WTJ 56 (1994) 153-71

THE APOSTLE AMONG THE AMAZONS*

S. M. Baugh

Not long ago, Marcus Barth said in regard to Pauline Ephesus: "The cult of the Great Mother and the Artemis temple stamped this city more than others as a bastion and bulwark of women's rights."[1] Echoes of this speculation have formed the foundation of a popular egalitarian argument that the prohibition of women "teaching and exercising authority over a man" in 1 Tim 2:12 was only designed to correct a radical situation at Ephesus (cf. 1 Tim 1:3).[2] "The gospel [was] struggling in Ephesus with gnostic-influenced women trumpeting a feminist reinterpretation of Adam and Eve as precedent for their own spiritual primacy and authority."[3] In other words, because "the Ephesian women were radical feminists and trying to dominate men,"[4] Paul merely objects to *Ephesian* women teaching and exercising authority.

* Richard Clark Kroeger and Catherine Clark Kroeger, *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1992. 253. $12.95). Some abbreviations used in this review are: *OCD* for *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (ed. N. Hammond and H. Scullard; 2d ed.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1970); *IEph* for the (repertorium) collection of Ephesian inscriptions: *Die Inschriften von Ephesos* (ed. Wankel, Merkelbach, et al.; 8 vols.; Bonn: Rudolf Habelt, 1979-84); *JÖAI* for *Jahreshefte des Österreichischen Archäologischen Institutes in Wien; ZPE* for *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik;* and *New Docs* for the series *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity* (ed. G. H. R. Horsley and S. R. Llewelyn; 6 vols.; Macquarie University, 1981-92). Abbreviations of ancient authors and their works, when used, are those of the *OCD.*

[1] M. Barth, *Ephesians 4-6* (AB 34; 2 vols.; Garden City: Doubleday, 1974) 2.661; see also id., "Traditions in Ephesians," *NTS* 30 (1984) 16.

[2] See, for example, Sharon Hodgin Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers, and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus: A Study of 1 Timothy 2:9-15 in Light of The Religious and Cultural Milieu of The First Century* (Lanham, New York, and London: University Press of America, 1991).

[3] Bruce Barron, "Putting Women in Their Place: 1 Timothy 2 and Evangelical Views of Women in Church Leadership," *JETS* 33 (1990) 451-59. Cf. Kenneth E. Bailey ("Women in/of the New Testament: A Middle Eastern Cultural View" [unpublished study paper, n.d.]): "What kind of female attitudes would have developed in a town centered on a fertility goddess whose worship was exclusively led by women and eunuchs. . . . It does not take too much imagination to fill in the spaces between the lines of I Timothy . . . A group of powerful women appear [sic] to have seized control of the council of elders. . . . The author of I Timothy means, 'I do not permit women in the church to exercise unlimited brutalizing power over men such as happens in the cult of Artemis in Ephesus' " (pp. 17, 19).

[4] John Cooper, *A Cause for Division? Women in Office and the Unity of the Church* (Grand Rapids: Calvin Theological Seminary, 1991) 50.

Up to this point, no one has established historically that there was, in fact, a feminist culture in first-century Ephesus.[5] It has merely been assumed.[6] Enter Richard and Catherine Kroegers' *I Suffer Not a Woman: Rethinking 1 Timothy 2:11-15 in Light of Ancient Evidence.* As the subtitle suggests, the chief purpose of this book is to support the egalitarian restriction of 1 Tim 2:12 to a feminist climate at Ephesus through presentation of a wide range of archaeological and ancient literary material. (Mrs. Kroeger speaks from her twin vantage points as a classicist and founder of an evangelical feminist organization.)[7]

The actual argument of *I Suffer Not a Woman* has many parts; its main lines run as follows. The Kroegers begin from what is now a standard egalitarian assumption that all distinctions between men and women are erased in Christ. When Paul forbade women from exercising the authority of the pastoral and teaching office ("teaching and ruling over a man," 1 Tim 2:12), he was addressing only the Ephesian situation because of its feminist religious culture where women had usurped religious authority over men. Paul's real purpose was only to prevent *Ephesian* women from teaching men. More specifically, he was only forbidding women from teaching

[5] Gritz's *Paul . . . and the Mother Goddess at Ephesus* may appear to be an exception, but her work is flawed by similar methodological problems as *I Suffer Not a Woman.* Gritz fails to use any of the abundant archaeological and epigraphical sources from Ephesus (with very slight exceptions). How else could she have relied so heavily on the mistaken notion that the priestesses of Artemis Ephesia engaged in sacred prostitution (pp. 39-41)? Compare Richard Oster, "The Ephesian Artemis as an Opponent of Early Christianity," *JAC* 19 (1976) 24-44, esp. p. 28, where he points to ancient evidence for "the sexual purity of the priests of Artemis, and the absolute exclusion of prostitutes from the temple of Artemis." The priestesses of Artemis of the Imperial era were maiden daughters of the Ephesian elite or wealthy matrons known to have husbands and children, for example: Stertinia Marena (*IEph* 411; 4123), Claudia Trophime (*IEph* 508), Hordeonia Pulchra (*IEph* 984; see *IEph* 20 for her famous father), Hordeonia Paulina (*IEph* 981; see *IEph* 690 for her son), Auphidia Quintilia (*IEph* 637 who honored her husband), Claudia Crateia Veriane (*IEph* 980), Vipsania Olympias (*IEph* 987), Ulpia Euodia Mudiane (*IEph* 989), and many others. Plutarch likened the priestesses of Artemis to the vestal virgins of Rome (*An seni respublica gerenda sit* 24 [795d-e]; cf. *IEph* 990). They were not sacred prostitutes! (The Kroegers also refer to sacred prostitution as "widely practiced in the temples of Asia Minor" [p. 98]; this too is mistaken for the NT era.) Even Gritz's title begs an important question: was Artemis Ephesia truly a Mother Goddess? See below.

[6] The worship of a female goddess, even a fertility goddess, does not *ipso facto* imply a feminist culture as Barth and others assume. Did the worship of Astarte create a feminist culture in Old Testament Israel or her neighbors? Athene was the chief deity in Athens, but no historian would dream of describing Athenian culture as feministic, where a woman's greatest fame was "to be least talked about by men" (Thucydides 2.44). Cf. *Women's Life in Greece and Rome: A Source Book in Translation* (ed. M. Lefkowitz and M. Fant; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1982) 12-20; Eva Cantarella, *Pandora's Daughters: The Role and Status of Women in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins, 1987); David Cohen, "Seclusion, Separation, and the Status of Women in Classical Athens," *Greece and Rome* 36 (1989) 3-15.

[7] See also C. C. Kroeger, "1 Timothy 2:12—A Classicist's View," in *Women, Authority and the Bible* (ed. A. Mickelsen; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1986) 225-44.

a particular gnostic notion concerning Eve.[8] They conclude in light of this scenario that women should be ordained to pastoral ministry.

There are already reviews of *I Suffer Not a Woman* which subject the book's handling of the Bible and its speculations on gnosticism to searching criticism.[9] Therefore, this essay will not cover the same ground (with one exception). Instead, I will concentrate upon the Kroegers' attempt to substantiate matriarchy at ancient Ephesus, since the cultural and religious background is less familiar to NT students and has not received specialized investigation in this connection to date.[10]

In my opinion, the Kroegers (and others mentioned above) have painted a picture of Ephesus which wanders widely from the facts. Yet because the Kroegers cite a number of ancient authors, their portrait of Ephesus and of the cult of Artemis Ephesia may appear to be more plausible than it actually is. One must recognize, though, that their portrayal of Ephesus is inspired by an eccentric reading of 1 Tim 2:12. In order to illustrate this point, let us look briefly at their treatment of this key passage.

In general, the Kroegers show a tendency to interpret biblical passages idiosyncratically without offering defense for their understanding.[11] Their interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12 is defended, but it is confused and confusing

[8] "In this book, we shall suggest that 1 Timothy 2:11–15 is not a decree of timeless and universal restriction and punishment but a corrective: a specific direction as to what women should not teach and why" (p. 23). That Paul grounds his teaching upon the created order (1 Tim 2:13; cf. 1 Cor 11:8–9) rather than upon a post-lapsus "punishment" does not enter into the authors' consideration.

[9] For example, Albert Wolters' review in *Calvin Theological Journal* 28 (1993) 208–13; and Robert Yarbrough, "I SUFFER NOT A WOMAN: A Review Essay," *Presbyterion* 18 (1992) 25–33.

[10] I am preparing a more technical discussion of Ephesian society and its mythical gynecocracy for a different forum: "A Foreign World: Ephesus in the First Century," in *Women and the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:11–15 in Its Literary, Cultural, and Theological Contexts* (ed. S. Baldwin, A. Köstenberger, and T. Schreiner; Grand Rapids: Baker, forthcoming).

[11] For example, they cite Tit 2:3 as evidence of "female elders" (p. 91) who taught men in the NT church (p. 81), but these are clearly "older women" (versus "older men," v. 2) who are to disciple "younger women" "to be homemakers, kind, subject to their own husbands" (Tit 2:5). And they take 1 Tim 5:5–10 as referring to women "who are to be enrolled as members of the clergy" (p. 91), although this list clearly refers to financial support in context (5:16; cf. Jas 1:27; Acts 6:1). And does Timothy's instruction in the faith by his mother and grandmother really act as warrant for ordination to the pastoral office (p. 17)?

The Kroegers follow a familiar egalitarian line by taking Phoebe as an example of an ordained "overseer" in the NT church (p. 17). But if the term προστάτις in Rom 16:2 refers to the office of elder or pastor, Paul would be saying that Phoebe exercised spiritual rule over himself as well: "she was προστάτις of many even of myself also." Perhaps to avoid this problem, but still to retain Phoebe as an example of a female overseer, the Kroegers resort to what can only be called a desperate translation of Rom. 16:2: "For she has been appointed, actually by my own action, an officer presiding over many." But there is no grammatical defense for taking the genitive "of myself also" as expressing agency: "by my own action." The preposition ὑπό is required at least.

at best. Their translation is: "I do not allow a woman to teach nor to proclaim herself author of man but she is to be in conformity (with the Scriptures) (or that she keeps it a secret)" (pp. 103, 189, et al.). In the discussion that follows, we will focus upon their interpretation of the first two infinitive clauses.[12]

In the authors' rendering and interpretation, the lead verb "I do not allow" has two parallel, infinitive complements: "to teach" and "to proclaim herself author of." The authors clearly wish to *interpret* the second infinitive as indirect discourse (pp. 37, 190–92, et al.), even though their translation expresses it as a complement. If the second infinitive functions as indirect statement, the rendering would be: "I do not allow a woman to teach *that* she is the originator of man" (p. 191; emphasis added), which ignores the conjunction οὐδέ. Although they confuse the reader at this point, the authors seem to recognize that the Greek does not allow taking the second infinitive as indirect discourse after all,[13] yet they adopt this interpretation anyway: "We can understand the content of the forbidden teaching as being the notion that woman was responsible for the creation of man" (p. 103).[14]

The Kroegers claim justification for their interpretation of 1 Tim 2:12 by taking αὐθεντεῖν as an act of speech: "to *proclaim* oneself author of," a highly questionable meaning for this verb at best.[15] (And it does *not* function

[12] The Greek of 1 Tim 2:12 has one main verb ("I do not allow") with three infinitive complements; it woodenly reads: "I do not allow a woman to be engaged in teaching nor (do I allow her) to be exercising authority over a man, but (I command her) to be in silence" (cf. NIV "she must be silent"). The Kroegers' eccentric translation of the last infinitive clause misfires in both options they give: (1) "in conformity (to the Scriptures)" for the phrase ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ, "in silence" or "quietly," is forced at best, and (2) to take the infinitive "to be" as the content of the teaching ("but I do not allow a woman to teach . . . that she keep it a secret") ignores the adversative conjunction and makes the clause unintelligible.

[13] To take the second infinitive as indirect discourse would require taking the third infinitive in the same way, yielding nonsense: "I do not allow a woman to teach that she is the originator of man but (to teach) that she should be silent." The οὐ . . . οὐδέ series has two meanings: (1) to mark a parallel statement: "For we did *not* bring anything into the world, *neither* can we take anything out of it" (1 Tim 6:7; cf. 6:17–18; 1 Cor 15:13, 16; Gal 1:12; Phil 2:16; etc.); and (2) to mark the negation of a concession: "There is *no* righteous person, *not even one*" (Rom 3:10; cf. 8:7). (The notion that "*oude* indicates that *authentein* explains what sort, or what manner, of teaching is prohibited" [p. 84] is never this word's semantic function.) It is easier to see how clear Paul's point is—not the Kroegers'—if we put 1 Tim 2:12 positively: "I allow a woman to teach *and* to exercise authority" or "I allow a woman to teach, *even* to exercise authority" (cf. analogous Matt 8:21; Mark 10:4; 1 Tim 2:4; 5:4; 5:14; Tit 3:1–2; etc.). See esp. 1 Cor 14:34 for a syntactically and lexically close parallel to 1 Tim 2:12.

[14] "Bearing in mind that *oude* can introduce an infinitive of indirect discourse. . . . The word *didaskein* (to teach) is frequently accompanied by an infinitive which defines what was taught" (p. 191). And see the anecdote on pp. 37–38.

[15] I will defer analysis of this much-discussed verb to what should prove to be the definitive treatment: Scott Baldwin's contribution in *Women and the Church* (forthcoming); cf. L. E. Wilshire, "1 Timothy 2:12 Revisited: A Reply to Paul W. Barnett and Timothy J. Harris," *EQ* 65 (1993) 43–55 for bibliography in the meantime.

as indirect discourse with this meaning!) But what is most interesting in the authors' philological treatment is that they come up with a classic case of "illegitimate totality transfer," which becomes programmatic for their historical investigation: "*Authentes* and *authentein* sometimes occur in contexts in which both sex and murder are present" (p. 95). "Possibly [Paul] wished to evoke more than one image [with *authentein*]" (p. 79). "It is strange indeed that our target verse should include a pivotal word which has implications of killing, beginning, and copulating, as these all were elements of the mystery religions practiced in Asia Minor" (p. 87).

I Suffer Not a Woman is filled with efforts to find "sex reversal," "female dominance," and "sex and death" motifs in Ephesian society, because the Kroegers believe that, in the end, all these things are implied in Paul's prohibition that women should not αὐθεντεῖν. It is no wonder that L. E. Wilshire, even though he shares the egalitarian outlook, says: "This is a breathtaking extension into (pre-) Gnostic content yet an interpretation I do not find supported either by the totality of their own extensive philological study, by the NT context, or by the immediate usages of the word *authenteo* and its variants."[16]

If a sympathetic reader is not convinced by the Kroegers' interpretations, one may wonder why further discussion of their book is necessary. May we not quietly consign it to the curiosity shop, expecting it to find its way eventually to the bookshelf of some restaurant? I think not, because of Wilshire's further remarks on *I Suffer Not a Woman:* "Its finest sections are those analyzing the culture of Ephesus and Asia Minor along with the pagan literature and religions of the first-century era. The appendices on ritual murder, grammar, ancient novels, and the Gnostic use of sex are extremely valuable."[17] Since others may share Wilshire's high estimation of this book's value as a guide to Ephesian culture, presentation of more facts in this area is warranted, especially if Richard Oster is right about "the neglect of ancient Ephesus in current New Testament scholarship."[18] The present review will show that a different picture of Ephesian society than found in *I Suffer Not a Woman* is more credible.

[16] "Revisited," 54. Wilshire observes that his earlier study on αὐθεντεῖν (*NTS* 34 [1988] 120–34) is missing in the Kroegers' book, although it is normally cited in discussions of this verb. "The omission," he says, "would seem to be deliberate" (p. 53).

[17] Wilshire, "Revisited," 54.

[18] Oster, *A Bibliography of Ancient Ephesus* (ATLABS 19; Metuchen and London: Scarecrow, 1987) xxii. Greg Horsley's recent survey was designed to be "consciousness-raising" for NT scholars: "The Inscriptions of Ephesus and the New Testament," *NovT* 34 (1992) 105–68. More limited in scope is Peter Lampe, "Acta 19 im Spiegel der ephesischen Inschriften," *BZ* 36 (1992) 59–76. For my work relating to Ephesus, see "Paul and Ephesus: The Apostle among His Contemporaries" (Ph.D. diss., University of California, Irvine, 1990); "Phraseology and the Reliability of Acts," *NTS* 36 (1990) 290–94; and " 'Savior of All People': 1 Tim 4:10 in Context," *WTJ* 54 (1992) 331–40.

There are a few indications in the NT itself that Ephesus was a typically Hellenistic culture in regard to female roles in family and society. For instance, we have no direct evidence that women taught in any official or public capacity at Ephesus.[19] In line with this, the false teachers mentioned in the pastorals are said to be men "who worm their way into homes and gain control over weak-willed women" (2 Tim 3:6, NIV; cf. 1 Tim 1:6-11). And Ephesian women do not appear as the sophists, rhetors, teachers, philosophers, or their disciples in our ancient sources, whereas several men do.[20]

Furthermore, the evidence of Acts hints that men took a leading role in economic, civil, and religious affairs at Ephesus; no Ephesian women are mentioned in these connections. Demetrius the silversmith and his guild (whom he addresses as ἄνδρες, "men") were in the marketplace deriving a lucrative profit from the Artemisium tourist trade (Acts 19:24-27). Luke also mentions the (male) Asiarchs who were members of the premier social circles in the province of Asia (Acts 19:31).[21]

When we look further into Acts 19, we find hints of male involvement in Ephesian religious affairs. It was the Secretary of the People (γραμματεύς), certainly a man,[22] who defused the excited mob in the theater by defending the goddess' honor (Acts 19:35-40). The Secretary mentions that Ephesus itself was "νεωκόρος of the great goddess" (Acts 19:35). This term, νεωκόρος, is frequently used for the individual or group charged with the oversight of a cult.[23] Since women were not citizens of Greek

[19] Public involvement of women in Roman society is sometimes interpreted as evidence for a more "egalitarian attitude" than was found in Greek cities (Gritz, *Paul, Women Teachers,* 16); but compare Tacitus' nasty remarks about Agrippina's public appearances (*Ann.* 12.37). Regarding Roman women and their intellectual pursuits, one cannot help recalling Calpurnia, Pliny the Younger's wife, who did listen to his public recitals—discreetly behind a curtain (*Ep.* 4.19). Compare Ramsay MacMullen, "Woman in Public in the Roman Empire," *Historia* 29 (1980) 208-18.

[20] Examples of male sophists, rhetors, etc. are T. Flavius Damianus (*IEph* 672a-b, 676a, 678a, 735, 811, 2100, 3029, 3051, 3080-81; *VS* 2.23); P. Hordeonius Lollianus (*IEph* 20 and 984; *VS* 1.23); Tib. Claudius Flavianus Dionysius (*IEph* 426 and 3047; *VS* 1.22); Soterus the "Chief Sophist" (*IEph* 1548; *VS* 2.23); Hadrianus of Tyre (*IEph* 1539); L. Vevius Severus (*IEph* 611); [-ius] Secundinus of Tralles (*IEph* 4340); and Ofellius Laetus (*IEph* 3901). Ephesus was "a center of philosophical and rhetorical studies" (*VS* 8.8; also Tacitus, *Dial.* 15.3); cf. Knibbe and Iplikçioglu, "Neue Inschriften aus Ephesos VIII," *JÖAI* 53 (1981/82) 136-40 and 149-50.

[21] See still Baugh, "Paul and Ephesus" (esp. chap. 6, "Paul and the Asiarchs") despite the continuing debate over identification of the Asiarchate with the provincial high priesthood (e.g., Kearsley in *New Docs* 4, pp. 46-55). My point—that the Asiarchs were the social elite at Ephesus—is not affected by this debate.

[22] Perhaps this was Alexander Memnon, son of Artemidorus (*IEph* 261), who served as γραμματεύς in the mid-first century AD.

[23] An inscription identifying Ephesus as "the νεωκόρος of Artemis" is often mentioned in Acts commentaries; for instance, Foakes Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, *The Beginnings of Christianity: The Acts of the Apostles* (London: MacMillan, 1933) 4.250; cf. Colin Hemer, *The Book of Acts in the Setting of Hellenistic History* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1989) 122.

πόλεις like Ephesus,[24] it was the male citizen body of Ephesus—acting through its municipal officers, the γραμματεύς and the all-male βουλή ("State Council")—who claimed the oversight of the cult of Artemis Ephesia. We can safely infer from this slight NT evidence alone that religious affairs at Ephesus were not exclusively in the hands of women as the authors of *I Suffer Not a Woman* allege.

Turning to the Kroegers' main thesis, we might mistakenly think that they hope to establish that Ephesian society *in toto* was "a *society* that looked upon the feminine as primal source" (p. 105; emphasis added). They say that "for millennia the matriarchal goddesses reigned supreme" and that "the maternal aspect was glorified in a manner almost unknown farther west" (p. 50). Hence, this "divine maternal principle" was "the concept underlying *the political, economic, and social existence of Ephesus*" (p. 57; emphasis added). This certainly is the force of Marcus Barth's and others' understanding noted above.

Yet, conversely, the Kroegers also say quite explicitly that Ephesus was *not* a "matriarchal" society! "Nevertheless there is no evidence that women took an ascendant role over the men in civil life" (p. 92).

> Modern scholarship tends to find that female dominance is not attested in the civil affairs of western Asia Minor, and that matriarchy can be found with certainty only in the religious realm of Bronze Age Crete.[25] Nevertheless the tradition of a religiously-based rule of men by women is incontestable. . . . The Lycians were said to have been ruled by women from ancient times. They claimed descent through their mothers, honored women more than men, and bestowed the inheritance on daughters rather than sons. [Pp. 193–94][26]

[24] Notice that the Secretary addressed the mob as the ἐκκλησία of male citizens: ἄνδρες Ἐφέσιοι, "Men, Ephesians" (Acts 19:35, 39). In this connection, Gal 3:28–29 is all the more revolutionary, but as a reference to legal and political standing touching one's own right of inheritance; it cannot be pressed for implications on church office.

[25] To support matriarchy in Minoan Crete, the Kroegers cite two articles by Simon Pembroke despite the fact that Pembroke refutes this notion (p. 240 n. 7). "As Simon Pembroke has shown, there is no evidence whatever for the existence of matriarchal societies in the ancient world" (Mary Lefkowitz, "Influential Women," in *Images of Women in Antiquity* [ed. A. Cameron and A. Kuhrt; Detroit: Wayne State, 1983] 49). See Pembroke, "Last of the Matriarchs: A Study in the Inscriptions of Lycia," *Journal of Economic and Social History of the Orient* 8 (1965) 217–47; and id., "Women in Charge: The Function of Alternatives in Early Greek Tradition and the Ancient Idea of Matriarchy," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institute* 30 (1967) 1–35. For other denials of matriarchy in Minoan civilization see, for example, Stella Georgoudi, "Creating a Myth of Matriarchy," in *A History of Women in the West* (ed. P. Pantel; Cambridge, MA: Belknap/Harvard University Press, 1992) 1.460; and Cantarella, *Pandora's Daughters*, 14–15.

[26] Does the last statement seem self-contradictory? They say there was no matriarchy except in Minoan Crete (ca. 3000–1500 BC), but the Lycians (south central Asia Minor) had "rule by women."

The Kroegers are trying to establish a careful distinction despite their hazy statements about "Ephesus' strong emphasis on *the maternal principle*" (p. 55; emphasis added).[27] They are aware that historians are unanimous: there were no matriarchal (or gynecocratic) societies in antiquity. So, in order to establish their thesis about the background and interpretation of 1 Tim 2:9–15, they need some type of matriarchy at Ephesus. The answer? Although women were not dominant in *civil* affairs, they say: "Religious affairs were significantly different . . . within its (Asia Minor's) temple systems and especially in the mysteries, matriarchy prevailed" (p. 92). Hence, they would have us believe that "Ephesus stood as a bastion of feminine supremacy *in religion*" (p. 54; emphasis added).

Now, the notion that any ancient culture could maintain a matriarchy only in the religious sphere but not in the social-civic spheres of life betrays an astonishing innocence of how ancient societies worked. It is a commonplace in the study of antiquity that all areas of life were interconnected, evidenced in that "a magistrate was usually a priest as a part of his official functions" in Hellenic cities.[28] To separate these spheres of existence and to assert patriarchy or something similar in the civil sphere and matriarchy in the religious sphere is *prima facie* implausible. Accordingly, we must look carefully at the arguments the Kroegers advance to support their novel idea.

Our authors' argumentation is quite complicated actually, so I will try to reproduce its main points in this simpler form:

Premise 1: first-century worship of Artemis Ephesia embodied an ancient Anatolian sex-reversal principle. Hence, Pauline Ephesus may be characterized as the "bastion of a strongly developed theological system" (p. 58) of female dominance in religion ("matriarchy").

Evidence A: The Anatolian religious situation was begun by the Amazons (mythical gynecocrats) and preserved in their myths (pp. 47, 52, 93, 193–96).

Evidence B: There is a myth that Hercules was forced into submission to Lydian women as one of his labors (pp. 194–95).

Evidence C: Herodotus mentions matrilinearity in fifth-century BC Lycia (pp. 109, 194).[29]

[27] The Kroegers fail to distinguish *gynecocracy* (actual rule of women), *matriarchy* (priority or rule of mothers), *matrilinearity* (tracing descent through one's mother), and *feminism* (an ideology and a modern movement). All gets mixed up as this vague "maternal principle" and what not. These distinctions are rightly insisted upon by Pembroke ("Women in Charge," 1).

[28] "Priests," *OCD;* cf. Burkert, *Greek Religion* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1985) 95–98.

[29] It is never made clear how this piece of evidence relates directly to the Kroegers' argument, but I am guessing that it has something to do with their idea that "Lydian women appear to have been especially active in the cult of the Ephesian Artemis" (p. 70; cf. pp. 193–94). Of course, one may ask for evidence of specifically "Lydian women" in the first-century AD Artemis cult. The Kroegers present references to "Lydian maidens" dancing in honor of Artemis Ephesia from two Athenian comic poets writing from 450 to 500 years

Evidence D: It is assumed that Artemis was syncretized to the Anatolian Great Mother and given the nature of a fertility goddess (pp. 50–54).

Evidence E: Eunuch priests and hermaphrodites were part of Artemis Ephesia's entourage according to the authors (p. 196).

Evidence F: Women had greater religious status at Ephesus as "principal mediators of the gods" (p. 71; see pp. 70–74). In line with this, Artemis' "high priest" (a misnomer) was replaced by a "high priestess" (another misnomer) in the first century AD (pp. 71, 89, 196).

Evidence G: "Sex and death" is a theme of second or third-century AD novels set in Ephesus (Appendix 4, pp. 197–202).

Premise 2: Gnostic teaching on the reversal of the role of Eve in creation was popular in Pauline Ephesus.[30]

Conclusion: 1 Tim 2:9–15 is merely countering this theological matrix of the Artemis cult and gnosticism combined: "In 1 Timothy 2:5–15 [sic] Paul addresses the notion that women were necessary to communicate ultimate truth. He is as well combatting the willingness of women to assume that they had a monopoly on the divine enlightenment" (p. 73). "We suggest that the writer of the Pastorals was opposing a doctrine which acclaimed motherhood as the ultimate reality" (p. 112).[31]

It is difficult to imagine how such a momentous conclusion could have been erected upon such fragile, tottering evidence. And what is more egregious than the Kroegers' reliance upon such implausible information is the

earlier! (Lydia back then was still remembered as the kingdom of the legendary Croesus, but that was all ancient history by NT times.) How anachronistic poetic references to Lydian dancing girls connect another anachronistic reference to Lycian matrilinearity is a mystery (Lydia and Lycia were separate regions of Asia Minor). And how this all relates to thoroughly Hellenistic-Roman Ephesus of the first century AD (which was in the region of *Ionia*) is an even graver mystery.

[30] The gnostic question is not addressed in this review, yet I might note in passing that the Kroegers' historical method in their search for gnosticism at Pauline Ephesus leaves much to be desired. For example, in chap. 15, "The Veneration of the Serpent and Eve," they use representations of snakes found at Ephesus as partial support for the presence of gnosticism there. But the snake was a very *widespread* religious symbol in the pagan world, as the Kroegers observe (p. 161). These Ephesian snakes, if they were truly religious symbols, could very well have represented Greek household deities or the equivalent Roman *lares* from the home of a Latin merchant living at Ephesus (e.g., "*qui in statario* [the slave-market] *negotiantur*," *IEph* 646 and 3025). More likely, they stood for the god of healing, Asclepius. Ephesus possessed a well-known medical college whose chief-doctor (ἀρχιατρός) also served as priest to Asclepius (cf. snakes on modern medical symbols). As an interesting sidelight, one of these chief-doctors was Jewish (*IEph* 1677). A snake symbol is unlikely to indicate the presence of gnosticism without solid, corroborating evidence.

[31] "Such a pagan element, based upon sex hostility and reversal of gender roles, may well have found a place in a cult practice among the dissidents in the congregation at Ephesus. The apostle who taught that in Jesus there is neither male nor female would surely have condemned it. If this is the case, the condemnation [i.e., 1 Tim 2:12] is not directed against women participating in leadership but rather against a monopoly on religious power by women. Such a monopolistic attitude in the church is wrong, whether arrogated to themselves by men or women" (p. 93).

fact that among their "enormous amount of supplemental material" (p. 14) they virtually ignore a vast body of evidence of a historically much more reliable and relevant quality: the approximately 4,000 Ephesian inscriptions and the burgeoning secondary literature surrounding them.[32]

Furthermore, evidence from materials they do utilize but which contradicts the authors' position often goes unmentioned by them. For instance, the second-century novel by Achilles Tatius is discussed by the Kroegers in Appendix 4 (pp. 200–202). It challenges the authors' theses in three ways. (1) A male priest appears as the head of the Artemisium at Ephesus and no priestess appears in the novel; however, this fact goes unnoticed in place of some (fanciful) interpretations of "sex and death" motifs. (2) Artemis Ephesia herself is presented in this novel as the classic Greek "goddess of purity" and "the Virgin," yet this does not detour the authors from taking her as a fertility goddess dedicated to "sex-reversal." (3) Tatius writes: "From ancient days this temple [the Artemisium] had been forbidden to free women who were not virgins. Only men and virgins were permitted here. If a non-virgin woman passed inside, the penalty was death."[33] If non-virgins (e.g., mothers) were specifically barred from access to Artemis Ephesia's temple, it would seem to undermine the idea that "within [Asia Minor's—including Ephesus'] temple systems and especially in the mysteries, *matriarchy* prevailed" (p. 92; emphasis added).

As one can now guess, I believe that each piece of evidence noted above (Evidence A-G) is open to the gravest of doubts. But rather than give a detailed response to each point *seriatim*—which would tax the reader's patience beyond limits—let me respond in a general way and then take up specific points in varying degrees of detail.

[32] For a recent bibliography on Ephesus see Oster, *Bibliography.* The inscriptions were collected and published from 1979 to 1984 in the "*IEph*" volumes. Newer inscriptions are periodically published by Dieter Knibbe et al. in *JÖAI.* Discussion of Ephesian material occupies much of *New Docs* volumes 4 through 6 and occurs frequently in *ZPE* and in the newer *Epigraphia Anatolica.* Some Ephesian inscriptions can be found in English translation, for example, Naphtali Lewis, *Greek Historical Documents: The Roman Principate: 27 BC—285 AD* (Toronto: Hakkert, 1974) passim. Only two inscriptions are actually quoted (pp. 52 and 89 [repeated on p. 202]) and the following statement is made: "By the first century CE, it appears from inscriptional evidence that the function of the male high priest had been supplanted by that of the high priestess. Two inscriptions tell of the performance of the mysteries in the cult of Artemis by a priestess, but we know of none in which the officiant is a male" (p. 89). Since identification of these inscriptions is not provided, it is difficult to know exactly what they are talking about; there was neither a "*high* priest" nor a "*high* priestess" of Artemis (see below). As for their latter statement, it is true that "fulfilled the mysteries" is used by priestesses of Artemis (on more than two inscriptions), but it is not true that officiants were all female when one considers the male κουρῆτες et al. (see below). The famous Salutaris inscription from Ephesus provided endowments to various civil and religious officials to defray the cost of their participation in the annual festival of Artemis. See the full analysis of this inscription by Guy M. Rogers, *The Sacred Identity of Ephesos* (London and New York: Routledge, 1991).

[33] Tatius, "Leucippe and Clitophon," in *Collected Ancient Greek Novels* (trans. J. Winkler; ed. B. P. Reardon; Berkeley: University of California, 1989) 267.

Please observe, first, how few genuinely historical facts support the Kroegers' elaborate argument: Artemis the Virgin's worshippers lifting their skirts in worship as part of fertility rites (pp. 74-75)? This is at best sheer imagination, when, in fact, Artemis' female devotees prided themselves on their modest piety. Take Laevia Paula, for example, who died a few decades before Paul was in Ephesus. She was the wife of M. Antonius Albus, "the patron [προστάτης] of the temple of Artemis" (*IEph* 614c)—notice again male involvement in the cult. At Laevia's funeral a herald proclaimed: "The Council and People crown Laevia Paula daughter of Lucius, who lived a modest and decorous life" (*IEph* 614b).[34]

Note also the Kroegers' heavy reliance upon mythology as historical sources. Amazons?[35] Hercules? (Evidence A-B). Were we to analyze modern American society, would we rely on myths of Paul Bunyan and his blue ox Babe or on tales of Johnny Appleseed? Certainly the ancients did not all take their myths very seriously: "The bards tell many lies" was proverbial by Plutarch's day (ca. AD 50-120).[36]

Other evidence for matriarchy adduced by the Kroegers is wildly anachronistic, and some is historically unreliable even for its own day. For instance, they rely upon Herodotus (fifth century BC; pp. 109, 194); Autocrates (fourth century BC; p. 70); and Aristophanes (fifth century BC; pp. 70-71). Let us look briefly, for example, at the evidence from Herodotus (Evidence C).

A Greek man would normally state his full name as "So-and-so, son of So-and-so" (his father).[37] But, says Herodotus, a Lycian "will say that he is the son of such a mother, and recount the mothers of his mother" (1.173; LCL). Now, let us accept the veracity of Herodotus' remark for the moment.[38] How is this statement relevant? Tracing lineage through one's

[34] The phrase "modest and decorous life" is σωφρόνα καὶ κόσμιον . . . βίον, reminiscent of 1 Tim 2:9: σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς, "to adorn themselves with modesty."

[35] Scholars today see the Amazon myths not as an indication of ancient gynecocratic ideology, but rather as an attempt "to indicate how bad things could be when women got the upper hand" (Lefkowitz, "Influential Women," 49). Cf. "Amazons" in *OCD;* Lorna Hardwick, "Ancient Amazons—Heroes, Outsiders or Women?" *Greece and Rome* 37 (1990) 14-36.

[36] *Quomodo adul.* 16A. Plato, similarly, would censor the poets' myths in his ideal πόλις (*Resp.* 376e-378e).

[37] A quote from Aristophanes, *Thesm.* 622. Greek women, likewise, would give their lineage from their fathers (or their husbands); e.g., Artemoi (daughter of) Artemidorus (*IEph* 3031; AD 4-14). The Roman practice is similar: "C. Iulius C. f. Caesar" means "Gaius Julius Caesar son of Gaius" and "Claudia C. f. Secunda" means "Claudia the Second daughter of Gaius." Cf. "Names, Personal" in *OCD;* Arthur E. Gordon, *Illustrated Introduction to Latin Epigraphy* (Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London: University of California, 1983) 17-30; and Colin Hemer, "The Name of Paul," *TynBul* 36 (1985) 179-83.

[38] Simon Pembroke (whom the Kroegers cite [p. 240, n. 7]) casts doubts on the accuracy of Herodotus' statement. Some Lycian men list their father's name, their mother's name, and even their uncle's name. Pembroke explains the instances where a mother's name was used as remarriage situations, illegitimacy, adoption, or fosterage ("Last of the Matriarchs," passim). As for Herodotus, Pembroke concludes: "What the Greeks knew about their past, and about their neighbors turns out to be very little" ("Women in Charge," 35). Nevertheless, the

mother does not itself prove *matriarchy.* But more critically, how can Herodotus' distant statement carry any weight in light of all the abundant names on first-century AD Ephesian inscriptions that conclusively demonstrate that Ephesians listed their father's name, not their mother's?[39] Herodotus' statement is not only anachronistic and irrelevant, but goes contrary to more germane, lavish evidence.

The Kroegers' argument relies heavily on two key points: (1) that Artemis Ephesia was a manifestation of the Anatolian mother goddess; and (2) that fertility practices and ideologies were therefore connected to Artemis' cult (Evidence D). Both of these crucial questions are begged by the Kroegers, and both are most implausible for Artemis the Unbroken Virgin.[40] Although she may have originated from the Anatolian Great Mother in pre-Hellenic times, the identification of Artemis Ephesia with the Great Mother *in historical times* is most unlikely according to Richard Oster, a specialist in this area. He writes:

> The nature and essence of the cult of Artemis was open, as all religions are, to change and flux. Even if the eunuch priests known as Megabyzi [who disappeared after the first century BC] suggest fertility rites similar to the Mother Goddess of Asia Minor, it is necessary to remember that *this part of the cult vanished in the period*

Kroegers take Herodotus as reliable evidence of Lycian matriarchy somehow relevant for NT Ephesus (which had no direct ties to Lycia anyway—it was in Ionia).

[39] For instance, evidence from *New Docs* 4 (pp. 7, 74–82, 127) shows only patronymics: T. Aelius Marcianus Priscus son of Aelius Priscus, who was "the leader of the festival (in honor of Artemis) and president of the athletic games" (Horsley's translation); Heliodoros son of Philippos and grandson of Philippos, a sacred official of Artemis (νεοποιός); and Claudia daughter of Erotion. Since the Kroegers quote from Horsley's volume (p. 52 [224 n. 5]), one would expect this evidence to enter into their discussion; it does not. More example names, from the hundreds possible, come from the fishery customs-office inscription (*IEph* 20; AD 54–59). There are 88 legible names of whom 44 have Roman and 44 have Greek names. Of the men with Greek names, 27 clearly give their filiation from their father (e.g., Heraclides son of Heraclides son of Heraclides), 16 give no filiation (e.g., Didymus Theuda), and the rest are too fragmentary to be of help. But no Greek (or Roman) gives his mother's name in his lineage. (See Baugh, "Paul and Ephesus," Appendix Two; and Horsley, *New Docs* 5, pp. 95–114, who reads 89 names.)

[40] Homer, *Od.* 6.109 (as cited by Burkert, *Greek Religion,* 150). For Artemis of Ephesia as "the Virgin," see Oster, "Opponent," 28; see also the statue of a classically Hellenic Artemis found in an Ephesian home (A. Bammer et al., *Führer durch das archäologische Museum in Selçuk-Ephesos* [Vienna: Österreichisches Archäologisches Institut, 1974] photo no. 9). We should not interpret the other, very oriental statues of Artemis Ephesia too hastily. As Stella Georgoudi warns in connection with Minoan Crete: "To deduce the existence of a matriarchal society from such images in the absence of related myths, to write history on the basis of iconographic sources alone, is a risky business that can lead only to the most dubious conclusions" ("Myth of Matriarchy," 460). The "breasts" on these statues were probably some kind of ornamentation. After careful study, Robert Fleischer concludes, "Bezüglich der Bedeutung der 'Brüste' scheint es auch heute noch nicht möglich, über Spekulationen hinauszukommen" (*Artemis von Ephesos und Verwandte Kultstatuen aus Anatolien und Syrien* [Leiden: Brill, 1973] 87; see esp. plates 58 and 138–41 for similar ornaments on Zeus [!] and Cybele).

of the early Roman Empire. . . . A final argument against a fertility interpretation of the goddess in the Roman Empire is the deafening silence from all the primary sources. None of the extant myths point in this direction, neither do the significant epithets of the goddess.[41]

If the Kroegers' argument is based upon shaky interpretations of doubtful evidence so far, we should also point out the outright errors of fact (Evidence E). For example, we have the following statement of evidence: "The inclusion of castrated priests and hermaphrodites in the official retinue of the Ephesian Artemis further suggests the presence of sex reversal. The assumption of ultimate power in the cult by a high priestess rather than a high priest again indicates that the primary religious power lay with women by the first century CE" (p. 196).[42]

First, the Kroegers have derived these "castrated priests and hermaphrodites" from the well-known "Megabyzus," a eunuch priest who served as head of a hierarchy of maiden priestesses according to Strabo (*Geog.* 14.1.23). But our evidence indicates that this priesthood was discontinued toward the end of the first century BC.[43] Not only have the Kroegers multiplied this one eunuch into many (and invented hermaphrodites!), but they tacitly affirm that this priesthood was discontinued—the Megabyzus was the only discontinued Ephesian priesthood of which I know—and was replaced by a "high priestess." This fact, therefore, cannot support their argument for "sex reversal" in Pauline Ephesus. If anything, the formerly Persian character of Artemis' retinue was being conformed to traditional Graeco-Roman standards by this time.

Similarly, the replacement of a eunuch priest by a "high priestess"[44] by

[41] Oster, "Ephesus as a Religious Center under the Principate, I. Paganism before Constantine," *ANRW* 2.18.3 (1990) 1725–26 (emphasis added); see also his "Opponent," 28; and "Artemis" in *OCD*. Note that the Great Mother had a separate cult at Ephesus into the Roman era: Oster, "Ephesus as a Religious Center," 1687–88; and Dieter Knibbe, "Ephesos—nicht nur die Stadt der Artemis: die 'anderen' ephesischen Götter," in *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens* (ed. S. Sahin, E. Schwartheim, and J. Wagner; 2 vols.; Leiden: Brill, 1978) 2.490–91. For related chthonic cults, see, for example, *IEph* 902 (26–19 BC) which mentions "Isidorus son of Apollonis son of Apollonis, the priest of Fruitful Earth" (καρποφόρος γῆ).

[42] "By the first century CE the high priestess had replaced the high priest as the chief functionary of the cult, both at Ephesus and at neighboring Sardis. Women were assuming greater status as principal mediators of the gods" (p. 71).

[43] Note that Strabo himself (late first century BC) speaks in the past tense: "They used to have eunuch priests, whom they would call 'Megabyzoi' " (*Geog.* 14.1.23). Cf. Oster, "Ephesus as a Religious Center," 1721–22.

[44] As mentioned, neither the term "high priest" nor "high priestess" occurs in reference to the Artemis cult. The Kroegers have evidently confused the high priesthood of the provincial cult of the emperors ("High Priest of Asia" and "High Priestess of Asia") with the priesthood of the separate Artemis cult (see *I Suffer Not a Woman*, 92–93). In the inscriptions, sometimes the term "high priestess" without the qualifier "of Asia" is used for a provincial high priestess (e.g., *IEph* 810), and "priestess" without "of Artemis" occurs (e.g., *IEph* 508). See, for instance, *IEph* 994 where the offices are distinguished: "(daughter of) a priestess and

the first century (Evidence F) would seem to undermine the Kroegers' point that Artemis Ephesia's character as a fertility goddess is derived from the previous cult of the Anatolian Great Mother. If "primary religious power" lay with women because of a centuries old principle of female dominance, as they argue, why would the rise of a "high priestess" only occur by the first century? We would have expected women to hold the reigns of "religious power" from the earliest period.[45]

But the truth is, the presence of a "priestess of Artemis" in the cult of Artemis Ephesia—evidenced by a fair number of inscriptions—does not nullify the fact that "religious power" at Ephesus was firmly in the hands of: (a) the Roman government; (b) the municipal magistrates and council (see on Acts 19 above); and (c) various sacred offices filled primarily by men. This assertion is easy to validate from several sources, but let us look closely at only one, the edict of the Roman proconsul of AD 44, Paullus Fabius Persicus, which reads in part:

> The temple of Artemis herself—which is an adornment to the whole province because of the magnificence of the building, the antiquity of the worship of the goddess, and the abundance of the incomes granted to the goddess by the Emperor—is being deprived of its proper revenues. These had been sufficient for the maintenance and for the adornment of votive offerings, but they are being diverted for the illegal wants of the *Koinon's* leaders,[46] according as they consider will bring them profit. . . . While using the appearance of the divine temple as a pretext, they sell the priesthoods as if at public auction. Indeed, they invite men of every kind to their sale, then they do not select the most suitable men upon whose heads the crown would fittingly be placed. (Instead) they restrict incomes to those who are being consecrated to as (little) as they are willing to accept, in order that they themselves might appropriate as much as possible. [The edict goes on to regulate other matters. *IEph* 17, 1-20.]

From the fact that (a) the Roman proconsul (possibly acting for Claudius) pronounced on the election of priests of Artemis, and that (b) certain incomes were granted to the goddess by the emperor as an exercise of his *auctoritas,*[47] we can conclude that the Roman government was quite willing

κοσμήτειρα of Artemis and of a high priestess of Asia." One should also note that there were significantly more high priests of Asia than high priestesses; see now: Steven J. Friesen, *Twice Neokoros: Ephesus, Asia, and the Cult of the Flavian Imperial Family* (Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill, 1993) 76-113 and the comprehensive list of officers in Appendix I. In any case, this is another example of the Kroegers' apparent lack of facility with Ephesian historical material.

[45] That "religious power" is attendant with priesthoods in the Greek world is a misunderstanding of the nature of Hellenic priesthoods anyway. I daresay, of the Christian ministry as well.

[46] These are magistrates in either the provincial or municipal government. See Baugh, "Paul and Ephesus," 159-61.

[47] Income from fish ponds and farmlands were granted to the goddess by the emperor; the latter is indicated on boundary stones which read, "*Imp. Caesar Augustus fines Dianae restituit*"

to believe that it held the ultimate religious power in Ephesus (and in other provincial cities).[48] And we know that the Ephesians sometimes acknowledged this Roman overlordship in the religious realm.[49]

But what were the priesthoods which these men (ἄνθρωποι) were "buying"? The title "priest of Artemis" does occur on early imperial inscriptions. C. Julius Atticus was "priest of Artemis *Soteira* (and) of the family of Caesar" (*IEph* 1265), and Apollonius Politicus was "the priest of Artemis" who dedicated a local altar.[50] C. Stertinius Orpex (whose daughter was a priestess of Artemis) says that he donated 5,000 denarii "to the Council of the Ephesians and to the priests" (*IEph* 4123; under Nero). Although "priest of Artemis" is not a commonly mentioned title, these few occurrences are enough to show that women did not exclusively hold priesthoods of Artemis Ephesia in the imperial era.[51]

The Kroegers make no mention of male priests of Artemis. Instead, they present a quite different scenario, such as this:

> In Ephesus women assumed the role of the man-slaying Amazons who had founded the cult of Artemis of Ephesus. . . . The female dancers at the temple of the Ephesian Artemis clashed their arms, so lethal weapons were part of the priestesses' religious accoutrements. There are reasons to suspect that the dances may have contained a simulated attack on males, especially as they were performed with spears. . . . They would surely have inspired terror; and this, Strabo tells us, was one of the purposes of the dance. [Pp. 186–87]

(*IEph* 3501–3502); cf. Dieter Knibbe et al., "Der Grundbesitz der ephesischen Artemis im Kaystrostal," *ZPE* 33 (1979) 139–46.

[48] Augustus also limited the boundaries of the asylum area of the Artemisium (Strabo, *Geog.* 14.1.23; Dio Cassius 51.20.6). For other provinces, see, for example, Pliny's and the Emperor Trajan's correspondence regarding relocation of the temple of the Great Mother in Nicomedia (*Ep.* 10.49–50), the consecration of burial ground (*Ep.* 10.68–69), and the sanctity of a neglected shrine to Claudius (*Ep.* 10.70–71). Trajan was consulted in the latter two cases as *pontifex maximus;* cf. A. N. Sherwin-White, *The Letters of Pliny: A Historical and Social Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966) 632, 655–59.

[49] The Ephesians petitioned the Roman proconsuls for permission to perform mysteries to Demeter "with all sanctity and lawful customs" (*IEph* 213; AD 88–89) and to celebrate festivals throughout a whole month in honor of Artemis (*IEph* 24; AD 162–64). (Both these inscriptions are discussed by Horsley [*New Docs* 4.74–82, 94–95]). Ephesian inscriptions usually give an emperor's full titles, including his high priesthood; for example: "To Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, son of D[rusus], *pontifex maximus* (*archiereus megistos*)" (*IEph* 259b).

[50] Knibbe and Iplikçioglu, "Neue Inschriften aus Ephesos IX," *JÖAI* 55 (1984) 120–21.

[51] Possibly another "priest of Artemis" occurs on *IEph* 4337, and note also the priest of Artemis in "Leucippe and Clitophon," mentioned above. Oster lists 23 sacerdotal and honorary offices connected to the cult of Artemis ("Ephesus as a Religious Center," 1722); most were held by men. We should mention especially the important (male) νεοποιοί who functioned something like a board of trustees for the Artemisium and its property (*IEph* 27, 1570–1590b, 2212, etc.; cf. Horsley, *New Docs* 4.127–29). There were also professional guilds (e.g., "Association of the Sacred Taste") which managed the banking, real estate, and agricultural resources of the Artemisium (Baugh, "Paul and Ephesus," 39–42).

Now, Strabo says that this ritual act—he does not call it a "dance"—was performed by the κουρῆτες.[52] The Kroegers have identified them as priestesses of Artemis. The only problem is that we have honorary lists naming κουρῆτες on over 50 extant Ephesian inscriptions.[53] On first-century AD inscriptions alone there are over 100 κουρῆτες named (*IEph* 1001–20, 1047). These κουρῆτες are *all men.* For example, a list dating to AD 54–59 reads:

> When Tiberius Claudius Hermias, son of Ariēos, Quirinian tribe, was prytanis, the loyal, pious κουρῆτες were: Halys son of Ariēos, Dionysius son of Charesios son of Mithridatus, Ti. Claudius Erastus son of Hermias, Antiochus son of Antiochus, Trypho Assklas son of Trypho (son of Trypho); Marcus was victim-inspector, Menodotus was sacred herald, Olympicus was incense-bearer, (and) Metras was flautist of the drink offering. [*IEph* 1008][54]

Somehow, the Kroegers turn the male κουρῆτες into women, and use these phantom priestesses as evidence for Amazonian religious power! Since many of these κουρῆτες inscriptions were published as long as a century ago, are we wrong to expect them to have entered into the Kroegers' purview?[55]

That women were involved in the cult of Artemis Ephesia is not in question. But the Kroegers interpret the fact that there was a priestess of Artemis as an indication that "the primary religious power lay with women by the first century" (p. 196). Let us ignore for the moment the previously discussed involvement of Roman and Ephesian men in the cult. Do the authors not know that priestesses were a common phenomenon throughout the Graeco-Roman world where no matriarchy was present? Although it is not invariable, "a priestess very commonly officiates for goddesses and a priest for gods" in Greek cults.[56] The fact that Artemis Ephesia had a

[52] Here is the passage in Strabo: "Above the grove (Ortygia) lies Mt. Solmissus, where, it is said, the Curetes [κουρῆτες] stationed themselves, and with the din of their arms frightened Hera out of her wits. . . . A general festival is held there annually; and by a certain custom the youths vie for honour, particularly in the spendour of their banquets there. At that time, also, a special college of the Curetes [κουρῆτες] holds symposiums and performs certain mystic sacrifices" (*Geog.* 14.1.20 [LCL]).

[53] See Dieter Knibbe, *Forschungen in Ephesos. 9.1.1. Der Staatsmarkt. Die Inschriften des Prytaneions. Die Kureteninschriften and sonstige religiöse Texte* (Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1981). Most of the inscriptions analyzed by Knibbe are given in vol. 4 of the *IEph* collection (ca. *IEph* 1001–1080). See also the brief treatment in *New Docs* 6.196–202.

[54] Many κουρῆτες on the surviving lists served also on the city council, further evidencing the connection between the municipal government and the Artemis cult mentioned above.

[55] "If our love of God demands hard mental effort, let us not forget also to love God with all our strength. It is our responsibility to exercise the most serious scholarly endeavor of which we are capable" (p. 38).

[56] Burkert, *Greek Religion,* 98. For one example of each, notice: "the priest of Zeus" at Lystra in Acts 14:13 and the well-known priestess of Athene Polias (e.g., Pausanias 1.27). Michael Grant observes: "Athenian women acted as priestesses in more than forty cults" (*A Social History of Greece and Rome* [New York: Scribner, 1992] 8). For Rome, recall the important Vestal

priestess does not at all act as evidence of "matriarchy," "sex-reversal," or "primacy of the maternal." Instead, it shows that this cult had typical Hellenic features where men still might play a leading role.[57]

The social and religious role of the priestess of Artemis is hard to discern precisely. Sometimes the title "priestess" is joined with the title κοσμήτειρα, "adorner" (*IEph* 892, 983–84, 989, etc.), suggesting that the priestesses were involved with clothing the cult statue of Artemis, since we know that sacred clothing was part of her cult.[58] Their role may have been much like the girls and priestesses who made and helped present an ornate new robe (πέπλος) to Athene during the Panathenaia procession of Athens.[59] Such processions were not only "very prominent features of Greek festivals" in general (*OCD*) but are explicitly mentioned in connection with Artemis Ephesia.[60]

The priestesses of Artemis may have had not only a ceremonial part in Ephesian pageants, but were probably expected to underwrite some of its expenses also. As evidence, one first-century (?) priestess, Vipsania Olympias, says that she not only "served as priestess circumspectly," but she "wreathed the temple and all its precincts in the days of the goddess' manifestations" (*IEph* 987). Another priestess, Ulpia Euodia Mudiane, daughter of Mudianus and Euodia "performed the mysteries and made all expenses through my parents" (*IEph* 989), showing, by the way, that she was undoubtedly an unmarried girl.[61] But that these Ephesian girls and

Virgins (e.g., Pliny, *Ep.* 4.11; Tacitus, *Ann.* 11.32). We should mention that apart from the priestesses of Artemis and of Hestia, most Ephesian cults (of gods or goddesses) were served by male priests (e.g., *IEph* 702, 902, 1210, 1213, 1235, 1239, 3239, and 4337).

[57] I must once again ask the reader to consult my forthcoming study sketching Ephesian society in *Women and the Church* noted above. In the meantime, Oster's "Ephesus as a Religious Center" is an excellent, authoritative overview.

[58] *IEph* 2; cf. F. Sokolowski, "A New Testimony on the Cult of Artemis of Ephesus," *HTR* 58 (1965) 427–31.

[59] H. W. Parke, *Festivals of the Athenians* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1977) 33–50; Burkert, *Greek Religion,* 232–33.

[60] *IEph* 1577 mentions a procession under the supervision of two men connected to the Artemisium's rent office (cf. *IEph* 26 and 221). Various processions are also detailed in the famous Salutaris foundation (*IEph* 27–37; AD 104), the subject of Rogers' *Sacred Identity;* cf. I. Ringwood, "Festivals of Ephesus," *AJA* 76/1 (1972) 17–22. Such a procession in Ephesus opens the second-century (?) romance by Xenophon of Ephesus ("An Ephesian Tale," in *Collected Greek Novels,* 128–69). The heroine of this tale, Anthia, is called a "priestess" by the Kroegers (p. 197), but this is an example of their overly imaginative reading of the ancient novels. Anthia, a 14-year-old, simply led the contingent of marriageable girls, since, says Xenophon, "It was the custom at this festival to find husbands for the girls and wives for the young men" ("Ephesian Tale," 129). For similar participation of girls and young women in Greek festivals, see Louise Bruit Zaidman, "Pandora's Daughters and Rituals in Grecian Cities," in *A History of Women,* 338–76.

[61] See also a Flavia Chrysanthe who "fulfilled the myster[ies] *generously*" (second-third centuries AD; Knibbe and Iplikçioglu, "Neue Inschriften IX," 123, no. 4261); and a stone from ca. AD 165 which reads: "[name lost] served as priestess of Artemis piously and generously . . .

matrons carried spears and performed "simulated attacks on males" is, frankly, incredible. They may have resembled "Rose Bowl Queens" in Artemis Ephesia's parades more than Amazon warriors!

Finally, the Kroegers' Evidence G consists of a creative, abstract use of ancient "gothic novels" to establish that there was "sex and death in an Ephesus-oriented context" (p. 200). But are not "sex and death" everywhere present in ancient (and modern) literature? Look at the *Iliad:* sex and death. Plato's *Symposium:* sex; his *Apology:* death. Suetonius' *Nero:* lots of sex and death. Shakespeare's "Romeo and Juliet": sex and death on stage. Any modern novel or television program: sex and death *ad nauseam.* What exactly is the point?

We could find much more to critique in *I Suffer Not a Woman,*[62] but the reader has probably seen enough to gather that the Ephesian religious and cultural situation was not, in fact, marked by matriarchy of any sort. And it seems quite clear to me after prolonged study of the issues that 1 Tim 2:9-15 is an appropriate mandate in any ancient (or modern) city or culture.

However, despite my negative evaluation of *I Suffer Not a Woman,* I should mention that I sincerely agree with the authors' stated purpose: "Our purpose is to maintain on the basis of Scripture that both men and women are equally called to commitment and service, wherever and however God may lead" (p. 14). But let us be clear that the point at issue between us is in defining the areas of "commitment and service" into which God leads women. The ordination issue is not about whether women may "teach or make decisions" as the Kroegers put it (p. 17), but whether or not God calls women to the office(s) of elder or pastor-teacher.

The Kroegers adduce NT examples of women active in service to Christ in support of women's ordination. But are not these merely illustrations of the general office of believer? In order for discussions to advance among evangelicals, one would hope that writers such as the Kroegers will begin by clarifying their views of gifts and church office—which would have been highly desirable in *I Suffer Not a Woman.*

Furthermore, let us discuss these issues of church office from known ecclesiastical positions. For the Kroegers to speak vaguely about their opponents as "traditionalists," or worse, anecdotally as "those who justify the abuse of women by citing Scripture" (p. 38), is itself an abuse of one's brothers and sisters who, we trust, are motivated by the love of God and his truth

and gave 5,000 denarii to the city in accordance with the Council's vote" (Knibbe, Engelmann, and Iplikçioglu, "Neue Inschriften XI," 176, no. 4521). There may have been a set fee for serving as priestess of Artemis, and the βουλή controlled the office. Also, that these priestesses served for a limited duration (annually?) shows the characteristically Hellenistic, not Anatolian, nature of the cult of Artemis Ephesia, contra the Kroegers.

[62] For instance, their association of the "mysteries" of the Artemis cult with the so-called mystery religions far overruns the evidence. The "mysteries [better, 'rites'] and sacrifices" at Ephesus probably had nothing to do with bizarre sexual practices as the Kroegers suggest.

rather than by "a monopolistic attitude" (p. 93). Let us discuss this issue without rancor or prejudice. But let us discuss it clearly, with a competent grasp of the issues and of the historical facts. On the latter point, let the notion that Ephesus was a "bastion of women's rights" or "matriarchy" be dropped once and for all. It was not.

And let us further be clear about the consequences of the women's ordination debate. If God does not call women into the pastoral office, they are in danger of acting like non-Levites who would presumptuously handle the tabernacle equipment (Num 1:51; 2 Sam 6:6–7). God does not take the office of pastor-teacher lightly: "Not many of you should presume to be teachers, my brothers, because you know that we who teach will be judged more strictly" (Jas 3:1, NIV).

Westminster Theological Seminary in California
1725 Bear Valley Parkway
Escondido, California 92027