

Avoiding Fallacies in Interpretation: How Fallacies Distort Understanding of the New Testament Gender Passages

Andreas J. Köstenberger

This article has been adapted from "Gender Passages in the NT: Hermeneutical Fallacies Critiqued," originally published in the Westminster Theological Journal 56 (Fall 1994): 285-301.

The last few decades have witnessed an increasing awareness of the importance of hermeneutical procedure in interpreting the gender passages in the NT. Grant Osborne contends that "the determining factor in the discussion [of gender passages in the NT] is hermeneutical."¹ Robert Johnston attributes the differences in approach regarding the role of women in the church taken by evangelicals to "different hermeneutics," calling the study of women's roles a "test case" of evangelical interpretation.²

If Johnston is correct, evangelical hermeneutics seem to have failed the test, since the existing exegetical conclusions on the NT gender texts vary widely. What is perhaps even more disturbing is the apparent lack of consensus regarding a proper methodology.

The present essay therefore seeks to readdress some of the issues taken up in earlier treatments, taking into account developments since these studies appeared. It also attempts to sharpen further the discernment of improper methodology. It is hoped that the critique of fallacious methodologies will contribute to better hermeneutical procedures. This, in turn, might lead to a greater convergence of exegetical conclusions.

In this article, my usual procedure will be to identify the hermeneutical fallacy, illustrate it by giving concrete examples, and then make a few comments pointing toward a better approach.

Underestimating The Power Of Presuppositions

In the case of the interpretation of biblical gender texts, every writer has preconceived notions of how male-female relationships are properly conducted. An illusory notion of hermeneutical objectivity will render genuine dialogue with both the text and other interpreters and interpretive communities much more difficult.

Of course, the existence of presuppositions does not mean that all presuppositions are equally valid or that an interpreter's prior convictions in approaching the text cannot become more and more consistent with biblical teaching.³ Nevertheless, it is helpful to be aware of the way in which one's experience,

interpretive and denominational traditions, cultural and social backgrounds, vocation, gender, education, and other factors influence one's interpretation of Scripture.

An example of presuppositions that remain largely unacknowledged is the recent article, "Why God is Not Mother," by Elizabeth Achtemeier. In an essay that purportedly critiques the radical feminist movement, she states at the outset what she considers to be the general evangelical consensus:

The Scriptures *clearly proclaim* that both female and male are made in the image of God (Gen. 1:27), that husband and wife are to join flesh in a marital union of *mutual helpfulness* (Gen. 2:18), that the ancient enmity between the sexes and *the subservience of women are a result of human sin* (Gen. 3), that *such enmity and subservience have been overcome by* the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ (Gal. 3:28), and that all women and men are called equally to discipleship in the service of their risen Lord. The Scriptures further show that our Lord *consistently treated women as equals* and that *the New Testament churches could have women as their leaders*.⁴

However, except for the statements that both female and male are made in the image of God and that women and men are equally called to discipleship, all of the above assertions, far from representing an evangelical consensus, are strongly disputed. What, according to Achtemeier, the Scriptures "clearly proclaim" are in fact Achtemeier's own interpretive conclusions.

Generally, the practice of seeking to substantiate a theological point by way of appeal to "hard" lexical, morphological or syntactical data when the available evidence itself seems far from conclusive may reveal a selective appraisal of the data which may be a result of an interpreter's conscious or unrecognized presuppositions.⁵

Lack Of Balance In Hermeneutical Methodology

In principle, most students of the NT gender passages would probably agree that the process of interpreting a biblical passage should include the following components: an identification of the book's genre, a reconstruction of the historical and cultural background of a document, lexical and syntactical studies, and a survey of the passage's literary context and the flow of the argument. However, interpreters do not always live up to their best hermeneutical intentions. As the examples below will attempt to demonstrate, a lack of balance in hermeneutical methodology (i.e., the giving of inadequate weight to one element of the hermeneutical process at the expense of other components) accounts for varying degrees of distortion in interpreters' exegetical results.

With regard to balance in hermeneutical methodology, the important questions are: (1) What is the *relative weight* given to the various elements of the interpretive process by an interpreter? (2) Which of these factors is *judged decisive* by a given author? And (3) what *criteria* are used to arrive at one's judgment among alternative interpretive options?

For example, an interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:8-15, conducted properly, should incorporate the use of all of the hermeneutical procedures listed above in proper balance. What is the genre of the Pastorals? Granted that it is an occasional writing, does that necessarily mean that the letter cannot contain any injunctions of permanent validity? What is the most probable historical-cultural background for 1 Timothy 2:8-15? What significant words or important syntactical constructions need to be studied? And what is the passage's function in its immediate and larger contexts? Ideally, the results of these various analyses are properly related in order to arrive at a balanced interpretation of the passage.

However, one's overall interpretation will only be as strong as its weakest link. An improper emphasis on one element in the interpretive process or a wrong judgment in one area of study will weaken, if not invalidate, one's entire interpretation.

Thus a given writer may give preeminence to lexical study. George W. Knight, finding no instances of *authentēin* ("to have or exercise authority") with a negative connotation in extrabiblical literature, argues against the possibility that the term can take on a negative connotation in any imaginable context.⁶ However, while the lack of extant references to that effect may suggest a certain (some might say high) plausibility of Knight's thesis, it seems much harder if not impossible, to prove the impossibility of a term's taking on a certain connotation in a given context.

When engaging in literary-theological analysis, contextual and syntactical factors should be carefully balanced with lexical considerations. Word studies of *authentēin* in extrabiblical literature (1 Tim. 2:12 is the only instance where the word is used in the NT) are able to supply a range of possible meanings. As one considers the term's meaning in its specific context in 1 Timothy 2:12, one should seek to determine the *probable* meaning of *authentēin* with the help of contextual and syntactical studies.

Contextually, it is apparent that 1 Timothy 2:11-12 is framed by the phrase "in quietness" or "in silence" (*hesychia*), while "teaching" (*didaskein*) and "exercising authority" (*authentēin*) in verse 12 correspond to "learning" (*manthaneto*) and "in full submission" (*pasē hypotagē*) in verse 11. This juxtaposition already suggests that *authentēin* means "to have or exercise authority" rather than "to usurp authority," as has been suggested by some.⁷ Recent lexical analyses have confirmed this interpretation.⁸

Detailed comparisons of the NT and extrabiblical Greek literature conducted by the present writer have shown that *didaskein* and *authentēin* are linked in 1 Timothy 2:12 by the coordinating conjunction *oude* ("nor") in a way that requires them to share either a positive or negative force. Thus 1 Timothy 2:12 could either be rendered as "I do not permit a woman to teach nor to exercise authority over a man" (both terms share a positive force) or "I do not permit a woman to teach *error* nor to *usurp* a man's authority" (both terms share a negative force).

Moreover, since *didaskein* in the Pastorals always has a positive force (cf. 1 Tim. 4:11; 6:2; and 2 Tim. 2:2), *authentēin*, too, should be expected to have a positive force in 1 Timothy 2:12, so that the rendering "I do not permit a woman to teach nor to *exercise authority* over a man" is required. Other instances of

didaskein in the Pastorals indicate that if a negative connotation or content is intended, the word *heterodidaskalein* ("to teach heretical doctrine") or other contextual qualifiers are used (cf. 1 Tim. 1:3-4; 6:3; Tit. 1:9-14).

Underrating The Importance Of The Use Of The OT In The NT

There is general agreement regarding what the relevant passages on gender issues in the NT are. The references usually listed are 1 Corinthians 11:2-16; 14:33b-36; Galatians 3:28; Ephesians 5:21-33; Colossians 3:18-19; 1 Timothy 2:8-15; and 1 Peter 3:1-7.⁹ To this may be added a number of instances in the Gospels where Jesus relates to or teaches regarding women. It is also commonly recognized that Genesis 1-3 is a foundational passage for the gender passages of the NT. It seems, however, that more could be done in studying the exact way in which Genesis 1-3 is used in the respective NT gender passages.

Evangelical hermeneutics affirms the significance of authorial intention in determining meaning. If one seeks to understand the Pauline gender passages with regard to authorial intent, one must not take lightly the fact that Paul, in virtually every instance, refers to some portion of Genesis 1-3. This, as noted above, has not gone unnoticed. However, fundamental hermeneutical questions remain to be asked and answered.

First, regarding authorial intention: What does this consistent reference to some aspect of Genesis 1-3 reveal about authorial intention? That is to say, why did Paul refer or allude to Genesis? Did he do so simply to establish a connection with antecedent Scripture? Did he resort to "prooftexting" to bolster his arguments? Did he use Genesis merely as illustrative material? Did he believe in the authority of the OT Scriptures and use them to establish equally authoritative NT principles? Or did he have any other purposes in mind? How did he craft his arguments?

Second, regarding reader response and the dynamics of the communicative context: How did Paul want his references to Genesis to be received by the recipients of their correspondence? How did he desire his audience to respond? What was his readers' perception of Scriptural authority? What were these readers' perceptions of apostolic authority, especially in regard to Paul's interpretation and use of the OT? How were those writings in fact received and responded to? What impact did Paul's use of the OT have, especially compared with the impact his teachings on gender issues would have had without reference to the OT?

Of course, this last question is a hypothetical one. Still, it is a legitimate question to ask. One should face the fact that the OT, particularly the opening chapters of Genesis, is commonly referred to when Paul deals with gender issues. This procedure should be understood in relation to the possibility that Paul might have used other points of reference or grounds of appeal, such as a direct reference to his readers' contemporary context, community standards, their own personal views, or other forms of argumentation. While these alternative procedures are not completely absent (cf. 1 Cor. 11:2, 16), one must give proper

weight to the fact that Paul commonly referred to the fundamental passages in Genesis 1-3 as his ultimate reference point in his respective contemporary contexts.

Third, regarding the text itself: What does the text say explicitly, especially in connection with OT references? Does Paul himself give an OT principle as the reason for his argument in a certain contemporary context, as he does in 1 Timothy 2:13 and 14? What is the relationship between references to the OT and to contemporary practice or community standards? Are those reference points of equal weight and authority and thus to be placed side by side, or is one more important than the other? Does the contemporary context ever override OT principles? Or is the OT principle the fundamental ground of appeal, with contemporary practice as a corroborating aspect? How the questions posed above are answered will largely determine the final outcome of an interpreter's historical exegesis as well as her contemporary application.

There seem to be instances where Paul makes the whole force of his argument rest on principles derived from the OT. In 1 Timothy 2:8-15, he draws significance from both the historical sequence of the creation of man and woman (v. 13; cf. also 1 Cor. 11:8) and from the way in which the historical fall of man occurred, i.e. by a reversal of the created order (v. 14).¹⁰ Finally, by way of synecdoche, Paul assures his readers that the woman will be saved "by the bearing of children," i.e. by adhering to her God-ordained role.¹¹

The interpretive conclusion and implication Paul draws from the narrative accounts in Genesis 2 and 3 is that both creation order and fall have in fact abiding significance for male-female relationships. For the man, to have been created first means that he has first responsibility for the stewardship entrusted to him by God. The role reversal at the fall is a further argument, according to Paul, that the final responsibility and authority legitimately rest with the man. Thus, Paul, in 1 Timothy 2:8-15, draws from the OT narratives abiding principles for male-female relationships and applies them to his contemporary context. It seems that Paul's appeal to the OT as well as his own apostolic office were, in his mind, definitive, at least in the context at hand.

The question of authorial intent has great significance for the proper interpretation of the passages in the NT that cite the Old. Paul, Peter, and their fellow-apostles perceived the OT, as well as the evolving NT writings, as authoritative.¹² Thus, when those writers quoted the OT in their arguments, they did so because they considered it to be authoritative. Consequently, the contemporary interpreter should submit to the apostolic interpretation of the OT where such is available.

Improper Use Of Background Data

While certain writers appear to devote too little attention to background matters, others allow their own reconstruction of the ancient cultural milieu to control almost entirely their exegesis of a given gender passage.

An example of the latter extreme is the work by Richard Clark and Catherine Clark Kroeger on 1 Timothy 2:12.¹³ As Yarbrough rightly contends, there is virtually no basis for the existence of the gnostic heresy that the Kroegers allege forms the background to 1 Timothy 2:12.¹⁴ Throughout their book, the Kroegers are so predominantly concerned with the ancient cultural milieu supposedly underlying 1 Timothy 2:12 that there is little room in their treatment for contextual exegesis.

Moreover, not only do the Kroegers use late sources to establish the background of a NT writing, there also remains widespread disagreement regarding the interpretation of the available evidence.

For example, Steven Baugh has recently argued that "there is not the slightest evidence that there was a feminist movement at Ephesus."¹⁵ He contends that the worship of goddesses alone does not constitute sufficient evidence for the presence of feminism in a given society.¹⁶ These findings sharply contradict the Kroegers' assertions. In any case, a general reconstruction of the Ephesian milieu in the first century must not be used indiscriminately in one's reconstruction of the circumstances prevailing in the Ephesian church that occasioned the writing of 1 Timothy.

As noted above, Paul explicitly adduces two reasons from the OT creation account to substantiate his injunction regarding women's teaching of men (cf. 1 Tim. 2:13-14). The Kroegers, however, hardly discuss these OT references, while they give ample attention to their own reconstruction of this passage's contemporary background. This neglect to consider adequately a text's explicit argumentation in favor of a preoccupation with questions of cultural background lacks balance.

It is certainly appropriate to seek to illumine a text with relevant background information. But to all but ignore explicit textual material and to allow the text to be superseded by background information fails to meet the standard of a hermeneutical methodology that properly employs *all* the tools at its disposal and does so with proper balance.

An Arbitrary Distinction Between "Paradigm Passages" And "Passages With Limited Application"

A hermeneutical fallacy that is quite common in the discussion of gender passages in the NT is the arbitrary distinction between passages conveying a "general principle" and those of "limited application." Specifically, Galatians 3:28 is often viewed as establishing Paul's general parameters and thus providing the paradigm into which "passages of limited application" such as 1 Timothy 2:8-15 or 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 and 14:33b-36 have to be fitted.

As Osborne writes, "Feminists are quick to argue that Galatians 3:28 is the theological and hermeneutical key to the issue."¹⁷ On the other hand, those who do not share the view that Galatians 3:28 is the paradigm for the interpretation of all the gender passages in the NT are at times said to "de-emphasize the importance of the verse for understanding male and female relations in this age."¹⁸

Indeed, as Klyne Snodgrass charges, "For them, it is not the primary passage for discussing the relation of male and female. In fact, it is not even a key text. Focus is usually placed instead on 1 Corinthians 11 and 14 and 1 Timothy 2."¹⁹ Snodgrass concludes, "I view 1 Corinthians 14:33b-36 and 1 Timothy 2:11-15 as statements necessitated by specific problems in Corinth and Ephesus, respectively, and as shaped by an ancient culture. These texts do not become less important than Galatians 3:28, but they are less direct in their application."²⁰

However, the question arises whether or not Galatians 3:28, too, could be seen as "necessitated by specific problems" in the Galatian church. Moreover, it appears that Snodgrass uses the term "necessitated" in an unduly limited sense, i.e., as meaning "limited to the instance which occasioned a teaching." It is also unclear what Snodgrass means when he calls the texts in 1 Corinthians and 1 Timothy "less direct in their application." Snodgrass also fails to provide convincing evidence that would allow one to limit the application of 1 Timothy 2:12 to the Ephesian context.

But Snodgrass's statements seem restrained compared to unequivocal statements such as the following comment by W. Ward Gasque: "*Galatians 3:28 is the necessary theological starting place for any discussion on the role of women in the church...*Other texts must not be used to undermine this fundamental theological affirmation."²¹

Gasque also refers to F. F. Bruce who comments, "Paul states the basic principle here [Gal. 3:28]; if restrictions on it are found elsewhere in the Pauline corpus, as in 1 Cor. 14:34f.... or 1 Tim. 2:11f., they are to be understood in relation to Gal. 3:28, and not vice versa."²² This decision regarding "paradigm passages" tends to predetermine one's exegetical conclusions. As Gasque summarizes, "By taking Galatians 3:28 as the starting place for Paul's view on women, it becomes extremely difficult, if not impossible, to come to the traditionalist conclusion."²³

Again, modern presuppositions regarding gender issues may raise their head. When Snodgrass remarks, "Being in Christ did not change a Jew into a Gentile, rather, it changed the way that Jews and Gentiles relate to each other," and again, "Being in Christ does not change a woman into a man any more than it changes Gentiles into Jews, but it changes the way that men and women relate to each other just as it changed the way Jews and Gentiles relate," does he represent Paul accurately or are his statements flavored by his contemporary concerns?²⁴ Was it really Paul's point in Galatians 3:28 to address the issue of how Christ "changes the way that men and women relate to each other"? A reading of the passage in its context of chapters 3 and 4 makes this interpretation rather dubious. As the ensuing discussion details, Paul's concerns are salvation-historical rather than relating to social, racial, or gender issues as such.

A hermeneutical procedure that assigns certain passages into "paradigmatic" categories and labels others as passages with "limited application" is highly suspect. The superimposition of a topical grid onto a cluster of "gender passages" is probably one of the major culprits for the development of such arbitrary distinctions.

When approaching Galatians 3:28, the interpreter who puts aside his interests in gender issues, at least temporarily, will discover that the verse is linked with Galatians 3:16. There Paul argues that Genesis 12:7 pointed not to Abraham's *many* offsprings, but "to one [*eph henos*] which is Christ." Thus the statement in Galatians 3:28b, "For you are all one in Christ Jesus," refers back to the divine promise made to Abraham of which all believers are indiscriminately heirs. This is made clear by verse 29 which draws this exact conclusion: "And if you are Christ's, then you are Abraham's offspring, heirs according to promise."

The other important contextual reference point of Galatians 3:28 is Galatians 3:26. The statements in verses 26 and 28 are parallel, as can easily be seen: "For you are all sons of God through faith in Christ Jesus" and "For you are all one in Christ Jesus". The two parallel elements are "sons of God" in v. 26 and "one" in v. 28. This further underscores the conclusion reached with regard to the relationship of Galatians 3:28 with 3:16 and 29 above. "You are all one in Christ Jesus" means essentially, "You are all *sons of God* in Christ Jesus." In the context of the divine promise to Abraham, Paul's point is that in the one Son of the promise, Jesus Christ, all believers are indiscriminately heirs of God's promise to Abraham. There is no discrimination in that promise between Jew or Gentile, slave or free, male or female, as Paul proceeds to develop in chapter four of Galatians.

Thus an interpretation that starts with the assumption that Galatians 3:28 relates directly to contemporary gender issues will have difficulty entering into Paul's argument in the context of the passage. Contrary to the assertion that Galatians 3:28 contains "an unequivocal statement of absolute equality in Christ in the church" where "Paul excludes all discrimination against Gentiles, slaves or women,"²⁵ Galatians 3:28 in fact contains the salvation-historical demonstration that the divine promise to Abraham includes Jews as well as Gentiles, slaves as well as free, and men as well as women. That is Paul's point in Galatians 3:28 in the context of chapters 3 and 4, and, indeed, of the whole epistle.

Leveling The Distinction Between Historical Exegesis And Modern Contextualization

The importance of maintaining a distinction between historical exegesis and modern contextualization has already become apparent in the discussion up to this point. The power of presuppositions, however, tends to inject at least some elements of the modern interpreter's contemporary horizon into the interpretive process. Openness to correction by the ancient horizon of the text is required in this "hermeneutical circle" (or, hopefully, "spiral") in order for this tendency to be counteracted.

In practice, as has been seen in the examples given above, the line between the ancient and the contemporary horizons is often blurred. Topical concerns with modern "gender issues" often supersede in effect biblical-theological considerations, resulting in superficial systematizations.

For these reasons it is important not to level the distinction between historical exegesis and modern contextualization. Of course, once the interpreter has determined the authorial intention in the ancient context and reconstructed the historical message, his task still remains unfinished. While it is essential to

distinguish clearly between historical exegesis and contemporary application, both are required for the process of interpretation to be complete. R.T. France calls for "the priority in biblical interpretation of what has come to be called 'the first horizon,' i.e., of understanding biblical language within its own context before we start exploring its relevance to our own concerns, and of keeping the essential biblical context in view as a control on the way we apply biblical language to current issues."²⁶

If France's call were heeded, perhaps a greater consensus could be reached at least on the level of historical exegesis, i.e., what the text *meant* to its original recipients. It would then be easier to draw appropriate applications for the diverse contemporary contexts in which various interpreters find themselves.

Unfortunately, however, modern hermeneutics has witnessed a radical shift toward the subjective element in interpretation. A pluralism that affirms the legitimacy of "feminist hermeneutics," "liberation hermeneutics," "African-American hermeneutics," and, it may be supposed, "white Anglo-American hermeneutics," contains within itself the seeds of a subjectivism that denies the priority of what France calls the "first horizon." In this framework, it is the reader's response, not the author's intent, that decisively shapes the interpretation of the text.²⁷

Conclusion

The following hermeneutical fallacies were critiqued: (1) underestimating the power of presuppositions; (2) lack of balance in hermeneutical methodology; (3) underrating the importance of the use of the OT in the NT; (4) improper use of background information; (5) an arbitrary distinction between "paradigm passages" and "passages with limited application"; and (6) leveling the distinction between historical exegesis and modern contextualization. As the various examples have shown, each of these fallacies distorts an interpreter's understanding of the NT's gender passages. Perhaps by raising these hermeneutical issues to a conscious level this essay can make a contribution toward the avoidance of these fallacies and toward a greater degree of methodological consensus in the study of NT gender passages.



Endnotes

¹ Grant Osborne, "Hermeneutics and Women in the Church," *JETS* 20 (1977):337.

² Robert Johnston, "Biblical Authority and Interpretation," in *Women, Authority and the Bible*, ed. Alvera Mickelsen (Downers Grove: IVP, 1986), 30-41.

³ Grant Osborne, *The Hermeneutical Spiral* (Downers Grove: IVP, 1991).

⁴ Elizabeth Achtemeier, "Why God is Not Mother," *Christianity Today* 37/9 (Aug. 16, 1993), 17. Emphasis added.

⁵ Cf. James Barr, *Semantics of Biblical Language* (Oxford: University Press, 1961).

⁶ George W. Knight, *The Role Relationship of Men and Women* (rev. ed., Phillipsburg, NJ: Presbyterian and Reformed, 1985), 18, n.1.

⁷ Cf. Philip Barton Payne, "Libertarian Women in Ephesus: A Response to Douglas J. Moo's Article, '1 Timothy 2:11-15: Meaning and Significance,'" *Trinity Journal* 2 NS (1981): 169-97, John Stott, *Decisive Issues Facing Christians Today* (Old Tappan, NJ: Revell, 1990), 269, 277-80, and the KJV and the NEB.

⁸ Cf. H. Scott Baldwin, "A Difficult Word: *authenteō* in 1 Timothy 2:12," in *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, eds. Andreas J. Kstenberger, Thomas R. Schreiner, and H. Scott Baldwin (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995), 65-80.

⁹ See Osborne, "Hermeneutics and Women," 337; Piper and Grudem, *Recovering*; Mickelsen, *Women*.

¹⁰ Moo notes that the introductory *gar* ("for") is rarely simply explanatory or illustrative and that such a usage would make little sense in this context. It normally gives the reason or logical grounds for a command. See Moo, "The Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:11-15: A Rejoinder," *Trinity Journal* 2 NS (1981):202-4.

¹¹ Cf. Thomas R. Schreiner, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9-15: A Dialogue with Scholarship," in *Women in the Church*, 105-54.

¹² Cf. 2 Tim. 3:16 and 2 Pet. 3:15b-16. Furthermore, Peter, Paul, and John also thought of their own writings as authoritative (cf. John 21:24; 1 Cor. 4:1; 2 Cor. 10:10-11 with 11:2-3; and the openings of the Pauline and Petrine correspondences).

¹³ Richard Clark and Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992).

¹⁴ Robert W. Yarbrough, "New Light on Paul and Women?" *Christianity Today* 37/11 (Oct. 4, 1993) 68.

¹⁵ Steven M. Baugh, "Feminism at Ephesus: 1 Timothy 2:12 in Historical Context," *Outlook* 42/5 (May 1992) 10.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹⁷ Osborne, "Hermeneutics and Women," 348.

¹⁸ Klyne R. Snodgrass, "Galatians 3:28: Conundrum or Solution?" in Mickelsen, *Women*, 164-65.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 180.

²¹ W. Ward Gasque, "Response," in Mickelsen, *Women*, 189.

²² *Ibid.*, 189-90. Cf. F.F. Bruce, *The Epistle to the Galatians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1982), 190.

²³ Gasque, "Response," 190.

²⁴ Snodgrass, "Galatians 3:28," 176-77.

²⁵ Gasque, "Response," 189.

²⁶ R.T. France, "The Church and the Kingdom of God: Some Hermeneutical Issues," in *Biblical Interpretation and the Church: The Problem of Contextualization*, ed. D. A. Carson (Nashville: Nelson, 1984), 42.

²⁷ Cf. the two appendices in Osborne, *Hermeneutical Spiral*, 366-415.