

1 CORINTHIANS 11:2-16 AND PAUL'S VIEWS REGARDING WOMEN

WM. O. WALKER, JR.

TRINITY UNIVERSITY, SAN ANTONIO, TX 78284

RECENTLY, there has been a renewed interest in Paul's views regarding the proper status and role of women, sparked, at least in part, by the current "Women's Liberation" movement.¹ Some members of the movement regard Paul as one of the chief "all-time male chauvinists," while some opponents of the movement appeal to his words in support of their belief that the traditional "female roles" are divinely ordained. Serious NT scholars recognize, however, that both views are, at best, an oversimplification, for, whatever Paul may have to say about male supremacy or priority and female subordination, he also states that in Christ "there is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female" (Gal 3:28), and it is clear that he labored alongside certain women in his evangelistic and pastoral activities and obviously respected them as co-workers in Christ and leaders in the churches.² Furthermore, Pauline authorship of at least some of the passages advocating male supremacy has been seriously questioned and often rejected. Thus, 1 Tim 2:8-15 and Tit 2:3-5 are widely regarded as non-Pauline,³ as are Eph 5:22-33⁴ and Col

¹ See E. Käbler, *Die Frau in den paulinischen Briefen* (Zürich: Gotthelf, 1960); J. M. Ford, "Levirate Marriage in St. Paul (1 Cor. vii)," *NTS* 10 (1963-64) 361-65; M. D. Hooker, "Authority on Her Head: An Examination of 1 Cor. xi.10," *NTS* 10 (1963-64) 410-16; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (HNTC; New York: Harper & Row, 1968) 153-87, 246-58, 330-33; P.-H. Menoud, "Saint Paul et la femme," *RTP* 19 (1969) 318-30; A. Jaubert, "Le voile des femmes (1 Cor. xi.2-16)," *NTS* 18 (1971-72) 419-30; W. D. Thomas, "The Place of Women in the Church at Philippi," *ExpT* 83 (1972) 117-20; G. B. Caird, "Paul and Women's Liberty," *BJRL* 54 (1972) 268-81; R. Scroggs, "Paul: Chauvinist or Liberationist?" *Christian Century* 89 (1972) 307-9; "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," *JAAAR* 40 (1972) 283-303; W. A. Meeks, "The Image of the Androgyne: Some Uses of a Symbol in Earliest Christianity," *History of Religions* 13 (1974) 165-208; R. Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman: Revisited," *JAAAR* 42 (1974) 532-37; E. H. Pagels, "Paul and Women: A Response to Recent Discussion," *ibid.*, 538-49.

² See W. D. Thomas, "The Place of Women;" cf. Phil 4:2-3; Rom 16:1-16; 1 Cor 16:19.

³ See W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, (14th ed.; Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1966) 261-71. An interesting point regarding 1 Tim 2:8-15 is that here the author identifies Eve as the original transgressor, whereas Paul normally speaks of Adam as the author of sin (see Rom 5:12-21; 1 Cor 15:21-22, 45-49; but cf. also 2 Cor 11:3, where Paul speaks of Eve as being "deceived" by the serpent).

⁴ See W. G. Kümmel, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 251-56.

3:18-19⁵ by a smaller but still significant number of experts, and 1 Cor 14:33b-36 (or 34-35), which forbids women to speak in Christian assemblies, is viewed by many as a post-Pauline gloss.⁶

Robin Scroggs has recently argued quite cogently that 1 Corinthians 7 cannot be interpreted as advocating female subordination, for here "Paul in almost every instance addresses himself explicitly to *both* men and women in order to show that each sex has the same freedom and the same responsibility."⁷ Scroggs also asserts that in this chapter "Paul's preference for the single state arises neither out of a sense of the inferiority of women, nor out of a moral judgment

⁵ Ibid., 240-44. Kümmel finally accepts the Pauline authorship of Colossians (though not of the Pastorals or Ephesians); cf. E. Lohse, *A Commentary on the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971) 177-83.

⁶ This has long been considered a possibility and is accepted, with varying degrees of certainty, by a number of scholars. The arguments include the following: (a) the passage appears to contradict 1 Cor 11:2-16, where it is clear that women do have the right to speak in Christian assemblies; (b) the verses break the context of ch. 14, which deals with the regulation of glossolalia and prophetic activity in assemblies; (c) Codex Claromontanus (D) and certain related Western MSS have vss. 34-35 at the close of ch. 14, which suggests that they may have originated as a marginal gloss and been inserted later into the text at different places; (d) the appeal to the law as authority in vs. 34 sounds un-Pauline; and (e) the idea is very similar to that of 1 Tim 2:11-12, which suggests that the verses are a gloss originating from a circle such as that which produced the Pastorals. See R. Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," 284; H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (Meyer 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969) 290; C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 330-33; J. Leiboldt, *Die Frau in der antiken Welt und im Urchristentum* (Gütersloh: Mohn, 1962) 123-26; J. Weiss, *Das Urchristentum* (completed by R. Knopf; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1917) 456; C. T. Craig, "The First Epistle to the Corinthians: Exegesis," *The Interpreter's Bible* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1953), 10. 213; H. Lietzmann, *An die Korinther I, II* (4th ed., completed by W. G. Kümmel; HNT 9; Tübingen: Mohr, 1949) 75. E. Schweizer ("The Service of Worship: An Exposition of I Corinthians 14," *Int* 13 [1959] 402) adds: "The twofold 'in the churches' in verses 33b, 34a is utmost clumsiness. 33b may originally have been connected with 33a. The term 'permit' is used in this sense nowhere else in the Pauline letters, but appears in the same way in I Tim. 2:12."

It should be noted, however, that the later discussion in this paper of the authenticity of 1 Cor 11:2-16 will call into question the weight of argument (a) above; argument (d) is also debatable (see, e.g., 1 Cor 9:8; 14:21; Rom 7:12; Gal 3:11-13; 4:21-31). Moreover, J. B. Hurley ("Did Paul Require Veils or the Silence of Women? A Consideration of I Cor. 11:2-16 and I Cor. 14:33b-36," *The Westminster Theological Journal* 35 [1973] 216-18) argues that vss. 33b-36 should be interpreted not as a general prohibition against women speaking in Christian assemblies but rather, in the immediate context of 1 Cor 14:29-33a, as a stricture against women entering into the judgment of prophets (vs. 29b), who often were men, and thus violating the divinely ordained structures of authority; such an interpretation, of course, calls into question arguments (a) and (b) above, and Hurley also rejects the force of argument (c). Nevertheless, it seems to me that the evidence, taken as a whole, weighs against the authenticity of at least vss. 34-35.

⁷ "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," 294.

on sexuality, nor from a sense of the imminent advent, but rather out of his consuming passion that the living in and upbuilding of the eschatological community is the decisive reality to which the believer must commit himself."⁸ It would appear that 1 Corinthians 7 has too often been read in the light of the deutero-Pauline or pseudo-Pauline statements regarding the subordination of women, rather than in its own light or in the total context of Paul's theology!

Only 1 Cor 11:2-16 remains, then, as a possible basis for regarding Paul as an anti-feminist or advocate of male supremacy and female subordination, if Pauline authorship of other such passages is rejected and 1 Corinthians 7 is interpreted along the lines suggested by Scroggs. That 1 Cor 11:2-16 presents serious problems for the exegete is widely recognized. Wayne A. Meeks, for example, refers to it as "one of the most obscure passages in the Pauline letters,"⁹ and Scroggs observes:

In its present form this is hardly one of Paul's happier compositions. The logic is obscure at best and contradictory at worst. The word choice is peculiar; the tone, peevish. All these difficulties point to some hidden agenda, hidden probably to the Apostle himself as well as to his readers.¹⁰

Scroggs attempts to interpret the passage, however, in such a way as to show that its demand for a distinction in dress and hair-length between men and women is not a call for subordination of women but rather an insistence upon woman's equality with man in the church and her complete freedom to participate equally with man in the worship and guidance of the community.¹¹

Thus, according to Scroggs, Paul should not be regarded as "the all-time male chauvinist," but, on the contrary, his is "the one clear voice in the New Testament asserting the freedom and equality of women in the eschatological community."¹²

It is not the purpose of this paper to deal in any comprehensive fashion with Paul's views regarding women, but rather to examine the crucial passage, 1 Cor 11:2-16. Scroggs's discussion of this passage is obviously very interesting and illuminating in many respects, but, as he himself acknowledges, the interpretation of the passage "*in its present form*" (my italics) is beset with great difficulties.¹³ I believe that the key to overcoming at least some of these difficulties is suggested by his words, "in its present form." There is convincing evidence, it seems to me, that the present form of 1 Cor 11:2-16 is not its original form.

⁸ Ibid., 297. Note that in 1 Cor 9:1-12 Paul speaks of giving up certain "rights," including the right "to be accompanied by a wife" (Greek: "a sister as wife"), in order not to "put an obstacle in the way of the gospel of Christ."

⁹ *The Writings of St. Paul: A Norton Critical Edition* (New York: Norton, 1972) 38.

¹⁰ "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," 297; he suggests that this "hidden agenda" might be Paul's fear of homosexuality (n. 38).

¹¹ Ibid., 297-302; cf. "Paul: Chauvinist or Liberationist?" 309.

¹² R. Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," 302.

¹³ Ibid., 297.

I

I propose, in the first place, that the entire passage, 1 Cor 11:2-16, is an interpolation.¹⁴ It is widely accepted that the Pauline writings must have undergone some revision at the hands of one or more editors. John Knox, for example, asserts that these writings "did not achieve the form in which they have survived until a generation or so after their author's death" and that the final editor "almost certainly made, as any editor would, many occasional interpolations, glosses, or omissions, with a view to clarifying, as he saw it, the meaning of the apostle."¹⁵ Particularly in the Corinthian correspondence, many scholars have seen the hand of an editor. Günther Bornkamm, for one, although he assumes the unity of 1 Corinthians, maintains that 2 Corinthians is composed of parts of five different letters, written at different times to deal with different situations, and that its various parts were perhaps not combined until near the end of the first century.¹⁶ Walter Schmithals goes further, suggesting that 1 and 2 Corinthians together are composed of parts of six different letters.¹⁷ Jean Héring, dealing specifically with 1 Corinthians, argues that the material derives from two separate letters.¹⁸ Even scholars who regard 1 Corinthians as a unity, however, have often detected the presence of one or more interpolations.¹⁹ The

¹⁴ As far as I have been able to determine, no one has ever suggested this for the passage as a whole. J. Weiss suggested that vs. 3 is an interpolation; see n. 33 below.

¹⁵ *Chapters in a Life of Paul* (New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1950) 18. There is no compelling reason to assume, as Knox seems to do, that only *one* such editor was involved.

¹⁶ G. Bornkamm, *Die Vorgeschichte des sogenannten Zweiten Korintherbriefes* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter, 1961); cf. *Paul* (New York/Evanston: Harper & Row, 1971) 244-46. Bornkamm identifies the parts, arranged chronologically, as (1) 2 Cor 2:14-7:4; (2) 2 Cor 10:1-13:14; (3) 2 Cor 1:1-2:13; 7:5-16; (4) 2 Cor 8:1-24; and (5) 2 Cor 9:1-15. On the grounds of its non-Pauline vocabulary and theological content, as well as the fact that it breaks the context, he regards 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 as a non-Pauline interpolation. As to why chs. 10-13, which form the second part chronologically, would have been placed last by the editor, Bornkamm suggests that since heresy was regarded in the early church as one of the perils of the last days, warnings against it were characteristically located at the end of writings. Otherwise, letter 3 contains the basic material, into which letter 1 was inserted and to which letters 4 and 5 were added.

¹⁷ *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians* (Nashville/New York: Abingdon, 1971) 87-101; Schmithals identifies the parts, arranged chronologically, as: (A) 2 Cor 6:14-7:1; 1 Cor 6:12-20; 9:24-10:22; 11:2-34; 15; 16:13-24; (B) 1 Cor 1:1-6:11; 7:1-9:23; 10:23-11:1; 12:1-14:40; 16:1-12; (C) 2 Cor 2:14-6:13; 7:2-4; (D) 2 Cor 10:1-13:13; (E) 2 Cor 9:1-15; and (F) 2 Cor 1:1-2:13; 7:5-8:24. As Bornkamm does, Schmithals suggests that this collection may have been made near the end of the first century (pp. 88-89), but, differently from Bornkamm, he regards 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 as authentically Pauline (p. 94, esp. n. 21).

¹⁸ *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (London: Epworth, 1962) xiii-xiv.

¹⁹ J. C. O'Neill (*The Recovery of Paul's Letter to the Galatians* [London: S. P. C. K., 1972]) argues similarly that Galatians contains a number of glosses added by a series of scribes and editors (e.g., Gal 5:13-6:11). On possible glosses in Romans, see R. Bultmann, "Glossen im Römerbrief," *TLZ* 72 (1947) 197-98; reprinted, *Exegetica* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1967) 278-79.

likelihood that 1 Cor 14:33b-36 (or perhaps only vss. 34-35) is such an interpolation has already been pointed out, and it has occasionally been suggested that 1 Corinthians 13 should also be so regarded.²⁰ It should also be noted that many scholars regard 2 Corinthians 6:14-7:1 as an interpolation.²¹

It is true that there is no direct manuscript evidence for regarding 1 Cor 11:2-16 as an interpolation; all of the extant manuscripts, so far as I know, have the passage at the same place in the text of 1 Corinthians. But as C. K. Barrett has pointed out,

The evidence of the MSS can tell us nothing about the state of the Pauline (or, for that matter, of any other) literature before its publication. That what we call 1 Corinthians was published in the form in which we now know it is certain; but this does not prove that the form we know was not put together out of a number of pieces.²²

Furthermore, there is strong manuscript evidence suggesting that *some* alteration of the text has occurred. Vs. 2 reads: ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς ὅτι πάντα μου μέμνησθε καὶ καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε, "I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I have delivered them to you." Vs. 17, according to the RSV, begins: "But in the following instructions I do not commend you, because . . ." (τοῦτο δὲ παραγγέλλων οὐκ ἐπαινῶ ὅτι . . .). This reading follows $\aleph$, G, and the majority of MSS, but A, C*, and the Latin and Syriac versions have τοῦτο δὲ παραγγέλλω οὐκ ἐπαινῶν ὅτι . . ., while B has τοῦτο δὲ παραγγέλλων οὐκ ἐπαινῶν ὅτι . . ., and D* and a minuscule have τοῦτο δὲ παραγγέλλω οὐκ ἐπαινῶ ὅτι Two points call for comment. First, when a later verse repeats significant words from an earlier verse, and particularly when the two verses are separated by a self-contained unit which, if eliminated along with one or the other of the two similar verses, leaves a smooth connection between what precedes and what follows, this is often evidence of the work of "an editor who is making an insert."²³ The proposed interpolation probably includes vss. 2-16, but it is possible that vs. 2 was originally followed immediately by vs. 17, with the interpolation consisting of vss. 3-16. Second, the textual variations in vs. 17 themselves are a strong indication that the text has been altered in some way, as various editors or copyists have attempted in different ways to improve what must originally have been a rather rough transition to vs. 17b. Thus, there is evidence that some alteration of the text has occurred, and this evidence could easily be explained by the hypothesis that vss. 2-16 (or possibly 3-16) are an interpolation.

²⁰ See E. L. Titus, "Did Paul Write I Corinthians 13?" *JBR* 27 (1959) 299-302.

²¹ See, most recently, H. D. Betz, "2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?" *JBL* 92 (1973) 88-108.

²² *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 14.

²³ W. A. Meeks (ed.), *The Writings of St. Paul*, 41. Meeks makes reference here specifically to 1 Cor 12:31b-13:13, which separates 12:31a and 14:1, but his remarks are equally applicable to 11:2-16; cf. also 2 Cor 6:11-13 and 7:2-4, which are separated by 6:14-7:1, which is widely regarded as an interpolation.

The most compelling reason, however, for regarding 1 Cor 11:2-16 as an interpolation is the fact that it so obviously breaks the context of the letter at this point. As they now stand, chs. 8-11 deal in general with matters pertaining to "eating" and "drinking" and other more or less related questions. The verses immediately preceding 11:2-16 read:

So, whether you eat or drink, or whatever you do, do all to the glory of God. Give no offense to Jews or to Greeks or to the church of God, just as I try to please all men in everything I do, not seeking my own advantage, but that of many, that they may be saved. Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ. (10:31-11:1)

Immediately after 11:2-16, the letter again deals with matters of eating and drinking. The passage under consideration clearly interrupts this discussion with its totally unrelated concern for the roles and relationships of men and women in the church. If the passage belongs anywhere in 1 Corinthians, it is somewhere in chs. 12-14, not in ch. 11!

As has already been pointed out, some scholars have questioned the integrity of 1 Corinthians. Jean Héring, for example, suggests that the material should be divided into two letters: the first containing 1:1-8:13; 10:23-11:1; 16:1-4, 10-14 and the second containing 9:1-10:22; 11:2-15:58 (with ch. 13 standing apart); 16:5-9, 15-24.²⁴ If his suggestion is accepted, then 11:2-16 interrupts a discussion of "the bread" and "the cup of the Lord" (10:14-22 and 11:17-34), and this discussion is much more coherent if 11:2-16 is removed. Regardless, then, of whether 1 Corinthians is regarded as a unit or is divided into two letters, as suggested by Héring, 11:2-16 breaks the context. I believe that this fact, coupled with the indirect manuscript evidence cited above and the general probability of the presence of interpolations in the Pauline writings as they now stand, and particularly in the Corinthian correspondence, establishes a strong basis for regarding 11:2-16 as, in fact, such an interpolation.²⁵

This conclusion does not, of course, necessarily deny Pauline authorship of 11:2-16. An editor may have composed the passage himself and inserted it here, he may have inserted a passage written by someone other than either himself or Paul, or he may have inserted an authentic Pauline passage which originally belonged elsewhere in this letter or in some other letter.

As to why the interpolation would have been inserted at this particular place in 1 Corinthians, since it so obviously breaks the context, one can only guess.²⁶ In my opinion, the editor who inserted the passage was not its author; if he himself had composed the material, he would have taken more care to make it fit into whatever context he chose to place it. He likely believed that the material came from Paul, and his problem was that of determining exactly where

²⁴ *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, xiii-xiv.

²⁵ Arguments against Pauline authorship of 1 Cor 11:2-16, which will be set forth later in this paper, will conclusively show that the passage is an interpolation.

²⁶ H. D. Betz ("2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?" 108), in speaking of it as an interpolation, can only refer to "reasons unknown to us."

to locate it among the other materials which now make up the letter.²⁷ It is quite possible that the parts of the present letter were either originally parts of different letters or, if parts of the same letter, were somehow accidentally disarranged. The editor, then, may either simply have left the materials in the order in which he found them, attempting only to provide or improve the transitions, or, less likely, have rearranged them in what seemed to him the best order. It is possible, of course, that he inserted 11:2-16 into what was otherwise a reasonably orderly and well-arranged letter, but the likelihood of other interpolations in the Corinthian correspondence argues against this possibility.²⁸ If the editor did himself decide where to locate the passage, then his basic principle may have been one of verbal similarities. For example, if vs. 2 was a part of the passage as the editor found it, the *μου μέμνησθε* ("you remember me") may have been reminiscent to him of the *μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε* ("be imitators of me") in the immediately preceding vs. 1. Or it may be that the editor associated the words of vs. 2 ("I commend you because you remember me in everything and maintain the traditions even as I have delivered them to you") with the similar words at the beginning of vs. 17 ("But in the following instructions I do not commend you, because . . ."). Other verbal similarities include "glory" (*δόξα*), which occurs three times in 11:2-16 (cf. 10:31), "the churches of God" in vs. 16 (cf. 10:32; 11:18, 22), and "judge for yourselves" in vs. 13 (cf. 10:15). There are numerous possibilities, but even a tentative decision must await a careful study of the ways in which other pericopae in the Corinthian correspondence (and perhaps in other letters) are connected, assuming, of course, that 11:2-16 is not the only such instance of an editor's work.

One final point is to be noted, and it is highly significant but easily overlooked: once 11:2-16 is removed as an interpolation, the *τοῦτο* of vs. 17 (translated in the RSV as "the following") almost certainly should refer not forward to what follows in 11:17-22, but back to the command in 11:1 (or perhaps 10:31-11:1), and this is a more accurate grammatical use of the word. Vs. 17 then would be translated somewhat as follows: "But in commanding this (i.e., to become imitators of Paul's rather "situational" approach to matters of eating and drinking), I am not commending the fact that when you come together it is not for the better but for the worse"; in other words, "situationalism" has its limits, where the peace and purity of the church are involved!²⁹

²⁷ The problem of the relationship between this and other interpolations in the authentic Pauline materials, on the one hand, and the pseudo-Pauline writings, on the other hand, needs much further study. As will be pointed out later, there are definite similarities between 1 Cor 11:2-16 and both Colossians and Ephesians, on the one hand, and 1 Timothy, on the other hand. This suggests the possibility that the interpolation comes from the same source (or sources) as the pseudo-Pauline writings; but, if this is so, then it would appear, for the reason just cited in the text, that the interpolation was added to the text of 1 Corinthians by someone other than its author (or authors).

²⁸ On the work of the editor, see G. Bornkamm, *Die Vorgeschichte des sogenannten Zweiten Korintherbriefes*, passim; this is summarized in *Paul*, 244-46; see also W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 87-101.

²⁹ If Héring's division of 1 Corinthians is followed (*The First Epistle of Saint Paul*

II

Assuming, now, that 1 Cor 11:2-16 is an interpolation, I propose, in the second place, that the passage actually consists of three originally separate and distinct pericopae, each dealing with a somewhat different though related topic.

The *first* such pericope to be identified is found in vss. 3, 8-9, 11-12 and will be referred to as "pericope A." These verses, when separated out and combined, form a self-contained unit, which reads as follows in the RSV:

But I want you to understand that the head of every man is Christ, the head of a woman is her husband, and the head of Christ is God. For man was not made from woman, but woman from man. Neither was man created for woman, but woman for man. Nevertheless, in the Lord woman is not independent of man nor man of woman; for as woman was made from man, so man is now born of woman. And all things are from God.

Furthermore, the removal of these verses leaves a *second* smoothly connected self-contained pericope in vss. 4-7, 10, 13, 16,⁸⁰ free of many of the difficulties which the passage presents in its combined form. This second pericope, which will be referred to as "pericope B," reads as follows in the RSV:

Any man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonors his head, but any women who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled dishonors her head — it is the same as if her head were shaven. For if a woman will not veil herself, then she should cut off her hair; but if it is disgraceful for a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her wear a veil. For a man ought not to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God; but woman is the glory of man. That is why a woman ought to have a veil on her head, because of the angels.⁸¹ Judge for yourselves; is it proper for a woman to pray to God with her head uncovered? If any one is disposed to be contentious, we recognize no such practice,⁸² nor do the churches of God.

to the Corinthians, xiii-xiv), then *touto* refers to the dangers of confusing "the cup of the Lord" and "the table of the Lord" with "the cup of demons" and "the table of demons" (10:14-22).

⁸⁰ I shall argue below that vss. 14-15 form the third self-contained pericope in the passage.

⁸¹ "Because of the angels" (διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους) has never been satisfactorily explained, although many suggestions have been offered; see J. A. Fitzmyer, "A Feature of Qumrân Angelology and the Angels of I Cor. xi. 10," *NTS* 4 (1957-58) 48-58; reprinted with a "Postscript" in J. Murphy-O'Connor (ed.), *Paul and Qumran* (London: Chapman, 1968) 31-47; and in *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament* (London: Chapman, 1971; paperback form, Missoula: Scholars Press, 1974) 187-204, with relevant bibliographical data. Perhaps the phrase διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους, which appears somewhat redundant after διὰ τοῦτο at the beginning of vs. 10, was originally a part of pericope A and thus was somehow parallel to the διὰ τὴν γυναῖκα and διὰ τὸν ἄνδρα of vs. 9. This would mean, however, that something has been lost from the text at some point in its transmission.

⁸² The RSV actually reads "no other practice," but the Greek is ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν, i.e., "no such practice" as a woman praying to God with her head uncovered (vs. 13).

Not only does each of the two pericopae form a smoothly connected self-contained unit when thus separated, but it also becomes apparent that there are very significant differences between the two and that there are plausible reasons for their having been eventually combined, even though the combination actually tends to distort the real meaning of each separate pericope. It has often been noted, for example, that *κεφαλή*, "head," appears to be used in a metaphorical sense in vs. 3 (pericope A) but in a literal sense in vss. 4, 5, 7, and 10 (pericope B).⁸³ If the entire passage is left in its combined state, this presents serious problems of interpretation. If, however, the passage is divided as I propose, these problems immediately disappear. There is also a marked difference in literary style between the two pericopae. Scroggs comments on "the economic use of words" in vss. 11-12:⁸⁴ the Greek here has no verbs and is poetic and even cryptic in style. The same is true, although to a somewhat lesser degree, of vss. 3 and 8-9. Taken as a unit, the style of pericope A stands in notable contrast to the more expansive prose style of pericope B and, for that matter, of vss. 14-15 as well. Finally, pericope A is a general statement on the relationship between man and woman in the church, similar in tone and vocabulary to Col 3:18-19 and Eph 5:22-33, while pericope B deals with a specific question, that of covering or not covering the head by men and women in worship, and is in this respect more akin to 1 Tim 2:9-15 (cf. also 1 Pet 3:1-7).⁸⁵

The *third* pericope (vss. 14-15), which will be referred to as "pericope C," is perhaps not initially as easily distinguishable as are the first two, but there are four strong reasons for separating it from pericope B. In the first place, it forms a complete and intelligible unit by itself, reading as follows in the RSV:

Does not nature itself teach you that for a man to wear long hair is degrading to him, but if a woman has long hair, it is her pride? For her hair is given to her for a covering.

⁸³ R. Scroggs, "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," 299 n. 42: "The problem, whether the object of the dishonoring in 4b and 5b is the literal or the metaphorical meaning of *κεφαλή*, is notorious, and there can hardly be certainty in the matter. The literal meaning makes a little more sense in and of itself, but then that makes vs. 3 meaningless. According to Barrett, J. Weiss considered vs. 3 to be a later gloss, and it is true that removing that verse would solve the problems in 4f., cf. Barrett p. 250. On the assumption that vs. 3 was original, however, it seems better to take *κεφαλή* in the passages to be the same metaphorical use as the word has in vs. 3." I am proposing, of course, to remove not only vs. 3 but also vss. 8-9, 11-12, which clearly eliminates the problem.

⁸⁴ "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," 300 n. 49.

⁸⁵ A consideration of all of the NT epistolary passages dealing in detail with the status and role of women and their relationship to men suggests that there was a specific literary form, developed perhaps for the purpose of "keeping women in their place." The form characteristically consists of three parts: (a) an assertion or command; (b) the reason (either theological or historical) for the assertion or command; and (c) a "mitigation" or "softening of the blow." The pattern is clearly exhibited in 1 Tim 2:9-15.

In the second place, the material immediately preceding and following (pericope B) is complete and intelligible without pericope C—much more intelligible, in fact, than with it included, because, in the third place, the two pericopae really deal with different topics. Pericope B is concerned with the question of a head-covering in worship, while pericope C deals with the proper length of hair for men and women and actually implies rather strongly that women do not need any artificial head-covering, since they have their long hair as a natural covering.⁸⁶ Finally, in the fourth place, there are significant differences in vocabulary between the two pericopae. Pericope B consistently uses *αἰσχρός* (vs. 6) and the cognate verb *καταισχύνειν* (vss. 4, 5) to express the idea of "dishonor" or "disgrace," while pericope C uses *ἀτιμία* (vs. 14) for the same idea. Also, pericope B speaks of man as the "glory" (*δόξα*) of God and woman as the "glory" (*δόξα*) of man (vs. 7), while pericope C uses *δόξα* to refer to woman's long hair.⁸⁷

It appears, then, not only that 1 Cor 11:2-16 as a whole should be regarded as an interpolation, but also that the passage actually consists of three originally separate and distinct pericopae, each dealing with a somewhat different topic, yet having in common the fact that all three are concerned with some aspect of the relationship between men and women. Pericopae A and B also have in common the use of the word "head" (*κεφαλή*), though used differently in the two, as well as the general idea of the supremacy (or perhaps only priority) of man over woman in relationship to God. Pericopae B and C also have in common their concern for the head or hair, the idea of "dishonor" or "shame," and the word "glory" or "pride" (*δόξα*). Thus, it is not difficult to understand how

*R. Scroggs ("Paul and the Eschatological Woman," 298 n. 40) senses something of the problem: "Paul is actually self-contradictory in the 'argument from nature.' In 5b uncovered hair is equated with a shorn head, while in vs. 15 he claims that the long hair was given to woman *ἀντὶ περιβολαίου*, which has to mean 'in place of,' 'as,' or 'for' a covering. That is, Paul here says the woman's hair is the equivalent of a head-covering. If that is so, why should she need an 'artificial' covering in place of the one given her by God? It is in any case the very opposite of a shorn head." Scroggs, however, is unable to offer a satisfactory solution to the problem.

*J. B. Hurley ("Did Paul Require Veils," esp. pp. 193-204) argues, primarily on the basis of Jewish and Hellenistic custom and LXX vocabulary, that throughout 1 Cor 11:2-16 the author (whom he regards as Paul) is dealing with essentially the same problem: that of the proper hair-style and length rather than that of a head covering such as a veil or shawl. The terms *κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων* (vs. 4), *κατακαλύπτεται* and *κατακαλύπτεσθαι* (vs. 6), and *κατακαλύπτεσθαι τὴν κεφαλὴν* (vs. 7) refer to the appropriate custom for women which has the braids of hair pinned or folded on the top or at the back of the head, while *ἀκατακάλυπτος* (vss. 5, 13) refers to the custom followed by courtesans and prostitutes of allowing the hair to hang loose. Thus, according to Hurley, Paul does not advocate the wearing of a veil or shawl, since the long hair is an adequate head covering (vs. 15), but he does insist that women wear their hair up to distinguish them from prostitutes and to indicate their husbands' authority over them (vss. 3-13) and that there be a distinction in hair length between women and men (vss. 14-15).

and why the three pericopae might have been combined to form 1 Cor 11:2-16 as it now stands. Whether they were first combined by the editor who inserted the entire passage in its present place in 1 Corinthians, or whether he found them already combined, cannot at this point be determined. Neither is it certain whether they were first combined to provide material for dealing with some particular problem or question in the church or simply because it was believed that all were written by Paul and thus deserved a place in the corpus of his correspondence.⁸⁸

III

Assuming, now, that 1 Cor 11:2-16 is an interpolation and that it consists of three originally separate and distinct pericopae, each dealing with a somewhat different though related topic, I propose, in the third place, that none of the three pericopae now contained in the passage is authentically Pauline.

There are three very strong reasons for regarding pericope A as non-Pauline. The first is that the ideas which it expresses regarding the relationship between man and woman are not in agreement with what Paul appears to say in his authentic writings. If the Pastorals, Ephesians, and Colossians are regarded as pseudo-Pauline, and 1 Cor 14:33b-36 (or 34-35) as a non-Pauline gloss, there is no other passage in the entire Pauline corpus (except, of course, pericopae B and C of the passage under consideration, the authenticity of which I shall shortly dispute) which even possibly might be interpreted as advocating any form of male priority and female subordination. Surely, this fact, coupled with Paul's clear statement of equality in Gal 3:28 and his very positive references to female co-workers, carries some weight in determining the authenticity of this passage. A second reason for regarding pericope A as non-Pauline is the fact, which has already been suggested, that it is so similar in tone and vocabulary to Col 3:18-19 and Eph 5:22-33, both of which, of course, are widely regarded as pseudo-Pauline. It appears that some of the same interests which led to the writing of the pseudo-Pauline literature may have been responsible for at least some of the interpolations of non-Pauline materials into Paul's authentic

Hurley's argument is very ingenious, based as it is in part upon the fact that in the LXX the *καλύπτω* word-group sometimes translates a form of פָּרַע, which would refer to long hair in both the OT and the rabbinic writings (cf. Lev 13:45; Num 5:18; cf. *b. Taanith* 17b). In reply, however, it must be noted that, while there is often good reason to translate *prc* as "let loose," this does not necessarily mean that the LXX translators so understood it with their use of the *καλύπτω* word-group, which would not normally have this meaning. Furthermore, even if what I have called pericope B and pericope C do both deal with the question of hair rather than that of an artificial head covering, account must still be taken of the differences in vocabulary between the two pericopae, as well as of the fact that pericope B (according to Hurley) deals with hair style, while pericope C deals with hair length.

⁸⁸ It should be noted that vs. 2 has not been included in any of the three pericopae. It is possible that this verse is not part of the interpolation, which would then include

writings.⁸⁹ The third, and perhaps the most compelling, reason for regarding pericope A as non-Pauline is its use of the word "head."⁴⁰ Outside of 1 Cor 11:2-16, this word occurs only twice in the undoubtedly authentic Pauline writings (Rom 12:20; 1 Cor 12:21), in both instances with its literal meaning, "head" of a body. It is more frequent, however, in the pseudo-Pauline writings (Col 1:18; 2:10, 19; Eph 1:22; 4:15; 5:23), where it always has the same extended or metaphorical meaning which it carries in the passage under consideration. It is true that Paul perhaps hints at such a metaphorical use of *κεφαλή* in 1 Cor 12:12-27, where he speaks of the church as "the body of Christ" (cf. 1 Cor 6:15a; 10:16b-17; Rom 12:4-5), and in 2 Cor 11:2, where he refers to Christ as the "husband" (*ἀνὴρ*) of the church (cf. Rom 7:1-6, esp. vs. 4), but it is only in the later pseudo-Pauline writings that the metaphor of Christ as the "head" is actually employed. The idea of man as the "head" of woman, like that of Christ as the "head" of the church (or of all creation), appears to be pseudo-Pauline, rather than authentically Pauline.⁴¹

A careful examination of pericope B discloses three serious objections to attributing it to Paul. The first is the same as the first argument against Pauline

vss. 3-16, and that it was originally followed immediately by vs. 17 (with one or both of the verses likely in a form slightly different from that now appearing in the text). In my opinion, however, it is more likely that vs. 2 was composed by the editor to provide a transition, however awkward, between 11:1 and what now follows in 11:3-16. The use of *ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς ὅτι*, "I commend you because," is similar to *οὐκ ἐπαινῶ ὅτι*, "I do not commend you because," in vs. 17; *μὴ μνησθε*, "you remember me," is reminiscent of *μιμηταὶ μου γίνεσθε*, "be imitators of me," in vs. 1; and *καθὼς παρέδωκα ὑμῖν τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε*, "you maintain the traditions even as I have delivered them to you," suggests *ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου ὃ καὶ παρέδωκα ὑμῖν*, "for I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you," in vs. 23 (cf. also 15:1-3a). Thus, everything in vs. 2 could have been derived from the phraseology of the material immediately preceding and following vss. 3-16.

⁸⁹ See n. 27 above.

⁴⁰ On *κεφαλή*, see H. Schlier, "*κεφαλή, ἀνακεφαλαιοῦμαι*," *TDNT* 3 (1965) 673-82; S. Bedale, "The Meaning of *κεφαλή* in the Pauline Epistles," *JTS* 5 (1954) 211-15.

⁴¹ Apparently, the pseudo-Pauline concept is related to certain gnostic or proto-gnostic speculation; see, e.g., H. Schlier, "*κεφαλή, ἀνακεφαλαιοῦμαι*," 680-81, esp. pp. 676-78. As regards the origin of pericope A, the following parallel to vss. 11-12, which occurs twice in the *Genesis Rabbah* (8,9 and 22,2) is suggestive: "In the past Adam was created from dust and Eve was created from Adam; but henceforth it shall be *in our image, after our likeness* [Gen 1:26]; neither man without woman nor woman without man, and neither without the Shekinah." Although the *Genesis Rabbah* dates from the late fifth or early sixth century, it is likely that much of its material originated earlier, and the particular quotation in question is specifically ascribed, respectively, to Rabbi Simlai (ca. A.D. 250) and Rabbi Akiba (ca. A.D. 135). If these ascriptions are correct then the parallel to 1 Cor 11:11-12 existed in an oral form in the early second century, and it is possible that these verses are based upon earlier rabbinic teaching. Of course, it is also possible that the rabbinic parallel is based upon the NT passage. See M. Boucher, "Some Unexplored Parallels to 1 Cor 11, 11-12 and Gal 3, 28: The NT on the Role of Women," *CBQ* 31 (1969) 50-58.

authorship of pericope A. The ideas expressed in pericope B, particularly as they relate to the relationship between man and woman, are not in agreement with what Paul appears to say in his authentic writings. A second reason for regarding pericope B as non-Pauline is that in his undoubtedly authentic writings Paul nowhere indicates any concern for such "incidental" matters as whether men and women should pray or prophesy with their heads covered or uncovered or whether their hair should be long or short or confined or loose. It is impossible to say with any certainty just what the actual practices in ancient times were regarding head-coverings and hair-styles,⁴² but many scholars believe that the author of the passage in question (assumed by them to be Paul) is arguing for the introduction (or, more likely, the preservation) of an oriental and, specifically, Jewish custom against the Greek custom.⁴³ Except in matters of sexual purity, Paul appears to have had little concern for such differences between Jews and Greeks; indeed, he expressly disavows such concern in his well-known claim that he has "become all things to all men" (1 Cor 9:19-23; cf. 10:32-33), which sounds very much like "when in Rome, do as the Romans do."⁴⁴ Even in the potentially explosive matter of eating meat that had been offered to idols, Paul refused to set forth any "legalistic" requirements (1 Corinthians 8-10; cf. Romans 14). Finally, when Paul does give directions or advice regarding specific matters of conduct (again, except in matters of sexual purity), he characteristically supports such directions or advice not by general theological arguments but rather by pragmatic considerations, such as the nearness of the parousia and the need for complete freedom to serve God (1 Cor 7:26-35), the effects of one's conduct on other Christians (1 Corinthians 8; 10:23-29), the edification of the church (1 Corinthians 14), or the effect on outsiders (1 Cor 14:23-25). The third reason for regarding pericope B as non-Pauline is its use of the word "glory" (δόξα).⁴⁵ Vs. 7 speaks of man as the "glory" of God and woman as the "glory" of man. Paul quite often uses the word "glory," and in a variety of ways, but never does he speak of man, in his present existence, as the "glory" of God. Indeed, Paul insists quite explicitly

⁴² See J. C. Hurd, Jr., *The Origin of I Corinthians* (New York: Seabury, 1965) 184, esp. n. 2. W. M. Ramsay (*The Cities of St. Paul: Their Influence on His Life and Thought* [London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1907] 201-5) cites Dio Chrysostom to the effect that the oriental custom of veiling women was practiced in Tarsus and suggests that this accounts for Paul's teachings on the subject.

⁴³ See W. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 238; cf. G. Deutsch and K. Kohler, "Bareheadedness," *Jewish Encyclopedia* (new ed.; New York/London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1925), 2. 530-33; "Head, Covering of," *Universal Jewish Encyclopedia* (New York: Universal Jewish Encyclopedia, 1941), 5. 262-63; "Covering of the Head," *Encyclopedia of the Jewish Religion* (New York/Chicago/San Francisco: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1966) 101; and Meir Ydit, "Head, Covering of the," *Encyclopaedia Judaica* (New York: Macmillan, 1971), 8. 2-4.

⁴⁴ Obviously, Paul would have set certain limits to such a policy, but it seems highly unlikely that these limits would have included the matter of head-covering or hair-style.

⁴⁵ On δόξα, see G. Kittel and G. von Rad, "δόξα," *TDNT* 2 (1964) 233-53.

and pointedly that, because of sin, man has lost the "glory" of God which he had in the beginning (Rom 3:23).⁴⁶ Thus, for him, "glory" is essentially an eschatological concept, applied not to man's present life but to the new creation which is still to be consummated in the future.⁴⁷

There are also three compelling reasons for regarding pericope C as non-Pauline. The first is that the idea of being taught by nature in vs. 14 (ἡ φύσις αὐτὴ διδάσκει ὑμᾶς) occurs nowhere in the undoubtedly authentic Pauline writings, although it is common in Greek philosophy generally, and in Stoicism in particular.⁴⁸ Many scholars have argued otherwise, asserting that Paul, like contemporary rabbinic Judaism, did hold to a notion of a universal moral law or a "law of nature" and citing Rom 1:26-27; 2:14 as parallels to the passage in question (cf. also Rom 2:27; 11:21, 24; Gal 2:15; 4:8).⁴⁹ It must be pointed out, however, that Rom 1:26-27; 2:14 are not really parallels at all, for they do not represent a "hypostasizing" of "nature" as a "quasi-divine" reality or power such as is found in Stoicism and in 1 Cor 11:14. The adjective φυσικός, the prepositional phrase παρὰ φύσιν, and the noun φύσις as an adverbial dative should properly be translated, respectively, simply as "natural," "unnatural," and "naturally." A second reason for denying Pauline authorship of pericope C is the improbability that Paul would have stated that "for a man to wear long hair is degrading to him" (vs. 14b), particularly if the tradition in Acts 18:18 is accurate, which reports that "at Cenchreae he cut his hair, for he had a

⁴⁶ See R. Scroggs, *The Last Adam: A Study in Pauline Anthropology* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1966) 73-74. It might be argued that in 1 Cor 11:7 Paul has in mind the *intended* status of man or his status *prior* to the Fall, while in Rom 3:23 he refers to man's *actual* status *subsequent* to the Fall. Such an argument, however, has no basis in the texts themselves and would appear to depend upon certain theological and/or literary presuppositions rather than an exegesis of the materials in question. In the passage under consideration, the author appears to be speaking of the *actual* status of men and women. Scroggs (*ibid.*, 70 n. 30) notes "that in I Cor. 11:7 Paul refers to man *in his present existence* as image and glory of God" (my italics).

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, esp. pp. 64-65; on p. 70 n. 30, Scroggs refers to 1 Cor 11:7 with its application of δόξα to man's present existence as "an exception to Paul's usual practice, for which δόξα is an eschatological term," and states: "Man does not possess this δόξα any more than he retains the image [of God]; cf. Rom 3:23. Paul has 'lapsed' here into non-eschatological thinking. He does consider the new age to be somehow present within the believer now, but to take the Corinthians passage in this sense is to ignore the most natural interpretation of the text." My suggestion is that it is precisely this "lapse" into non-eschatological thinking which is one of the characteristics of pseudo-Pauline, as opposed to authentically Pauline, writings.

⁴⁸ See M. S. Enslin, *The Ethics of Paul* (Apex ed.; New York/Nashville: Abingdon, 1957) 19-23, 91, 200.

⁴⁹ See A. Richardson, *An Introduction to the Theology of the New Testament* (New York: Harper, 1958) 49; R. M. Grant, "Hellenistic Elements in 1 Corinthians," *Early Christian Origins: Studies in Honor of Harold R. Willoughby* (ed. A. Wikgren; Chicago: Quadrangle, 1961) 62; and C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 256. For a highly illuminating treatment of the topic, see H. Köster, "φύσις, φυσικός, φυσικῶς," *TDNT* 9 (1974) 251-77, esp. pp. 271-75 (on Paul).

vow."⁵⁰ Even if that tradition is not accurate, and Paul himself did not let his own hair grow long, it is nevertheless unlikely that a Jew would have adopted such an attitude toward long hair on a man, because, as R. C. Dentan points out, "long hair on men was greatly admired" in the OT,⁵¹ and it appears that Palestinian Judaism, at least, preserved the custom of long hair for men in NT times.⁵² The statement in pericope C sounds much more Greek or Roman than Jewish,⁵³ and such concern about the length of hair and other related matters would seem to be more characteristic of the post-Pauline than of the Pauline period.⁵⁴ The third reason for regarding pericope C as non-Pauline has already been suggested in connection with pericope B: it appears that Paul simply was not concerned about such "peripheral" matters as the length of a person's hair and the like.

The various arguments which have been raised against the authenticity of 1 Cor 11:2-16 all assume the validity of my earlier suggestion that the passage consists of three originally separate and distinct pericopae. If, however, the passage were to be regarded as a unit rather than as composite, the cumulative weight of the arguments against its authenticity would, it seems to me, be virtually overwhelming. There is simply nothing else like this passage, in tone or in vocabulary or in content, anywhere in the undoubtedly authentic writings, but it shows many similarities to the pseudo-Pauline writings.⁵⁵

⁵⁰ I am indebted to my colleague, F. O. Garcia-Treto, for calling this to my attention. Cf. also Acts 21:23-24. On the vow, which would undoubtedly have been a Nazirite vow, see J. C. Rylaarsdam, "Nazirite," *IDB* 3 (1962) 526-27 and the bibliography cited there.

⁵¹ R. C. Dentan, "Hair," *IDB* 2 (1962) 512.

⁵² See J. L. McKenzie, *Dictionary of the Bible* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1965) 333.

⁵³ See Tertullian, *De corona* 4; Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 33. 48. J. L. McKenzie (*Dictionary of the Bible*, 333) says that the author (whom he regards as Paul) "in speaking to the Corinthians accepts the Roman rather than the Palestinian style." C. K. Barrett (*A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 256-57) observes that Hellenistic portraiture showed men with short and women with long hair and cites an interesting parallel to 1 Cor 11:14-15 in Epictetus, *Diss.* 1. 16, 9-14: "Let us leave the main works (*ἔργα*) of nature (*φύσις*), and behold her minor works (*πάρεργα*). Is there anything less useful than the hair on the chin? What then? Has not nature used this also in the most fitting way possible? Has she not by means of it distinguished the male and the female? Has not the nature of each one of us immediately cried out from afar, I am a man; on this understanding approach me, speak to me, seek nothing else; here are the signs? Again, in regard to women, as she has mingled something gentler in the voice so she has taken away the hair (of the chin) . . . For this reason we ought to keep the signs that God has given, we ought not to throw them away, nor to confound, so far as we can, the distinctions of the sexes." Lucian (*Dialogi meretricii* 5.3) similarly shows that it was considered "unnatural" for a woman to shave (as did the most manly, *ἀνδρώδεις*, of athletes).

⁵⁴ Cf. 1 Tim 2:9; 1 Pet 3:3.

⁵⁵ It is possible, of course, that the non-Pauline features of 1 Cor 11:2-16 should be attributed to Paul's use of traditional materials. It is difficult, however, to see why Paul would have used such materials at this particular point in his correspondence (perhaps

IV

My conclusion, then, is that 1 Cor 11:2-16 is an interpolation, that it consists of three originally separate and distinct pericopae, each dealing with a somewhat different though related topic, and that none of the three pericopae is authentically Pauline. This means, of course, that the passage cannot be used as a source for determining Paul's attitude toward the proper status and role of women. If the authenticity of 1 Tim 2:8-15; Tit 2:3-5; Eph 5:22-33; Col 3:18-19; and 1 Cor 14:33b-36 (or 34-35) is similarly rejected on critical grounds, as I am inclined to do, then the genuine Pauline corpus contains none of the passages which advocate male supremacy and female subordination in any form. On the contrary, the only direct Pauline statement on the subject is Gal 3:28, which insists on absolute equality in Christ.⁵⁶ Other related passages, such as 1 Corinthians 7 and the various references to women as Paul's honored co-workers in the church, imply the same attitude.

Nevertheless, it is still not completely clear just what Paul's views on the proper relationship between men and women were. The complexity of the problem is suggested by a look at his treatment of the other two pairs (Jew/Greek and slave/free) mentioned in Gal 3:28. The distinction between Jew and Gentile is a thing of the past for Paul, at least in the church.⁵⁷ He does, however, continue to use the traditional terminology to refer to the two groups.⁵⁸ Perhaps his basic view is that one who is "in Christ" has exchanged his previous status as either a Jew or a Gentile for a third, new status—that of the "new creature" (2 Cor 5:17).⁵⁹ As to the second distinction, that between slave and free, Paul insists that Onesimus, the runaway slave, is to be received back by his master "no longer as a slave but more than a slave, as a beloved brother, especially to me but how much more to you, both in the flesh and in the Lord" (Phlm 16), but he does not explicitly and clearly state that Onesimus should be freed, nor does he condemn the institution of slavery as such. More-

the passage is misplaced), and it is even more difficult to understand why he would have used materials containing ideas which are so much at odds with his own views as stated and implied elsewhere.

⁵⁶ Since the immediate context in Galatians 3 calls for only the first of the three pairings in vs. 28 (Jew and Greek), and since the other two passages in the NT where the same pairings are found (1 Cor 12:12-13; Col 3:9-11) both suggest baptismal contexts, it has been proposed that Gal 3:27-28 is "a fragment of an early Christian baptismal liturgy," not originally composed by Paul. Scroggs argues, however, that Paul registers his own complete agreement with the passage, not only by quoting it here, but also by providing in 1 Cor 7:17-27 "an explicit commentary" on it ("Paul and the Eschatological Woman," 291-93).

⁵⁷ This is particularly evident in Gal 2:11-14, where Paul is severely critical of Cephas for refusing to eat with Gentile Christians. Cf. also Rom 10:12.

⁵⁸ In many instances, however, he is clearly speaking of Jews and Gentiles who are not Christians.

⁵⁹ Note that in 1 Cor 10:32, for example, Paul apparently distinguishes between Jews, Greeks, and "the church of God."

over, his word to slaves in 1 Cor 7:21b can be interpreted either as a suggestion that slaves take advantage of any opportunity which arises to gain their freedom or as an admonition to take advantage of their status as slaves (perhaps to win their masters to faith in Christ). In any case, his basic principle is that "every one should remain in the state in which he was called" (1 Cor 7:20). Thus, whether Paul's clear insistence that "in Christ" all distinctions between male and female are overcome also means to him that such distinctions should be abolished "in the world" (i.e., in the realm of social and domestic relations) is, I think, not entirely clear. Paul apparently had no interest in challenging the existing political, economic, or social institutions and customs, except where these directly conflicted with Christian belief or morality, and it may even be that he would not himself have been willing or able to apply his own theological insight in a completely consistent manner.⁶⁰

What is clear, however, as Scroggs suggests,⁶¹ is that, for whatever reason, a later generation of Christians thought it necessary to compose and attribute to Paul a number of statements which severely restrict the equality and freedom for women in the church which Paul's own statements imply.⁶²

⁶⁰ It is probable that this insight was not original with Paul (see n. 56 above).

⁶¹ "Paul and the Eschatological Woman," 302-03.

⁶² On the early church's fear of the freedom implied by Paul's gospel, see 2 Pet 3:15b-17. R. H. Fuller (*The New Testament in Current Study* [New York: Scribner, 1962] 137) points out that it is not enough simply to leave the deutero-Pauline and pseudo-Pauline materials out of account in attempting to reconstruct Paul's theology; "these writings must be evaluated as evidence for the development towards early catholicism in the sub-apostolic age." This also applies, it seems to me, to any non-Pauline interpolations within the generally authentic Pauline letters.

Copyright and Use:

As an ATLAS user, you may print, download, or send articles for individual use according to fair use as defined by U.S. and international copyright law and as otherwise authorized under your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement.

No content may be copied or emailed to multiple sites or publicly posted without the copyright holder(s)' express written permission. Any use, decompiling, reproduction, or distribution of this journal in excess of fair use provisions may be a violation of copyright law.

This journal is made available to you through the ATLAS collection with permission from the copyright holder(s). The copyright holder for an entire issue of a journal typically is the journal owner, who also may own the copyright in each article. However, for certain articles, the author of the article may maintain the copyright in the article. Please contact the copyright holder(s) to request permission to use an article or specific work for any use not covered by the fair use provisions of the copyright laws or covered by your respective ATLAS subscriber agreement. For information regarding the copyright holder(s), please refer to the copyright information in the journal, if available, or contact ATLA to request contact information for the copyright holder(s).

About ATLAS:

The ATLA Serials (ATLAS®) collection contains electronic versions of previously published religion and theology journals reproduced with permission. The ATLAS collection is owned and managed by the American Theological Library Association (ATLA) and received initial funding from Lilly Endowment Inc.

The design and final form of this electronic document is the property of the American Theological Library Association.