

receives wages, and gathers fruit for eternal life, so that sower and reaper may rejoice together; ... I sent you to reap that for which you did not labour...' (John 4:35-38).¹⁸⁰ Note the key words 'harvest', 'labourer', 'sow', 'reap', and 'wages' as distinct from 'fruit unto life eternal'.¹⁸¹ The metaphor of man as a labourer in God's Kingdom is in evidence in Judaism at least as early as the second century BCE, and shows interesting parallels with the Hippocratic saying *ars longa, vita brevis*.¹⁸² The sayings of R. Tarfon are also revealing: "The day is short, the work is plentiful, the labourers are indolent, the reward is great and the landowner is urgent. ... It is not incumbent on you to finish the work, but neither are you free to abandon it..."¹⁸³

The related metaphor of the seed as denoting the word of God or Tora is basic to a number of Jesus' parables¹⁸⁴ and is also found in the Apocalypse of Ezra¹⁸⁵ and Rabbinic literature.¹⁸⁶ In a wider perspective both Rabbinic aggada and liturgy view the earthly blessing of a rich harvest within the context of the covenant relationship which extends to resurrection into the world to come.¹⁸⁷

As stated these metaphors appear in Paul's letters too, and not only in the present passage. The applications vary. 1Cor 3:6-9 compares Paul and Apollos as preachers of the gospel with labourers who plant and water and will 'each receive reward according to his own labour', while it is God who gives the increase; this directly relates to the tradition of Apostles as workers in God's harvest in 1Cor 9 and to the synoptic despatch narrative.¹⁸⁸ In 1Cor 15:36-44 Paul uses the simile of the seed to explain the resurrection into the world to come, a simile also attributed to Jesus (John 12:24). Faintly related is Gal 6:7-9 which juxtaposes 'sowing' and 'reaping on the flesh' to the same 'on the Spirit', finally 2Cor 9:6, 10 apply 'sowing' and 'reaping' to charity connected with the collection for Jerusalem. In this connection 2Cor 9:10 uses a remarkable expression which does not fit in traditional Paulinism: 'He Who supplies seed to

¹⁸⁰ The talk of food v31-34 also relates to this complex and its halakhic stratum. But for the extant gospel halakhic connotations seem to have become meaningless.

¹⁸¹ Cf fruits in this world vs main reward in the world to come, in return for exemplary good deeds (mPea 1:1); treasures gathered in heaven by loving kindness (tPea 4:18; yPea 1, 15a; Matt 6:19 par; Luke 12:16-21; Matt 19:21 par).

¹⁸² See Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 141-58: *ars* = τέχνη, 'craft'. See his important remarks on the wider implications of such relationships between Rabbinic parables and popular Greek ethics. Cf Jesus' parables of labourers and tenants, Matt 20:1-15; Matt 21:33-39 par.

¹⁸³ mAv 2:15f.

¹⁸⁴ Matt 13:3-8 par; Matt 13:24-30; Mark 4:26-29. See Flusser, *Gleichnisse*, 122-8 on 'allegory' in these parables.

¹⁸⁵ 4Ezra 4:28-32; 8:41-44; 9:17, 30-37.

¹⁸⁶ tSot 7:11, Tora a plant which multiplies; ARN b 34 (38a-b), good deeds as roots of a plant. Both are attributed to R. Elazar ben Azaria. - The λόγος σπέρματος seems another stray seed blown away by the spirit.

¹⁸⁷ On rain, childbirth and resurrection see GenR 13.3-6 (p115-7); MidrGad Deut 28:12 (p610-3); and par indicated there. On liturgy see prayer for rain and fasts for drought, mTaan chs 1-2. In one Palestinian version of *berkat ha-shanim* (9th benediction of the *Shemone Esrei*) the prayer for a good harvest is directly associated with the coming of the 'end': יָרֵב (Elbogen, *Gottesdienst*, 49); the play is in the word יָרֵב (summer).

¹⁸⁸ See Fjärstedt (above n158).

the sower and bread for food (Isa 55:10) ... will increase the revenues of your charity (δικαιοσύνης).¹⁸⁹

Summing up we can state that Paul expounds his rights as an Apostle in connection with a halakhic saying of Jesus, developing the halakhic midrash on which the latter is based. Such connections were quickly and completely lost from Christian tradition, with the result that today they have to be 'discovered' anew. The development was facilitated by the rapid influx of gentile Christians, stimulated by Paul himself, and is already reflected in the New Testament. One of the deutero-Pauline letters supports the call to honour preachers and teachers as follows: 'For the scripture says: "You shall not muzzle the ox when it is treading out the grain", and, "The labourer deserves his wages"' (1Tim 5:18). The Jesus logion is quoted, in its secondary Lukan form, as though it were Scripture. The author shows no awareness that it concerns a halakhic saying expounding the verse just quoted; he purports to be quoting two independent, authoritative sayings each supplementing the other. The loss of distinction between 'Scripture' and gospel, between Written Tora and midrash, suggests we are confronted here with an early, canonized example of the *de facto* hellenization and de-judaization of Pauline tradition.¹⁹⁰ It reminds us that it was Paul's fate to be read and preserved in later history - on the basis of being misunderstood.¹⁹¹ And unfortunately, this is not restricted to the concern for oxen either.

Worship and Liturgy (1Cor 11-14)

Chapters 11-14 of First Corinthians are wholly devoted to worship and liturgy. It is a weighty subject which sometimes involves appeal to doubled or even tripled formal sources of authority. The section is introduced as being about 'traditions' taught by Paul (11:2). Other explicit designations used are the 'practice' of the 'church of God' (11:16); that which Paul 'received from the Lord and also delivered to you' (11:23); that which is 'written in the Law' (14:21); and that which is customary 'in all the churches of the saints... as even the Law says', and which moreover 'is a command of the Lord' (14:34, 37).

PARTICIPATION OF WOMEN

The liturgical section contains two instructions regarding the participation of women during worship: their headcovering (11:3-16) and their silence (14:33-36). These commandments have a multiple interest for present-day study into Paul and the Jewish Law.

In the first place the two passages stand out remarkably in First Corinthians and particularly here. The other subjects treated are practical procedures at the eucharist (11:17-34) and, in a complex argument, the spiritual gifts of speaking

¹⁸⁹ This relates to the material mentioned above n181.

¹⁹⁰ De-judaization does not of necessity imply anti-Judaism, but has no defense against it.

¹⁹¹ Cf Overbeck's saying, above p10 n43.

...the concluding instruction on female silence apparently refers to the public activities of female prophets, the one concerning the headcovering prefaces the adhortation for decency during the sacred community meals. In effect the two laws on women open and close the entire section on worship. This can hardly be considered co-incidental and signifies special emphasis.

In the second place, as we shall see below, the traditions involved are closely related to ancient Jewish custom. As has been stated they are explicitly introduced as 'traditions' (παράδοσεις) and 'custom' (συνήθεια) followed by all 'churches of God' or 'churches of the holy' (1Cor 11:3, 16; 14:34). The authoritative, Jewish-Christian character of such formal ascriptions has been outlined in the previous chapter. Indeed these passages well illustrate that Paul is no exception to the general affirmation of patriarchy in antiquity and in this sense he appears to be firmly rooted in ancient Jewish tradition.

In the third place these passages have been used in the framework of Christian social teaching to support the subjugation of women even in cultural situations where such did not or no longer corresponded to women's self-awareness.¹⁹² Historical criticism, which originated in a post-revolutionary climate of profound social and religious transformation, by nature must face up to the various interests reflected in and projected into these texts and try to decode the distinct messages they imply.

In the perspective of a feminist-oriented historical criticism,¹⁹³ Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza emphasizes the strategic function of these laws in First Corinthians, making a link with with the prominence of Chloe in 1Cor 1:11 and the crucial role of women in the marriage instructions in ch 7. She also interprets Paul's authoritative language in First Corinthians as a repressive reaction to the more liberal position of women in the Corinthian church.¹⁹⁴ As such it would indicate Paul's regression from an original Christian egalitarianism.¹⁹⁵ This is a compelling analysis, but one important aspect of historical criticism is not taken into account: the genetic relation of early Christianity to Judaism.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹² For this perspective see Stendahl, *Bible*.

¹⁹³ For a thorough theoretical discussion see Schüssler Fiorenza, *Bread*, esp chs 5-6 (recognizing a hopeful solidarity both with liberation and 'post-holocaust' theology, p14f).

¹⁹⁴ Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Rhetorical Situation'; less radical in *Memory*, 226-33. There is some exaggeration here. Authoritative speech is densest in 1Cor 14:34-37 which directly relates to female silence, but aims also at spiritual gifts and the eucharist. But stronger language is used for the idol offerings (1Cor 10:1-23) and especially the incest case (5:1-6:20), in which women's rights are not emphasized.

¹⁹⁵ This projects Enlightenment rationalism into Paul (cf 'the abolition of the religious distinctions between Jew and Greek'; *Memory*, 210, 213). Correspondingly the author rejects the pluralist interpretation of Paul's ecclesiology ironically as 'the "equal but different assumption"' (p207) and takes 1Cor 7:17-21 to mean that 'Paul clearly does not [sic] advise the former Jew or the former gentile to remain in their Jewish or pagan state' (p221). More moderate is 'Die Frauen', 129.

¹⁹⁶ Jewish feminist criticism applies, see Plaskow-Daum, 'Blaming Jews', 11 (mentioning Fiorenza, ib 13); cf also Brooten, 'Jewish Women's History'. While aware of this criticism (*Memory*, 105-7), Schüssler Fiorenza's description of the 'Jesus Movement' as a 'Renewal Movement Within Judaism' (ib ch4) is inadequate. The idea of Jesus as 'the woman-identified man' (p154) and of his followers as 'the discipleship of equals' (p107) is a romanticism in view of the massive patriarchalism of Jewish

An adequate assessment of Paul's stance on the rights of women, which is incumbent on his modern interpreters,¹⁹⁷ requires a historic-critical evaluation of (1) his relation to contemporary Jewish and Jewish-Christian traditions and (2) the attitudes towards women in those traditions. While Paul's relationship to Jewish tradition is the main subject of the present study, some words about the place of women in ancient Jewish society and worship are relevant here.

Apparently quite in line with contemporary Mediterranean culture,¹⁹⁸ Josephus summarized the position of women in ancient Judaism: 'The woman, says [the Law], is in all things inferior to the man; let her therefore be submissive, not for her humiliation, but that she may be directed; for the authority (αρχατος) has been given by God to the man.'¹⁹⁹ While later Tannaic halakha as reflected in the Mishna gave the woman legal power, the ancient conception reflected in Philo and Josephus her permanent subordination, if not to her father or brother, then to her husband.²⁰⁰ This social inferiority was expressed in the woman's dress. While in general women were supposed to appear in public as little as possible,²⁰¹ an unmarried girl could occasionally go out with her hair uncovered,²⁰² but the headcovering of the married woman when appearing in public was an essential feature of the 'Law of the Jews', violation of which was considered very serious: 'These (women) are divorced without their *ketuba* (marriage contract stating the divorce fee): if she transgresses the Law of Moses and the Jews משה יהודים ... What (is a transgression of) the Law of the Jews? If she goes out with her hair unbound, or spins in the street, or talks to everyone...'²⁰³ Conversely, men did not cover their head as a rule: 'Why does the woman cover her head and does the man not cover his head?'²⁰⁴ The reason given in the latter tradition is Eve's sin – an answer commensurate with that of common male Jewish opinion of the day, like the one expressed by Paul that woman was created second (1Cor 11:8), or Philo, that womanhood is inferior and sense-directed.²⁰⁵ Greek and Roman head covering fashions were different. Roman men apparently used to wear veils during religious ceremonies,²⁰⁶ while

and Apostolic tradition.

¹⁹⁷ An admirable endeavour, though practically excluding Rabbinic literature, is Küchler *Schweigen*.

¹⁹⁸ See Heinemann's unsparing and passionate analysis, *Bildung*, 231-53, placing Philo in genera Hellenistic and Jewish perspective. Only some Cynics seem to have been an exception, ib 233. Heinemann's more positive impression about the Mishna (e.g. p240) does not hold for mid-first century halakha, certainly not in Alexandria; see above p38f.

¹⁹⁹ Ag Ap 2:201. 'The Law' (δ νόμος ib 199) refers not to the written Law but to the halakha.

²⁰⁰ See Belkin, *Alexandrian Halakah*, 53-55; id *Philo*, 225-8; Heinemann, *Bildung*, 302-9.

²⁰¹ Cf Philo, Spec leg 3:169-172.

²⁰² mKet 2:1; yKet 2, 26b. Even girls often remained inside the house in Jewish and genera Hellenistic custom; Heinemann, *Bildung*, 234f.

²⁰³ mKet 7:6; cf mBK 8:6; mShab 6:1, 5. See Str-B 3, 423-35. See Lieberman, *Texts*, 54-56 on piou Jewish women even covering their faces.

²⁰⁴ ARN b 9 (13a); according to the parallel GenR 17 (p159) the author of the derasha is R. Yohua. See Str-B 3, 423-6 for later traditions indicating occasional headcovering by males in the talmudic period. The standard Jewish skullcap is a medieval innovation.

²⁰⁵ Above n54, 58. See Spec leg 3:169-180.

²⁰⁶ Oster, 'Veils'.

in certain Hellenistic cult rites, which may have been familiar to Corinthian gentiles, women participated with hair unbound.²⁰⁷

As to community worship, the participation of women was generally accepted in Judaism as a matter of course. While the majority of Essenes shunned the presence of women,²⁰⁸ in other pious circles the presence of men and women during worship, even though seated separately, was apparently well established.²⁰⁹ The evidence of literary and archeological sources is that female attendance in synagogue was a regular practice. Women used to pray along with the men in the main room, and only in the middle ages did the women's gallery become a standard part of the synagogue.²¹⁰ Combined evidence also suggests that women played prominent roles: many extant inscriptions mention female 'leaders', 'elders' and 'mothers of synagogues'.²¹¹ While the impression is that these were not mere honorific titles, they may have been related to any of the various social and religious functions of the ancient synagogue and not necessarily have indicated a liturgical function.²¹² On the other hand, the Tannaim held that women should not officiate during community prayers: 'One does not invite women to read out before the community'.²¹³ In other words they are not accepted as 'deputy of the community' שליח ציבור (*shaliah tsibbur*) to pray or read in the name of the community.²¹⁴ In view of the more general subordination of women,²¹⁵ this must have been common practice. Thus women attended synagogue but prayed silently and did not officiate.

For Paul too, female participation in community worship was self-evident. Elsewhere, he advocates the participation of women in an interesting midrashic tradition. Using the verse in which God promises David that his son shall build a temple (2Sam 7:14) he continues: 'For we are the temple of the living God, as God said: ... "I will be a father to you, and you shall be sons and daughters to Me, says the Lord Almighty"' (2Cor 6:16-18). The verse reads, 'I will be a to him, and he shall be a son to Me'; hence Paul not only changes to the plural

²⁰⁷ See references in Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 227.

²⁰⁸ Above n55.

²⁰⁹ TRaub 6:1f suggests separation of men and women 'in order to purify their minds'. Similarly the Therapeutes worshipped while men and women could not see each other, Philo, Vit cont 32f; but cf ib 83-89.

²¹⁰ For sources and treatment see Safrai, 'Women's Gallery', and 'Synagogue', 919-21 and, following him, Brooten, *Women Leaders*, 103-47.

²¹¹ Brooten, *Women Leaders*; Kraemer, 'A New Inscription'.

²¹² See vague evidence adduced by Brooten ib. On the function and organisation of the diaspora synagogue see Applebaum, 'Organization'; on Palestinian city leadership Safrai, 'Self-Government', 412-7.

²¹³ tMeg 3:11, see Lieberman a.1.1; bMeg 23a.

²¹⁴ The Bavli gives as basic explanation 'respect for the community'. Other commentaries point out that a woman does not have the biblical obligation to read and therefore cannot fulfil the obligation of the community (cf mRH 3:8); see Lieberman, *Tosefta Ki-fshutah* 5, 1176-8; cf Albeck, *Mishna* 2, 366 (on mMeg 4:6). SifDeut 235 (p269) cites the rule, 'Women have no authority (רשות) to speak in the name of men', in connection with the woman's testimony (Deut 22:16), which suggests that women could not officiate because of legal incompetence.

²¹⁵ See mAv 1:5, summary of halakhot tSot 2,7-9, and cf mKet 4:4 and mSot3:8.

'sons' but adds 'and daughters'.²¹⁶ While the context of the exposition emphasizes Christian separation from paganism by means of dualistic language reminiscent of Essenism,²¹⁷ the targumic inclusion of the 'daughters' points toward Pharisaic mainstream Judaism. Paul's exposition also seems to draw on Isa 43:6, 'Bring my sons from afar and my daughters from the end of the earth', which apart from the daughters also suggests the inclusion of gentiles in the church.²¹⁸

Now we turn to Paul's instruction about the headcovering of women during worship. In the light of the above, it is in no way remarkable for its own time. The argument opens with a statement which leaves no doubts about the Apostle's view:²¹⁹

The head of every man is Christ, but the head of woman is the man, and the head of the Christ is God. Any man who prays or prophesies with his head covered dishonours his head, and any woman who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled dishonours her head. (1Cor 11:3-5a).

Reason is selective: a woman praying bareheaded dishonours her 'man', but a man when praying should uncover his head in honour of Christ. Paul further develops the idea of 'dishonour' by stating that a woman who prays bareheaded might as well have her head shaven, which in his eyes is equally disgraceful (1Cor 11:5b-6). In ancient Judaism a shaven woman was repugnant and could be divorced.²²⁰ Another connotation which is directed more at the readers may be that in the Isis cult, which was present in Corinth, male initiates had their hair shaven.²²¹

Then another element is introduced: 'A man is not obliged to cover his head, since he is the image and glory of God, but the woman is the glory of a man' (v7). This continues the usage of man as 'the head' in v3, but involves a biblical allusion. In fact it is an androcentric midrash which expounds the words 'in the image of God he created him' (Gen 1:27) as separate from the clause immediately following, 'male and female he created them' and hence as referring to man only. The insinuation is that woman was not created in the image of God.²²² Another biblical allusion is added: 'Indeed a man was not created for the woman but a woman for the man; therefore a woman is obliged to have ar

²¹⁶ Attention to this passage is also drawn by Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 194-6.

²¹⁷ 4QFlor 1:1-13 views the community as a spiritual temple on the basis of 2Sam 7 (Flusser, 'Two Notes'; Dimant, 'Qumran', 518-21). TLev 19:1 uses related dualistic language including the name of Beliar. The possibility of a Qumranic interpolation was raised by Fitzmeyer, 'Qumran'; Betz, '2 Co 6:14-7:1' sees cultic and anti-gentile anti-Paulinism. Positions are summarized by Thrall, 'Problem'

²¹⁸ Another parallel is Ps 107:3. This midrash seems also reflected in Matt 8:11, but in an un-Pauline anti-Jewish revision (see Flusser, 'Two Anti-Jewish Montages').

²¹⁹ I am indebted to Jaap van der Meij for his perceptive comments on the structure of 1Cor 11:2-16
²²⁰ mNaz 4:5; tNex 3:12-14; cf Str-B 3, 434f. The main spokesman is R. Akiva. See Lieberman *Tosefta Ki-fshutah* 7, 531-3 on the complicated explanation in the Bavli; and note by Albeck, *Mishna* 4, 374. Later Jewish and Christian sources mention shaving the head as a punishment for indecency Lieberman, *Texts*, 53f.

²²¹ See reference in Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 227.

²²² More positively Schüssler ib 229.

authority (ἐξουσία) *net head*, because of the angels (1Cor 11:9f). *Εξουσία* equals Hebrew שׁוֹרֵת: authority, power.²²³ What appears to be meant is the veil precisely as a sign of woman's subordination to man.²²⁴ The clause mentioning 'angels' sounds incidental but may actually explain the main statement: the 'angels' should be reminded that the woman is under authority. It connects with ancient traditions about the seduction of angels by women,²²⁵ and incidentally this gives us another glimpse of Paul's realistic angelology. Thus Paul's midrash demonstrates the subordination of women from the biblical perspective.

At this point Paul's rhetorical sensitivity seems to lead him to introduce a quite different line of thought, which even runs against the grain of his argument: 'At any rate, woman is not apart from man nor man from woman, in the Lord; for as the woman is from the man, so the man is through the woman; and all is from God' (v11f).²²⁶ The mood here is one of tolerance and equality and of the relativity of all human positions. It is reminiscent of Stoic-Cynic ideas more clearly expressed in other passages,²²⁷ as well as of the ecclesial christology expressed by Paul especially in Galatians.²²⁸

This leads us to the final phase of the argument. It begins by reiterating the theme of shamefulness (v13; cf v5) and then adds a new aspect apparently meant to be irresistible to the Corinthians: 'Does not nature itself teach you that for a man to wear long hair is degrading to him, but if a woman grows long hair it is her glory? For her hair is given to her for a covering' (11:14f). The reference to nature is another typical feature of the Cynico-Stoic tradition (above p85) and may have been placed at the end, after the biblical motive, because of its universal appeal. What it also shows is that 'nature' could refer to such obvious cultural features as hair-styling.

An authoritative statement, stressing the 'custom' recognized by the Apostle and the 'churches of God', closes the discussion (v16).²²⁹ In line with Jewish practice, women must cover their heads at least when praying.

The question remains as to what situation Paul's command concerning female headcovering during worship refers to. It is often thought to contradict the

²²³ See below n283. G. Kittel and before him Herklotz (BZ 10 p 154) supposed a more direct connection with אֲרָבָה (yShab 6, 8b) = 'head-band', but lit. 'authority'. See Str-B 3, 436; Klausner, *Von Jesus zu Paulus*, 524 n27; and the rich note in Weiss 274f.

²²⁴ Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 227 reads 11:15 ἀντὶ as 'instead' (of a head-covering) and on that basis rejects a parallel with the Jewish custom. Unconvincingly she proposes to interpret Paul's teaching as a positive affirmation of 'bound-up hair as the symbol of women's prophetic-charismatic power' (230). This overlooks (in spite of ib p229) the link with v7 where the woman, including her hair, is the husband's glory (in Paul's view). 'Decency' forbade Jews except the husband to look at a woman's hair, cf mSot 1:5. See below.

²²⁵ Above at n58; cf Küchler, *Schweigen*, 89-110.

²²⁶ Schüssler Fiorenza ib 229 reads this as Paul's assurance that he maintains sex equality in the church. The atmosphere here is very similar to R. Yohua's *derasha*, see n204.

²²⁷ See below ch 6.

²²⁸ E.g. 3:28; see Conclusion below.

²²⁹ It is less reasonable to associate the 'custom' with 'being contentious', but the net result is the same.

prohibition for women to speak up during worship.²³⁰ But there is no reason to suppose that prayer and prophecy should always be aloud when practised in the community. The headcovering of married women would naturally apply both in private and public worship, irrespective of their speaking or being silent. It should not be confused with the issue of female officiating.

The silence of women in church (1Cor 14:33-38) is emphasized by Paul according to ancient Jewish traditions: 'For they are not permitted to speak but should be subordinate, as also the Law says' (1Cor 14:34). The reference to 'the Law' apparently needed no explanation, but again may be assumed to refer to the Genesis narrative.²³¹ At any rate it seems that Paul, in line with Tannaic tradition, opposes the idea that women be allowed to speak in the name of the congregation or in other words that they should not be allowed to officiate as *shallah tsibbur*. This interpretation seems confirmed by the halakhic implications of 1Cor 14:16 (below). Opposition to public performance by women was also found in Roman circles.²³² A further specification by Paul which apparently no longer refers to actual worship is remarkable: 'If they want to be informed about anything, let them ask their own men at home' (v35). This opinion seems to reflect the more restrictive and conservative trend in ancient Judaism. There are reports of women bringing their questions to the Houses of Study, but not all Sages welcomed this, notably R. Eliezer the Shammaite.²³³ It is remarkable that this opinion is represented in Apostolic Christianity.

Judging from the textual variants, resistance to the accumulated authority of the commandment is ancient; modern exegetes are also inclined to radical solutions,²³⁴ A number of manuscripts place v34f after v40 and in v37 omit the word ἐντολή.²³⁵ The effect is that not only does the silence of women become a secondary appendix but the rhetorical unity is broken. 14:39f clearly give a concluding rule: 'So, my brethren, be zealous to prophesy and do not prevent speaking in tongues, but do everything decently and in order.' Another solution is offered by the manuscripts which read a plural in v37, 'commandments of the Lord',²³⁶ to the effect that female silence would be one item among many. The question then comes down to where the actual summary of the chapter begins: in v39 or earlier. But this is no real problem. As usual, Paul comes up with an important subject at the end. Even if the summary were to start at v36 and the accumulation of authority sources were to refer to the chapter as a whole, the words on female silence would resound poignantly in the reader's ears, As they

²³⁰ Schüssler ib 230f takes 14:33-36 to refer to wives and 11:2-16 to unmarried women. See above.

²³¹ The parallel in 1Tim 2:13f suggests Gen 1:27 and 2:18-23. Str-B 3, 468 also propose Gen 3:16.

²³² Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 231f adduces a striking parallel from Livy. Sevenster, *Paul and Seneca*, 192-6 describes Seneca's view of women as rather lowly with occasional exceptions.

²³³ Safrai, 'Oral Tora', 68f. See mSot 3:4; mNed 4:3; ySot 3, 18d-19a; yHag 1, 75d.

²³⁴ Conzelmann p298f considers the passage an interpolation since it contradicts 11:2ff, deviates in vocabulary and reflects post-Pauline bourgeois consolidation. He fails to refer to 11:16 (but of his sceptical treatment there, p233f).

²³⁵ D', F, G, b, Ambst; Dodd, 'Ennomos', 105 n1 (below n239) adds Origen.

²³⁶ D², Athos ms, Byzantine majority, lat, sy, sa.

seem to be meant to do.

The accumulation of formal authority sources in this instance is unmistakably emphatic: the appeal is to the custom of the 'congregations of the Holy' (v33b); to 'the Law' (v34); and to a 'commandment of the Lord' (v37). If we add the strategic position of the two women's commandments in the letter, the impression is that Paul must have come against fundamental resistance here. One is reminded of the possibility of active participation of women in non-Jewish cult societies.²²⁷ Inscriptions indicate that even the θεολογία, the festive speech at a banquet in honour of the gods, could be delivered by a woman.²²⁸ Paul's instruction regarding his gentile sisters on this point appears to have implied that they should assimilate to Jewish custom; and to a stricter variant in fact, one which even excluded asking questions.

Most intriguing is Paul's appeal to a Jesus tradition: 'If anyone thinks that he is a prophet, or spiritual, he should acknowledge that what I am writing to you is a commandment of the Lord (Κυρίου ἐντολή, 14:37). If this reading is acceptable, as seems confirmed by the undisputed Pauline ἐπιταγή Κυρίου in 1Cor 7:25,²²⁹ it is unique in the New Testament. While parallel phrases are found in the Johannine tradition,²³⁰ the word ἐντολή otherwise generally refers to a commandment of the Tora. The expression ἐντολή Κυρίου however is attested in the later Apostolic writings.²³¹ First Corinthians apparently reveals its Apostolic origin.

The precise contents of this 'commandment of the Lord' are not clear. As we have seen, the solution of reading it as referring to the Apostolic authority of Paul's teaching in general does not suffice. Moreover such appeals are made in a much more specific sense elsewhere in First Corinthians.²⁴² In this case the extant gospel tradition does not help us out; Paul is our only source for this sort of teaching of Jesus. The combination with the equally obscure appeal to 'the Law' leads us to hypothesize some midrash on the creation story which figures elsewhere in Paul's other instruction as well as in Jesus' teachings.²⁴³

Apparently Paul's reference to Jesus cannot easily be dismissed on literary grounds. This raises the historical question about Jesus' attitude towards women. While women are prominent in many gospel stories, an openness towards women also seems to be typical of the hasidic personalities who figure in ancient Rabbinic literature.²⁴⁴ But the question is whether this necessarily implies a more liberal stance on public offices held by women. Jesus' strong emphasis on modesty and decency towards the opposite sex (Matt 5:27-30) and, as in ancient

²²⁷ See Moffatt, xxi, 149; and references by Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 229f.

²²⁸ Poland, *Geschichte*, 268. See also ib 289ff on the position of women.

²²⁹ See above n235. Dodd rejects ἐντολή in view of the ms evidence, and because he cannot see how the rule can follow both from 'the Law' and a 'commandment of the Lord'.

²³⁰ John 13:34; 14:15, 21; 15:10, 12; 1 John and 2 John *passim*.

²³¹ Did 4:13 and Barn 19:2, both in the catechism of the Two Ways; cf Ign Eph 9:2, Tr 3:1 (cf Sm 8:1); Polyc Phil 4:1.

²⁴⁰ Cf 9:4-14; 3:6, 10f, 4:15; and, especially, 7:6-12, 25, 40.

²⁴¹ 1Cor 11:8f; Mark 10:6f; cf 1Cor 6:16.

²⁴² Safrai, 'Hasidim', 141-4.

hasidic tradition, on inwardness and concentration in prayer (Matt 6:5f), suggests a more complex situation.²⁴⁵ It is of course thinkable that on certain details the early Apostolic church headed by James the brother of the Lord was stricter than Jesus himself, but this should not be assumed automatically. At any rate Paul draws on a custom which Apostolic tradition ascribed to Jesus.

Each generation takes its own message from sacred texts. Traditionally the stress is laid on the element of patriarchy in these passages. A generation which has become sensitive to the value of social equality and conceives social change as a human activity has no choice but to focus on the aspect of equality which is explicit in other texts:²⁴⁶ 'There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither slave nor free, there is neither male nor female; for you are all one in Christ Jesus' (Gal 3:28); 'At any rate, woman is not apart from man nor man from woman, in the Lord; for as the woman is from the man, so the man is through the woman; and all is from God' (1Cor 11:11f). As in other passages, this theoretical egalitarianism is of Cynico-Stoic provenance.²⁴⁷

THE EUCHARIST

The section on the eucharist (1Cor 11:17-34) involves a number of halakhic elements. Paul calls it κυριακὸν δεῖπνον 'supper of the Lord' (1Cor 11:20), apparently because of the tradition 'from the Lord' (v23) which is at its centre. It appears to be meant as a community meal, the decorous character of which was blurred in Corinth. Quite bluntly Paul reprimands his church: 'In giving you this instruction I do not commend you...; Shall I commend you in this? No, I will not' (v17, 22; cf v2!). In reaction Paul most formally presents the 'tradition':²⁴⁸

For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread, and having said a benediction broke it and said, This is my body for you; do this in order to remember me. In the same way also the cup, after supper, saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood; do this, as often as you drink it, in order to remember me. ... Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of (profaning) the body and blood of the Lord. (1Cor 11:23-26)

The tradition was already well-known to the Corinthians, and for some reason the Apostle repeats it word by word in his instructional letter. Paul adds at the end of the section: 'About the other things I will give instructions διατάξομαι when I come' (v34). The atmosphere is that of practical instruction and involves halakha.

²⁴⁵ Cf mBer 5:1, 5 (on which see Safrai, 'Mishnat hasidim', 147-50). On 'snakes and scorpions' cf Luke 10:19; 11:12.

²⁴⁶ Thus with admirable frankness Stendahl, *Bible*.

²⁴⁷ Cf indications in Heinemann, *Bildung*, 233 and Conclusion below. Nevertheless it is striking that in both parallels in 1Cor (7:17-24; 12:13) the male-female binary is lacking.

²⁴⁸ Following the text in the major mss, including P46.