PROHIBITING WOMEN IN AUTHORITY ROLES AND PARALLELS WITH FOOD PROHIBITIONS.

JOSEPH R. GREENE

PRESENTED AT THE 77TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SOCIETY. NOVEMBER 19, 2025, BOSTON MA.

Abstract: Many classify women in authoritative teaching roles as a secondary issue. This paper examines the apostle Paul's approach to secondary issues through an analysis of the food prohibitions in 1 Corinthians 8–10 and Romans 14–15. How the apostle applied the Jerusalem council's prohibition against eating food sacrificed to idols (Acts 15) should inform contemporary approaches to secondary issues. Methodologically, this paper proposes that the more qualifications a prohibition is subordinate to in the scriptures, the lower it should be on a doctrinal taxonomy. The apostle's approach to food prohibitions will then be applied to his prohibition of women in authoritative teaching roles (1 Tim 2:12). The parallels between these two prohibitions argue for treating women in authority as a lower tier secondary issue on one's doctrinal taxonomy.

Creeds define the essential doctrines of the faith, but non-essential doctrines can cause division even within churches unified on the essentials. In contemporary Protestant Christianity, women in authority roles constitutes one such divisive issue, even though many classify this issue as "secondary."[1] A major biblical basis for treating some issues as secondary comes from the apostle Paul's approach to food prohibitions in Romans 14–15 and 1 Corinthians 8–10. This paper will compare prohibiting women in authoritative teaching roles to food prohibitions.[2] It will argue that the parallels between food prohibitions and prohibitions of women in authority warrant treating the latter as a lower tier secondary issue. Ranking issues as secondary is inherently subjective. Moreover, there is no consensus on what criteria one should use to develop

[1] Gavin Ortlund, *Finding the Right Hills to Die on* (Crossway, 2020), 116–23; Albert Mohler, "A Call for Theological Triage and Christian Maturity," https://albertmohler.com/2005/07/12/a-call-for-theological-triage-and-christian-maturity/.

[2] On a popular level, Marg Mowczko makes this comparison with Romans 14 on her blog: "Romans 14 and the Divisive Issue of Women Pastors," https://margmowczko.com/romans-14-women-pastors-division.

a doctrinal taxonomy.[3] This paper proposes incorporating another criterion: the more considerations an issue is subordinated to in the scriptures, the lower it should be on a doctrinal taxonomy.

I will support this claim by examining how the apostle Paul applies the Jerusalem council's prohibition on food sacrificed to idols in First Corinthians and Romans. Paul's instructions to the churches treat those prohibitions being secondary to the essential prohibition against idolatry as well as secondary to the church's faith, unity and mission. Moreover, contextual considerations condition Paul's particular instructions. These features mark an issue as secondary. Paul's own prohibition against women in authority (1 Tim 2:12) can be read in an analogous way; his commendation of women in authority roles demonstrates that the prohibition is secondary to other considerations.[4] The parallels between these two prohibitions argue for treating women in authority as a lower tier secondary issue on one's doctrinal taxonomy.

The argument will proceed by examining the following: 1) The Jerusalem council's prohibition (Acts15:28ff) against things sacrificed to idols (εἰδωλόθυτα); 2) Paul's instructions on applying this food prohibition in 1 Corinthians 8–10; 3) Paul's instructions concerning food in Romans 14–15 including a synthesis of how Paul's treatment of food prohibitions should inform an approach to other secondary issues; 4) 1 Timothy 2:12, followed by a comparison of Paul's treatment of food prohibitions with his prohibition on women in authority.

---

[3] For various doctrinal taxonomies and criteria for developing a taxonomy see: Kevin DeYoung, "Where and How Do we Draw the Line" *Tabletalk* 36.7 (2012):12–5; Rhyne R. Putman, *When Doctrine Divides the People of God* (Crossway, 2020), 201–40. Some suggest a two category taxonomy of essential and nonessential. Others propose three categories like Mohler, "Theological Triage," and Kevin Vanhoozer, *Biblical Authority After Babel* (Brazos, 2016), 204–6. Ortlund (*Finding the Right Hills,* 16) proposes a four-level taxonomy. If this paper were using Ortlund's taxonomy, it would argue that this issue is a lower second or third tier doctrine.

[4] Pauline authorship of the Pastoral Epistles is assumed throughout, but authorship does not significantly impact the thesis.

Because each of the above passages is heavily debated, this paper will only mention their dominant interpretations. While certain interpretations support my thesis more than others, the goal is identifying Paul's approach to food sacrificed to idols and more generally his approach to secondary issues. These findings should then inform, and be integrated into, contemporary applications of secondary matters like women in authoritative teaching roles.

THE JERUSALEM COUNCIL

The account of the Jerusalem Council (Acts 15) pulls together many themes and marks a narrative shift towards the Gentile mission. The council addressed whether Gentiles had to fully convert to Judaism to join God's new covenant people. Some believers "from the Pharisee party" argued that Gentiles needed to be circumcised and to keep the law of Moses (Acts 15:5). These requirements probably were the most common expectations for true converts to Judaism.[5] The gathered "apostles and elders" rejected these requirements for the Gentiles. They wrote down their decision and sent a letter to the churches. The letter closes with the following instructions: "For it has seemed good to the Holy Spirit and to us to lay on you no greater burden than these requirements: that you abstain from what has been sacrificed to idols, and from blood, and from what has been strangled, and from sexual immorality" (Acts 15:28–29). While the context emphasizes that circumcision and the law of Moses are not required for the Gentiles, the written judgment includes prohibitions.

[5] Scot McKnight, *A Light among the Gentiles* (Fortress, 1991), 88–9. McKnight notes that first-century Gentiles could adhere to Judaism in various ways, but full male converts would most likely be expected to adopt these Jewish identity markers.

The list of prohibitions clearly is not exhaustive, and scholars debate their background, purpose, and extent.[6] Some argue these four prohibitions refer to Leviticus 17–18, wherein similar ideas are presented in the same order as in the apostolic letter.[7] Leviticus 17–18 repeatedly uses the phrase "in the midst of my people," to specify what the "alien in your midst" (Gentiles) must abstain from.[8] Others argue for a background in the Jewish understanding of the Noahic covenant.[9] The background of a passage often adds weight to interpretive options, but no consensus has been reached concerning the background of the prohibitions of Acts 15.

The questions of background intertwine with the question of the extent and purpose of the prohibitions. Are these prohibitions an essential ruling that extends to all Gentiles in all circumstances? The purpose behind abstaining from these things could be to facilitate fellowship between Jewish and Gentile Christians. If these items are prohibited for the purpose of fellowship, then they might not apply in an all-Gentile context. However, the prohibitions might be intended to keep Gentiles believers from idolatrous practices.[10] As will be discussed later, participation in idolatry was prohibited throughout the NT churches.

---

[6] Schriener describes four main views in Patrick Schriener, *Acts,* CSC (Holman, 2021), 425–7. Many of the difficulties attached to each view are summarized in A.J.M. Wedderburn "The 'Apostolic Decree': Tradition and Redaction," *NovT* 35.4 (1993): 362–89.

[7] Those who see Leviticus as background include: Richard Bauckham, "James, Peter, and the Gentiles," in *Missions of James, Peter, and Paul*, ed. Bruce Chilton and Craig Evans (Brill, 2005), 120; W. Gil Shin, "Holy Land Sanctity for Every Greco-Roman City: Rethinking the Lukan Apostolic Decree (Acts 15:19–21)," *JBL* 141.3 (2022): 553–74; Mikeal C. Parsons, *Acts* (Baker, 2008), 218. Craig Blomberg strongly argues against the Lev 17-18 view from the flow of the narrative. He posits that Luke is giving an ad hoc list and ultimately saying the law no longer has foundational significance. Craig Blomberg, "The Christian and the Law of Moses," in *Witness to the Gospel: The Theology of Acts,* ed. I. Howard Marshall and David Peterson (Eerdmans, 1998), 408–10.

[8] Parsons, *Acts*, 219.

[9] Todd Hanneken, "Moses Has His Interpreters: Understanding the legal Exegesis in Acts 15 from the Precedent in Jubilees," *CBQ* 77 (2015): 686–706.

[10] Schriener, *Acts*, 425–7. Darrell L. Bock, *Acts,* BECNT (Baker. 2007), 506–13. Bock comments, "The prohibitions are designed to not only prevent offense to the Jews but also, if they are tied to worship, to prevent offense to God."

Are the prohibitions an ad hoc list focused on Jew and Gentile fellowship? Are they strict prohibitions for Gentiles taken from Leviticus or the Noahic covenant? Something in between?[11] The exact intentions for, and extent of, the council's prohibitions are hard to determine from the immediate context. The reader (both ancient and contemporary) encounters prohibitions and must discern the extent of the prohibitions. If the prohibition does not extend to certain contexts, then the prohibition is subordinate to (secondary to) those contextual considerations.

I will focus exclusively on the prohibition against εἰδωλόθυτα. In general, εἰδωλόθυτα refers to food sacrificed to idols. James's use of "ἀλισγημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων" (things polluted by idols) for εἰδωλόθυτα in Acts 15:20 means the term probably incorporates anything involved in pagan rituals, including wine.[12] In a Gentile dominated area meat and wine purchased at the market often were involved in pagan sacrifices.

How does the apostle Paul apply this prohibition against εἰδωλόθυτα in his letters to the Corinthians and Romans?[13] As will be shown, Paul subordinates the prohibition against εἰδωλόθυτα to contextual concerns and to the church's unity and mission. Paul's approach demonstrates that he considers this food prohibition a secondary matter. His treatment of the council's prohibition on εἰδωλόθυτα sharply contrasts to his approach to the council's ruling

[11] Ben Witherington ("Why Not Idol Meat?" *BRev* 10.3 (1994): 38–54) contends that the decree simply prohibits Gentiles from attending pagan temple meals and not following any other OT food laws. In contrast, Hanneken ("Moses Has His Interpreters," 686–706) argues that these prohibitions are developed from the Noahic covenant and binding upon the Gentiles. Likewise, W. Gil Shin ("Holy Land Sanctity," 574) contends that these prohibitions are a necessary element for all Gentiles as they participate in Israel's restored eschatological worship.

[12] *Contra* Ben Witherington III, "Not so Idle Thoughts About *EIDOLOTHUTON," TynBul* 44.2 (1993): 237–54. E. Coye Still III ("The Meaning and Uses of ΕΙΔΩΛΟΘΥΤΟΝ in First Century Non-Pauline Literature and 1 COR 8:1-11:1: Toward Resolution of the Debate," *TTJ* 23 (2002): 225–34) argues for the broader definition saying εἰδωλόθυτα "means simply food with a sacrificial history." See also John Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: A Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1–11* (Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 14. The term ἀλίσγημα only appears here in the NT, but the verb form appears in the LXX Daniel 1:8 where it refers to both food and wine. Wedderburn "Apostolic Decree," 371–2.

[13] Although Paul does not directly refer to the council's instructions about εἰδωλόθυτα in his letters, he is either addressing those instructions or similar beliefs about abstaining from εἰδωλόθυτα held by a good portion of the early church (as evidenced by Didache 6:3 and Revelation 2:14).

against requiring circumcision for Gentiles. Paul consistently speaks against requiring the Gentiles to be circumcised (Rom 3:30; 4:11; 1 Cor 7:18–19; Gal 5:2–6; Phil 3:2–3; Col 3:11; Eph 2:11–22).[14]

PAUL'S APPLICATION OF FOOD PROHIBITIONS IN CORINTH

Paul's extant epistles to the Corinthians address various problems in their church. One problem area was εἰδωλόθυτα, and Paul discusses this issue in 1 Corinthians 8–10. Although Paul does not specifically cite the Jerusalem council's decision in First Corinthians, he was present at the council and delivered their letter to gentile churches (Acts 15:31–35; 16:4).[15] One may assume Paul integrated their prohibition against εἰδωλόθυτα into his guidance to the Corinthians.

In 1 Corinthians 8:1, Paul transitions to a new topic with, "Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων." Paul uses περὶ δὲ to introduce new material throughout the letter and now he will address εἰδωλόθυτα from 8:1 to 11:1. Paul's instructions concerning εἰδωλόθυτα seem to be more contextually conditioned than the Jerusalem council's prohibition would suggest. Paul directs his instructions at persons who have "knowledge" that allows them to have no reservations about eating food sacrificed to idols, perhaps even eating it at the pagan temple.[16] This group probably consists of influential Gentiles whose social connections were intertwined with paganism.[17] This group exercised their "right" to eat εἰδωλόθυτα even though it caused the "weak" to stumble in their faith (1 Cor 8:9). The identity of the "weak" is debated, but they felt that the actions of the

[14] In Acts 16:3 Timothy's circumcision was not required; it was done so that Timothy could minister alongside Paul in Jewish contexts.

[15] For space purposes, I assume, but do not argue, that Acts 15 reflects historical reality.

[16] Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. rev ed. NICONT (Eerdmans, 2014), 396.

[17] Toney, *Paul's Inclusive Ethic*, 49–90.

"strong" were tantamount to idolatry.[18] If the weak were influenced to follow the strong, the weak would wound their consciences and stumble in their faith (1 Cor 8:10–13). These two groups have different convictions about the prohibition against eating εἰδωλόθυτα, and Paul is guiding them through this issue.

At least rhetorically, Paul agrees "an idol has no real existence," that "there is no God but one" (1 Cor 8:4) and idol-polluted food itself is not the problem: "Food will not commend us to God. We are no worse off if we do not eat, and no better off if we do" (1 Cor 8:8). In 1 Cor 10:25, Paul allows the Corinthains to "eat whatever is sold in the market without raising any question" even though that food may have been sacrificed to an idol. These verses depict Paul as treating the prohibition on εἰδωλόθυτα as comparatively unimportant, a matter of subjective perception.

Paul does instruct abstinence in certain contexts, but the concern centers on the potential stumbling block eating may put before for the weak who don't have the same "knowledge" (8:7–10). Paul orders the strong to forgo their right to eat when the weak are present to protect them from stumbling in their faith.[19] The Jerusalem council instructs Gentiles to abstain from εἰδωλόθυτα, but Paul subordinates those instructions to other considerations. If this were all that Paul said, one could classify eating εἰδωλόθυτα as a lower-tier secondary or tertiary issue. However, amid all these statements that treat εἰδωλόθυτα as unimportant, Paul issues the strong warning to "Flee idolatry . . . You cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of demons" (1

[18] Although "strong" is not used here, it is a reasonable label in contrast to the "weak" and Paul's usage in Romans 14

[19] Because the weak don't have knowledge that an "idol is nothing" they eat believing it is a religious act, whereas the strong believe it is like any other food. See Gregory W. Dawes, "The Danger of Idolatry: First Corinthians 8:7–13," *CBQ* 58.1 (1996):82–98. Nonetheless, the strong are called to protect the weak as Christ would, H. H. Drake Williams III. "Recalibrating Christian Ethics at Corinth: Paul's Use of Jesus the Prototype and Collective Remembrance to Provide Spiritual Guidance on Weaker Brothers and Food Offered to Idols," *Religions* 15.316 (2024), https://doi.org/10.3390/rel15030316.

Cor 10:14–21). Partaking of εἰδωλόθυτα not only could cause the weak to stumble, but the strong themselves may "fall" as they become "idolaters" as the Israelites did (1 Cor 10:7–12).

Most scholars reconcile Paul's seemingly contradictory statements by arguing that he is addressing different contexts. For instance, Martin Sanfridson contends that Paul has three contexts in mind:

> In 1 Cor 8:1–13, he addresses the situation where a Christ follower eats food offered to idols in an idol's temple; second, in 10:14–22, Paul addresses those Christ followers who participate in the sacrificial rituals at the altar in gentile cults and share in the innards of the animals, which they would have roasted as the god's portion burnt on the altar; third, in 10:25–29, he instructs the Corinthians about buying meat from the market and dining with those who are not members of the *ekklesia*.[20]

Paul pronounces an absolute prohibition in only the second context (1 Cor 10:14–22) because they have crossed into actual participation in idolatry. Paul signals this new context by using the word εἰδωλολατρία instead of εἰδωλόθυτα. In the other two instances (eating in the temple precincts or from the market), Paul considers εἰδωλόθυτα as inherently no different from any other food.[21] Its consumption is a secondary matter, subordinate to more important considerations like not causing offense. Sanfridson argues that Paul is not only concerned with offense caused to the weak by partaking of the food, but the social offense caused by not partaking. Paul is interested in preserving the social bonds that members of the church have with

[20] Martin Sanfridson, *Paul and Sacrifice in Corinth: Rethinking Paul's Views on Gentile Cults in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10* (Mohr Siebeck, 2025), 264.

[21] Ibid., 198.

outsiders (1 Cor 5:9–13).[22] Those bonds would have been cultivated through community meals, which were connected to pagan sacrifice in Corinth.

Sanfridson is not alone in presenting Paul's approach to eating εἰδωλόθυτα as more lenient than the Jerusalem council's letter would imply. Barrett suggests that Paul's instructions go so far as to contradict the apostolic decree, and yet Barrett acknowledges that Paul draws a line when eating becomes participation in idolatry.[23] Most scholars grant the early church prohibited idolatry. Idolatry was an essential boundary that couldn't be crossed, but in what contexts did eating idol food constitute idolatry?

While Sanfridson and others argue that Paul was more lenient than the Jerusalem council, others argue that Paul was enforcing the prohibition. For instance, Ben Witherington argues that Paul prohibits all meat eating in the temple precincts but allows eating meat sacrificed to idols in private homes.[24] Witherington considers this passage as Paul's way of applying the Jerusalem council's instructions in Corinth. If this is the case, then the council's instructions were not intended to be an absolute prohibition against eating idol food per se, but a prohibition against participating in idolatry. Idolatry prohibitions are essential and apply across contexts, but the food prohibitions themselves are secondary, and Paul is drawing the boundaries for Corinth. If Witherington's view is correct, Paul understands this part of the council's direction as secondary; their primary concern was crossing the line into idolatry (1 Cor 10:14–21). Witherington argues Paul draws the line at the door of pagan temples but Sanfridson argues that Paul draws it within those temples. The dominant view in scholarship sees Paul as drawing the line at the doors of

[22] Joel R. White ("Meals in Pagan Temples and Apostolic Finances," *BBR* 23.4 (2013): 531–46) argues persuasively that the function of 1 Corinthians 9 is to encourage the Corinthains to be willing to give up these social and economic connections if they involve actual participation in idolatry.

[23] C. K. Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols," *NTS* 11.2 (1965): 149–50.

[24] Witherington, "Why Not Idol Meat?" 38–43, 54.

pagan temples.[25] Eating εἰδωλόθυτα within the temple constitutes idolatry, whereas eating εἰδωλόθυτα in other contexts was subordinate to other considerations (like the "good of one's neighbor" in 1 Cor 10:24).

One final view that deserves comment are those who argue that knowingly eating food sacrificed to idols was considered participating in idolatry regardless of the context.[26] Alex Cheung contends that abstaining from food sacrificed to idols was a basic teaching of Paul's gentile preaching.[27] Acts 15, Revelation 2:14, as well as Didache 6:3 reflect the widespread ethical abstinence from idol food. In 1 Corinthians 8-10, Paul is drawing the line at any conscious consumption of εἰδωλόθυτα. In this view, abstaining from eating εἰδωλόθυτος is an essential issue because eating it is tantamount to idolatry.

This view has been criticized from many different directions.[28] If eating εἰδωλόθυτα was inherently defiling, Paul could have argued that point as he does concerning joining oneself to a prostitute in 1 Corinthians 6.[29] Instead, Paul repeatedly grants that εἰδωλόθυτα itself is nothing (1 Cor 8:4, 8; 10:19, 26). Even those who see the prohibition of knowingly eating εἰδωλόθυτος as extending to all contexts must account for Paul's allowances in limited circumstances.[30]

---

[25] Carl N. Toney, *Paul's Inclusive Ethic,* WUNT 252 (Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 176–190. Panayotis Coutsoumpos, "Paul's View of Αδιάφορα in 1 Corinthians 8–10," in *Paul and Scripture*. eds. Stanley Porter and Christopher Land (Brill, 2019), 173–87. For a survey of scholarship see Trent A. Rogers, *God and the Idols* (WUNT 427; Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2016), 7-15. Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols*, 1–38.

[26] Alex T. Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth: Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy,* JSNTSup 176 (Sheffield Academic, 1999), 128; 296; Peter D. Gooch, *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthains 8–10 in Its Context* (Laurier Univ. Press, 1993), 86.

[27] Cheung, *Idol Food*, 191.

[28] E. Coye Stille ("Paul's Aims regarding εἰδωλόθυτα: A New Proposal for Interpreting 1 Corinthians 8:1–11:1," *NovT* 44 (2002):335) points out that if eating food was not a legitimate right of the strong then Paul's analogy in 1 Corinthians 9 would not resonate. Paul sets aside his own legitimate right to financial support as an example for the Corinthians to set aside their right to eat εἰδωλόθυτα. Stephen C. Barton, "'All Things to All People': Paul and the Law in the Light of 1 Corinthains 9.19–23," in *Paul and Mosaic Law*, ed. James D. G. Dunn (Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 276–8.

[29] Sanfridson, *Paul and Sacrifice in Corinth*, 208.

[30] Fotopoulos (*Food Offered to Idols*, 185–8) seems to agree that the prohibition of idol food was a basic teaching of the church but then is careful to speak of "cultic participation constituting idolatry" because Paul's allowances entail that at the very least ignorant eating does not constitute true participation. Rogers, *God and the Idols*, 214–221.

Cheung's view is the least supportive of this paper's thesis, and it demonstrates the complex nature of defining and ranking secondary issues.

The above discussion necessarily neglects many other studies and their unique views of 1 Cor 8–10.[31] Analyzing the countless views individually would cause us to lose the proverbial forest for the trees. Therefore, let us take stock of some general insights into Paul's approach to food prohibitions in 1 Corinthians 8–10: 1) While one could interpret the prohibition against eating εἰδωλόθυτα as extending to all contexts, Paul does not apply it in this way; 2) Paul's particular instructions are based on contextual considerations, which means eating εἰδωλόθυτα is secondary to these other considerations; 3) First Corinthians 10 demonstrates that the extent of contextual considerations is limited by essential issues, in this case, idolatry.

Although both essential and secondary issues need to be contextualized in practice, a defining mark of a secondary issue is that it is subordinate to other considerations and essential issues. In 1 Corinthians 8–10 Paul's application of the prohibition against εἰδωλόθυτα was subject to its context in a pagan temple as well as the effect it would have on the weak. Paul's instructions were further subjected to the essential prohibition of participation in idolatry. Once the eating crossed into participation in idolatry, it was no longer contextually conditioned. This paper proposes that the more considerations an issue is subordinate to, the lower it should be on a doctrinal taxonomy. Cataloguing these considerations should involve as much biblical data as possible, which is why we now turn to Romans 14.

[31] For instance, E. Coye Stille ("Paul's aims," 333–43) argues that while Paul agrees with the strong that they have a fundamental right to eat idol food, Paul instructs them to give it up entirely in all contexts for the sake of the weak.

PAUL'S APPLICATION OF FOOD PROHIBITIONS TO ROME

Many have noticed the similarities between 1 Corinthains 8–10 and Romans 14–15. For the purposes of this paper, the most significant similarity is that both passages deal with disagreements about food prohibitions. There are as many proposed identities of the rival groups in Romans 14–15 as there are in 1 Corinthians 8–10. This paper agrees with those who conclude that the "weak" in Romans are mostly Jewish believers who abstain from eating certain foods and the "strong" are mostly Gentiles who have no such restrictions.[32]

Beginning in Romans 14:1 and extending to 15:7 (or perhaps to 15:13), Paul instructs the strong to accommodate the weak as he does in 1 Corinthians 8-10, which suggests that the strong have more social standing and influence in the community.[33] In Romans 15:1, Paul says, "We who are strong have an obligation to bear with the failings of the weak, and not to please ourselves." However, Paul also cautions those who do not eat against judging those who do: "Let not the one who eats despise the one who abstains, and let not the one who abstains pass judgment on the one who eats, for God has welcomed him" (Rom 14:3). In contrast to 1 Corinthians 8–10, the primary issue in Romans seems to be these groups welcoming one another for table fellowship *within the church* since the command to welcome one another bookends the passage at 14:1 and 15:7. Resolution of the food disagreement is a part of Paul's larger discussion of God bringing together Jews and Gentiles as the true children of Abraham (Rom 4:9–17; 10:12; 11:11-12; 15:8–9). The two different groups are to welcome one another as God

---

[32]Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *Romans: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 33 (Yale University Press, 2008), 687–96; Toney, *Paul's Inclusive Ethic*, 49–90; John M.G. Barclay, "'Do We Undermine the Law?': A Study of Romans 14.1–15.6," in *Paul and Mosaic Law*, ed. James D. G. Dunn (Mohr Siebeck, 1996), 289–90; Douglas J. Moo, *The Epistle to the Romans*, NICNT (Eerdmans, 1996), 827–31 (also see Moo for a survey of various interpretive options). Reasoner (*The Strong and The Weak*, 136–8) cautions against seeing these categories as exclusively Jews vs. Gentile since many Greco-Roman groups called for vegetarianism and regard for special days.

[33] Thomas H. Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric in its Contexts* (Hendrickson, 2004), 409–10.

has already welcomed them both into one unified fellowship (Rom 14:3). Idolatry is not a big concern for Paul in Romans 14-15.

Paul may not directly address idolatry, but a part of the weak's motivation for abstaining from certain foods was due to its potential contact with idol worship. Romans 14–15 does not explicitly use the term εἰδωλόθυτα, but it does imply that the weak stay away from food they consider κοινός. This word can refer to unclean food like swine that Jews were prohibited from eating, but food also could be considered unclean because of its connection to idolatry. In Gentile cities, any food or wine could have been involved in idol worship and therefore εἰδωλόθυτα and thus κοινός. The weak were abstaining from food and wine, at least in part, because it may have been associated with idolatry (a practice attested in Tob 1:10–12; *Jos. Asen*. 12.5).[34] The mention of abstaining from wine in Rom 14:21 argues that some of the weak's concern included pollution from idols. Wine was not unclean, but in Gentile contexts a small portion was often poured out as a libation to pagan deities. For this reason, Jewish literature contains several examples of abstaining from wine in a pagan environment over concerns about idol pollution (Dan 1:5–16; Jdt 12:1–2, 19; *Jos. Asen*. 8.5).[35] At the Jerusalem council, James' comments used τῶν ἀλισγημάτων τῶν εἰδώλων instead of εἰδωλόθυτα (Acts 15:20) most likely reflecting a wider concern for anything associated with idolatry.[36] If the strong in Rome provided the food and wine for the community meals, the weak would feel that they couldn't take part because checking on the meal's origins was not important to the strong. This tension led to the weak "judging" the strong and the strong "despising" the weak. Mark Reasoner posits that the strong would have

[34] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 287; Steven E. Runge, *High Definition Commentary: Romans* (Lexham Press, 2014), 241.

[35] Toney, *Paul's Inclusive Ethic*, 59.

[36] Bock, *Acts*, 505. Polluted things in LXX Daniel 1:8 clearly includes wine. See footnote 13 above.

looked down on the weak as superstitious or over-scrupulous.[37] The weak judged those eating unclean foods as unsuitable for fellowship.[38] Paul corrects the attitudes of both parties by pointing out that if they are eating or not eating "in honor of the Lord" (Rom 14:6-8), then they belong to the Lord and He will judge (Rom 14:10–12). They are not to judge one another on such convictions: "The faith that you have, keep between yourself and God," (Rom 14:22). Within this sentence, "faith" means convictions about acceptable food practices.[39] In the overall context of Romans, this faith/conviction about food practices would be subordinate to saving faith in the Christ event (Rom 3:21–26; 4:22–25; 5:1–2; 10:6–13).[40] In service of building a unified faith in Christ, Paul allows different convictions and practices concerning eating unclean food (including some forms of εἰδωλόθυτα like wine). Food prohibitions are secondary or tertiary matters.

As a secondary matter, Paul subordinates food prohibitions to other considerations as he does in 1 Corinthians 8-10. After establishing the freedom to either eat or not eat unclean foods, Paul subordinates that freedom to eat unclean food to concerns over making another stumble in the faith. Not only does Paul here express concern for the weak stumbling, but he also places the obligation for action on the strong similar to 1 Corinthians 8–10.[41] This obligation is most clearly expressed in Romans 15:1: "We who are strong have an obligation to bear with the failings of the weak, and not to please ourselves." Considerations for building up others in faith are placed over the freedoms of the strong to partake of polluted food and wine. For Paul, a matter being

[37] Reasoner, *Strong and Weak*, 159–74.

[38] Peter's behavior in Galatians 2:11–14 probably was based on this attitude. Arthur A. Just, "The Apostolic Councils of Galatians and Acts: How First-Century Christians Walked Together," *CTQ* 74 (2010): 268–74.

[39] Fitzmyer, *Romans*, 689–98.

[40] John M.G. Barclay, "Faith and Self-Detachment from Cultural Norms: A Study in Romans 14-15," *ZNW* 104 (2013): 192–208.

[41] Tobin, *Paul's Rhetoric*, 412–3

secondary not only entails freedom for oneself, but an obligation to serve Christ with that freedom.

Unlike 1 Corinthians 10, Paul does not here give warnings against idolatry. This omission may stem from Paul's focus on table fellowship *within* the Roman church versus the Corinthians' fellowship with those *outside* the church. Eating εἰδωλόθυτα in a pagan temple or household could result in active participation in idolatry, whereas bringing market-bought εἰδωλόθυτος to a church meal would not slip into idol worship. The essential issue Paul seems to be concerned about is not idolatry, but the uniting of Jews and Gentiles into one faith and one people of God. Building unity within the church and mission to those outside the church (to Gentiles in 1 Corinthains and to Jews in Romans) are important considerations for Paul. Stated in a way that supports my thesis: Paul subordinates the prohibition against εἰδωλόθυτα to considerations for church unity and mission. I agree with Carl Toney that this "inclusive ethic" informs Paul's instructions in both letters. Toney writes:

> In both 1 Cor 8–10 and Rom 14–15 Paul promotes an inclusive ethic of accommodating to the practices of others. In 1 Cor 8–10 Paul allows for a broader practice of eating Gentile food. In Rom 14–15 Paul makes room for Jewish dietary practices. This inclusive ethic promotes unity within the Christian communities of Corinth and Rome. In addition, in both 1 Cor 8–10 and Rom 14–15, Paul's advice about meals affects both the internal unity of community gatherings as well as the interaction of the community with non-Christians. . . . In 1 Cor 10:32–11:1 Paul allows the weak and strong to continue eating with unbelievers. In Rom 14:1–15:6 Paul encourages the strong to accommodate to the behaviors of the weak, which allows the weak to interact with the wider Jewish community, . . . In both letters Paul sees the internal unity and accommodating behavior

> of the community as being important for outreach to non-Christians. Just as Paul encouraged the Corinthains to accommodate each other for the sake of unity and mission, so Paul encourages the Romans to accommodate each other for the sake of unity and mission.[42]

In both Corinth and Rome, food prohibitions are subordinate to considerations of unity and mission. Of course, this approach may have been the Jerusalem council's intention all along. Whether the secondary nature of the prohibition was the council's intention or Paul's interpretation is not important for this paper. Contemporary interpreters of Acts 15 must discern the nature and extent of the prohibition. An examination of Romans 14–15 yields similar insights into Paul's approach to food prohibitions as were found in 1 Corinthians 8-10: 1) While one could interpret the prohibition against eating εἰδωλόθυτα as extending to all contexts, Paul does not interpret it in this way; 2) Paul's particular instructions are based on contextual considerations, which means eating εἰδωλόθυτα is secondary to these other considerations; 3) In contrast to 1 Corinthians 10, Romans 14–15 does not clearly exhibit a limiting essential issue like idolatry. However, one could argue that Jewish and Gentile unity within the church and mission to those outside the church were essential priorities in Paul's mind.

The above examination of 1 Corinthians 8–10 and Romans 14–15 demonstrates that the prohibition against εἰδωλόθυτα is not an essential doctrine for Paul. His approach to the issue places higher importance on other considerations, while acknowledging idolatry as primary. Paul's approach to the prohibition against εἰδωλόθυτα can inform contemporary interpretive approaches to biblical prohibitions. If the prohibition is subordinate to other considerations, this is evidence that the issue is secondary. I propose that the more considerations an issue is

[42] Toney, *Paul's Inclusive Ethic*, 204.

subordinate to in the scriptures, the lower it should be placed on a doctrinal taxonomy. This approach can now be applied to the prohibition of women in authority or teaching roles.

1 TIMOTHY 2:12: THE PROHIBITION AGAINST WOMEN IN ROLES OF AUTHORITY OVER MEN.

The above conclusions concerning food prohibitions can now be applied to the prohibition against women in authority found in 1 Timothy 2:12. Although these prohibitions are different in many ways, comparing them is illuminating. In 1 Timothy 2:12, Paul writes: "I do not permit a woman to teach or to exercise authority over a man; rather, she is to remain quiet." Similar to the food prohibitions in Acts 15, the reader is left to discern the extent of this prohibition. Is a woman prohibited to teach *in any form* or exercise *any* authority over a man in *all* situations? Answering this question has spawned legions of literature that examine both literary and cultural contexts. The meaning of αὐθεντέω as well as Paul's purpose in referring to Adam & Eve all affect one's reading of this text. Evangelical scholars have argued various proposals for Paul's intentions as well as the broader implications of this prohibition.[43] Rehashing all these arguments would not contribute much to the state of scholarship or to this paper's thesis. Most scholars recognize some contexts where a woman may teach or exercise authority over a man. We will survey those contexts to determine when this prohibition is subordinate to other considerations. If the aforementioned food prohibitions are a relevant guide, the more considerations a prohibition is subordinate to, the more warrant one has to interpret the prohibition as secondary.

[43] For a thorough evangelical treatment of this text and bibliography see: Andreas Köstenberger and Thomas Schreiner, eds., *Women in the Church* (3d ed. Crossway, 2016). On the egalitarian side see Cynthia Long Westfall, *Paul and Gender* (Baker, 2016).

Many scholars have compiled lists of biblical examples of women teaching or having authority over men.[44] For space purposes, we can only note that the OT background contains both limitations on women serving in certain roles (priests were male) as well as several examples of women in authority (like Deborah the judge and prophet in Judges 4:4–5).[45] Likewise, examining the role of women as the first witnesses to the resurrection (John 20:17-18) or to Jesus' messianic identity (John 4:25–30; 11:25–27) would entangle us in issues of whether witness is a form of authoritative teaching.[46] Instead we will focus on women in the early church, since they would have been the most relevant recipients of the prohibition in 1 Timothy 2:12. When is this prohibition subject to other considerations?

Paul's prohibition against women giving authoritative instruction does not include prophecy. Paul acknowledges women prophesying in 1 Cor 11:5, and prophecy contains public instruction (1 Cor 14:31).[47] Paul explains at-length the valuable role of prophesy in the context of the spiritual gifts (1 Cor 12–14) because it builds up and instructs (1 Cor 14:19) the whole church.[48] Paul's recognition of women prophets agrees with other NT texts (Luke 2:36; Acts 2:17; 21:9) as well as OT antecedents (Ex 15:20; 2 Kings 22:14–20; Isa 8:3). The prohibition against women having authority over men in 1 Tim 2:12 is therefore subordinate to prophetic allowances.

---

[44] Craig S. Keener, *Paul, Women, & Wives* (Hendrickson, 1992), 237–49. Terran Williams, *How God Sees Women* (Spiritual Bakery Publications, 2022), 199-250. Westfall, *Paul and Gender,* 268–77.

[45] For a basic survey of the relevant biblical texts and issues concerning women's roles in the church see David Wenham, "Men and Women in the Church" *Themelios* 12.3 (1987):73-9.

[46] See Lucy Peppiat, *Rediscovering Scripture's Vision for Women* (IVP Academic, 2019), 33-5.

[47] *Contra* Wayne Grudem, "Prophecy—Yes, but Teaching—No: Paul's Consistent Advocacy of Women's Participation without Governing Authority," JETS 30.1 (1987): 11–23. Grudem's contention that NT prophecy had lesser authority than teaching is suspect as noted by Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives*, 243–246, and Thomas Schriener, "An Interpretation of 1 Timothy 2:9–15: A Dialogue with Scholarship," in *Women in the Church*, eds. Andreas Köstenberger and Thomas Schreiner (3d ed. Wheaton: Crossway, 2016), 193–4.

[48] Westfall, *Paul and Gender*, 234–6. In addition to prophecy, 1 Cor 14:26 includes teaching as one of the many things that anyone can bring to build up the congregation.

On Paul's ministry teams, women serve in ways that most likely included authority and teaching over men. Therefore, Paul subjected his own prohibition to other considerations. In Romans 16 Paul commends several women, beginning with Phoebe who carried the letter and is called a "deacon of the church at Cenchreae" (16:1–2). As the carrier of the letter, Phoebe would have authority as a representative of Paul and interpreter of his writing.[49] The role of deacons is debated, but it is a specific role with qualifications (1 Tim 3:8–12), which suggests authority.[50] Korinna Zamfir also notes, "Paul commonly describes his ministry, centered on announcing the gospel, as *diakonia* and those people carrying out this ministry as *diakonoi* (Rom 11,13; 1 Cor 3,5; 2 Cor 3,6; 6,4)."[51] Female *diakonoi* spread the gospel in various ways and this type of proclamation sometimes would be perceived as "teaching" (the Jews in John 9:34 were offended that the blind man was "teaching" them). In addition, the early post-apostolic writings connect deacons with teaching under the authority of a bishop.[52] Paul's commendation of Phoebe as a deacon and bearer of his letter argues that she is a recognized authority and teacher.

After acknowledging Phoebe, Paul moves on to greeting several women who, whether they have worked directly with Paul or not, are commended for their gospel work. The highest commendation is given to Junia, who is referred to as an apostle (Rom 16:7). While the meaning

[49] Allan Chapple, "Getting *ROMANS* to the Right Romans: Phoebe and the Delivery of Paul's Letter," *TynBul* 62.2 (2011): 195–214.

[50] If Acts 6 describes the beginning of the deacon role, then deacons had authority to oversee service ministries of the church. Phillip went on to preach and lead revival in Samaria. His possible role as deacon in Jerusalem may not be relevant to his ministry in Samaria, but we place more weight on institutional roles than the NT. The overriding NT missionary impulse favors an assumption that all believers authoritatively proclaim the gospel wherever they go.

[51] Korinna Zamfir, *Men and Women in the Household of God* (Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 352.

[52] Robert L. Saucy, "Women's Prohibition to Teach Men: An Investigation into Its Meaning and Contemporary Application," *JETS* 37.1 (1994):85. Although it is a second-century work of fiction, *The Acts of Paul and Thecla* attests that some Christian groups read Paul as endorsing women teachers. Paul tells Thecla to "Go and teach the word of the Lord." She later goes to Seleucia and enlightened many in the knowledge of Christ (10.1–11).

of apostle here is debated, this title most likely carried some church-wide authority (especially since Andronicus and Junia were ἐπίσημοι among the apostles).[53]

Paul greets Tryphaena, Tryphosa, and Persis who have toiled in the Lord (Rom 16:12). Toiling "in the Lord" implies leadership in the community since this terminology is used for leaders in 1 Thess 5:12.[54] Back in Romans 16:3, Prisca is called a "fellow worker" just like Timothy (Rom 16:21) and Titus (2 Cor 8:23).[55] Acts 18:26 describes Prisca and her husband instructing the gifted preacher Apollos.

The degree of authority and instruction that these women exercised is difficult to establish definitively. Even if these women only exercised authority or taught men under the supervision of their husbands or other male leaders, the prohibition of 1 Tim 2:12 would be subordinate to these additional considerations.

The biblical evidence demonstrates that in Paul's own practice, women had at least some teaching authority over men. This authority was practiced through prophecy. Moreover, the titles and roles of women in Paul's ministry give additional examples of women with teaching authority over men. The reasons and extent for these allowances are heavily debated. Complementarian scholars often integrate this data by limiting Paul's prohibition to women serving as elders/pastors in a church. These scholars qualify the prohibition as "*publicly* teach" or "*primary* leadership" authority.[56] Space does not allow a larger survey of the various ways complementarians integrate these considerations.

---

[53] Eldon Jay Epp, *Junia: The First Woman Apostle* (Fortress, 2005).

[54] Westfall, *Paul and Gender*, 275.

[55] In addition to Prisca, Paul names two other women as "coworkers" in Philippians 4:2–3.

[56] Schreiner, "An Interpretation," 192; George W. Knight III, *The Pastoral Epistles*, NIGTC (Eerdmans, 1992), 140–1; Robert W. Yarbrough, "Familiar Paths a Fresh Matrix" in *Women in the Church*, eds. Andreas Köstenberger and Thomas Schreiner, (3d ed. Crossway, 2016), 228.

The most important finding for this paper is most scholars grant that the prohibition of 1 Tim 2:12 is subject to additional qualifications. If the food prohibitions are an analogous guide, then these additional considerations would argue for treating women in authority roles as a secondary issue. If each woman, or role open to women, mentioned above had some authority over or instructed a man, then the prohibition of 1 Tim 2:12 is subject to several considerations. These numerous considerations would argue for treating this issue as a lower-tier secondary issue on the doctrinal taxonomy.

One further consideration in assessing a secondary issue is what essential issues might limit it. Concern over practicing idolatry limited allowances for eating εἰδωλόθυτα. Do similar concerns limit allowances for women in authority? In other words, if 1 Timothy 2:12 does not communicate an essential doctrine/practice, what essential doctrine (like a prohibition against idolatry) might limit women in authority? Answering this question is often behind many interpretations of 1 Tim 2:12 that theorize a greater essential issue motivates Paul's prohibition. For instance, some egalitarian scholars theorize that prohibiting false teaching is the essential issue underlying all of 1 Timothy, including the prohibition in 2:12.[57] In this interpretation, the women in Ephesus (perhaps influenced by the Artemis cult) were the primary purveyors of the false teaching, which gave rise to the prohibition in 1 Tim 2:12.[58]

In the text itself, Paul points to the created order and the fall as the reasons for the prohibition. Does this raise "male headship" as the essential issue Paul is concerned with? Although I am not familiar with any scholar who explicitly calls male headship an essential doctrine, certain interpretations approach male headship as if it is an essential or high secondary

[57] Westfall, *Paul and Gender*, 298–308; Talbert, *Romans*, 341.

[58] Linda Belleville, "Commentary on 1 Timothy," in *Cornerstone Biblical Commentary:1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews*, (Tyndale House, 2009), 61-3; Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers*, 111–8.

issue.[59] If male headship is the essential issue that Paul has in mind (and I am not arguing it is), then Paul's prohibition in 1 Tim 2:12 would be subordinate to that issue nonetheless. Paul's prohibition in 1 Tim 2:12 would set a boundary so that the doctrine of male headship is not transgressed in Ephesus. Like the prohibition against εἰδωλόθυτα in 1 Corinthians 8–10, there are many contexts where this practice does not cross into the essential issue, and there are some contexts where it does. While many complementarian scholars contend that Paul sets the boundary for male headship at women serving as elders/pastors, Paul may have been drawing a line to protect the idea of male headship within marriage more than within the church. First Timothy 2:12 could be instructing wives not to lead or teach in a way that usurps their husbands' authority within their house church.[60]

Whether male headship is the essential issue being supported by 1 Tim 2:12 or not, an essential doctrine need not be definitively identified for an issue to be considered secondary. If an issue is subordinate to other concerns of any kind, that is evidence that the issue is secondary.[61] In the case of 1 Tim 2:12, the same concerns Paul expressed in the food prohibitions

---

[59] The contributors in "Application: Roundtable Discussion" (*Women in the Church*, 304-308) imply a high importance to "the consistent pattern of male headship and female partnership throughout scripture." They don't go nearly as far as Zachary Garris in "Godly Women Don't Teach or Exercise Authority over Men (1 Timothy 2:9–15)," https://knowingscripture.com/articles/godly-women-dont-teach-or-exercise-authority-over-men-1-timothy-2-9-15 . He states, "Salvation is at stake (2:15), for to rebel against God's commands is no light matter."

[60] Sharon Hodgin Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and Mother Goddess at Ephesus* (University Press, 1991), 157–8; Zamfir, *Men and Women*, 158–9; Andrew D. Clarke, *A Pauline Theology of Church Leadership,* NTS 362 (T&T Clark, 2008), 43–6. The Christian community within a particular city consisted of several house-churches with the head of the household serving as the overseer. Andrew Clark, commenting on the relationship between 1 Tim 2:12 and the elder qualifications of "well thought of by outsiders" and "managing their own household well" (1 Tim 3:4, 7), states, "The requirement of an orderly household is then that a wife should not usurp the position of her husband, just as nobody should usurp the position of the *paterfamilias*. The situation is not envisaged where either a man or woman is addressing a large ecclesiastical context; rather it is a smaller domestic setting in which the head of the household has been appointed as the head of a house-church with the specific responsibility of teaching. . . . Furthermore, there were contexts in which the head of a household was an unmarried woman (perhaps Lydia or Phoebe), and in these instances, she would be expected to teach within her household (Clarke, *Church Leadership*, 154).

[61] These "other concerns" may be essential issues themselves, even if interpreters don't recognize them as such. For instance, Paul probably considered the unity of Jew and Gentile into one people of God as an essential issue – even if this is a neglected doctrine in contemporary protestant circles. Unity within the church and mission to outsiders consistently were Pauline priorities. Michelle Lee-Barnewall (*Neither Complementarian nor Egalitarian*

could be present in the prohibitions against women in authority. Church unity and mission conditioned Paul's ethics concerning food prohibitions and these same concerns most likely fed into his ethics concerning women in authority.

Advancing the gospel mission was one of Paul's highest considerations, so it stands to reason that Paul would recognize or appoint women like Junia, Prisca, and Phoebe to positions of authority in contexts where it advanced the gospel. It also stands to reason that Paul would be willing to limit women's authority roles in a context where it inhibited the spread of the gospel. Paul communicates the priority of preaching the gospel in several places (Rom 15:20; 1 Cor 9:12–23; 2 Cor 10:16; Eph 6:19; 1 Thes 2:2; 2 Tim 4:2). In Philippians, he rejoices that his imprisonment has resulted in a greater proclamation of the gospel, even by people who preach from false motives: "Some indeed preach Christ from envy and rivalry, but others from good will. . . . What then? Only that in every way, whether in pretense or in truth, Christ is proclaimed, and in that I rejoice" (Phil 1:15–18). Some would say that Christ being proclaimed in "every way" would not include a woman giving authoritative instruction in the gospel to a man. However, the evidence shows that Paul subordinates both food prohibitions and prohibitions against women in authority to other considerations like mission, unity, and building others up in the faith. Conversely, if women in authoritative teaching roles is a lower tier secondary issue, we should not be surprised at Paul's willingness to prohibit women from teaching in certain contexts. Whether it is because the women in Ephesus were especially prone to false teaching, or to protect male headship, or because the unity and mission of the house church benefited, Paul was willing to prohibit women in authority because it was a secondary issue. Egalitarian sensibilities may not like the implication that Paul considered women's freedom to teach as a

[Grand Rapids: Baker, 2016]) points out several ways that modern interpreters' concerns do not align with the biblical writers' concerns and emphases.

lower secondary issue, but Paul considered personal freedoms as an avenue to serve Christ and others.[62]

SUMMARY CONCLUSIONS

A big picture examination of Paul's approach to the prohibition against εἰδωλόθυτα described in Acts 15 demonstrates that Paul does not consider it an essential doctrine. In both 1 Corinthians 8–10 and Romans 14–15, Paul places higher importance on other considerations, while acknowledging other related issues (like idolatry) as primary. Paul's approach to the prohibition against εἰδωλόθυτα can inform contemporary interpretive approaches to other biblical prohibitions. If the prohibition is subordinate to other considerations, this is evidence that the issue is secondary. This paper proposes that the more considerations an issue is subordinate to, the lower it should be placed on a doctrinal taxonomy.

This approach was then applied to the prohibition on women teaching or exercising authority over a man (1 Tim 2:12). In Paul's ministry, some roles with authority/teaching over men seemed to be open to women. Paul commends several women who had some authority over or instructed men, which means the prohibition of 1 Tim 2:12 was subordinate to several considerations. Interpreters theorize many plausible essential and other secondary issues that motivated the prohibition of 1 Tim 2:12. Any of them, if accurate, would support this thesis. Moreover, if Paul privileges other considerations over the food prohibitions, one should look for these considerations in Paul's treatment of other matters. Indeed, the issues of unity and mission seem to condition the issue of women having authority and teaching over men.

[62] Doug McPherson & Ben Tertin, "Learning to Love in Faith, Rather than Fight with Power" in *Conflict Management and the Apostle Paul* (Cascade Books, 2018), 52–71.

All these considerations argue for treating women in authority/teaching roles as a lower tier secondary issue. This approach may unsettle both sides of the issue, but perhaps secondary issues should not be so easily settled since new contexts present new considerations.