXT ALONE):	14	6.5%
TOTAL OCCURRENCES OF γυνή /IN THE GNT:	212	
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WOMAN/WOMEN”:	126	59.4%
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WIFE/WIVES” (DIRECT MODIFIERS):	41	19.3%
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WIFE/WIVES” (INDIRECT MODIFIERS):	24	11.3%
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WIFE/WIVES” (CONTEXT ALONE):	21	9.9%

Figures for the Greek New Testament & the LXX Combined

TOTAL OCCURRENCES OF αὐτὸς IN THE GNT & LXX:	1836	
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “MAN/MEN”:	1658	90.3%
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “HUSBAND/HUSBANDS” (DIRECT MODIFIERS):	120	6.5%
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “HUSBAND/HUSBANDS” (INDIRECT MODIFIERS):	41	2.2%
TOTAL WHERE αὐτὸς IS “HUSBAND/HUSBANDS” (CONTEXT ALONE):	17	0.9%
TOTAL OCCURRENCES OF γυνή /IN THE GNT & LXX	1148	
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WOMAN/WOMEN”:	565	49.2%
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WIFE/WIVES” (DIRECT MODIFIERS):	394	34.3%
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WIFE/WIVES” (INDIRECT MODIFIERS):	149	13.0%
TOTAL WHERE γυνή /IS “WIFE/WIVES” (CONTEXT ALONE):	40	3.5%

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akiyama, James E. *The Bible Word Program*. This computer program, available for \$150 from Hermeneutika (1-206-824-9673), includes the KJV, RSV, UBS Greek NT, Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia Hebrew OT, and the LXX Greek OT. It allows the user to search any specific word or root, and will display the Greek or Hebrew on any VGA monitor. All references in the Appendices were found with this program.
- Bacchiocchi, Samuele. *Women in the Church: A Biblical Study of Women in the Church*. Berrien Springs, Michigan: Biblical Perspectives, 1987.
- Balge, Richard. "An Exegetical Study of Galatians 3:28—"There is No Male and Female ... in Christ Jesus,"" in *The Role of Man and Woman in God's Order of Creation*. Mequon: Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Press, 1990.
- Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Becker, Siegbert. "An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36," in *The Role of Man and Woman in God's Order of Creation*. Mequon: Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Press, 1990.
- Braun, Mark. "An Exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:11-15 and its Relation to the CHE Statement: The Role of Man and Woman According to Holy Scripture." Paper presented to the Michigan District Southwestern Conference: Peace Lutheran Church, Otsego, MI. February 24, 1981. Essay on file at WLS Library: File No. 607 c.2.
- Brug, John. "Application of Principles: Application of the Scriptural Principles Concerning the Service of Women in the Church." Paper delivered to the Northern Wisconsin District Conference, February 1992.
- Diener, Robert. "Passages which seem to limit the role of women/wives." Letter sent to all pastors in the Northern Wisconsin District. Dated 10-23-91.
- Diener, Robert. "We Simply Must Be Sure," University Lutheran Chapel Update. Vol. 2, No. 3, April-June 1992.
- Diener, Robert. "Anthroopos, Aneer and Gynee." A word study used in a University Lutheran Chapel Bible Class, date unknown, but c.1992.
- Gawrisch, Wilbert. "Man and Woman in God's World." Paper on file at Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Library. Essay File Number 2135 c.2.
- Kuske, David. "Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 11:3-16," in *The Role of Man and Woman in God's Order of Creation*. Mequon: Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Press, 1990.
- Kuske, David. "Exegesis of 1 Timothy 2:11-15," in *The Role of Man and Woman in God's Order of Creation*. Mequon: Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Press, 1990.
- Kuske, David. "The Christian Woman in the Church." A paper presented to the Metro-North Pastoral Conference SEW District, WELS. Faith, Sussex, Wisconsin. 9-18-78. Essay on file at WLS Library: File No. 472 c.3.
- Kuske, David. "The Order of Creation as Moral Law and as it is Applied by the New Testament Writers to the Role of Man and Woman," in *The Role of Man and Woman in God's Order of Creation*. Mequon: Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Press, 1990.
- Lawrenz, Carl. "Selections from a Genesis Commentary," in *The Role of Man and Woman in God's Order of Creation*. Mequon: Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Press, 1990.
- Leyrer, Daniel. "Women in the Church: Drawing the Line between Truth and Tradition." Paper given to the WELS/ELS Pastor-Teacher Conference, Cannon Beach, Oregon, October 10, 1991.

Panning, Armin. “**AUQENTEIN**—A Word Study,” in *The Role of Man and Woman in God’s Order of Creation*. Mequon: Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Press, 1990.

Panning, Armin. “Exegesis of 1 Peter 3:1-7,” in *The Role of Man and Woman in God’s Order of Creation*. Mequon: Wisconsin Lutheran Seminary Press, 1990.

Stadler, Richard; Albrecht, Michael; & Johnson, Iver. *Heirs Together of the Gracious Gift of Life*. 1991.