

4942 Alf
ZAMFIR, K.
2008



BRILL

Novum Testamentum 50 (2008) 376-406

Novum
Testamentum
An International Quarterly for
New Testament
and Related Studies

www.brill.nl/nt

Text-Critical and Intertextual Remarks on 1 Tim 2:8-10

Korinna Zamfir^{a, b} and Joseph Verheyden^b

^{a)} Cluj

^{b)} Leuven

Abstract

After reassessing the various ways of dealing with the ellipsis in 1 Tim 2:9, it is argued that βούλομαι προσεύχασθαι offers a plausible resolution. Yet the ambiguity of the text suggests that 1 Tim 2:8-15 resulted from using several sources. The intertextual analysis shows that 1 Timothy very likely used as a pre-text the cultic rule found in 1 Cor 11 and its context. A second pre-text consists of a station code tradition and of Neo-Pythagorean exhortations. This complex intertextual enterprise allows 1 Tim to “correct” Paul’s more permissive attitude regarding the role men and women can play in public worship.

Keywords

1 Tim 2:8-10; ellipsis; textual criticism; intertextuality; 1 Cor 11:3-15

In a recent essay Kenneth L. Cukrowski discusses and compares two possible ways to supply the ellipsis in 1 Tim 2:9.¹ One possibility is to add βούλομαι only, as suggested by a number of scholars,² and understand v. 9

¹ K.L. Cukrowski, “An Exegetical Note on the Ellipsis in I Timothy 2:9”, in J.W. Childers, D.C. Parker (eds.), *Transmission and Reception: New Testament Text-Critical and Exegetical Studies* (Texts and Studies. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature 4; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2006) 232-238.

² For βούλομαι plead: N. Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (RNT; Regensburg: Pustet, 1969) 132; J. Roloff, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKK XV; Zürich/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988) 126; G.W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992) 130-133; J.M. Bassler, *1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996) 55-57; W.D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC 46; Nashville: Nelson, 2000) 106, 108; L.T. Johnson *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (AB 35A; New York/London: Doubleday, 2001) 199. We list here T.R. Schreiner, “An Interpretation of 1 Tim 2:9-15: A Dialogue with Scholarship”, in A.J. Köstenberger, T.R. Schreiner, H.S. Baldwin (eds.), *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995) 105-154 (114); L. Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe* 1.

Text-Critical and Intertextual Remarks on 1 Tim 2:8-10

Korinna Zamfir^{a, b} and Joseph Verheyden^b

^{a)} *Cluj*

^{b)} *Leuven*

Abstract

After reassessing the various ways of dealing with the ellipsis in 1 Tim 2:9, it is argued that βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι offers a plausible resolution. Yet the ambiguity of the text suggests that 1 Tim 2:8-15 resulted from using several sources. The intertextual analysis shows that 1 Timothy very likely used as a pre-text the cultic rule found in 1 Cor 11 and its context. A second pre-text consists of a station code tradition and of Neo-Pythagorean exhortations. This complex intertextual enterprise allows 1 Tim to “correct” Paul’s more permissive attitude regarding the role men and women can play in public worship.

Keywords

1 Tim 2:8-10; ellipsis; textual criticism; intertextuality; 1 Cor 11:3-15

In a recent essay Kenneth L. Cukrowski discusses and compares two possible ways to supply the ellipsis in 1 Tim 2:9.¹ One possibility is to add βούλομαι only, as suggested by a number of scholars,² and understand v. 9

¹⁾ K.L. Cukrowski, “An Exegetical Note on the Ellipsis in I Timothy 2:9”, in J.W. Childers, D.C. Parker (eds.), *Transmission and Reception: New Testament Text-Critical and Exegetical Studies* (Texts and Studies. Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature 4; Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias, 2006) 232-238.

²⁾ For βούλομαι plead: N. Brox, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (RNT; Regensburg: Pustet, 1969) 132; J. Roloff, *Der erste Brief an Timotheus* (EKK XV; Zürich/Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1988) 126; G.W. Knight, *The Pastoral Epistles: A Commentary on the Greek Text* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992) 130-133; J.M. Bassler, *1 Timothy, 2 Timothy, Titus* (ANTC; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996) 55-57; W.D. Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles* (WBC 46; Nashville: Nelson, 2000) 106, 108; L.T. Johnson *The First and Second Letters to Timothy* (AB 35A; New York/London: Doubleday, 2001) 199. We list here T.R. Schreiner, “An Interpretation of 1 Tim 2:9-15: A Dialogue with Scholarship”, in A.J. Köstenberger, T.R. Schreiner, H.S. Baldwin (eds.), *Women in the Church: A Fresh Analysis of 1 Timothy 2:9-15*, Grand Rapids: Baker, 1995) 105-154 (114); L. Oberlinner, *Die Pastoralbriefe* 1.

as merely referring to the way women should adorn. The other is to supply *βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι*, a reading that would clearly specify that women are expected to pray.³ Other authors leave the question open,⁴ or do not address the matter directly, but their interpretation implies a certain understanding.⁵ This evidence apparently suggests that there are two major

Kommentar zum ersten Timotheusbrief (HThK XI/2/1; Freiburg/Basel/Wien: Herder, 1994) 87; U. Wagoner, *Die Ordnung des Hauses Gottes: Der Ort von Frauen in der Ekklesiologie und Ethik der Pastoralbriefe* (WUNT 2.65; Tübingen: Mohr, 1994) 72-74 (referring to public prayer); A. Merz, *Die Fiktive Selbstausslegung des Paulus: Intertextuelle Studien zur Intention und Rezeption der Pastoralbriefe* (NTOA 52; Göttingen: V&R, 2004) 274-275; Ph. Towner, *The Letters to Timothy and Titus* (NICNT; Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2006) 204.

³) Cukrowski mentions C.K. Barrett, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1963) 55; M. Dibelius, H. Conzelmann, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972) 45 [cf. 44]; B. Witherington, *Women in the Earliest Churches* (SNTSMS 58; Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1988) 119, cf. n. 203 on p. 263 (see also *Letters and Homilies for Hellenized Christians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on Titus, 1-2 Timothy and 1-3 John* [Grand Rapids: InterVarsity, 2006] 224); W. Liefeld, *1 and 2 Timothy, Titus* (The NIV Application Commentary; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1999) 93-95. See also E. Hautsch, *Die Evangelienzitate des Origenes* (TU 34.2a; Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1909) 8; H.-H. Mayer, *Über die Pastoralbriefe: I-II Tim Tit* (FRLANT N.F. 3; Göttingen, 1913) 31-32; D. Guthrie, *The Pastoral Epistles* (Tyndale NT Commentaries; Leicester: InterVarsity; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1957, repr. 1986) 74; H.-W. Bartsch, *Die Anfänge urchristlicher Rechtsbildungen: Studien zu den Pastoralbriefen* (Theologische Forschung 34; Hamburg-Bergstedt: Reich, 1965) 60; G. Holtz, *Die Pastoralbriefe* (ThHKNT 13; Berlin: EVA, 1972) 65; M. Küchler, *Schweigen, Schmuck und Schleier* (NTOA 1; Freiburg/Göttingen: V&R, 1986) 11, cf. 4; I.H. Marshall, *The Pastoral Epistles* (ICC; London/New York: T&T Clark, 1999) 446-447. With nuances J.D. Quinn, W.C. Wacker, *The First and Second Letter to Timothy* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000) 194, 215 (explicitly supplying *βούλομαι*, but asserting that women "are to pray in precisely the way that the men have just been directed to"); C. Spicq, *Les Épitres Pastorales I* (Paris: Gabalda, 1969) 374-375 (not directly *βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι*, but *πάνιν ἑρῶ*: women are to pray for the salvation of the world, performing an apostolic function).

⁴) See A. Schlatter, *Die Kirche der Griechen im Urteil des Paulus. Eine Auslegung seiner Briefe an Timotheus und Titus* (Stuttgart: Calwer, 1958) 83-84; D.C. Verner, *The Household of God. The Social World of the Pastoral Epistles* (SBL Dissertations 71; Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983) 168; J.M. Holmes, *Text in a Whirlwind. A Critique of Four Exegetical Devices at Timothy 2.9-15* (JSNT Sup 196; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2000) 55-59; R. Van Neste, *Cohesion and Structure in the Pastoral Epistles* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2004) 37; cf. 40.

⁵) A.T. Hanson regards 2:9-15 as a domestic code and does not apply it to prayer (*The Pastoral Epistles* [NCBC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, London: Marshall, Morgan, Scott, 1982] 71, cf. 43). G.D. Fee does not discuss the ellipsis, but states: "Paul continues his

camps adopting opposite positions, but as a matter of fact the issue is much more complex. Many of those who supply only βούλομαι explicitly or implicitly indicate that they understand vv. 9-10 as a reference to women praying in public worship.⁶ It seems then that there is no clear-cut distinction between two factions, one asserting and the other denying that women are to pray, since only very few authors take vv. 9-10 to be merely part of a household code. Cukrowski himself pleads for βούλομαι, pointing to seemingly insolvable grammatical difficulties when reading βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι.

In this essay three issues will be addressed. First, it will be argued that a text-critical analysis allows for both options to supply the ellipsis, and an explanation will be suggested for this ambiguity. Second, building on the possibility to read βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι in v. 9, in an intertextual analysis, 1 Tim 2:8-10 will be compared with 1 Cor 11:4-15 (more particularly vv. 4-5, 7a). Third, it will be shown that the ambiguous character of vv. 9-10 derives not only from a merger of two different genres, but results from a decision by 1 Tim to provide a relecture of the pre-text in 1 Cor 11 and to offer a correction of Paul by “Paul”.

1. The Ellipsis and the Text of 1 Tim 2:8-10

1.1 *The Solutions Proposed by K.L. Cukrowski*

Cukrowski offers two possible reconstructions and readings of vv. 8-10:

1.
Βούλομαι οὖν προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας
ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ
ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χειῖρας
χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμῶν.

instructions on ‘prayer’” (*1 and 2 Timothy, Titus* [Good News Commentaries; New York: Harper&Row, 1984] 33-34).

⁶ Explicitly Knight, *Pastoral Epistles*, 130-133; Schreiner, “Interpretation”, 114 (both refer to 1 Cor 11:1ff as proof); Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 87, who notes that Bartsch might have a point when relating the attributes in vv. 9-10 to προσεύχεσθαι; Mounce, *Pastoral Epistles*, 106, 108. R.F. Collins does not discuss the ellipsis, and although explaining κοσμεῖν (*1 2 Timothy: A Commentary* [NTL; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002] 66), he connects vv. 8-10 to prayer: “Men are urged to come to prayer with no anger in their hearts or quarrelling [...]. Women are urged to come to prayer with lives characterized by good works” (p. 64).

ὡσαύτως [βούλομαι προσεῦχεσθαι] γυναῖκας
 ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς
 καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς,
 μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ,
 ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσεβείαν, δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν.

2.

Βούλομαι οὖν προσεῦχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας
 ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ
 ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους
 χεῖρας χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμῶν.

ὡσαύτως [βούλομαι] γυναῖκας
 ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης
 κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς,
 μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ,
 ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσεβείαν, δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν.

This text differs from NA²⁷ in two instances. Cukrowski does not explain his reason for replacing διαλογισμοῦ in v. 8 with διαλογισμῶν. A decision is not easy, as the manuscript evidence is divided.⁷ J.K. Elliott argues that the singular results from a harmonisation with ὀργῆς.⁸ But a change to the plural is equally possible. I.H. Marshall cites evidence for the use of the singular from the ethical lists in Col 3:8; Eph 4:31f.⁹ In the NT, διαλογισμός is mostly used in the plural (eleven out of fourteen instances). The exceptions are 1 Tim 2:8 and Luke 9:46, 47 (par. Mk 9:33 διαλογίζομαι), but in the latter the choice of the singular may have been influenced by the fact that one issue, and only one, is at stake: τὸ τίς ἂν εἴη μείζων αὐτῶν (contrast the double question in Luke 5:21 and the plural διαλογισμοί in v. 22). The frequency of the plural would rather indicate a harmonisation in that direction, and the text is well attested.

In v. 9 Cukrowski drops καὶ before γυναῖκας (introduced in square brackets in NA²⁶⁻²⁷, against NA²⁵), which he thinks was added merely to smooth the syntax.¹⁰ The conjunction is missing in a number of

⁷ The plural occurs in ⳨² F G H 33 81 104 365 630 1505 1739 1881 sy (NA²⁷); cf. also 204 424 876 1022 1518 1873 1908 vt g bo Orig Eus Bas Hier (J.K. Elliott, *The Greek Text of the Epistles to Timothy and Titus* [Studies and Documents 36, Salt Lake City, 1968] 39). WH reads the plural, but has διαλογισμοῦ as v.l. The text is supported by a large variety of witnesses: ⳨* A D Ψ Ɔ lat (NA²⁷); cf. K L P, most minuscules, arm got eth Dam Euthal Orig Chrys Theod-Mops Ambst (Elliott, *Text*, 39).

⁸ Elliott, *Text*, 39.

⁹ Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 443.

¹⁰ Cukrowski, "Ellipsis", 234, n. 6.

witnesses.¹¹ This reading was generally preferred by the older editions up to NA²⁵ (T, H, S, V, M, B), on the authority of $\aleph^*$ A. However $\aleph$ has a tendency to omit καί, and in general scribes were inclined to drop καί, for stylistic reasons, as Elliott remarks.¹² The word may also have dropped out by mere parablepsis (ΩCAYTΩCΚAIGYNAIKAC). Καί is supported by an important number of witnesses, both on its own and followed by τάς¹³ (καὶ τάς also supports καί). Elliott may be right that the combination of ὡσαύτως with καί was likely to be original, because scribes would rather have dropped καί than added it after ὡσαύτως.¹⁴ The Pastoral Epistles (PE) combine instances of ὡσαύτως with arthrous and with anarthrous nouns.¹⁵ The noun is usually in pre-position, except in 1 Tim 2:9 and 5:25. In v. 9 the article was probably added to harmonise with v. 8 (τοὺς ἄνδρας). Even if τάς is secondary, there are obvious arguments in favour of καί that should be considered. Καί following ὡσαύτως is additionally reinforcing the parallelism between vv. 8 and 9.

1. When supplying βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι a close parallel is established between the way men and women ought to pray, reinforcing the effect of ὡσαύτως. In this case γυναῖκας is the subject of the infinitive προσεύχεσθαι. The prepositional phrase ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς functions adverbially and parallels the analogous ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ in v. 8. Cukrowski suggests that this reconstruction can work only if both infinitives, προσεύχεσθαι and κοσμεῖν, depend on βούλομαι and are connected by καί. Therefore μετὰ αἰδοῦς has to be disconnected from σωφροσύνης and linked to ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ.¹⁶ As a result, μετὰ αἰδοῦς further specifies the attire (“in modest attire with modesty”), while σωφροσύνης would explain

¹¹ $\aleph^*$ A H P 33 81 1175 pc sa^{ms} bo^{ms}.

¹² Elliott, *Text*, 207, cf. 206, 209, 211. Καί is also omitted in v. 8 (before διαλογισμοῦ). Additionally the same H P 33 omit καί before χρυσίῳ. $\aleph$ also omits καί in 2 Tim 1:12 (first καί); 1 Tim 1:16 (both); possibly also in 1 Tim 1:12 and 2 Tim 2:21.

¹³ Καί is read by $\aleph^2$ D* F G 6 365 1739 Ambst, Spec; καὶ τάς by: D¹ K L H Ψ Φ 69 1881 1908 Chrys Theod Euthal. See NA²⁶⁻²⁷ and Elliott, *Text*, 39. For καί pleads Mayer, *Pastoralbriefe*, 31, as well as Marshall (with some hesitation), because of 1 Tim 5:25 (*Pastoral Epistles*, 443).

¹⁴ Elliott, *Text*, 207-208.

¹⁵ For the use of the article: 1 Tim 5:25 (ὡσαύτως καὶ τὰ ἔργα) and Tit 2:6 (τοὺς νεωτέρους ὡσαύτως). In 1 Tim 3:8, 12 both nouns are anarthrous: διακόνους ὡσαύτως σεμνοὺς [...] γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως σεμνάς; cf. Tit 2:3: πρεσβύτειδας ὡσαύτως. See Elliott, *Text*, 39.

¹⁶ Cukrowski, “Ellipsis”, 234, reconstruction and n. 7.

κοσμεῖν. Cukrowski rightly concludes that the first option as he presents it does not stand, for the modifier of κοσμεῖν has to take the dative, not the genitive.¹⁷ In addition, one would have to break up the phrase μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης that naturally holds together. A few witnesses have inverted the order, nonetheless indicating that the two nouns were clearly understood as belonging together.¹⁸ The close association of these concepts is attested in ancient authors.¹⁹

Since the grammatical inappropriateness of this construction overweighs its strength in terms of thematic coherence, Cukrowski is right that the first option, as he presents it, does not work.

2. If only βούλομαι is supplied, γυναῖκας is the subject of κοσμεῖν, that is further defined by the adverbial construction ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης. The clause describes the way women should adorn themselves.

Cukrowski now seems to disconnect ὁσίους from χεῖρας in v. 8, and connect it to ἄνδρας.²⁰ If not a mere mistake of layout, this presentation probably results from erroneously taking ὁσίους to be an accusative plural masculine. For the same reason some manuscripts have substituted ὁσίας, but in the Hellenistic declension ὁσίους can also denote the accusative plural feminine.²¹ Apart from that, disconnecting ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους from χεῖρας does not make much sense, since “lifting up hands” is a widely attested gesture of prayer, described by the almost formulaic ὁσίους χεῖρας.²² Men are expected “to lift up their hands”, i.e. to pray, in a manner

¹⁷ The author quotes a number of examples from Classical and Jewish authors, apocrypha and early Christian writings, where κοσμεῖν is used with a dative; cf. BDAG, s.v. κοσμέω (Cukrowski, “Ellipsis”, 235).

¹⁸ D; also Cypr and Ambs (Elliott, *Text*, 40). Although the v.l. probably occurred through transcriptional inversion, it supports the connection between αἰδώς and σωφροσύνη.

¹⁹ Though mostly related to women’s attitude and adornment, these terms occur together even in the king’s mirror: Diotogenes, περὶ βασιλείας, H. Thesleff, *The Pythagorean Texts of the Hellenistic Period* (Acta Academiae Aboensis A. 30.1; Åbo, 1965) 71-75 (74,16: κατακοσμηθῆμεν καταπεπαλγμένως αἰδοῖ καὶ σωφροσύνα διαθέσει τε τῇ περὶ τὰν ἐπιτρέπῃαν).

²⁰ Cukrowski, “Ellipsis”, 236.

²¹ H 1734 1 241 2404 2587 2626 249** 479** 489. Therefore Elliott rightly regards ὁσίας as an Atticist correction (*Text*, 39).

²² See the references to Jewish, Hellenistic and Christian texts that define purity or holiness as a quality of praying hands in Dibelius/Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 44-45, who rightly show that the emphasis is on χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ. Cf. also G. Strecker,

that is characterised positively by holiness and negatively by the absence of anger and disputes (or doubts).²³

Κοσμεῖν in v. 9 becomes the equivalent of προσεύχεσθαι in v. 8, thus prayer is excluded. The proposal provides both a verbal (βούλομαι), and a formal parallel between vv. 8 and 9. Moreover, the construction is grammatically correct.²⁴ Cukrowski concludes that this reading should be preferred, although it eliminates 1 Tim 2:9 from the list of instances referring to women praying, and could therefore be judged as a difficulty by “those who desire a passage that explicitly mentions women praying.”²⁵

The present essay is not motivated by the desire to save 1 Tim 2:9 for such a list. However, this second proposal of Cukrowski is itself not without difficulties. The main problem with this reading is that it skips quite abruptly from the motif of prayer in v. 8 to that of women’s attire in v. 9. Cukrowski answers the objection by pointing out that the reconstruction offers a coherent reading of 2:1-15, where prayer is introduced in vv. 1-2, and the repetition of the topic in v. 8 functions as a link “to a specific treatment of problems in worship.”²⁶ But with such an argument Cukrowski makes worship the unifying theme of the pericope, and so in a way comes close to those who think that βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι should be supplied in v. 9. Moreover, there are other ways to supply the ellipsis. We will argue that it is possible to supply βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι and still preserve a grammatically correct structure.

Anyway, the analysis of the two reconstructions proposed by Cukrowski indicates that the text seems to require from the reader to choose between grammatical or thematic coherence. Cukrowski has opted for the first. Even so his decision is not without difficulties. Both his reconstructions imply an artificial division of the clauses (disconnecting μετὰ αἰδοῦς from σωφροσύνης in the first, and detaching ὁσίους from χεῖρας in the second reading).

It is important to note that the passage is intrinsically ambiguous. The most probable explanation is that the text resulted from the merger of elements belonging to different genres, as will be explained below. This results

U. Schnelle, G. Seelig (Hg.), *Neuer Wettstein. Texte zum Neuen Testament aus Griechentum und Hellenismus* II/1 (Berlin-New York: W. de Gruyter, 1996) 850-851; Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 85; Johnson, *Timothy*, 198.

²³ On the possible translations of διαλογισμός: BDAG, s.v.; Bartsch, *Anfänge*, 47; Dibelius/Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 45; Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 86-87.

²⁴ Cukrowski, “Ellipsis”, 236.

²⁵ Cukrowski, “Ellipsis”, 236-237.

²⁶ Cukrowski, “Ellipsis”, 237.

in the difficulty to ascertain at once absolute grammatical and thematic consistency.²⁷

1.2 *The Ellipsis of 1 Tim 2:8-10 Revisited*

The possibilities for supplying the ellipsis are not exhausted by Cukrowski's two proposals. In the following, two other suggestions are presented, before returning once more to the option supplying βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι.

1.2.1. *Κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς as a Secondary Expansion*

It is clear that the requirements addressed to men and women are analogously structured, but they are not identical, and are more elaborately formulated in v. 9. The requests addressed to women are further expanded with other exhortations (to preserve silence, to be submitted) and prohibitions (to teach and exert authority over men). Women are reminded of their inferiority in creation and their fallacious nature, and they are promised salvation by childbearing. All these manifold requirements and prohibitions have no counterpart in the exhortation addressed to men. The most likely explanation of this unbalance (apart from possible ideological reasons) is the fact that vv. 8-9 (±10) contain a cultic rule²⁸ largely expanded with material reflecting the catalogues of virtues incorporated in the "station code" tradition²⁹ and in Neo-Pythagorean exhortations to women.³⁰

²⁷ After a thorough analysis, Wagener, *Ordnung*, 74 rightly concludes: "eine eindeutige und alle syntaktischen Merkmale befriedigend integrierende Interpretation von v9f nicht zu finden ist".

²⁸ The term "cultic rule" refers here to early Christian regulations defining the attitudes to be displayed or avoided by participants in the worship.

²⁹ It has been objected that the PE do not have household codes properly speaking (such as Col 3:18-4:1; Eph 5:21-6:9), since they lack the three pairs of addressees (husband-wife, parents-children, master-slaves) and the reciprocal obligations. Yet Verner rightly remarks that these codes could take various forms and that specific *topoi* (e.g. references to the πόλις, to authority, or feminine virtues), are found in the PE, including 1 Tim 2 (*Household*, 83-111). Nonetheless, the term "station code" is preferred (Verner, *Household*, 90, 92; Wagener, *Ordnung*, 62; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 232-236). It is likely that the household code tradition has been integrated into church orders (Dibelius/Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 44-45; Wagener, *Ordnung*, 62; Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 83, 87). L. Donelson might be right that the household codes were fragmented and various parts were placed in different locations of the PE; e.g. 1 Tim 2:8-15; 5:1-6:2; Tit 2:1-10; 3:1-2 (*Pseudoepigraphy and Ethical Argument in the Pastoral Epistles* [HUTH 22; Tübingen: Mohr, 1986] 177).

³⁰ Neo-Pythagorean tractates, such as Kallikratidas, Περὶ οἴκου εὐδαιμονίας; Perictyone, Περὶ γυναικὸς ἁρμονίας; Phintys, Περὶ γυναικὸς σωφροσύνας (Thesleff, *Pythagorean*

On the hypothesis of a composite text some authors, while asserting that the ellipsis should be supplied with βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι, have recurred to a more radical way of dealing with the passage. E. Hautsch remarked that v. 9 in its present form is incomprehensible because of κοσμεῖν (ἑαυτάς).³¹ In his analysis of the church regulations (“Kirchenordnungen”) of the PE, H.H. Mayer, taking up Hautsch, understands vv. 9-10 as referring to women praying, and agrees that the main difficulty of the text arises from κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς.³² Vv. 8-9 refer to a cultic rule in which v. 9 deals with the attitude of praying women, and κοσμεῖν has to be dismissed as a secondary expansion. Mayer suggests the following reading:

ὡσαύτως [βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι] καὶ γυναῖκας ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης, [κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς] μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ, ἀλλ’ ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν, δι’ ἔργων ἀγαθῶν.³³

Mayer is followed by H.-W. Bartsch, who regards κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς as an addition by the author, modifying the cultic rule. The text reflects a later stage in the elaboration of church regulations.³⁴

This reading is largely based on Origen, who in his *Περὶ εὐχῆς* interpreted 1 Tim 2:9-10 as referring to the manner in which women should pray. After commenting on v. 8, he goes on stating,

πρὸς τούτοις τὴν γυναῖκα χρὴ ἔχειν μάλιστα εὐχομένην τὸ κατεσταλμένον καὶ τὸ κόσμιον ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι, πάντων μάλλον ἐξαιρέτως καὶ ὅτε εὐχεται αἰδουμένην τὸν θεόν καὶ πᾶσαν ἀκόλαστον καὶ γυναῖκειαν ὑπόμνησιν ἐξορίσασαν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡγεμονικοῦ καὶ κεκοσμημένην οὐκ “ἐν πλέγμασι καὶ χρυσῷ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ”, ἀλλ’ οἷς πρόπον ἐστὶ κεκοσμηθῆαι γυναῖκα θεοσέβειαν ἐπαγγελλομένην [...], ὡς ἐδίδαξεν ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ ἐπιστολῇ ὁ Παῦλος λέγων: “γυναῖκας ὡσαύτως ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμιῶς (κοσμίῳ) μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν

Texts, 103-107; 142-145 and 151-154, respectively), as well as the epistolary material (e.g. Melissa to Kleareta, in A. Städele, *Die Briefe des Pythagoras und der Pythagoreer* [Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 115; Meisenheim an Gln: Hain, 1980] 160/161-162/163) show striking thematic and verbal similarities with the PE. On the strategy of these pseudoeptigraphic writings see Wägener, *Ordnung*, 89-92.

³¹ Hautsch, *Evangelienzitate*, 7-9.

³² Mayer, *Pastoralbriefe*, 32.

³³ Mayer, *Pastoralbriefe*, 31.

³⁴ *Anfänge*, 63-64, 67-68. Bartsch reads βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι τὰς γυναῖκας, and deletes κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς.

ἑαυτάς, μὴ ἐν πλέγμασι καὶ χρυσῷ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ, ἀλλ' ὁ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν, δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν.³⁵

Origen interprets καταστολή as demeanour, not attire, and connects μετὰ αἰδοῦς (καὶ σωφροσύνης) to women's deportment. Thus the first part of 1 Tim 2:9-10 refers to attitude,³⁶ and only the subsequent part to the outward manifestation of their inward disposition.

The reconstruction proposed by Hautsch, Mayer and Bartsch is in a way a source-critical decision, as it is based on the hypothesis that the text combines two different types of tradition. It is an attempt to explain the ambiguity of v. 9, as well as the obvious thematic discordance between v. 8 and vv. 9b-12, 15b. Additionally, it solves the syntactic-grammatical difficulties of v. 9 and the question about the verb to which the adverbial phrases should be related. The fact that this reconstruction is based on a conjecture is a major difficulty. Nonetheless, Mayer and Bartsch are right about the heterogeneous character of vv. 9-15, which combine a general rule concerning women's demeanour and a cultic rule, a hypothesis taken over by other scholars as well.³⁷

1.2.2. *Supplying the Ellipsis with the Entire Clause of v. 8*

A different option to supply the ellipsis was suggested already by Chrysostom. He understood ὡσαύτως as referring to the whole clause of v. 8. Thus he reads: ὡσαύτως καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας βούλομαι, φησί, Θεῷ προσιέναι, χωρὶς ὀργῆς, χωρὶς διαλογισμοῦ, ὁσίους χεῖρας ἔχειν.³⁸

This proposal was adopted by modern scholars as well. In their translation, Quinn and Wacker explicitly supply only βούλομαι ("I also wish them to be attractive / to make themselves attractive"), but they clearly understand the text as a reference to prayer, when stating that women "are

³⁵) Origen, *Περὶ εὐχῆς*, 9.1 (GCS 2; Leipzig, 1899) 318; cf. p. 300. The GCS edition reads κοσμίῳ in the text, i.e. the adjective (κόσμιος) defining καταστολή, which would suggest a reference to attire. But in the list of errata (p. 542, referring to pp. 300 and 308) this is corrected to κόσμιος. Already the apparatus of GCS 2, p. 318 (cf. p. 300), mentions that Delarue reads κοσμίως, in agreement with codex T (also Hautsch, *Evangelienzitate*, 7-8). Other textual variants in Origen are: πλέγμασι, χρυσῷ (cf. also Elliot, 41).

³⁶) See also Hautsch, *Evangelienzitate*, 7-9; Mayer, *Pastoralbriefe*, 32.

³⁷) Dibelius/Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 44-45, followed by Brox, *Pastoralbriefe*, 131. Yet Dibelius/Conzelmann argue somewhat differently from Bartsch, suggesting that 2:9ff apply to worship a general rule regarding women.

³⁸) *Hom. VIII*, PG 62, 540.

to pray in precisely the way that the men have just been directed to [...]. Accordingly they as much as the men were obliged to participate in the Christian liturgy, to raise their holy hands in prayer, [...] to quench personal anger and quarrelsomeness".³⁹

This solution is not implausible. It is supported by the otherwise enigmatic ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, which most likely refers to all worship places in any local community (household church),⁴⁰ indicating that the subsequent clauses describe attitudes at prayer, in general, in agreement with the universal perspective in vv. 1-2.⁴¹ Bartsch thinks that this often overlooked clause is meant to strengthen the cultic rule.⁴²

The question is whether one should supply the whole subordinate clause from v. 8 or only its first part (ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας). If one opts for the first possibility, vv. 9 (ἐν καταστολῇ κτλ.) and 10 do not have a counterpart in v. 8 and the structure is very unbalanced. In the second option, part of the requirements are gender-specific: men are expected to refrain from anger and debates, women from excessive beautification.⁴³ This option may be the more likely, for reasons of composition (balanced structure) and of content. This could mean an expansion of the cultic rule with χωρὶς ὀργῆς κτλ. in v. 8, and ἐν καταστολῇ κτλ. in v. 9, both stemming from a station code tradition.

1.2.3. *Supplying βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι*

The two previous solutions offer valuable insights which deserve attention. The first points to the merger of sources and genres, the second offers a

³⁹) Quinn, Wacker, *Timothy*, 194, 215.

⁴⁰) Spicq, *Épîtres* I, 372; Quinn, Wacker, *Timothy*, 209 rightly argue for "place" as "holy place" based on biblical and extra-biblical texts. For every worship place opt Fee, *1-2 Timothy*, 34; Knight, *Timothy*, 128; Merz, *Selbstausslegung*, 270 as well. The broadest sense of wherever men pray, in and outside worship-places is improbable because of the context, where public and not individual prayers and intercessions are envisaged.

⁴¹) Παρακαλῶ... πάντων ποιεῖσθαι δεήσεις... ὑπὲρ πάντων ἀνθρώπων... καὶ πάντων τῶν ἐν ὑπεροχῇ ὄντων, cf. v. 4: ὅς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι and v. 6: ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων. This connection is supported by Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 87 (cf. Bartsch, *Anfänge*, 56), who emphasises that the general requirement of prayer is theologically grounded in the universality of the divine saving will (2:4-6), and is connected to the universal character of the intercessions (2:1-2): "Beten muß immer und überall so erfolgen. Doch dieses 'überall' hat ein theologisches Fundament im universalen Heilswillen Gottes."

⁴²) Bartsch, *Anfänge*, 47, cf. 48-49.

⁴³) Spicq, *Épîtres* I, 371, 375; Collins, *Timothy*, 67.

reasonable interpretation of the parallel. However, they also create their own difficulties (the conjecture and the unbalanced structure). Therefore two other readings are presented here, that may be regarded as variants of the same structure. There is no need to alter the text, and in both prayer is implied.

Βούλομαι οὖν προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας
ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ
ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας
χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ.

ὡσαύτως [βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι] [καὶ] γυναῖκας
ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ
μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς,
μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ,
ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσέβειαν, δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν.

This reading reveals a number of quite remarkable similarities between vv. 8 and 9-10 in terms of structure and thematic thrust. Both parts deal with instructions concerning the way in which men and women should pray. In both a prepositional phrase in the dative (ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ / ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ) defines a general condition. There follow more concrete requirements about the manner of praying, detailed in a positive (ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας / μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς) and in a negative way (χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ / μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ πολυτελεῖ).

The two parts are not absolutely parallel of course. A participle is used in v. 8 (ἐπαίροντας) and an infinitive in v. 9 (κοσμεῖν). Though formally corresponding to ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ, ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ does not have exactly the same function, since it qualifies the manner of praying, while ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ either defines the location or emphasises the general character of the rule. (Yet this difference is not removed by supplying merely βούλομαι). Subsequently, ἐπαίροντας refers to προσεύχεσθαι directly, while μετὰ αἰδοῦς κτλ. does so only indirectly, as a further qualification of ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ. The qualification is expressed with an adjective in v. 8 (ὁσίος), and with two substantives functioning adverbially in v. 9 (μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης). The negative clauses apparently have a different object, rebuking inward attitude in men and outward appearance in women. But the latter is criticised precisely as an expression of an inner, morally wrong attitude. The negative clause in v. 9 (μὴ ἐν κτλ.) is obviously

much more elaborate (four types of adornment are listed) than its counterpart in v. 8 (χωρίς with double qualification). But the list of four qualifications in v. 9 could also be read as a sort of double qualification connected by καί (referring to hairdo *and* adornment), of which the second part is further elaborated into a triplet (with double ἤ). The admonition to men has a close parallel in Phil 2:14 (χωρὶς γογγυσμῶν καὶ διαλογισμῶν)⁴⁴ and can also be compared to 1 Tim 5:21 (χωρὶς προκρίματος μηδὲν . . . πρόσκλισιν). The final clause in v. 10 has no counterpart in v. 8, but represents the necessary complement in a μὴ . . . ἀλλὰ construction.

Thus the requirements are formulated differently, but they take a similar place in the overall structure of the passage, and in both cases one finds an association between outward gesture and inward disposition.

Alternatively, μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης and κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς could also be taken with ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ and with μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν κτλ. respectively:

Βούλομαι οὖν προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας
ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ
ἐπαίροντας ὁσίους χεῖρας
χωρὶς ὀργῆς καὶ διαλογισμοῦ.

ὡσαύτως [βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι] [καὶ] γυναῖκας
ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης
κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν καὶ χρυσίῳ ἢ μαργαρίταις ἢ ἱματισμῷ
πολυτελεῖ,
ἀλλ' ὃ πρέπει γυναιξὶν ἐπαγγελλομέναις θεοσεβείαν, δι' ἔργων ἀγαθῶν.

This reading differs from the previous one in only one issue, the position of μετὰ αἰδοῦς καὶ σωφροσύνης with respect to κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς. But the function of this latter phrase remains the same. In both readings κοσμεῖν functions as an exegetical infinitive, explaining the prepositional phrase ἐν καταστολῇ κοσμίῳ κτλ.,⁴⁵ either in an outright positive (μετὰ αἰδοῦς

⁴⁴) The negative clause is offered a positive counterpart in v. 15, including multiple qualifications: ἄμεμπτοι καὶ ἀκέραιοι, τέκνα θεοῦ ἄμομα.

⁴⁵) The exegetical infinitive can be used to show not only the intention but also the manner of accomplishing something, or again to explain a noun (as in Eph 3:4-6 where εἶναι defines μυστήριον), or an adjective (2 Tim 1:12: δύνάτος . . . φυλάξαι). See G.B. Winer, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms* (Leipzig, 1867) 298ff, 306. See also C.G. Wilke, *Die neutestamentliche Rhetorik* (Dresden/Leipzig, 1843) 166-167; F. Blass,

καὶ σωφροσύνης) or in a positive and a negative way (as part of the μή... ἀλλά clause).⁴⁶

Cukrowski argues that the reading with βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι cannot work because it leaves the two infinitives disconnected. But this is not the case: προσεύχεσθαι and κοσμεῖν are not on the same level. They do not define two coordinate clauses, but belong to the main and the subordinate clause, respectively, therefore they do not have to be connected by καί.

2. 1 Cor 11:3-15 as Pre-Text of 1 Tim 2:8-15

Many authors find a striking resemblance between 1 Tim 2:8-15 and 1 Cor 14:34-35, and with good reason.⁴⁷ Yet there are not many to offer a detailed discussion of the similarities between 1 Tim 2:8-15 and 1 Cor 11:3-15. Some authors argue for a clear textual parallel,⁴⁸ or notice the thematic similarities.⁴⁹ The function of 1 Cor 11:2ff as pre-text for 1 Tim 2:13 is discussed by A. Merz. However, her excellent intertextual analysis deals with the prohibition of teaching and its legitimation from creation and fall, and she does not focus primarily on 1 Cor 11:5-6.⁵⁰ Others establish various degrees of connection, but mostly reflect on the

A. Debrunner, F. Rehkopf, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch* ([BDR]; ¹⁴1976) 324 (§394). A relevant example is Acts 3:18, where παθεῖν defines the content of ὃ προκατήγγειλεν. In Rom 1:28 the infinitive depends on a prepositional phrase, as in 1 Tim 2:9 (παρέδωκεν αὐτοὺς... εἰς ἀδόκιμον νοῦν, explained by ποιεῖν).

⁴⁶ The construction with μή following the verb has a parallel in John 6:27 (with an imperative: ἐργάζεσθε μὴ... ἀλλά) and 1 Cor 5:8 (with a subjunctive, there too in a prepositional phrase). Moulton-Geden explicitly cite 1 Tim 2:9 as an example for μή following an infinitive (W.F. Moulton, A.S. Geden, *Concordance to the Greek New Testament*, ed. I.H. Marshall [London/New York, 2002, 696], their category 3). The choice for μή instead of οὐ(κ)... ἀλλά allows for the particle to deny a possibility (οὐ is used to deny a fact), and is not uncommon in later Greek. See Winer, *Grammatik*, 441; BDR, 357 (§429.1); LSJ, s.v. μή (D); BDAG, s.v. μή.

⁴⁷ Cf. Roloff, *1 Tim*, 128-130; Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 93; Ph.B. Payne, "Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1Cor 14:34-5", *NTS* 41 (1995) 240-262 (248-249); Merz, *Selbstauslegung*, 334-339; Towner, *Letters*, 193-194, 215, and many others.

⁴⁸ Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, 65.

⁴⁹ See the analogy established by Liefeld, *Tim-Tit*, 95, 109-110; Küchler, *Schweigen*, 76; Spicq, *Épîtres* I, 371, 376, 378-380, 386-387; Towner, *Letters*, 218 (evidence for prophesy-ing, 226-227).

⁵⁰ Merz, *Selbstauslegung*, 339-343.

common argumentation from Genesis.⁵¹ Nonetheless, the intertextual approach shows that 1 Tim knew and used 1 Cor 11:3-15 and its co(n)text, reinterpreting it in a restrictive manner. The evidence comes from the similarities between the two texts and their co-text. There is an obvious thematic parallel between the two passages, reinforced by a number of verbal connections. Thus both formulate rules regarding the way men and women have to pray in the community, and they combine regulations referring to prayer and outfit. Both legitimate the regulations with arguments from the creation account(s) and from social conventions. Moreover, the immediate context is very similarly structured and brings in a number of keywords which will have an important function for the (re)interpretation carried on by 1 Tim.

2.1 *The Co-Text of 1 Cor 11:3-15 and 1 Tim 2:8-15*

1 Cor 11 is part of a larger section dealing with public worship. The same context is asserted by most commentators for 1 Tim 2:1-10(15). The latter deliberately took over not only the topic of public prayer and regulations concerning men and women, but also adopted and adapted a number of concepts from the context, conveying a new meaning to the pre-text. A look at the co(n)text is highly important, as it reveals additional elements of intertextuality and points to the restrictive reinterpretation of Paul, with a reference to Paul's words, his name and his authority. This procedure is described by A. Merz as "fictitious self-reference", and is meant to offer a *relecture* of the pre-text and to eliminate other, competing interpretations of Paul.⁵²

In 1 Corinthians, the cultic rule in 11:4-7a is preceded by a discussion on alimentary rules (10:25-30). In this context Paul makes his case calling attention to three ideas: conscience (συνείδησις) is the governing authority, unjust criticism should be rejected as βλασφημία, and his ministry serves the universal salvation plan. Further, the cultic rule itself is intro-

⁵¹ Hanson mentions 1 Cor 11:8-12 as parallel for 1 Tim 3:13-14, especially referring to the inherent gullibility of the woman (*Studies*, 65-66). Roloff admits that 1 Tim has used the argumentation regarding man's priority in creation, but parallels only 1 Tim 2:11-15 with 1 Cor 14:34-36 (1 Tim, 129-130).

⁵² Merz, *Selbstauslegung*, 231-232, 333-334; cf. ead., "Fictitious Self-Exposition of Paul: How Might Intertextual Theory Suggest a Reformulation of the Hermeneutics of Pseudo-epigraphy", in Th.L. Brodie, D.R. MacDonald, S.E. Porter (eds.), *The Intertextuality of the Epistles. Explorations of Theory and Practice* (New Testament Monographs 16; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2006) 113-132.

duced by an assertion of Paul's apostolic authority. These four concepts (συνείδησις, βλασφημία, Paul's role in the universal plan of salvation, and his authority) immediately precede the cultic rule in 1 Tim 2 as well, therefore their meaning in 1 Cor needs to be discussed.

In 1 Cor 10 Paul argues that Christians should not have a troubled conscience (μηδὲν ἀνακρίνοντες διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν, vv. 25, 27), by consuming meat that might come from pagan sacrifices, nor by partaking in meals with non-believers.⁵³ The emphasis is on the freedom of conscience, certainly without disregarding the need to prevent scandal.⁵⁴ While being aware of this requirement, Paul adds in v. 29b: ἵνατί γὰρ ἡ ἐλευθερία μου κρίνεται ὑπὸ ἄλλης συνειδήσεως;. Although rules should govern worship and every day life, these rules should leave space for personal freedom, since conscience is the internal authority that in certain cases can overwrite external rules. The idea of possessing an ability to make personal judgments about what is right or wrong will be taken up again in 11:13 (ἐν ὑμῖν αὐτοῖς κρίνατε), and even the authoritative introduction of the cultic rule in 11:3 implies a demand for personal consent (θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι).⁵⁵ Even if Paul makes authoritative assertions, and his appeal is rather theoretical, he invites his readers to think with him.

After asserting the freedom of conscience and the respect for others' sensitivity, Paul rhetorically asks why is he vilified (τὶ βλασφημοῦμαι;) when he partakes in such meals with thankfulness, i.e. implicitly without being blamed by his conscience (v. 30). The question could be interpreted as an appeal to abstinence for the sake of those who could be scandalised, but it is more likely to stress freedom and rejection of this unjust denigration (βλασφημία), as suggested by the following verse ("whether you eat or drink", not "whether you eat or do not eat", cf. also v. 25). Therefore, although Paul pays attention to the conscience of the other, he qualifies the criticism of (his / a Christian's) freedom, which in certain cases might go against the rules, as βλασφημία.⁵⁶

⁵³) A. Lindemann rightly distinguishes between the meaning/belonging of συνείδησις in vv. 25, 27 and 29a respectively (*Der erste Korintherbrief* [HNT 9/I; Tübingen: Mohr, 2000] 231, 233). Pace W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (EKK VII/2; Solothurn-Düsseldorf-Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchner, 1995) 466.

⁵⁴) Schrage, *1 Kor*, 2, 461-473.

⁵⁵) Although commonly translated as "(I want you) to know", (θέλω ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι) implies not simply becoming acquainted with a matter, but also understanding and recognition (BDAG, s.v. οἶδα).

⁵⁶) Lindemann, *1 Kor*, 234: "Wenn der Christ mit Dank an Gott die Mahlzeit zu sich nimmt [...] besteht objektiv kein Grund, ihn dafür zu kritisieren (βλασφημεῖν)."

This discussion on rules, conscience and freedom is connected with the thought of universal salvation, expressed by Paul's concern for the whole church, reaching even towards the outsiders (vv. 32-33). In this context, Paul emphasises his personal, selfless example: he is a minister of salvation, and his only concern is the benefit of all, for the sake of their salvation (10:33: καὶ ὡς καὶ γὰρ πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω μὴ ζητῶν τὸ ἑμαυτοῦ σύμφορον, ἀλλὰ τὸ τῶν πολλῶν ἵνα σωθῶσιν). His example should be followed by the community, just as Paul himself is an *imitator of Christ* (11:1).

This statement is followed by an assertion of Paul's authority, based on the fact that he transmits the παραδόσεις (11:1-2). This apostolic authority allows Paul to formulate or reinterpret rules regulating the life of the community.

It is noteworthy that the co-text of 1 Tim 2:8-10 takes up the same key-concepts (συνείδησις, βλασφημέω, universal salvation, Paul's example and authority), in the same chain of thought, but while changing their meaning.

Just before introducing the section on prayer in ch. 2, "Paul", in a renewed empowering of "Timothy",⁵⁷ commands him to hold faith, in accordance with what has been entrusted to him, and a good conscience (ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις, 1:19). Vv. 18-19 resume the commissioning articulated in vv. 3-5.⁵⁸ For the PE faith, basically understood as faithfulness to the sound doctrine, finds its expression in attachment to a morally right lifestyle and in proper religious practice,⁵⁹ whereas false teachers and their adepts are deeply vicious.⁶⁰ Under these circumstances the intimate link between faith and lifestyle, both assuring a good conscience, becomes obvious. "Timothy's" commissioning, strengthened by apostolic authority, introduces the whole ecclesial rule in chs. 2-3 and confers a special weight to the cultic order that follows immediately after. Moreover, in this context, ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις is both a consequence and a sign of one's conform-

⁵⁷ Vv. 18-19, cf. Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 51-56; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 406.

⁵⁸ Here ἀγάπη is omitted, since in the context of combat (v. 20) it becomes less appropriate. Thus Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 55, who rightly defines ἡ καλὴ στρατεία as combat for the sound doctrine and against false teachers.

⁵⁹ See the cultic-ethical rules regarding men/women in 1 Tim 2, cf. Tit 2:2-6, the mirror of the ἐπίσκοπος and διακόνος in 1 Tim 3 (cf. Tit 1:6-8), the instructions to Timothy (1 Tim 5:6-8, 12; 6:11-14; 2 Tim 2:22-23; 4:10-14) and Titus (Tit 2:1, 7-8); the connection between truth and godliness in Tit 1:1. Note also the appeal to deacons in 1 Tim 3:9 to hold to the mystery of faith with καθαρά συνειδήσις. For a comparison of συνείδησις in Paul and the PE, see Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 217-227, 412.

⁶⁰ Cf. 1 Tim 1:8-10; 6:3-5; 2 Tim 1:15; 3:2-9.13; Tit 1:12. 16; 3:9-11.

ity to doctrinal and community rules, not of one's freedom from any such rules.

Interestingly enough βλασφημέω appears also in 1 Tim 1:20. Immediately after the reference to the good conscience, βλασφημέω characterises the attitude of Hymenaeus and Alexander as persons who have rejected good conscience (ἦν τινες ἀπωσάμενοι, v. 19), and have made shipwreck of their faith. If we take into account that ἀγαθὴ συνείδησις is both consequence and sign of conformity to doctrinal and congregational rules, these paradigmatic persons represent the opposite position of that described in vv. 18-19a,⁶¹ i.e. non-adherence to sound doctrine and to the rules which result from it. In 1 Cor Paul, as paradigmatic Christian, is right, although he breaks the rules, and his conscience correctly approves his decision to do so. Thus the criticism of his opponents about not holding to the rules is an unjust accusation, qualified as βλασφημία. Conversely, in 1 Tim 1:20 those who break the rules are rightly accused of βλασφημία, and their rejection of doctrinal and/or congregational rules means a rejection of good conscience and implicitly of faith, with utmost dramatic consequences. Subsequently the combined intertextual reference to Paul through συνείδησις and βλασφημέω is meant to emphasise what could be regarded as the opposite of 1 Cor 10:27-31, an appeal to strict adherence to doctrinal and community rules instead of freedom of conscience.

Further, in 2:1-7 "Paul" urges "Timothy" to make prayers for all men, including the civil authorities, so that Christians may live a quiet and peaceful life in godliness and propriety. This is good in the eyes of the saviour God, who wishes the salvation of all men (τοῦτο καλὸν καὶ ἀπόδεκτον ἐνώπιον τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν θεοῦ, ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν, vv. 3-4). In 1 Tim the situation has changed. Paul is no longer amongst them as a model to be imitated. The universal perspective is preserved, but the emphasis is not on the imitation of Paul's example, but on his paradigmatic character and his authority, received from Christ himself (εἰς ὃ ἐτέθη ἐγὼ κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος, 2:7). The commissioning of the apostle in v. 7 takes up again the longer version in 1:12-16 that strongly emphasises the paradigmatic nature of Paul's absolutism and mission. Paul is not only the exemplary sinner who has found

⁶¹⁾ The question of these characters' historicity and their possible identity with those mentioned in 2 Tim 2:17 and 4:14 is outside the scope of this paper. Whether historical false teachers, or paradigmatic characters (see Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 56-57), they embody the rejection of sound doctrine and implicitly of good conscience.

mercy, but also the manifestation of God's universal saving will, and this confers him a particular authority. While in 1 Cor Paul can still offer himself as an example of selfless endeavour in the service of universal salvation, in 1 Tim he becomes a paradigmatic presence. He has experienced God's universal saving will. Subsequently he has become a herald of this saving will that can be received in the ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας,⁶² and now his apostolic authority is mediated by "Timothy".

One additional change should be noted. While Paul's universal concern, expressed in 1 Cor 10:32-33, is motivated solely by his desire to be an instrument of salvation, in 1 Tim 2:1-7 this concern (prayers for everyone) is not only an expression of God's all-embracing saving will, but has the clear purpose to secure the quiet, peaceful and godly life of the community. This is a major concern for the PE, reflecting the ideal of "good citizenship", in the perspective of a remote parousia.⁶³

2.2 *The Cultic Rule*

2.2.1. *Fundament: The Authority of the Apostle*

Both the cultic regulations in 1 Cor 11:4-7a and those in 1 Tim 2:8-10 are introduced by a clear statement on the speaker's authority. Thus 1 Cor 11:3 relies on the preceding exhortation to follow the example of the apostle (v. 1), and on the commendation of the community for having preserved the tradition delivered to them by Paul (v. 2). This introductory remark conveys a special weight to what follows. This reference is followed by the authoritative θέλω. The κεφαλή argument serves as authoritative introduction and fundament for the subsequent cultic rule.

The cultic rule in 1 Tim 2:8-10 in its turn relies on the authority of the apostle, introduced in 1:18, where "Timothy" is entrusted with the παραγγελία.⁶⁴ The apostolic authority is mentioned once again in 2:7:

⁶² The meaning of ἐπίγνωσις ἀληθείας as appropriation of the doctrinal truths is rightly recognised by H. Von Lips, *Glaube-Gemeinde-Amt: Zum Verständnis der Ordination in den Pastoralbriefen* (FRLANT 122; Göttingen: V&R, 1979) 32-40, followed by Wagener, *Ordination*, 97. This reinforces the authoritative thrust of the context.

⁶³ Rightly so Dibelius/Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 39-40, notwithstanding criticism. It could also reflect an attempt to cope with persecutions (Merz, *Selbstausslegung*, 81, following Holtzmann, *Einleitung*, 286).

⁶⁴ For the interrelation between παρατίθημι and παραγγελία; and for the continuity in tradition, expressed by Timothy's designation as τέκνον (cf. also 1:2), see Roloff, *1 Tim*, 101.

“Paul” has been appointed herald, apostle and teacher of the nations, directly by Christ (cf. vv. 5-6). Moreover, Christ is described in his relationship to God, as sole mediator, therefore God is the source of Christ’s authority. Following this preamble, the cultic rule is introduced by the powerful βούλομαι.

However, authority is conceived in a somewhat different manner. 1 Cor 11:3, 13 implies an invitation to think with Paul, a participation of reason in the acknowledgment of the rules, which softens somewhat the authoritative θέλω.⁶⁵ Moreover, Paul’s authority is not absolute, but he possesses it inasmuch as he is himself an imitator of Christ, and therefore refers to Christ.⁶⁶ He is an element in the chain of transmission of what he himself has received. Therefore his demands are authoritative insofar as they are handed down to him (11:2, cf. 15:3). In 1 Tim Paul’s authority is immediate and complete: he has been directly appointed by Christ. The language of power does not allow for reasoning or questions. M. Wolter remarks that his authority derives from his quality of being the first to be saved, and this priority makes him an archetype, not an example (“Urbild”, not “Vorbild”).⁶⁷

2.2.2. *Praying and Prophesying*

Both 1 Cor 11:4-7a⁶⁸ and 1 Tim 2:8-10⁶⁹ regulate the behaviour of men and women at worship.

⁶⁵ Thus rightly Schrage, *1 Kor*, 2, 498: “Mit einem Imp. Aor. appelliert Paulus in V 13 an die Urteilsfähigkeit der Adressaten.”

⁶⁶ Cf. Schrage: “dieses Mal ist Paulus Vorbild darin, daß er selbst ein Vorbild hat: Christus” (*1 Kor*, 2, 466-467).

⁶⁷ M. Wolter, *Die Pastoralbriefe als Paulustradition* (Göttingen: V&R, 1988) 53, 56-57.

⁶⁸ Bartsch, *Anfänge*, 68 sees in 11:3 a reference to a well-established rule. See also H. Conzelmann, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (KEK; Göttingen: V&R, ²1981) 222; G. Dautzenberg, *Urchristliche Prophetie. Ihre Erforschung, ihre Voraussetzungen im Judentum und ihre Struktur im ersten Korintherbrief* (BWANT 104; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1975) 268: “eine Gemeindeordnung, welche charismatisches Reden vor der Gemeinde, Beten und Prophezeien kennt, und [...] Männer und Frauen zu Wort kommen läßt”. For Schrage, 1 Cor 11:2 introduces the section dealing with questions related to worship, extending to the end of ch. 14. Prayer and prophecy are a synecdoche defining worship, and Paul formulates rules for women’s appearance at prayer and prophesying (*1 Kor*, 2, 436-448, esp. 487, 505, 507). See also F. Watson, “The Authority of the Voice: Reading of 1 Cor 11,2-16”, *NTS* 46 (2000) 520-536 (525).

⁶⁹ Some object that the moral requirements addressed to men and women are generally compelling and do not refer only to public worship. E.g. Holmes (*Text*, 90-97 passim)

According to 1 Cor 11:4-7a worship involves not only prayer, but also prophesying, for both men and women. The requirements are formulated in a parallel manner (vv. 4-5):

πᾶς ἀνὴρ προσευχόμενος ἢ προφητεύων
πᾶσα δὲ γυνὴ προσευχομένη ἢ προφητεύουσα.⁷⁰

In light of ch. 14, prophecy is a form of public, religious authoritative speech.⁷¹ Prophecy is a gift that provides edification, encouragement and comfort to others (ὁ προφητεύων ἀνθρώποις λαλεῖ οἰκοδομὴν καὶ παράκλησιν καὶ παραμυθίαν, 3b). Moreover, prophecy edifies the church (4b, cf. v. 5). Because compared to tongues prophecy is an intelligible, edifying form of instruction, Paul states his preference: ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ θέλω πέντε λόγους τῷ νοί μου λαλῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ ἄλλους κατηχῆσω (v. 19).⁷² This assertion proves not only the communitarian aspect of prophesying, but its character of instruction as well (cf. also vv. 26-31). This dimension of teaching/instruction as an unambiguous function of prophecy is also affirmed in 14:31, where Paul encourages all to prophecy: ἵνα πάντες μανθάνωσιν καὶ πάντες παρακαλῶνται. These considerations are important for the way we read 1 Cor 11:4-5.

In 1 Cor 11 the issue is not praying or prophesying as such, but the way one behaves in doing so. There is no consensus on what exactly Paul means by κατακαλύπτω in v. 6, said of women, and κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων⁷³ in v. 4 referring to men. According to a common interpretation women have to be veiled.⁷⁴ Yet κάλυμμα does not appear in the text. Conversely, based on

rejects the congregational context, up to the point of suggesting that given the morphological choices (διδάσκειν, αὐθέντειν in pres. inf.) the text refers to an ongoing “nagging” of men by women, not to authoritative teaching. The interpretation is unconvincing. Moreover the general validity of moral principles is not an impediment for formulating specific expectations with respect to behaviour at worship.

⁷⁰ Προσεύχομαι τῷ θεῷ is used once more in v. 13.

⁷¹ For prophecy as authoritative speech: Lindemann, *1 Kor*, 240, 297, 299.

⁷² For the understandable character of prophecy as edification and instruction (contrasted to glossolalia), see Lindemann, *1 Kor*, 240, 297-300, 310; U. Luz, “Stages of Early Christian Prophetism”, *Sacra Scripta* 5.1 (2007) 45-62 (53-54).

⁷³ Κατὰ followed by a genitive is a “marker of extension or orientation in space or specific area [hanging down from the head]”, BDAG, s.v.

⁷⁴ Küchler, *Schweigen*, 73-74, 92-96; Johnson, *Timothy*, 206; J. Delobel, “1 Cor 11,2-16: Towards a Coherent Interpretation”, in A. Vanhoye (ed.), *L'apôtre Paul : Personnalité, style*

the references to hair in vv. 6.14-15, several authors think that the regulation actually concerns hairdo, and that the main issue is rather that of assuming gender roles, as suggested by the argument from nature in v. 14.⁷⁵ A number of early Christian readers supplied κατὰ κεφαλῆς ἔχων with κόμη,⁷⁶ but nonetheless regarded the demand concerning women as referring to veiling.⁷⁷ Whatever the case may be,⁷⁸ it is obvious that public prayer and prophesying, performed by both men and women, is connected to requirements regarding an appropriate appearance.

In 1 Tim 2:8-10 men are explicitly instructed to pray with the appropriate spiritual attitude. The discussion of the ellipsis has shown that the demand addressed to women is more ambiguous. Nonetheless, supplying βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι allows for interpreting vv. 9-10 as referring to women at prayer. Now only prayer is in view: prophesying is not mentioned. However, in vv. 11-12 there is a reference to teaching as a form of authoritative speech: women are exhorted to learn (μανθάνω) in full submission⁷⁹ and are forbidden to teach or exert authority over men.⁸⁰

When comparing the expectations in 1 Tim 2:8-10 with those in 1 Cor 11:4-7a, some key-words and themes from 1 Cor are repeated, but

et conception du ministère (BETL 73; Leuven: Peeters, 1986) 369-389; Watson, "Authority", 522.

⁷⁵ Schrage, *1 Kor*, 2, 492-494, 505-509; H.-J. Klauck, *1. Korintherbrief* (NEB.NT; Würzburg: Echter, 1984) 80-81; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, in R.E. Brown, J.A. Fitzmyer, R.E. Murphy (eds.), *The New Jerome Biblical Commentary* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1990) 798-815 (808-809); Lindemann, *1 Kor*, 240-241. Cf. E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, ²1990) 230 (hairdo not as a gender-specific symbol, but as a sign of women's prophetic authority).

⁷⁶ Chrysostom, *In Epist. I ad Cor. Homil. XXVI*, PG 61, 213, 217; Theophylact, *Expositio in Epistolam I ad Corinthios*, PG 124, 696AB. None of them assumes that the same type of rule should be understood as referring to both men and women.

⁷⁷ Some mss (vg^{ms}; Ptol^h) and a number of patristic witnesses read *velamen* / κάλλυμα instead of ἑξουσία (²⁷NA and the note in WH 2, 116).

⁷⁸ Others leave both possibilities open: Merz, *Selbstausagebung*, 340.

⁷⁹ On the PE's scorn of women's useless endeavour to learn, and the meaning of μανθάνειν: Wagener, *Ordnung*, 96-97; Merz, *Selbstausagebung*, 285-286.

⁸⁰ Merz correctly shows that the very act of teaching men by women was seen in antiquity as an illegitimate exercise of authority (*Selbstausagebung*, 294); see also Wagener, *Ordnung*, 75-76. Pace Köstenberger, "A Complex Sentence Structure in 1 Timothy 2,12", in Köstenberger *et al.*, *Women*, 81-103, whose detailed analysis is overshadowed by an aprioristic wish to prove that with οὐδέ Paul forbids women to exert two intrinsically positive, fundamentally different acts.

in a noteworthy manner, implying omissions and expansions, as well as the re-interpretation of the recurring themes.⁸¹

Both texts address the issue of prayer in the context of public worship. Πᾶς ἄνθρωπος προσευχόμενος ἢ προφητεύων in 1 Cor 11:4 can be paralleled with προσεύχεσθαι τοὺς ἄνδρας in 1 Tim 2:8. If προσεύχεσθαι is supplied in 1 Tim 2:9, the reading parallels πᾶσα δὲ γυνὴ προσευχομένη ἢ προφητεύουσα of 1 Cor 11:5.⁸²

An additional link between the two texts is created by the interconnection between prayer and the appropriate outward appearance at worship. Some suggest that the phrase ὁσίους χεῖρας in 1 Tim 2:8 could also refer to a symbolic physical purity.⁸³ Vv. 9-10 extensively discuss women's appearance, with reference to respectable apparel and to the way they should (not) wear their hair (μὴ ἐν πλέγμασιν). These motifs recall the regulation regarding feminine (hair)wear in 1 Cor 11:5-6, 13, 15. Another verbal and thematic link is realised by the requirement of a worthy manner of adorning (ὃ πρέπει, 1 Tim 2:10), which corresponds to Paul's rhetorical question in 1 Cor 11:13 (πρέπον ἐστίν;).⁸⁴ One could object that 1 Tim 2:10 refers only metaphorically to adornment, actually envisaging a moral attitude, but vv. 9b-10 clearly touch upon the manner of dressing. On the other hand, both texts regulate the outward appearance as manifestation of a morally fitting or inappropriate attitude.

A very strong link between the two texts is realised by the theological legitimization of the cultic rule, a matter that will be addressed below (2.2.3).

Beside the clear thematic and verbal connections, there are obvious differences as well. The most striking difference is the absence of prophecy.

⁸¹ Comparing 1 Cor 11:2-16 and 14:33b-36, Dautzenberg (*Prophetie*, 268-273) suggested that they represent two different types of community rule, an earlier, charismatic-Pauline one, and a later one, marked by Jewish (Hellenistic Jewish-Christian) influences, which would also be reflected in 1 Tim 2:11f. Yet, the silencing of women as specific (Hellenistic) Jewish rule is questioned by the evidence of women in leadership in Hellenistic Jewish communities: B.J. Brotoen, *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue* (Brown Jewish Studies 36; Atlanta, GA, 1982) 32, 35-99, passim; P.W. van der Horst, "The Jews of Ancient Crete", in id., *Jews and Christians in Their Graeco-Roman Context. Selected Essays on Early Judaism, Samaritanism, Hellenism, and Christianity* (WUNT 196; Tübingen: Mohr, 2006) 12-27 (25-27); Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 95, n. 45. Ancient Greek literature abounds with texts restricting women's public speech.

⁸² Holtz, *Pastoralbriefe*, 65; Liefeld, *Tim-Tit*, 95, 109-110.

⁸³ As suggested by Spicq, *Épîtres* I, 373; Collins, *Timothy*, 66. This meaning is debatable.

⁸⁴ Bartsch, *Anfänge*, 68 relates it to Tit 2:3, considering that both are to be understood on the background of 1 Cor 11:13.

In 1 Tim 2:8 men are no longer supposed to prophesy. Prophecy basically disappears from the PE.⁸⁵ The cognate προφητείας appears twice in 1 Tim (1:18; 4:14), in both cases in relation with “Timothy’s” institution/“ordination” as successor of Paul and defender of the sound doctrine. (A prophet appears once in the PE, in Tit 1:12, in a rather negative context). This “institutionalisation” of prophecy goes together with the omission of prophesying as a gift or attribution of regular members of the community, let them be even men.

For women, what was still obvious for Paul in 1 Cor 11:5, 13, has become either ambiguous (prayer), or inconceivable (prophecy) in 1 Tim 2. Since 1 Cor 14:19, 31 describes prophecy as a form of authoritative speech and instruction, which provides the possibility to learn (μανθάνω), it is probable that the exhortation addressed to women to learn in silence, paralleled by the prohibition to teach or exercise authority over men in 1 Tim 2:11-12 is a fictitious self-reference and self-correction, excluding women from any form of public authoritative speech and correcting Paul’s permissive attitude toward women prophesying.

A particular problem arises with respect to the subject of prophesying and learning in 1 Cor 11 and 14, and the relationship of these texts with 1 Tim 2:11-12. In 1 Cor 11:5 it is obvious that women prophesy. Further, according to 14:31, all are allowed to prophesy: they only need to respect a certain order, so that everyone may learn and receive encouragement. Hence there is an obvious reciprocity in both prophesying/instructing and learning. This reciprocity is nonetheless denied in 14:34-35, expecting women to keep silent. The latter text has striking semantic and thematic similarities with 1 Tim 2:11-12 that have been explained in various ways.⁸⁶ Based on text- and literary-critical arguments and on the contrast to 1 Cor

⁸⁵) Rightly Roloff, *1 Tim*, 102.

⁸⁶) Several scholars convincingly argue for the literary dependence of 1 Tim 2:11-12 on 1 Cor 14:34-35 (Roloff, *1 Tim*, 128-130; Wagener, *Ordnung*, 94-96; Merz, *Selbstausslegung*, 334-339). Those who plead for the authenticity of 1 Cor 14:34-35 often assume two different Pauline regulations: Towner, *Letters*, 194; Witherington, *Letters*, 221-222, and even Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 439-441 (though an adept of allonymity). A few think that 1 Cor 14:34-35 is more restrictive than 1 Tim 2:11-12, e.g. Dautzenberg, *Prophezie*, 258-260 (but his argumentation is not convincing). K. Thraede regards the interpolation in 1 Cor later than 1 Tim 2; both reflect a restrictive post-Pauline tradition (*Ärger mit der Freiheit. Die Bedeutung von Frauen in Theorie und Praxis der alten Kirche*, in G. Scharffenorth, K. Thraede, *Freunde in Christus werden... : Die Beziehung von Mann und Frau als Frage an Theologie und Kirche* [Gelnhausen: Burkhardhaus, 1977] 112, cf. 109).

11:5 and the rest of 1 Cor 14, a significant number of scholars regard vv. 34-35 as an early interpolation, probably by the time when the Corpus Paulinum was edited.⁸⁷ A few defend their authenticity, either because no manuscript omits these verses, the text-critical evidence for an interpolation being regarded as unconvincing,⁸⁸ or because of a certain understanding of inspiration.⁸⁹

The debate within scholarship regarding the authenticity and interpretation of 1 Cor 14:34-35 shows not only the contradiction between this text and 11:5, but also the fact that the scope of silencing is differently understood. Those scholars who regard the verses as Pauline, but nonetheless perceive the tension with 11:5, tend to limit the prohibition to disrespectful intervention of Corinthian women during the service.⁹⁰ Precisely

⁸⁷ J. Weiß, *Der erste Korintherbrief* (KEK 5; Göttingen: V&R, 1910) 342; Thraede, *Ärger*, 111-112; Ch. Senft, *La première Épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens* (CNT II.VII; Lausanne/Paris: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1979) 182-183; Dautzenberg, *Prophetie*, 257-273; Conzelmann, *1 Kor*, 298-299; Payne, "Fuldensis", 240-262; id., "Ms. 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14.34-5", *NTS* 44.1 (1998) 152-158; Ph. Payne / P. Canart, "The Originality of Text-Critical Symbols in Codex Vaticanus", *NT* 42 (2000) 105-113; Payne, "The Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus, with a Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14.34-35: A Response to J. Edward Miller", *JSNT* 27.1 (2004) 105-112; G. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987) 699-705; Schrage, *1 Kor*, 3, 458, 479-492 and the quoted literature; Klauck, *1 Kor*, 107-108; J. Murphy-O'Connor, *1 Kor*, 811-812, cf. id., *1 Corinthians* (NTM 10; Dublin, 1979) 133; R.B. Hays, *First Corinthians* (Interpretation; Louisville, KY, 1997) 245-249; Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 93-94; W.O. Walker, *Interpolations in the Pauline Epistles* (JSNTSup 213; Sheffield: Sheffield AP, 2001) 63-90; Lindemann, *1 Kor*, 316-321; Merz, *Selbstausslegung*, 335-336; F. Watson, "The Authority of the Voice", 520-536 (525); J.E. Epp, *Junia The First Woman Apostle* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Fortress, 2005) 15-19.

⁸⁸ C. Niccum, "The Voice of the Manuscripts on the Silence of Women: The External Evidence for 1 Cor 14.34-5", *NTS* 43 (1997) 242-255; J.E. Miller, "Some Observations on the Text-Critical Function of the Umlauts in Vaticanus with a Special Attention to 1 Corinthians 14.34-35", *JSNT* 26.2 (2003) 217-236, but they often misrepresent Payne's position. See also E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 230-233.

⁸⁹ A. Robertson, A. Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (ICC; Edinburgh, 1911) 324-325 (1 Cor 11:5 only hypothetical); C.T. Craig, J. Short, *1 Corinthians* (The Interpreter's Bible X; New York, 1953) 3-262 (212-213); W.H. Mare, *1 Corinthians* (The Expositor's Bible Commentary X, Grand Rapids, 1976), 276-277. Yet a number of authors seem to be undecided: F.F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (New Century Bible; London, 1971) 135; cf. W.F. Orr, J.A. Walther, *1 Corinthians* (AB; New York, 1976) 313: unless Paul is contradicting himself, or the verses are an interpolation.

⁹⁰ Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 230-233 (a limited prohibition addressed to wives publicly commenting on men's utterances); J. Kremer, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther* (RNT;

this choice to limit the interdiction to inconsiderate (small)talk, without applying it to teaching/prophesying, indicates that the text could have been liable from the beginning (even when an interpolation) to less restrictive interpretations. Thus one could assume that the author of 1 Tim has attempted to interpret this text in a restrictive and unequivocal manner, leaving no doubt about the full exclusion of women from public ministry and teaching.⁹¹ Yet other scholars who regard 1 Cor 14:34-35 as inauthentic, based on the obvious verbal and thematic similarities with 1 Tim 2:9-15, argue even that both texts could stem from the same or a similar patriarchal-misogynistic circle.⁹²

At any rate, 1 Tim 2:8-15 clearly narrows down the possibilities that are still open in 1 Cor 11. This is particularly true for women, but to a certain degree for men as well.

2.2.3. *Legitimation*

2.2.3.1 Theological Legitimation

In 1 Cor 11:3-16 Paul legitimises the rules regulating male and female appearance at public worship by the κεφαλή symbolism and by a double reference to Gen in vv. 7 and 9.

The meaning of his first argument (v. 3) is a matter of debate. A common interpretation of the κεφαλή metaphor asserts the subordination of the woman. Nonetheless, a number of authors suggest that Paul simply alludes to Gen 2, stating that the man is the source of the woman's existence.⁹³ Yet, even mere precedence in creation may suggest a hierarchical relationship between man and woman.

Regensburg, 1997) 312 (disturbing speech); Chr. Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (ThHKNT 7; Berlin, 22000) 341-346; Towner, *Letters*, 215 (particular forms of speech, e.g. unrestricted interpretation of tongues or prophecy, or interaction with men). The attempt to mitigate the prohibition is unconvincing.

⁹¹) Thus Roloff, *1 Tim*, 128-130; Merz, *Selbstausslegung*, 334-339.

⁹²) Conzelmann, *1 Kor*, 299; Dautzenberg, *Prophetie*, 272; Hays, *1 Cor*, 247; Schrage, *1 Kor* (EKK VII/3), 486-487, 490; Murphy-O'Connor, *1 Cor*, 811; Lindemann, *1 Kor*, 318-319. An alternative to this position is represented by Bartsch, *Anfänge*, 68-70, who assumes that both texts represent cultic rules, differing insofar as 1 Tim 2:9-10 expands the scope of cultic regulations to general attitude. Some of these authors even suppose that 1 Tim 2:9-15 could stem from the same circle which formulated the household codes in Eph and Col, but it is more likely that 1 Tim reflects a later, more conservative tradition (see Wagener, *Ordnung*, 63).

⁹³) This reading is based on the fact that in ancient Greek κεφαλή is not used as "ruler", but as "source": Murphy-O'Connor, *1 Cor*, 808; Schrage, *1 Kor*, 2, 501-505 and the quoted

A reference to the first account of creation appears in v. 7: the man is not supposed to cover his head (or to wear long hair), because he is the image and glory (εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα) of God. This is not only an allusion to, but also a reinterpretation of Gen 1:26-27, since in Paul the resemblance to God is a male attribute.

The third argument (v. 9) draws from Gen 2. Paul reinforces the implicit androcentrism of the account, emphasising that “man is not from (ἐκ) woman, but woman from man; nor was man created for/through (διὰ) woman, but woman for/through man” (vv. 8-9). Nonetheless, his subsequent reflection seems to correct this one-sided perspective, as he goes on stating the interdependence between man and woman, even in terms of origin (11:11-12).

1 Tim 2:13 legitimates the restrictions regarding women’s public role⁹⁴ by references to Gen 2-3. In 1 Tim 2 there is no mention anymore of the woman being the man’s δόξα. The chronological precedence of the man in creation (Gen 2), understood as a sign of his superiority, becomes even more categorical: the reciprocity-statement of 1 Cor 11:11-12 can no longer be found in 1 Tim 2.⁹⁵ Additionally, submission and exclusion are legitimised not only by the chronological order of creation, but also by a reference to the Fall, in the interpretative line of Sir 25:24 and Philo (*QG* I). The woman (not only Eve!) is allegedly liable to deception by nature.⁹⁶ Thus in 1 Tim 2 “Paul” makes use of another fictitious self-reference, in order to severely restrict the public ministry of women, based on the order of creation and on additional hamartiological arguments.

literature; Klauck, *1 Kor*, 81; cf. also LSJ, s.v. κεφαλή. For the use of κεφαλή in the sense of “ruler” pleads Fitzmyer, “Kephale in I Corinthians 11:3”, *Interpretation* 47.1 (1993) 52-59. It is possible however that Paul has a subordinationist view of both Christology (cf. 1 Cor 15:24-28) and society. This reading of 1 Cor 11:3 will be preferred by Eph 5:22-24, which legitimates women’s submission from the man’s headship. Theophylact combines the two meanings: the head of the woman is the man, to rule her, the head of Christ is God, as his cause, like the Father is the cause of the Son (*Exp. Ep. 1 Cor. XI*, PG 124, 693CD). See also BDAG, s.v. κεφαλή, “being of high status”, denoting superior rank.

⁹⁴ It is not the aim of this paper to discuss the reasons for the prohibition to teach or to exert authority over men, nor its various interpretations.

⁹⁵ Merz rightly speaks of the “neutralisation” of the potential corrective function of 1 Cor 11:11-12 (*Selbstauslegung*, 341-343).

⁹⁶ The argumentation based on the woman’s predisposition to be deceived has already been used by Philo, *QG* (SC 34A, Paris: Cerf, 1979) I, 33 (100/101). Cf. *QG* I, 43 (SC 34A, 108/109).

2.2.3.2 Social and Natural Legitimation

The rules regulating dressing and hairstyle were obviously part of a social code, as proved by a vast number of ancient sources.⁹⁷ Dressing code and rules regulating hairdo were related to gender roles, and implicitly to biological roles.⁹⁸ This interrelation is exemplified by Paul's argument from nature in 1 Cor 11:14.⁹⁹ The same kind of connection between social expectations regarding feminine adornment and gender roles can be found

⁹⁷ "Most women, if they are taken away their shoes ornamented with gold, their necklaces, bracelets, their purple and pearls (μαργαρίταις), will stay indoor" (Plutarch, *Coniug. Praec.*, *Mor* 142C, LCL). Compare *Mor* 141E: "that adorns or decorates a woman, which makes her more decorous. It is not gold or precious stones or scarlet that makes her such, but whatever invests her with that something which betokens dignity, good behaviour, and modesty." See also Melissa's letter to Kleareta: "Ἐχοις ἂν ἐπὶ τᾶς ὄψιος ἐρύθμα μὲν σαμειὼν αἰδοῦς ἀντὶ φύκιος, καλοκαγαθίαν δὲ καὶ κοσμιότατα καὶ σωφροσύναν ἀντὶ χρυσῶ καὶ σμαράγδω. οὐ γὰρ ἐς τὴν τᾶς ἐσθᾶτος πολυτέλειαν φιλοκαλεῖν δεῖ τὴν γλιχόμεναν τᾶς σωφροσύνας, ἀλλ' ἐς τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῷ οἴκῳ (Städele, *Briefe*, 160-163 [160,15-17.18-19]). On ancient criticism of costly adornment and hairstyles see also Dibelius/Conzelmann, *Pastoral Epistles*, 46; D. Balch, *Let Wives Be Submissive. The Domestic Code in 1 Peter* (SBLMS 26; Chico, CA: Scholars, 1981) 101-102; Wagener, *Ordnung*, 83-85; Marshall, *Pastoral Epistles*, 449-450; Towner, *Letters*, 208-209, Witherington, *Letters*, 224-225.

⁹⁸ Long hair and elaborated hairstyle in men were regarded as a sign of homosexuality/pederasty, repudiated as effeminacy, cf. Philo, *Spec. leg.* 3.37 (SC 25, Paris: Cerf, 1970, 80): μηδὲν ἐμπύρευμα τῆς ἄρρενος γενεᾶς ἔδωτες ὑποτύφεσθαι περιφανῶς οὕτως τὰς τῆς κεφαλῆς τρίχας ἀναπλεκόμενοι καὶ διακοσμούμενοι. His view on gender roles and sexual behaviour according to nature, marked by external appearance, is shared by Pseudo-Phocylides as well. Both follow Plato's view on nature and gender/sexual roles. See the ample discussion by R.B. Ward, "Why Unnatural? The Tradition behind Romans 1:26-27", *HThR*, 90.3 (1997) 263-284; cf. P. W. van der Horst, *Pseudo-Phocylides and the New Testament*, in id., *Essays on the Jewish World of Early Christianity* (NTOA 14; Göttingen: V&R, 1990) 19-34; Murphy-O'Connor, *1 Cor.*, 808-809; Klauck, *1 Kor.*, 80. Untied long hair in women marked participation in ecstatic cults, assimilated with moral and sexual impurity, while short hair was regarded as unfeminine (Schüssler Fiorenza, *Memory*, 227-228; Klauck, *1 Kor.*, 80-81; Schrage, *1 Kor.*, 2, 492-494, 505-509; Küchler, *Schweigen*, 79-82).

⁹⁹ On the relationship between veiling, hair and sexuality see T.W. Martin, "Paul's Argument from Nature for the Veil in 1 Corinthians 11:13-15: A Testicle Instead of a Head Covering", *JBL* 123.1 (2004) 75-84. His argument makes sense in the context of wild ancient physiological speculations. Whether Paul had indeed such physiological explanation in mind, is difficult to tell. The argument from nature could also imply that men and women should assume gender roles (in agreement with their biological role), as suggested e.g. by Philo's condemnation of passive and active pederasts (*Spec. leg.* 3.37, 39); see also 3, 32-33, 34-36 on other practices "against nature".

in 1 Tim 2:9-15 as well. The author not only offers a stereotyped description of the manner in which women are supposed to dress, but he also asserts that the only acceptable role through which women can attain salvation is childbearing.

3. Conclusion

The first part of the essay has shown that there are several ways for dealing with 1 Tim 2:9. Κοσμεῖν ἑαυτάς may be deleted as a secondary expansion, or the ellipsis can be supplied with the entire clause in v. 8, with βούλομαι or with βούλομαι προσεύχεσθαι. The latter reading does not interfere with the text, it can work grammatically, and it provides a thematic unity between vv. 8 and 9-10. Yet none of these solutions is without difficulties, and the text is ambiguous. This ambiguity is due to a merger of literary genres, and proves to be ideologically useful. As such it is likely to be intentional, as indicated by the similarly equivocal 1 Tim 3:9.¹⁰⁰

The intertextual approach shows that 1 Timothy very likely used as a pre-text the cultic rule found in 1 Cor 11, together with its broader context. This rule addressed praying and prophesying men and women, and articulated certain expectations regarding their appearance at worship. The rule was given a theological (Gen 1:26-27; 2:21-23) and a social-natural legitimation, based on gender roles. 1 Timothy amplifies Paul's one-sided reading of Gen, eliminating the positive reference to Gen 1:26-27, as well as Paul's concession on the interdependence between man and woman. The author proposes a restrictive, "corrective" re-interpretation of 1 Cor 11:11-12. To the theological legitimation based on the priority of man in creation 1 Timothy adds a hamartiological argument from Gen 3. Moreover, the relecture of Gen 3 is profoundly unilateral, making Eve the sole responsible for the Fall, and extending this blame to all women.

Additionally the meaning of the catchwords taken from the context (συνείδησις, βλασφημία, Paul's example and apostolic authority) is also modified, in order to "correct" some Pauline ideas. Thus freedom of conscience is replaced with perfect adherence to sound doctrine and strict

¹⁰⁰⁾ Oberlinner, *1 Tim*, 142 thinks that the author is probably obliged to mention the deaconesses in the catalogue of ministers, as they fulfil their task in the church for a longer time, but this brief, almost hidden reference in the mirror of the deacons, in the broader context of the silence commandment suggests that he places them in the shadow of their male colleagues, with the probably voluntarily ambiguous γυναικες.

observance of the ecclesial rules, which guarantee a good conscience. “Paul” becomes an absolute reference-point whose will is manifested in “Timothy”’s authority.

A second pre-text used in 1 Tim 2 is a combination of a station code tradition and Neo-Pythagorean-like exhortations, based on popular philosophical *topoi* regarding women and specific gender roles. These comprise requirements about the modest, respectable attire and adorning with good deeds instead of jewellery. Other *topoi* refer to typically feminine virtues, such as αἰδώς and σωφροσύνη, silence and subordination to man.¹⁰¹ Through the expansion of the congregational context with the station code tradition, 1 Timothy extends the scope of the restrictive rule to both the role of women in the church and in Christian life in general.

Men’s prayer is further regulated and prophecy is eliminated. A charisma potentially given to everyone is replaced by the institutional ministry that secures the orderly life of the community. This order is safeguarded by “Timothy”, who acts with “Paul”’s authority. Prophecy has no place in the cultic rule anymore, because authoritative instruction is no longer an attribute of any Christian, not even of men, but of ordained office-holders.

Further, 1 Timothy not only omits prophesying in case of women, but also obscures the reference to προσεύχομαι, opting for the more ambiguous ὡσαύτως [καὶ] γυναικάς. This ambiguity is enhanced by the combination of the cultic rule with the station code tradition.¹⁰² While prophecy is described by Paul as a form of instruction, of authoritative speech (1 Cor 14:19, 31), open to women (11:5), 1 Timothy prohibits women to teach or to exert authority over men. This prohibition, formulated in line with 1 Cor 14:34-35, is a fictitious self-reference, which comes to “correct” 1 Cor 11:5. Implicitly, 1 Timothy also “corrects” the potentially “misleading” Pauline assertion that all should learn (μανθάνω, 1 Cor 14:31). Through another unmarked corrective fictitious self-reference “Paul” now clearly states that women should not teach, but should learn (μανθάνω) in all submissiveness.

¹⁰¹ A. Malherbe, “The *Virtus Feminarum* in 1 Timothy 2:9-15”, in M.W. Hamilton, Th.H. Olbricht, J. Peterson (eds.), *Renewing Tradition. Studies in Texts and Contexts in Honor of James W. Thompson* (PTMS 65; Eugene, OR: Pickwick, 2007) 45-65; Merz, *Selbstausslegung*, 275-276.

¹⁰² Bartsch has rightly remarked that the reason for the difficulty of delimitating the cultic rule from the rules regulating general behaviour lies in the fact that the author himself is not interested in such delimitation (*Anfänge*, 60). Cf. Guthrie, *Pastoral Epistles*, 74.

Thus in 1 Timothy “Paul” reinterprets Paul, who had clearly endorsed men to pray *and* to prophesy, i.e. publicly exercise authoritative speech, and had manifested at least a tacit approval of women praying and prophesying. In 1 Tim 2:8-15, men are to pray, but they are no longer expected to prophesy. Women are left in an ambiguous position: the formulation of the requirements is vague enough to presume that they are or are not permitted to pray in public. What is obvious is that they are certainly prohibited from speaking with authority, and they are only expected to adopt the traditional gender role of household management and childbearing.

The ellipsis in 1 Tim 2:9 is more than a grammatical nicety.