

TECHNICAL PAPERS FOR
**THE BIBLE
TRANSLATOR**

*Published twice yearly
(January and July)
by the United
Bible Societies*
Vol. 55, No. 3, July 2004

EDITOR: Philip H. Towner

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT: Rosario U. Yu

GUEST EDITOR: David J. Clark

REVIEWS EDITOR: Roger L. Omanson

EDITORIAL BOARD:

| | |
|-----------------------|---|
| Dr Simon Crisp | <i>UBS Regional Translations Coordinator, Europe-Middle East Region, UK</i> |
| Prof Lourens de Vries | <i>Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands</i> |
| Dr Cynthia Miller | <i>University of Wisconsin, Madison, WI, USA</i> |
| Dr Graham Ogden | <i>Translation Consultant, UBS, Asia-Pacific Region, Australia</i> |
| Dr Stanley Porter | <i>McMaster Divinity College, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada</i> |
| Dr Ernst Wendland | <i>Translation Consultant, UBS, Africa Region, Lusaka, Zambia</i> |

REV DR PAUL ELLINGWORTH

This edition of *Technical Papers for the Bible Translator* is an expanded issue designated to honour its longest-serving editor Paul Ellingworth. Paul took over the editorial chair in January 1972, when *BT* was divided into the two now familiar series of *Technical Papers* and *Practical Papers*. With a brief gap from 1976-1978 when he was completing his doctoral studies in Aberdeen, he occupied that chair with great distinction until the end of 2000, combining academic acumen and administrative efficiency with unfailing courtesy and good humour. The editorial carrot was always much more in evidence than the editorial stick.

Paul came to UBS after a brilliant undergraduate career at both Oxford and Cambridge, and a lengthy spell teaching theology in West Africa (in Benin 1957-1961 and in Cameroun 1964-1967), where he served with the Methodist Missionary Society. He was appointed as the first UBS Regional Translation Coordinator for the Europe Region in 1971, and carried this responsibility until moving to Aberdeen in 1975. There he and his family stayed when his doctorate was finished, and from 1984 on, in addition to his UBS work as a translation consultant, he began lecturing in the University of Aberdeen. His contribution there was recognised in 1994 by the well deserved award of an honorary personal Chair of New Testament. Although Paul officially retired from UBS in 1996, he continued to edit *BTT* for the rest of the millennium(!).

As if travelling as a translation consultant, teaching, and supervising research students in a top university, and editing a prestigious journal were not enough, Paul has also managed to produce several significant books, culminating in his magisterial commentary on Hebrews in 1993. This was in fact his third commentary on that letter. In the UBS Handbook series, he co-authored the volumes on 1-2 Thessalonians, Hebrews, and 1 Corinthians, which many

translators acknowledge as among the most useful volumes in the series. In addition to books, a constant stream of articles and book reviews has flowed from his prolific pen, no less than 35 articles and 70 reviews in *BT* alone, not to mention those in a variety of other scholarly journals and composite works of reference, as well as the translation of articles into English from French and German.

All this may make it sound as if Paul is a kind of robotic working machine, but nothing could be further from the truth. In addition to his academic output, he is an inveterate collector of humorous *obiter dicta* and *obiter scripta*, a highly competent pianist, and no mean chess player. He is also a loyal and congenial colleague and friend to many people in the field of Bible translation, both in UBS and outside it. In all his activity both public and private, he has always been encouraged and supported by his wife Pauline, and their family of three sons.

In his various spheres of work, Paul has never lost sight of the goal behind Bible translation and all his other academic pursuits, to make known the gospel of Jesus Christ. In this connection he is a familiar figure especially but by no means only in Methodist pulpits in northeast Scotland. Throughout his ministry, Paul has not only advocated the Christian faith, but also demonstrated it. It is therefore with great pleasure that his colleagues from UBS and from Aberdeen dedicate to him this special edition of *Technical Papers for the Bible Translator*.

DJC / PHT

A Note of Thanks

Special issues of this journal require special efforts to make them possible. In this case, Dr David J. Clark graciously and enthusiastically accepted the invitation to serve as guest-editor. Without his assistance in every part of this project, from start to finish, including the contribution of a significant article, generous amounts of sage advice, and timely injections of much-needed humour, we would have been in for a longer haul and a much less creditable finish. Thank you, David!

Equally, Ms Rosario Yu, who constantly and professionally assists the editors of the journal in so many crucial matters, has distinguished herself yet again in the preparation of this collection of articles—solving problems with fonts and formatting, applying her careful eye to the reading and re-reading of proofs and revisions, waiting until well past the eleventh hour for overdue responses, among so many other things. Thank you, Rose!

PHT

I. HOWARD MARSHALL

BROTHERS EMBRACING SISTERS?

The author is Honorary Research Professor of New Testament in the University of Aberdeen, Aberdeen, Scotland.

The distinguished biblical scholar and translator for whose work we give thanks to God and whose contributions to scholarship we gladly acknowledge in this journal will know far better than myself which of the recent translations of the Bible have adopted the device of using the phrase “brothers and sisters” (or its equivalent in other contemporary languages) as a way of rendering occurrences of the Hebrew or Greek terms formerly translated “brothers” in order to bring out the fact that women are included as the addressees of God’s Word and as full members of his people. But, despite the fact that in this brief piece I can probably say nothing that he does not know already, it may be worthwhile taking another look at the issues raised.¹

Already some years ago Paul produced a characteristically well-nuanced discussion of the issues involved in the use of inclusive language in translation, which include the danger of making the biblical authors out to be more inclusive than they actually were.² There is no doubt a difference between making language open to inclusive interpretation and making it unambiguously inclusive. There are places in the inclusive version of the NIV, particularly in the Old Testament, where the language permits the understanding that combatants in the army could have included women, but it is wildly improbable that they were in fact other than male.³ The problem is more likely to arise in the New Testament where, e.g., in 1 Cor 14.26, the rendering, “What then shall we say, brothers and sisters? When you come together, each of you has a hymn, or a word of instruction, a revelation, a tongue or an interpretation,” would imply that sisters could participate in the congregational meeting in the same way as the (male) brothers; but the original, of course, has *adelphoi* and it might be open to question whether it was the case that only brothers took part.

This, in fact, is what has been argued by some scholars. Specifically, Leslie McFall, in a book published on his website and in a review of the *English Standard Version* (ESV), has argued that the translation “brothers and sisters” is unjustified

1 See further M. L. Strauss, *Distorting Scripture? The Challenge of Bible Translation and Gender Accuracy* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1998), 147-151. More generally, D. A. Carson, *The Inclusive Language Debate: A Plea for Realism* (Grand Rapids: Baker/Leicester: InterVarsity, 1998).

2 P. Ellingworth, “The Scope of Inclusive Language,” *BT* 43 (1992): 130-140. See also most recently “Men and brethren ... (Acts 1.16),” *BT* 55 (2004): 153-155.

3 Cf. how “bowmen” (NIV) is changed to “archers” (Isa 21.17); see also 1 Kgs 12.24. The stated position of the inclusive NIV is: “It was often appropriate to mute the patriarchalism of the culture of the biblical writers through gender-inclusive language when this could be done without compromising the message of the Spirit. This involved distinguishing between those passages in which an activity was normally carried out by either males or females, and other cases where the gender of the people was less precisely identified. While in cases of the former the text could be left unaltered, in cases of the latter words like ‘workmen’ could be changed to ‘worker’ or ‘craftsman’ to ‘skilled worker’.” *The Holy Bible. New International Version Inclusive Language Edition* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1995), vii.

and misleading.¹ It is misleading, not just because it fails to reproduce the intended sense of the original but also because it thereby gives false teaching to readers today who should be bound by the clear scriptural teaching that restricts participation in the church meeting to the men. There are a number of inter-connected issues here.

1. There is the *lexicographical* argument that the word *adelphoi* always (or virtually always) refers purely to brothers and does not include sisters. The common belief that the term can be inclusive, in the same sort of way as the term “guys,” which in UK English refers² exclusively to males, is commonly used in US English for addressing mixed audiences, is held to be without warrant.

2. There is the *historical* argument that in the culture of the time women did not participate in the congregational meetings but were silent (or at least were required to be silent, and those who attempted to participate were disciplined).

3. There is the further, *theological* argument that the church today is bound by the letter of Scripture and should maintain the cultural practices of the New Testament church, since the culture in which Christianity was born was provisionally ordained.

McFall’s position might well appear to be an example of unscholarly fundamentalism but it is buttressed by arguments that need to be taken seriously. The setting, according to him, is the fact that in OT and NT times men and women did not mix when they came together. Especially in the synagogues the women were physically separated from the men and sat silently out of the line of vision of the men who alone conducted and took part in the services. Similarly, in Christian congregations there was a differentiation: the women were related to their husbands as their heads, and the men were related to Christ as their head, and this was symbolised in the way that they had their heads covered and uncovered respectively. This husbandly or male headship goes back to the creation. Hence, e.g., in Acts, it is always the men (and only the men) who are addressed and it is the men who are counted (120 men, addressed as *adelphoi*, together with the women; Acts 1.12-16). The church, then, consists primarily of men, and teaching is normally given in the masculine gender; women are only rarely addressed directly.

Second, it is argued that although an unmarked term like “lion” normally refers to male lions but can refer to both lions and lionesses, this is not true of *adelphoi*, which is gender-specific. Nowhere in the Bible, it is claimed, does *adelphoi* refer to “brothers and sisters.” If there are exceptions to this rule, they are precisely that—exceptions. Hence McFall proceeds to criticise the policy of ESV and to reject its note to Acts 1.14 which states that *adelphoi* can refer to siblings as

¹ McFall’s material is contained in “Excursus 7. Book Review of the *English Standard Version*” (dated Sept. 2002) which appeared in his unpublished book, *Good Order in the Church*, to be found on his website, <http://www.btinternet.com/lmf12>. A revised and expanded version of the review will be issued in due course. I am grateful to the author for a hard copy version of the original review, and the following summary of his arguments is closely based on it.

² Or used to refer. The influence of US English should not be underestimated!

well as brothers. When the biblical writers want to refer to brothers and sisters they write *adelphoi kai adelphai* (cf. Matt 19.29; Mark 10.30; Luke 14.26).¹ Political correctness has led to misinterpretation of Scripture backed up by errors in lexicography.

Third, McFall's point is made in the context of a rejection of the contemporary, politically correct, feminist theology which allows women a place in the church which was forbidden to them in the providentially created cultural and religious background in which the New Testament was written.

Various issues are raised by this set of arguments. That society in biblical times (both OT and NT) was patriarchal is not in any dispute. Whether God intended that his people should live according to the pattern of such a culture for evermore is a question that most Christians would answer negatively, but this point cannot be taken up here.² The immediate issue is the twofold one of (a) whether the term *adelphoi* in the Bible can be used inclusively, and (b) how it should be translated for contemporary readers.

Our starting point lies in the fact that, whatever be the case regarding women in the Judaism of the time, there is no doubt that in the time of the early church women were recipients of salvation and included in the people of God in the same way as men. When Peter visited the home of Cornelius, he spoke words through which he *and all his household* could be saved (Acts 11.14), and the Holy Spirit fell on *all who heard him* (Acts 10.44). But a household included the women who were part of it, and therefore it follows that the women were included in Peter's address. The feminine form *mathētria* ("female disciple") is found once (Acts 9.36), and demonstrates that women were regarded as disciples. Similarly, the adjective *pistē* is used occasionally of believing women (Acts 16.1, 15; 1 Tim 3.11; 5.16), and there are frequent references to Christian women by name, whether along with husbands and other relatives, or as singles, and there are references to their hard work for the Lord (Romans 16; Phil 4.2f.). Paul refers to Nympha, in whose home there was a congregation (Col 4.15).³ There is the strong

1 In Mark 10.29-30 // Matt 19.29 // Luke 18.29, both Mark and Matthew have "or brothers or sisters," but Luke simply has "brothers," allowing the supposition that he thought that "brothers" could include "sisters." McFall does not mention this direct parallel in Luke but refers instead to Luke 14.26 which does have the full form (the saying here is probably parallel to Matt 10.37 which does not include either brothers or sisters; Luke may have combined the wording of the saying in Mark here with that of Q in order to make the extent of the renunciation required as clear as possible).

2 W. J. Webb, *Slaves, Women and Homosexuals: Exploring the Hermeneutics of Cultural Analysis* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2001), shows how there is a redemptive trajectory leading to a new evaluation of the position of both slaves and women (but not those who practise homosexual acts) in Scripture, and offers principles for discerning when teaching in Scripture requires to be re-expressed in a different cultural situation.

3 However, the reading is uncertain, and some MSS have a masculine pronoun, indicating that they thought that the ambiguous personal name was also masculine. It is more probable that an original feminine was corrected to a masculine than vice versa.

probability that Junia in Rom 16.7 was an apostle.¹ Even if she was not, nevertheless she is named along with Andronicus as being in Christ before Paul was in a manner that shows no distinction was made between male and female converts.

An important piece of evidence is to be found in 2 Cor 6.18 where Paul apparently cites 2 Sam 7.14 where God promises that he will be to David's offspring (Solomon) as a father and the offspring will be as a son to him. This verse, which is significant for the relationship of the Messiah to God, is here universalised to apply to the new people of God, perhaps under the influence of Isa 43.6 (cf. also Jer 31.9) where God speaks of the returning exiles as his sons and daughters. This rare specific inclusion of daughters is taken up by Paul. It follows that the immediately following address to the *agapētoi* ("beloved [ones]") must include the females with the males. But, if so, it would seem that in the places where Paul uses the term "sons" for believers, then this term would be understood to include females (Rom 8.14, 19; 9.26; Gal 4.6-7; 1 Thess 5.5); Gal 3.26 in particular must be understood in this way in view of the immediately following statement that explicitly includes females. Paul also uses the term "children" (*tekna*), which can hardly be restricted to male children, in the same way (Rom 8.16, 17, 21; 9.8; Gal 4.28; Eph 5.1; Phil 2.15), and the synonymity of the terms is shown by the alternation in Romans 8.² The use of "son" is no doubt intended to make the connection with Jesus as the son and heir of God, since Paul's point is that believers share with him in the inheritance. In any case, the stereotyped use of "sons of Israel" and the like to refer to the Israelites/Jews collectively shows that this term could be used inclusively to refer to females as well as males.

Similarly, the term *anthrōpoi* has as its primary meaning "human beings." When Paul makes sweeping statements about "all *anthrōpoi*" being sinners and liable to death, it must be at least implicitly inclusive of women.

The evidence so far adduced demonstrates that women are considered to be saved and included in the people of God in just the same way as men. It is freely admitted that the scriptural language is male-oriented, just as it was in English until recently, but without any intent to exclude women. There is a difference between being male-oriented or male-centred and being exclusive of females, and

¹ The view that she was outstanding in the eyes of the apostles (M. H. Burer and D. B. Wallace, "Was Junia Really an Apostle? A Re-examination of Rom 16.7," *NTS* 47 [2001]: 76-91) is less probable. Burer and Wallace agree that Junia (female) is the correct reading but hold that she was recognised by the apostles as an outstanding believer rather than that she was an apostle. Even if their view is adopted, she remains one of the examples of female Christians (probably Christian workers) whom Paul singles out in exactly the same terms as he does the men. E. Lohse, *Der Brief an die Römer* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2003), 408 n. 13, rejects their view but without discussion. K. Haacker, *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer* (Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1999), 320-321, argues that it would be curious for Paul to cite the opinion of the apostles here, and holds that she belonged to the wider group of early apostles (1 Cor 15.7; Gal 1.19). What Burer and Wallace claim as the closest parallel to Rom 16.7, namely Ps Sol 2.6, appears to have been misread by them and is not parallel. The text does not say that the Jewish captives were ἐπισήμῳ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν but that they were ἐν ἐπισήμῳ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν; the meaning is not absolutely certain, and H. E. Ryle and M. R. James propose that it is the noun ἐπίσημοι which is being used here with the meaning "badge," indicating the brandmark of slavery (ΨΑΛΜΟΙ ΣΑΛΟΜΩΝΤΟΣ [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1891], 12-13). The citations given from the papyri, where ἐπίσημος is followed by a genitive, are not persuasive evidence, since the reference in each case is to parts within wholes and (despite their claim) the genitives are not partitive. The parallel from Add. Esth 16.22 that they cite is stronger than they allow.

² The word *tekna* (τέκνα) unambiguously refers to females in 1 Pet 3.6.

it is perhaps only a recent development that women have felt that male-centred language made them second-class citizens and saw such language as exclusive when it was not intended to be, although it was open to that misunderstanding. It may be appropriate to cite the example of the Christian group known as the “Brethren,” in which, although the women were required to be silent and not to function as elders, nevertheless there was clearly no doubt whatsoever that the term “Brethren” was inclusive of women.

To neutralise the force of this clear evidence we would require some positive evidence that women were treated as separate from the men in the congregational meetings. It can be objected that, if the pattern of the synagogue was followed, then the women would automatically have been seated separately from the men and not participated audibly in the meetings. There was, therefore, no need to refer specifically to what can be taken for granted.

But this is unlikely. From 1 Corinthians 11 it is clear that women prophesied and prayed in mixed company, i.e., in congregational settings.¹ Prophecy by women is confirmed by the quotation from Joel 3.1 in Acts 2.17 and the reference in Acts 21.9. It is unlikely that this happened with people sitting rigidly divided from one another. The fact that women had to be warned against teaching in 1 Timothy 2 indicates that it was possible for them to do so and that an existing practice was being prohibited. Similarly, the requirement that women should be silent in the meeting in 1 Corinthians 14 visualises them being close to the men. Above all, Paul’s statement that in Christ the baptised are all one, whether male or female, Jew or Greek, slave or free (Gal 3.28) indicates that there was no distinction made between them.

In the light of this, it would appear that the Pauline letters were addressed to the whole congregation and not, as McFall supposes, merely to the men (*adelphoi*) who then had the responsibility of passing on Paul’s teaching to the womenfolk in the privacy of the home. The fact that congregations met as small groups in homes indicates that a sharp distinction between public and private occasions was impossible in practice.

The parallel case of 1 Peter is instructive. In chs. 2–3 Peter gives instructions to the congregation as a whole, followed by specific instructions to slaves, wives, and husbands, and then he gathers all the groups together with “all [of you]” in 3.8. Later in the letter he singles out the elders and the younger for specific attention, and then again follows up with “all.” This makes it perfectly clear that the letter as a whole is addressed to the whole of the congregations to whom it is sent. Consequently, when Peter addresses his readers as “beloved,” this must include them all; the unmarked *agapētoi* is inclusive. With all due caution, we may hold that the use of this address in other letters where we do not happen to have such clear evidence as in 1 Peter is also inclusive. Furthermore, Peter tells all the readers (3.8) to show brotherly love, i.e., to one another in the congregation; the women must be included here; they are, after all, joint-heirs with their husbands of the gracious gift of life (3.7). So when they are told to love the brotherhood (*adelphotēs*, 2.17; cf. 5.9) the implication must be that the congregation as a whole (and the church throughout the world) is known as the brotherhood, and again this must include the women.

¹ To avoid the force of this point McFall has to argue that 1 Corinthians 11 refers to private gatherings (the family) as opposed to public meetings of the congregation.

The situation in Paul's letters is just the same. When Paul precedes his list of categories in Gal 3.28 with the statement "in Christ Jesus you are all children of God through faith," this must be addressed to all the believers in each of the categories that he mentions. In Colossians 3–4 and in Ephesians 5 we have sets of instructions to different groups of people who are directly addressed, similar to that in 1 Peter. But these instructions are preceded and followed by material intended for everybody. It is totally implausible that this material is not directly addressed to the wives, children, and slaves. Eph 5.1 sees all the readers as "dearly loved children" (of God), and this term must be used inclusively. This makes it highly unlikely that the description of the readers of Colossians as "holy and faithful *adelphoi*" (Col 1.2) excludes the women. Similarly, the description in Col 3.12 of them as "God's chosen people, holy and dearly beloved" must apply to them all. This is confirmed by the inclusive formula in the previous verse which emphasises that racial and social distinctions are removed "in Christ."¹ Ephesians concludes with a benediction on all the *adelphoi*, but this is followed by a second benediction on all who love the Lord, and this surely implies that *adelphoi* is not being used exclusively. And, if Nympha is a woman, does it make sense to read Col 4.15 to mean "greet the male brothers, but not the sisters, in Laodicea" when this is immediately followed by greetings to Nympha and the congregation in her house?² The letter to Philemon is specifically addressed also to Apphia and Archippus with no differentiation made between male and female. In Phil 4.2 Paul issues a direct command to Euodia and Syntyche immediately after addressing the addressees generally as "brothers" and "beloved."³ We have already seen how "beloved" (*agapētoi*) appears to be used to address all the readers. Paul varies between *agapētoi* and *adelphoi* in his letters with a clear preference for the latter (the former is used 6 times; the latter some 67 times; and the combination *adelphoi agapētoi* "beloved brothers," 2 times). It is likely that the latter is used in the same way as the former.

In this indirect way we see that an interpretation of *adelphoi* in letters where the women are manifestly included in the congregation so as to exclude them from being directly addressed and included becomes implausible.

Therefore, we have adequate grounds for supposing that when Paul addresses his audience as *adelphoi* he is saying things that apply to all of them and not just to some, even though he may have the men primarily in mind.

There are, of course, places where the term *adelphos* or *adelphoi* refers specifically to males. If an audience is by definition male, then *adelphoi* is purely male (Acts 7.2; 13.15, 26, 38); instructions given in 1 Thess 4.3–8 are specifically for males. The context makes this exclusiveness clear. There may also be aspects of the historical and social context that influence the significance of a text. But otherwise, it may be presumed that the address *adelphoi* in Paul's letters does not exclude the women but tacitly includes them.

What we are suggesting is that the usage is one in which sometimes the context may make it clear that the reference is exclusive and purely to males, but

¹ The omission of reference to male and female in the formula in 1 Cor 12.13; Col 3.11 may or may not need explanation. There may have been special circumstances in Galatia of which we are ignorant.

² We do not know why this congregation is singled out for mention. Following the mention of Laodicea, the natural assumption is that Nympha lived some distance from Colosse and therefore would not have been present when the letter was read there.

³ Cf. 1 Cor 7.8–16 which directly addresses both men and women.

that the letters are addressed directly to mixed audiences, and therefore generally *adelphoi* is used in a way that does not exclude women, even if it is probable that the author may have been thinking primarily of the men.

Finally, there is the question whether linguistic usage stands in the way of our conclusion. LSJ record only one example of inclusive usage from classical Greek, but it must be emphasised that here, as in many other cases, LSJ were not attempting to be exhaustive in their documentation, and this example indicates that the usage is known in classical Greek.¹ McFall seizes upon this one entry as “one rare example,” not realising that with limited space LSJ do not multiply instances of different meanings. But unfortunately LSJ has misled him as to the rarity of the usage. BAG gives several examples where the plural refers to a brother and sister together, and fuller evidence is given in the later editions.² Usage in the LXX appears to be directed almost exclusively to males.³ The LXX usage is explained by its range of contexts which do not include the new situation created by the birth of the church. And this leads to a further consideration. To say, as McFall implies, that an exception does not invalidate a rule that is true in the vast majority of cases is not a way of escape from the fact that *adelphoi* can be used in a different way where the context is influencing the usage. There is a new situation in the Christian church in which women are given a new position, and this helps to explain the development of a different usage appropriate to that situation.

The usefulness of McFall’s review is that it challenges something that is so obvious to most readers that they simply take it for granted, and therefore it raises the question of how one justifies something that is “obvious.” I would claim that his interpretation does not do justice to the evidence of the New Testament letters in which women were part of the congregation and were involved in a considerable range of activities.⁴ This provides a context in which the language of Christian

1 Since it is generally assumed that brothers embraced sisters, it is hard to find any discussion of the topic in earlier literature. So far I have only come across the statement by G. Friedrich that the Greeks could understand *adelphoi* to apply to siblings (*Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher* [Das Neue Testament Deutsch. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976], VIII, 212-213).

2 A TLG (*Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*) survey is needed, but this must be left to somebody else to attempt. For the fullest information that I have been able to find so far, see W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1988⁶), 28-29, which lists in addition to the instances in BAG others where *adelphoi* are listed alongside children and parents and may be assumed to be of both sexes. In the light of this evidence it is claimed that there is no doubt that Luke 21.16 should be understood of siblings and not simply of male brothers. The evidence given by Bauer is significant in that it covers wide ranges chronologically and geographically, thus demonstrating that the usage was far from being exceptional.

3 McFall cites Deut 15.12: “When your brother is sold to you, a Hebrew or a Hebrewess, and he has served you six years, then in the seventh year you must send him out from you.” He argues that the focus is on the male servant, hence the reference to the female servant is not an inclusion but an extension, and the reference to the female may be a later addition (contrast Exod 21.5-6, where a shorter version of the same basic legislation refers only to the male servant). But, granted that the focus is on the male servant and that there may be a later addition to the original wording, nevertheless the compiler saw no difficulty in recognising that the $\alpha\delta\eta\lambda\phi\omicron\iota$ (*adh*) might be female. The effect of the “exception,” i.e., of this rare example, is to show that the word could be understood inclusively. In any case, the text emphasises that male and female must be treated alike (Deut 15.17).

4 The article on “Women in the Pauline Mission” by A. J. Köstenberger in *The Gospel to the Nations: Perspectives on Paul’s Mission* (eds. P. Bolt and M. Thompson; Leicester: Apollos, 2000), 221-247 is important here, since the author, who is a firm opponent of women acting as pastor-teachers or elders, nevertheless catalogues a wide range of ministerial tasks done by women in the Pauline churches. This clearly demonstrates their important place in the congregations.

discourse was being shaped. Granted that the society was patriarchal, nevertheless, it was in process of being changed.

It follows that in contemporary translations of the Bible in a culture where such terms as “brothers” have become exclusive by contrast with their earlier usage where they were tacitly inclusive but focussed more on males, it would be misleading to translate *adelphoi* by “brothers,” except where it is clearly exclusive, and that “brothers and sisters” is the correct translation. If this translation is thought to go too far in the direction of seeing male and female as equal partners rather than focussing on the males (as the older usage of “brothers” in English did), then it does so in a way that corresponds with the direction of the redemptive trajectory in Scripture that sees male and female as “all one in Christ Jesus.”