

Veiled Exhortations Regarding the Veil:
Ethos as the Controlling Factor in Moral Persuasion (1 Cor 11:2-16)

Prof. Troy W. Martin
Saint Xavier University
Chicago, IL

1. Introduction

The treatment of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ in the rhetorical handbook tradition does not comprehend the manifold and diverse use of characterization in rhetorical texts engaged in moral persuasion. This statement is particularly true of Aristotle's treatment (*Rhet.* 1.2.3-5 1356a; 2.1.5-7 1378a), which limits $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ to one of the three rhetorical proofs ($\pi\iota\upsilon\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\iota$), its goal to rendering a speaker worthy of belief ($\alpha\lambda\chi\iota\omicron\upsilon\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\iota$), and its means to a presentation of a speaker's wisdom ($\phi\rho\upsilon\nu\eta\sigma\iota\iota$), virtue ($\alpha\lambda\eta\theta\epsilon\upsilon$), and goodwill ($\epsilon\upsilon[\nu\omicron\iota\alpha]$). Even a quick perusal of paraenetic texts reveals that $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ serves many other purposes in moral persuasion and appeals to many more characteristics of the speaker than the three Aristotle mentions. Aristotle's additional limitation of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ to the speech itself and his exclusion of a speaker's socially ascribed reputation external to the speech further removes his treatment from the actual practice in paraenetic texts, which usually presume knowledge of a speaker's moral reputation. Even though Aristotle (*Rhet.* 1.2.4 1356a) describes $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ as the "controlling factor in persuasion," his limited treatment of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ as one of the three proofs is inadequate for an analysis of characterization in rhetorical texts occupied with moral persuasion.¹

Even the broader treatment of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ by other rhetorical theorists both before and after Aristotle does not adequately describe the diverse role of characterization in paraenetic texts. This broader treatment does not limit $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ to one of the three rhetorical proofs but treats $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ under disposition rather than invention. This treatment locates $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ primarily in the prooimium or prologue of the speech and identifies the goal of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ as inducing the audience's goodwill or sympathy for the speaker. This broader treatment accepts as relevant to $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ each and every quality of the speaker that wins the sympathy of the audience. Broadening $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ potentially to include all qualities of the speaker is consonant with the practice of characterization in paraenetic texts, but the goal of sympathy is neither exclusive nor even prominent in these texts, which also do not restrict the use of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ to the beginning of the speech. Even considering the broader treatment of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$, Donald D. Walker correctly states, "The use of ethical argumentation ran far ahead of rhetorical handbooks. . . . Reliance on handbooks will not reveal the potential for creativity in an orator's presentation of himself or his client."²

Even though rhetorical texts engaged in moral persuasion use $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ in ways that far transcend Aristotle's treatment and the handbook tradition, they nevertheless exemplify a function of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ not unlike Aristotle's description of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ as the controlling factor in persuasion.³ To determine the various uses and role of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ in these texts, the investigation must proceed beyond the handbooks to an analysis of the texts themselves. Such a comprehensive analysis is far too ambitious for the present essay, which assumes the more humble task of examining a single paraenetic text. Paul's argument regarding the veil in 1 Cor 11:2-16 is particularly pertinent to an investigation of the use of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ in paraenetic texts, for Paul concludes his argument with an appeal to his own ethos as well as the ethos ($\sigma\upsilon\nu\eta\nu\epsilon\iota\alpha$) of the churches of God (1 Cor 11:16). This text provides an insightful example of some of the ways paraenetic texts use $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ that transcend the handbook tradition but nevertheless conform to Aristotle's understanding of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ as the controlling factor in persuasion.

2. The Use of $\eta\lambda\theta\omicron\iota$ in Paul's Argument Regarding the Veil

Many deem Paul's notorious argument regarding the veil in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16 as convoluted and confused. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza says, "In a very convoluted argument, which can no longer be unraveled completely, Paul adduces several points for 'this custom' or hair fashion.⁴ Similarly, Marion L. Soards describes Paul's argument as 'bewilderingly difficult' and states, 'One hopes that the Corinthians had an easier time following Paul's logic than do modern readers'.⁵ One may hope, but the scholarly assessment is that neither the Corinthians nor possibly even Paul himself completely comprehended this argument regarding the veil. Determining the use of *hj~qoi* in such a convoluted and confused argument requires that some sense be made of the argument as a whole. Analyzing the rhetorical situation of 1 Cor 11:2-16 assists in specifying both the exigence and the constraints of this argument and thus provides for an understanding of both the topics and the function of *hj~qoi* in this argument.

2.1 The Exigence of the Argument

In his classic description of the rhetorical situation, Lloyd F. Bitzer defines rhetorical exigence as "an imperfection marked by urgency; it is a defect, an obstacle, something waiting to be done, a thing which is other than it should be." He further specifies that a rhetorical exigence "can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about the significant modification of the exigence." Bitzer's definition raises the question of the imperfection in the situation that Paul's argument in 1 Cor 11:2-16 seeks to remove.

Exegetes offer several different answers to this question that range from the private domestic insubordination of some women to the public social disobedience of certain "eschatological women" who were intent on obliterating the distinctions between the sexes and realizing the "ideal" of Gal 3:28.⁶ Even though exegetes disagree on the precise nature of the conduct that troubles Paul, all agree that the exigence of Paul's argument in 1 Cor 11:2-16 is actual conduct by some of the Corinthian women who remove the veil when praying or prophesying.

Several features of Paul's argument, however, contradict this assessment of the exigence as actual conduct. First, the argument begins by praising the Corinthians for retaining the traditions just as Paul transmitted them (1 Cor 11:2). Exegetes who understand the exigence as actual conduct must interpret this praise as ironic, but such irony is uncharacteristic of the rest of the letter, which directly addresses the Corinthians' failings. In 1 Cor 11:17, for example, Paul explicitly states that he does not praise them for their conduct at the Lord's Supper. If he is unhappy with their actual conduct while praying or prophesying, his praise for retaining his traditions is strange. Second, the positive formulation of the disclosure formula in v. 3 typifies communication of additional information rather than censure for disagreeable conduct. In contrast to this positive formulation in v. 3, the negative formulation "Do you not know that" in 1 Cor 3:16; 5:6; 6:2-3, 9, 15-16, 19; 9:13, 24 expresses censure for unacceptable conduct. Finally, Gordon F. Fee remarks that the style of 1 Cor 11:2-16 is "much less impassioned" than in vv. 17-34, which censures the Corinthians' conduct.⁷ Fee associates this style with 1 Cor 7:1-40 and chapters 12-14 and thinks all these passages are Paul's response to a letter of inquiry the Corinthians have sent to him. Fee admits lack of certainty about which passages belong to Paul's response, but a certain didactic "style" appropriate to such a response distinguishes some passages in 1 Corinthians from others. This didactic "style" typifies 1 Cor 11:2-16, which may not censure actual conduct but provide additional warrants and sanctions for the conduct they are currently maintaining.

The exigence thus shifts from an imperfection in the Corinthians' conduct to an imperfection in their knowledge. The argument in 1 Cor 11:2-16 provides additional rationale for the Corinthians' conduct in the face of someone who purposes to be contentious (*filovneikoi*; 1 Cor 11:16). Almost all exegetes presume that certain Corinthian women were expressing their contentiousness by actually removing their veils when praying

or prophesying. The term *filovneikoi*, however, cannot carry such exegetical weight but relates to verbal debate and argument. For example, Josephus states, "I suppose that what I have already said may be sufficient to such as are not very contentious."⁸ He then proceeds to marshal additional arguments for those who are contentious and refuse to accept his previous arguments as sufficient. A similar use of this term occurs in 1 Cor 11:16. Anyone who purposes to be contentious by refusing to accept the arguments in vv. 2-15 as sufficient receives in v. 16 two additional arguments based on the ethos of Paul and the churches of God. These two additional arguments should satisfy even the person who purposes to be contentious.

The exigence of the argument in 1 Cor 11:2-16 may indeed arise from the actual conduct of certain Corinthian women, and the broader context of this passage certainly supports such a conclusion since Paul elsewhere criticizes the unacceptable conduct of the Corinthians. Nevertheless, the immediate context of this passage supports the conclusion that the exigence arises from the need for the Corinthians to have additional rationale to support the conduct Paul's tradition specified for them. Nothing in 1 Cor 11:22-16 indicates that the Corinthians are doing anything other than holding to the tradition as Paul instructed them. This passage recognizes however that someone might purpose to be contentious about this practice but does not specify whether this person is inside or outside the church or whether this person expresses contentiousness by contrary conduct or merely by verbal argument.

To avoid introducing extraneous material into its analysis, the present essay limits itself to the exigence that arises from 1 Cor 11:2-16 and understands the imperfection as a lack in the Corinthians' knowledge of the rationale for the Pauline tradition regarding the veil that they have accepted and practice.⁹ The argument in this passage remedies this imperfection by providing this rationale but recognizes the possibility of a contentious refutation or rejection of the rationale proposed. An investigation of the constraints in the rhetorical situation of this argument explains the basis or origin of this contentiousness.

2.2 The Constraints of the Argument

Again in his description of the rhetorical situation, Bitzer defines constraints as "persons, events, objects, and relations which are parts of the situation because they have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence."¹⁰ He further states, "The sources of constraint include beliefs, attitudes, documents, facts, traditions, images, interests, motives and the like." The most relevant constraints in the rhetorical situation of 1 Cor 11:2-16 are the prior pagan tradition of the Corinthian Christians and the new tradition Paul delivered to them. Their prior traditions regarding the covering of the head in public worship was by and large the reverse of the tradition they received from Paul.

In his discussion of Roman practices, Plutarch poses the question, "Why is it that when they [the Romans] worship the gods, they cover their heads (*ejpikaluvptontai th;n kefalhv*), but when they meet any of their fellow-men worthy of honour, if they happen to have the toga over the head, they uncover (*ajpokaluvptontai*)?"¹¹ This question clearly indicates that the Roman tradition prescribed covering of the head for men in worship. Dionysius of Halicarnassus attributes this practice to Aeneas, the ancestor of the Romans, and explains, "Wishing to avert as an evil omen the sight of an enemy that had appeared at the time of a sacrifice, he [Aeneas] veiled himself (*ejgkaluvyasqai*). . . . When the sacrifices turned out rather favourably, he . . . observed the same practice on the occasion of every prayer."¹² Dionysius then comments that Aeneas' posterity continue this practice as "one of the customary observances." Accordingly, a statue of Augustus as he made a sacrifice stood in a large civic building at the end of the forum in Roman Corinth, and conforming to the Roman custom, part of his outer garment is pulled over his head.¹³

Living in a Roman colony, the Corinthian Christians' prior traditions included this Roman tradition of covering the head of men in worship. This practice was not entirely uniform, however, for Plutarch recognizes that the Romans sacrifice to the god named

Honor with the head uncovered (quvousin ajparakaluvptw/ th`/ kefalh`/). Nevertheless, his treatment of this practice emphasizes the anomaly of a man's worshiping with an uncovered head. Although the Roman tradition is not completely uniform, the absolute prohibition against covering the head of men in 1 Cor 11:2-16 contradicts the usual Roman custom that prescribes head coverings for men participating in worship. The Corinthian Christians' acceptance and adoption of the tradition Paul delivered to them created dissonance with their pre-Christian traditions.

The Greco-Roman evidence regarding women's practices in worship is even less uniform than for men. Several representations demonstrate that covering the head is common for women engaged in religious rites.¹⁴ Other representations, however, show women engaged in certain religious rites with uncovered heads.¹⁵ Sharon Kelly Heyob notes that Athenian funerary steles of the first and second centuries C.E. depict devotees of Isis with long hair and curls falling on their shoulders.¹⁶ Richard and Catherine Kroeger comment, "Disheveled hair and head thrown back were almost trademarks of the maenads in Greek vase painting and in literary sources. . . . Bacchus-Dionysus, the Liberator, gave women both a rallying point for protest and an occasion for sexual freedom, and they worshipped bareheaded."¹⁷ Livy mentions women's participating in the cult of Dionysus at Rome with unbound hair.¹⁸ Both of these cults were present in Roman Corinth, and belong to the pre-Christian traditions of the Corinthian Christians.¹⁹

Even though the evidence for the covering of women's heads in worship is less uniform than for men, the absolute prescription for the covering of women in 1 Cor 11:2-16 is similar to the absolute prohibition against the covering of men in creating dissonance with the Corinthian Christians' former traditions. Both before (1 Cor 10:14) and after (1 Cor 12:2) 1 Corinthians 11, Paul reminds these Christians of the pagan past from which they separated. Arguing for the uncovering of men and the covering of women in public worship separates these Christians from their idolatrous past.²⁰ They had formerly served idols (1 Cor 10:14) and been led astray to them (1 Cor 12:2), but now by adopting the traditions Paul delivered to them, they enter a new community and belong to the churches of God (1 Cor 1:2).²¹ Nevertheless, they remain surrounded by their former pagan culture with which they are now at variance.

Their prior pagan traditions regarding the covering of the head in worship and the new tradition Paul delivered to them represent the most relevant constraints in the rhetorical situation of 1 Cor 11:2-16. These former traditions and their continued practice in the culture surrounding the Corinthian Christians provide a powerful constraint from their continuing the traditions Paul gave them. The possibility of someone's contentiously challenging their current conduct is very probable, and in response, 1 Cor 11:2-16 supplies additional rationale in the form of arguments for the Corinthian Christians' continuing the conduct Paul delivered to them. The topics of these arguments clearly distinguish between the Corinthians' former pre-Christian tradition and the new tradition they have adopted.

2.3 The Topics of the Argument

Describing the topics of the argument in 1 Cor 11:2-16 requires the correction of a translation error in v. 15 that constantly thwarts attempts to interpret this passage. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza accurately articulates the problem:

We are no longer able to decide with certainty which behavior Paul criticizes and which custom he means to introduce in 1 Cor 11:2-16. Traditionally, exegetes have conjectured that Paul was insisting that the pneumatic women leaders wear the veil according to Jewish custom. Yet, v. 15 maintains that women have their hair instead of a *head-covering* (ajnti; peribolaivou), and thus militates against such an interpretation.²²

Translating the term peribovlaion in v. 15 as covering or head-covering nullifies the previous argument that a woman should wear a covering since her long hair apparently serves that

purpose. Clearly, such a translation is inadequate, and an accurate translation of peribovlaion is needed.

In an influential article, O. Motta argues that peribovlaion here means some type of head covering.²³ Paul Ellingworth and Howard Hatton explain, “The word translated covering is a general word for a garment, possibly one used as an outer covering. Although it does not specify any particular piece of clothing, there seems to be an obvious relation between this verse and the discussion in verses 4 and 5 about a covering for the head.”²⁴ Even though these scholars have identified the dominant semantic domain of this word, the term peribovlaion has a much broader semantic range.

Since peribovlaion is contrasted with hair, which is a part of the body, the physiological semantic domain of peribovlaion in 1 Cor 11:15b becomes particularly relevant. Euripides (Herc. fur. 1269) uses peribolaiva in reference to a body part. He casts Hercules as complaining, “After I received [my] bags of flesh when I entered puberty [I received] labors about which I [shall] undertake to say what is necessary” (ejpei; de; sarko; peribovlaiΔ ejkthsavmhn hJbw`nta, movcqoui ou}i e[tlhn tiv dei` levgein). A dynamic translation of the first clause would be: “After my testicles (peribolaiva) dropped at puberty.” In this text from Euripides, the term peribovlaion refers to a male testicle.

Achilles Tatius (Leuc. Clit. 1.15.2) plays on this meaning of peribovlaion in his erotic description of a garden in which Clitophon seeks an amorous encounter with Leucippe. Achilles Tatius describes the entwinings of the flowers, embracings of the leaves, and intercoursings of the fruits (aiJ tw`n petavlwv periplokaiv, tw`n fuvllwv peribolaiv, tw`n karpw`n sumplokaiv). He portrays this erotic garden by allusions to male and female reproductive organs. The term periplokaiv alludes to the female hair, the term peribolaiv to the male testicle, and the term sumplokaiv to the mixing of male and female reproductive fluid in the female. Achilles Tatius’ description of this garden associates female hair and the male testicle.²⁵

Ancient medical conceptions confirm this association. Hippocratic doctors held that hair is hollow and grows primarily from either male or female reproductive fluid or semen flowing into it and congealing.²⁶ Since hollow body parts create a vacuum and attract fluid, hair attracts semen. Appropriately, the term kovmh refers not only to hair but also to the arms or suckers of the cuttlefish.²⁷ Hair grows most prolifically from the head because the brain is the place where the semen is produced or at least stored.²⁸ Hair grows only on the head of pre-pubescent humans because semen is stored in the brain and the channels of the body have not yet become large enough for reproductive fluid to travel throughout the body.²⁹ At puberty, secondary hair growth in the pubic area marks the movement of reproductive fluid from the brain to the rest of the body.³⁰ Women have less body hair not only because they have less semen but also because their colder bodies do not froth the semen throughout their bodies but reduce semen evaporation at the ends of their hair.³¹

According to these doctors, men have more hair because they have more semen and their hotter bodies froth this semen more readily throughout their whole bodies.³² The nature (fuvsii) of men is to release or eject the semen.³³ During intercourse, semen has to fill all the hollow hairs on its way from the male brain to the genital area.³⁴ Thus, men have hair growth on their face, chest, and stomach. A man with hair on his back reverses the usual position of intercourse. A man with long hair retains much or all of his semen, and his hollow long hair draws the semen toward his head area but away from his genital area, where it should be ejected. Therefore, 1 Cor 11:14 correctly states that it is a shame for a man to have long hair since the male nature (fuvsii) is to eject rather than retain semen.

In contrast, the nature (fuvsii) of women is to draw up the semen and congeal it into a fetus.³⁵ A woman’s body is simply one huge gland, and the function of glands is to absorb.³⁶ The author of Glands writes:

In women the substance of the glands is very rarefied (ajraihv-loose textured), just like the rest of their bodies. . . . The male is close-pressed like a thick carpet both in appearance and to the touch. The female, on the other hand, is rarefied (ajraiovn-

loose textured) and porous (cau`non) like a flock of wool in appearance and to the touch: it follows that this rarefied and soft tissue does not reject moisture.³⁷ Earlier, this author describes glands with these same descriptive adjectives and likens the glands to wool.³⁸ Just as loose textured, porous glands absorb, so also the loose textured, porous body of a woman absorbs.

This author also writes that glands and hair fulfill a similar bodily function. Just as glands absorb the excess bodily fluid that flows to them, so also hair collects the excess, frothed fluid that rises to the surface.³⁹ What glands do within the body, hair does on the surface of the body. As one large gland designed to absorb male reproductive fluid, a woman's body is assisted by long hollow hair that increases the suction power of her hollow uterus.⁴⁰ Consequently, Pseudo-Phocylides appropriately states, 'Long hair is not fit for males, but for voluptuous women' (a[r]sesin oujk ejpevoike koma`n, clidanai`1 de; gunaixivn).⁴¹

This conception of hair as part of the female genitalia explains the favorite Hippocratic test for sterility in women.⁴² A doctor places a scented suppository in a woman's uterus and examines her mouth the next day to see if he can smell the scent of the suppository. If he smells the scent, he diagnoses her as fertile. If he does not smell the scent, he concludes she is sterile because the channels connecting her uterus to her head are blocked. The suction power of her hair cannot draw up the semen through the appropriate channels in her body. The male seed is therefore discharged rather than retained, and the woman cannot conceive.

This conception of hair as part of the female genitalia also explains one of Soranus' signs of conception. He states that immediately after coitus, the woman who conceives is conscious of a frikwvdhi.⁴³ Owsei Temkin translates that she is conscious of "a shivering sensation" while James Ricci explains that she "feels erection of the hair on the skin."⁴⁴ Soranus' connection of conception with the physiological experience of a chill often accompanied by erection of hair on the skin relates the hair to a woman's reproductive processes, and one Hippocratic doctor recommends that a woman neither bathe nor get her hair wet after coitus if she wants to retain the semen.⁴⁵

Finally, this conception of hair probably explains the curious practice of women's singeing their pubic hair.⁴⁶ In Aristophanes' *Ecccl.* 13, Praxagora praises the lamp for singeing the flowering hair (ajfeuvwn th;n ejpanqou`san trivca). A vase painting even depicts a woman engaged in this activity, which was common for women, and often inflicted upon male adulterers.⁴⁷ Singeing the pubic hair seals the opening in the hair and destroys its power to draw reproductive fluid to the genital area. Thus, singed pubic hair enhances female fertility by not counteracting the suction power of the hair on the head.

Translating peribovlaion as testicle in 1 Cor 11:15b resolves the problem Fiorenza articulates. Verse 15 does not nullify the previous argument by asserting that a woman's hair is given to her instead of a covering. Rather, this verse asserts that a woman's hair is given to her instead of a testicle and functions as part of her genitalia. This translation of peribovlaion and the understanding of a woman's hair as genitalia permit a description of the topics in the argument of 1 Cor 11:2-16.

The new tradition the Corinthian Christians received from Paul supplies the topic of the argument in 1 Cor 11:2-12. This argument begins with a series of relations expressed by the metaphorical use of the word head (kefalhv). Christ is the head of every man, man is the head of woman, and God is the head of Christ (v. 3). The metaphorical use of head to mean source specifies the topic of this argument as the creation account in Genesis.⁴⁸ Indeed, Gordon F. Fee comments, "The middle clause, 'the man is the head of woman,' refers to the creation account also alluded to in vv. 8 and 12."⁴⁹ Additionally, creation is even specifically mentioned in v. 9. The new tradition presented by Paul modifies the Genesis account to include the role of Christ, and this entire topic of creation belongs specifically to the new tradition the Corinthian Christians received. This topic of creation in this argument is only persuasive if the Corinthian Christians adhere to this new tradition since their former traditions identify a different god as the ultimate source, make no room

for Christ, and specify the origin of men and women differently. The new tradition the Corinthian Christians received from Paul clearly supplies the topic of creation as developed in 1 Cor 11:2-12.

The argument continues by asserting that every man who prays or prophesies with a covered head shames his (aujtuu`) head and that every woman who engages in these activities with uncovered head shames her (aujth`i) head (vv. 4-5). The third personal pronouns indicate that the shamed heads are the sources of the man and woman respectively.⁵⁰ A covered man shames Christ, and an uncovered woman shames her man. The rationale for the assertion that an uncovered woman's shaming her man is that an uncovered woman is one and the same with a shaved woman (v. 5b). Two conditional sentences conclude this rationale by saying that if she will not be covered, than let her be shaved, but if it is a shame for her to be shaved, then let her be covered (v. 6). This rationale proves more difficult to understand than the assertion it supports. To resolve this difficulty, scholars relate the shaved head to a prostitute or to an adulteress.⁵¹ The problem with both of these suggestions is the lack of evidence for the widespread correlation between a shaved head and either prostitution or adultery.

Understanding the rationale for an uncovered woman's shaming her man in the context of the new tradition received by the Corinthian Christians, however, resolves the difficulty. Praying or prophesying with uncovered head exposes part of a woman's genitalia. Such exposure when engaged in God's service is strictly forbidden by the new tradition advocated by Paul. In Isa 6:2, the seraphim who participate in the divine liturgy have six wings. Two are for flying, two cover the face for reverence, and two cover the feet for modesty. The term feet is a euphemism for the genitals of the seraphim.⁵² The priests in Yahweh's service receive special instructions for approaching the altar so that their nakedness is not exposed (Ex 20:26). As a further precaution when entering the tent of meeting or approaching the altar, these priests wear "linen breeches from the loins to the thighs to cover their naked flesh" (RSV; Ex 28:42-43). Again, flesh is a euphemism and refers to the genitals (Lev 15:2, 19; Ezek 16:26; 23:20). These breeches are for the glory and beauty of the priest (Ex 28:40) while exposure of the genitals subjects the priest to guilt and death (Ex 28:43). Informed by this tradition, any woman's praying or prophesying with an uncovered head would indeed shame her man as well as herself.

This tradition also correlates the shame of a shaved woman with an uncovered woman in God's service. In this tradition, participants in the divine liturgy are prohibited from shaving their heads (Ezek 44:20) or from having any bodily defect. A shaved woman is a castrated woman and, similar to the eunuchs, is prohibited from participating in the service of God (Deut 23:1; Lev 22:16-24).⁵³ In this tradition, therefore, an uncovered woman is one and the same from a liturgical point of view with a shaved woman. Both are prohibited from praying or prophesying. Of the two, 1 Cor 11:6a prefers the woman with no genitalia to the woman who displays her genitalia in the service of God. Since having the genitalia removed is a shame, however, the rationale leads to the conclusion that a woman in the service of God should be covered (v. 6b) and avoid shaming her man.

The rationale for a man's not covering himself when praying or prophesying follows in v. 7 and develops from the topic of creation. On the one hand, a man ought not to cover his head since he is the image and glory of God (v. 7). Fee comments, "In saying that man is God's 'image' Paul is certainly alluding to Gen. 1:26-28. . . . What we are not told here is why being God's [image and] glory means no covering."⁵⁴ The suppressed premise of the rationale is that being in a male God's image means a man's hair in contrast to a woman's does not function as part of his genitalia. Thus, a man ought not to treat his hair as genitalia by covering it and thereby denying his creation in the image and glory of God. On the other hand, a woman is not the image and glory of God or even the image of man but rather the glory of man (1 Cor 11:7b). She originates from man (v. 8) and was created on account of man (v. 9) and not the other way around, but she nevertheless has a different origin and purpose from man. Just as woman is from man, man is through woman

(v. 12), and neither exists without the other (v. 11). All of this discussion develops from the topic of creation.

This discussion of the relationship between men and women in vv. 8-9 and 11-12 is very similar to the discussion in 1 Enoch 15. After recognizing the mortality of men (v. 4), this text quotes God as saying, “On account of this, I gave females to them so that they might impregnate them and beget children by them [and continue their race]” (v. 5). In contrast, this text denies that God created (ejpoivhsa) females for the angels since the angels are eternal and do not need to propagate their race (v. 7). This text recounts, however, the violation of God’s separation of human and angelic categories when some angels mate with human females (vv. 3-4). On account of the creation of woman for man, a woman ought to hold authority over her head because of the angels (1 Cor 11:10).

After recounting the evidence supporting the older interpretation of this verse, Dale B. Martin concludes, “It is not at all unlikely, despite modern sensibilities to the contrary, that Paul . . . viewed angelic beings as a potential threat to the purity of women. . . . All these factors suggest that the angels in 1 Corinthians 11:10 represent some kind of threat to the female prophets, and that one aspect of this threat is sexual.”⁵⁵ A woman’s uncovering part of her genitalia increases this threat that is avoided by a woman’s covering her head when praying or prophesying.⁵⁶ Being created in the image of God as a male, a man is free from this threat and need not cover his head.

Thus, the new tradition the Corinthian Christians received from Paul supplies the topic of the argument in 1 Cor 11:2-12, and this argument from the topic of creation establishes the practice of a woman’s covering her head but a man’s uncovering his head in public worship. In vv. 13-15, the argument turns to the topic of propriety based on nature as an additional rationale for the veiling of women in prayer. In contrast to the topic of creation drawn from the new tradition the Corinthian Christians received, the topic of propriety based on nature has much in common with the Corinthians’ pre-Christian understanding of the nature of men and women.

According to this understanding, the masculine functional counterpart to long feminine hair is the testicle⁵⁷. Aristotle (Gen. an. 766b.5-6) calls the male testicles weights that keep the seminal channels taut. Their function is to draw the semen downward and perform the final frothing that adds the additional heat necessary to transmit the form of the individual to the female reproductive menses. The female is not given such weights but instead develops a hollow uterus and appropriate vessels to draw the semen upward (Gen. an. 739a.37-739b.20)⁵⁸. Thus, testicles do not drop at puberty for females as they do for males. Long feminine hair assists the uterus in drawing the semen upward and inward; masculine testicles draw the semen downward and outward. Long hair is a glory for the female fuvsiu but a shame for the male fuvsiu as 1 Cor 11:14-15a correctly states.

This physiological conception of hair indicates that the argument from nature in 1 Cor 11:13-16 contrasts long hair in women with male testicles. Appropriate to her nature, a woman is not given an external testicle (peribovlaion; 1 Cor 11:15b) but rather hair instead. Long hollow hair on a woman’s head is her glory (dovxa; 1 Cor 11:15) because it enhances her female fuvsiu, which is to draw in and retain semen. Since female hair is part of the female genitalia, Paul asks the Corinthians to judge for themselves whether it is proper for a woman to display her genitalia when praying to God (1 Cor 11:13).

Even though the understanding of male and female natures belongs to the Corinthians’ pre-Christian understanding, the correct application of this argument from nature relies upon the new tradition Paul delivered to them. Before becoming Christians, the Corinthians participated in a tradition that permits and sometimes even encourages display of genitalia in the presence of a deity. Even though nature teaches them that a woman’s hair is part of her genitalia, they would have perceived no impropriety in a woman’s uncovering her hair when praying or prophesying in certain circumstances. The new tradition they received, however, strictly forbids display of genitalia when engaged in God’s service. Informed by this tradition, the Corinthians can determine the propriety of a woman’s covering her hair when praying since it is part of her genitalia.

Paul recognizes that some informed by these pagan traditions might want to be contentious about his requirement that women cover their heads (i.e. hair) while praying to God (1 Cor 11:16). The Corinthians' new practice is certainly contrary to the dominant culture surrounding them. Nevertheless, Paul assures the Corinthians that neither he and his missionary entourage nor the churches of God has any such custom (sunhvqeia) of flashing genitalia (i.e. uncovering female hair) in the presence of God (1 Cor 11:16). In addition to his previous argument from the topic of creation, Paul's argument from the topic of propriety based on nature in 1 Cor 11:13-14 gives the Corinthians sound rationale for their "unusual" worship practice that Paul praises. Neither the argument from creation nor the argument from propriety, however, persuades apart from the $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ mentioned in v. 16.

2.4 The Function of $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ in the Argument

Many commentators understand Paul's appeal to his ethos and the ethos of the churches of God in 1 Cor 11:16 as a failure in his argument. For example, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza explains, "Therefore, whenever, as in 1 Cor 11. 1-16 . . . appeals and arguments break down, he [Paul] resorts to commands and claims the authority of Christ and that of other churches. His rhetoric does not aim at fostering independence, freedom, and consensus, but stresses dependence on his model, order, and decency, as well as subordination and silence."⁵⁹ Similarly, Victor Paul Furnish comments:

There is no doubt that Paul also means to provide a theological basis for his instructions about the hairstyle of women who pray or prophesy, but in this case his argument is obscure, at least to modern interpreters, and it may well have seemed unsatisfactory even to the apostle himself. At any rate, in the end he abandons argument altogether by suggesting that if his directives are not followed the Corinthians will be departing from the convention that obtains in other congregations (v. 16).⁶⁰

This understanding of Paul's appeal to $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ as a failure in his argument is common.

Paul's appeal to $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ does not represent a failure in his argument, but his argument certainly fails without this appeal. The argument from the topic of creation lacks persuasive force apart from the ethos of Paul and the churches of God. If the Corinthian Christians abandon this ethos and return to their pagan ethos, the creation story in Genesis ceases to be authoritative, and different myths inform their worldview and authorize practices other than those Paul recommends. Similarly, the argument from propriety based on nature is persuasive only if the Corinthian Christians retain their Christian ethos. If they return to their pagan ethos, the sense of propriety shifts and the argument fails to persuade them to maintain the counter-cultural practice Paul delivered to them. Paul's appeal to $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ is thus crucial in responding to someone who purposes to be contentious. Only by accepting the $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ of Paul and the churches of God does the argument in 1 Cor 11:2-15 persuade.

Considering Aristotle's (Rhet. 1.2.4 1356a) description of $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ as the "controlling factor in persuasion," many scholars express surprise that he devotes so little discussion to it. They also note some discrepancy between his description of $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ as the controlling factor and his description of the enthymeme as the strongest of the three proofs (Rhet. 1.1.11 1355a). This discrepancy is only apparent however. The controlling factor in persuasion is $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ because without the trustworthiness of the speaker even the most well crafted enthymeme lacks persuasive force. Nevertheless, the enthymeme is a stronger proof than $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ because the trustworthiness of the speaker does not demonstrate anything other than the speaker's trustworthiness. Aristotle, therefore, describes $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ as the controlling factor in persuasion because without it, the speech lacks persuasive force.

Even though 1 Cor 11:2-16 does not restrict $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ to the trustworthiness of the speaker and includes many more characteristics of the speaker/author than does Aristotle, it nevertheless relies upon a function of $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ not unlike the function of $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ that Aristotle describes. Unless the Corinthian readers accept the $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota$ of Paul and the churches of

God, the exhortations and the supporting rationale lack persuasive force. Similar to Aristotle's description, $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is then the controlling factor in the persuasiveness of the argument in 1 Cor 11:2-16.

3. Conclusion

Even though paraenetic texts do not restrict $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ to the trustworthiness of the speaker and they include many more characteristics of the speaker/author than does Aristotle, they nevertheless rely upon a function of $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ not unlike the function of $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ that Aristotle describes. Unless the readers of a paraenetic text accept the $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ of the speaker and the group, the exhortations and the supporting rationale will lack persuasive force. Similar to Aristotle's description, $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is then the controlling factor in the persuasiveness of paraenetic texts as this investigation of 1 Cor 11:2-16 demonstrates.

¹ Elsewhere and even in the *Rhetoric* (2.12-17 1388b-1392b), Aristotle uses $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ with a different meaning. See George A. Kennedy (*Aristotle on Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1991], 163-164) and Eckart Schütrumpf ["Die Bedeutung des Wortes *ethos* in der Poetik des Aristotle," *Zetemata* 49[1970]: 1-147; esp. 28-31.

² Donald D. Walker, "Paul's Offer of Leniency (2 Cor 10:1): Populist Ideology and Rhetoric in a Pauline Letter Fragment (2 Cor 10:1-13:10)," (Ph.D. diss., The University of Chicago, 1998), 356.

³ So great is the dissonance between the treatment of $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in the rhetorical handbook tradition and the use of $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in texts engaged in moral persuasion that Dionysius of Halicarnassus or the writer of the *Ars Rhetorica* 11.396-397 attributed to him recognizes two types of $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$, the common and the individual. Common $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is the purview of philosophy and pursues the ethical goal of leading people to virtue and away from evil by distinguishing between justice, self-control, courage, wisdom, and gentleness and their opposites. Individual $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is the purview of rhetoric and pursues the amoral goals of establishing the trustworthiness of the speaker or soliciting sympathy for him by presenting the speaker's nationality, family, age, and occupation. See Walker ("Leniency," 358).

⁴ Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, *In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad, 1983), 227-228.

⁵ Marion L. Soards, *1 Corinthians* (New International Biblical Commentary; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1999), 221, 224.

⁶ Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NICNT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 497-498.

⁷ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 491.

⁸ Josephus, *Ag. Ap.* 1.22 (160); William Whiston, *The Works of Josephus Complete and Unabridged: New Updated Edition* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 1987), 783.

⁹ Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza (“Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians,” *NTS* 33(1987): 388) states, “Rhetorical Criticism must distinguish between the historical argumentative situation, the implied or inscribed rhetorical situation as well as the rhetorical situation of contemporary interpretations which works with the canonical collection and reception of Paul’s letters.” The present essay is primarily interested in the second.

¹⁰ Lloyd F. Bitzer, “The Rhetorical Situation,” *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1(1968): 8.

¹¹ Plutarch, *Quaest. rom.* 10; *Mor.* 266C; Frank Cole Babbitt, *Plutarch’s Moralia* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1972), 20-21.

¹² Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Ant. Rom.* 12.16 (22); Earnest Cary, *The Roman Antiquities of Dionysius of Halicarnassus* (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), 234-235.

¹³ See Cynthia L. Thompson, “Hairstyles, Head-Coverings, and St. Paul: Portraits from Roman Corinth,” *BA* 51(1988): 101. See also the marble head of Nero on p. 103 that illustrates the Roman practice.

¹⁴ For a discussion of these representations, see Thompson (“Hairstyles, 112) and David W. J. Gill (“The Importance of Roman Portraiture for Head-Coverings in 1 Corinthians 11:2-16,” *TynBul* 41[1990]: 252). Gill (p. 257) uses these representations to conclude that Paul urges the Christian women to conform to their culture. The exigence of Paul’s argument, however, arises from dissonance rather than conformity with these women’s pre-Christian culture.

¹⁵ See Thompson (“Hairstyles, 112).

¹⁶ Sharon Kelly Heyob, *The Cult of Isis among Women in the Graeco-Roman World* (EPRO 51; Leiden: Brill, 1975), 60.

¹⁷ Richard and Catherine Kroeger, “An Inquiry into Evidence of Maenadism in the Corinthian Congregation,” *SBLSP* 14.2 (1978): 332. They (p. 331-332) state, “Diodorus tells us that women gathered together to imitate the ancient maenads in their adoration of Dionysius.” See Diodorus Siculus, *Hist.* 4.3.

¹⁸ Livy, *Ad urbe* 39.13.

¹⁹ Fiorenza (*Memory*, 237) notes that free-flowing hair was common among even “upstanding” women in the cults of Dionysus, Cybele, the Pythia at Delphi, and Isis, and she understands this practice as the background to 1 Cor 11:2-16. See also Kroeger-Kroeger (“Maenadism,” 332-333), Gill (“Head-coverings,” 255-256), and Thompson (“Hairstyles,” 112).

²⁰ Thompson (“Hairstyles,” 104) states, “So when Paul reminds Christian men to pray and prophesy with head uncovered, the recommendation fits the context of shunning

the worship of idols. Paul, with his Jewish background, would have experienced no conflict at men's bareheadedness in prayer."

²¹ Thompson, "Hairstyles," 100.

²² Fiorenza, Memory, 227-228.

²³ Othoniel. Motta, "The Question of the Unveiled Woman (1 Co. 11.2:16)," The Expository Times 44(1933): 139-141.

²⁴ Paul Ellingworth and Howard Hatton, A Translator's Handbook on Paul's First letter to the Corinthians (Helps for Translators; London: United Bible Societies, 1985), 221.

²⁵ For other texts that describe erotic gardens, see Erotica Antiqua: Acta of the International Conference on the Ancient Novel (ed. B. P. Reardon; Bangor: ICAN, 1977), 34-35.

²⁶ Hippocrates [Nat. puer.] 20; Émile Littré, Euvres complètes d'Hippocrate (10 vols.; Paris, 1839-1861; reprint, Amsterdam, 1961-1962), 7.506.23-7.510.17. For a summary of the Hippocratic and Aristotelian conceptions of hair, see Lesley Dean-Jones, Women's Bodies in Classical Greek Science (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), 83-85.

²⁷ See Maximus of Tyre, Phil. 4.5; H. Hobein, ed., Maximi Tyrii philosophumena (Leipzig: Teubner, 1910).

²⁸ Hippocrates, [Genit.] 1. Hippocrates himself may have held a different view, for Galen (On Medical Definitions, 439) states, "The seed is secreted, as Plato and Diocles say, from the brain and the spinal marrow, but Praxagoras, Democritus, and Hippocrates too, [say that it is secreted] from the whole of the body." Translated by Philip J. van der Eijk (Diocles of Carystus: A Collection of the Fragments with Translation and Commentary; Volume 1: Text and Translation [Ancient Studies in Medicine 22; Leiden: Brill, 2000], 85). Aristotle (Gen. an. 783b.38-784a.4) affirms the brain as the origin of the reproductive fluid.

²⁹ Hippocrates, [Nat. puer.] 20 and [Genit.] 2. The author of Aer. 22 states that cutting the vein behind each ear renders a man impotent. This statement assumes this cutting severs the connection between the brain and the genitals. See also Hippocrates, [Genit.] 2.

³⁰ Hippocrates, [Nat. puer.] 20 and [Genit.] 1. J. Chadwick and W. N. Mann (Hippocratic Writings [New York: Penguin Books, 1978], 317-318) translate the latter, "This [reproductive] fluid is diffused from the brain into the loins and the whole body, but in particular into the spinal marrow: for passages extend into this from the whole body, which enable the fluid to pass to and from the spinal marrow. Once the sperm has entered the spinal marrow it passes in its course through the veins along the kidneys. . . . From the kidneys it passes via the testicles into the penis." See also Aristotle (Gen. an. 728b.27-29).

³¹ Hippocrates, [Nat. puer.] 20. For texts illustrating the ancient debate of whether women's bodies were colder or hotter than men's, see Dale B. Martin (The Corinthian Body [New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995], 230-231).

³² Hippocrates, [Nat. puer.] 20.

³³ Aristotle, Gen. an. 730a.33-730b.2; 739a.37-739b.3. Soranus, Gyn. 1.8 (33).

-
- ³⁴ Aristotle, [Probl.] 893b.10-17.
- ³⁵ Hippocrates, [Genit.] 5 and [Nat. puer.] 12. See also Aristotle (Gen. an. 739b.1-20) and Soranus (Gyn. 1.8 [33], 1.14 [46], 1.10 [36], 1.12 [43], and 3.13 [47]).
- ³⁶ Hippocrates, [Gland.] 3. See also Dean-Jones (Women's Bodies, 56). Soranus (Gyn. 1.9 [34-35]) states that a woman's uterus is similar to her whole body. In selecting a female capable of conception, he recommends looking "for a woman whose whole body as well as her uterus is in a normal state. For just as no poor land brings seeds and plants to perfection, but through its own badness even destroys the virtues of the plants and seeds, so the female bodies which are in an abnormal state do not lay hold of the seed ejected into them, but by their own badness compel the latter also to sicken or even to perish." Translation by Temkin (Soranus, 34).
- ³⁷ Hippocrates, [Gland.] 16; Paul Potter, Hippocrates Volume VIII (LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1995), 124-125.
- ³⁸ Hippocrates, [Gland.] 1.
- ³⁹ Hippocrates, [Gland.] 4.
- ⁴⁰ Aristotle, Gen. an. 739a.37-739b.20.
- ⁴¹ Pseudo-Phocylides 212; P. W. van der Horst, "Pseudo-Phocylides: A New Translation and Introduction," in J. H. Charlesworth, The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha [New York: Doubleday, 1985] 2.581.
- ⁴² Soranus (Gyn. 1.9 [35]) rejects the validity of this test not because he rejects the theory on which it is based but because he conceives of 'certain invisible ducts' that can conduct the scent upward without being able to conduct the reproductive fluid, which has a greater viscosity.
- ⁴³ Soranus, Gyn. 1.12.
- ⁴⁴ Owsei Temkin, Soranus' Gynecology (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, 1956), 43. James V. Ricci, The Genealogy of Gynaecology: History of the Development of Gynaecology throughout the Ages 2000 B.C.-1800 A.D. (Second Edition; Philadelphia: The Blakiston Company, 1950), 118. The role of the woman is to cool the hot male semen and congeal it into a foetus. The sensation of a chill, therefore, indicates that conception has occurred. Since erection of body hair is a physiological response to a chill, Ricci appropriately identifies this response as one of Soranus' signs of conception and appropriately indicates that hair plays an important role in the female reproductive system.
- ⁴⁵ Hippocrates, [Mul.] 1.11. See Martin (Corinthian Body, 237-238).
- ⁴⁶ See W. A. Krenkel ("Me tua forma capit," WZ Rostock 33.9[1984]: 50-77. See also K. J. Dover (Greek Homosexuality: Updated and with a new Postscript [Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1989], 105-106, 117) and R. G. Ussher (Aristophanes Ecclesiazusae: Edited with Introduction and Commentary [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1973], 73).

⁴⁷ J. D. Beazley, *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1942), 218. For the punishment for adultery, see Aristophanes' *Nub.* 1083.

⁴⁸ For a discussion of whether *kefalhv* here means chief/leader or source, see Fee (*First Corinthians*, 502-505).

⁴⁹ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 504.

⁵⁰ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 506.

⁵¹ For the relevant texts, see Fee (*First Corinthians*, 510-511, esp. nn. 79-80). Fee, however, fails to mention a relevant text from Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 64.3; H. Lamar Crosby, Dio Chrysostom [LCL; Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1985], 46-47), who states, "Demonassa . . . gave the people of Cyprus the following . . . laws: a woman guilty of adultery shall have her hair cut off (*keiramevnhn*) and be a harlot—her daughter became an adulteress, had her hair cut off (*th;n kovmhn ajpekeivrato*) according to the law, and practiced harlotry." Whether this practice was common or limited to Cyprus is unclear, but Fee (p. 510 n. 79) mentions Tacitus, *Germ.* 19, which indicates this practice was not common among Romans.

⁵² Marvin H. Pope, 'Bible, Euphemism and Dysphemism in the,' *ABD* 1.721.

⁵³ Martin (*Corinthian Body*, 243) notes, "The removal of their hair symbolizes the shameful uncovering of their genitals." The shaving of a women's hair was not symbolic uncovering of her genitals but an actual removal of part of her genitalia.

⁵⁴ Fee, *First Corinthians*, 516.

⁵⁵ Martin, *Corinthian Body*, 244.

⁵⁶ Gail Patterson Corrington, "The 'Headless Woman': Paul and the Language of the Body in 1 Cor. 11:2-16," *PRSt* 18(1991): 227.

⁵⁷ The Greek term *o[rcii* refers both to male testicles and female ovaries. However, ancient medical science did not ascribe a corresponding reproductive function to testicles and ovaries. The testicles served as receptacles for reproductive fluid and performed the final frothing to transmit the heat that carried the form of the individual. Neither the Hippocratics nor Aristotle, however, ascribes such a function to ovaries. Their flat shape was not conducive to attracting reproductive fluid. Dean-Jones (*Women's Bodies*, 68) comments, "Nor did they [the Hippocratics] feel it necessary to discover a female analogy to the testicles. In both sexes, they believed that the seed was drawn either from all over the body at the time of conception or from a reservoir in the head. Although both sexes supplied seed it was accepted without question that they differed in reproductive anatomy. Moreover, the Hippocratics were not compiling an anatomy for its own sake and their models of disease and procreation in women worked well for them without having to invoke two small organs which had only been seen in quadrupeds and whose function was not immediately apparent."

⁵⁸ The author of *Vet. med.* 22 describes the shape of the uterus as designed for the attraction of fluids. See Dean-Jones (*Women's Bodies*, 65-67). Soranus (*Gyn.* 43) lists one of the initial signs of conception as the lack of moisture in the vagina because 'the

whole of the moisture [reproductive fluid] <or> its greater part having been directed upward'. See Temkin (Soranus, 43-44).

⁵⁹ Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 398.

⁶⁰ Victor Paul Furnish, The Theology of the First Letter to the Corinthians (New Testament Theology; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 77.