

Misreading Tertullian and Other Remarks on 1 Cor 14:34–35: A Response to Joseph Wilson

Aļesja Lavrinovića, Universität Regensburg

Abstract: This note is a short response to the article published by Joseph Wilson entitled “Recasting Paul as a Chauvinist within the Western Text-Type Manuscript Tradition: Implications for the Authorship Debate on 1 Corinthians 14.34–35.” In his article, Wilson aims to strengthen the arguments used by advocates of the so-called Corinthian slogan theory or the quotation/refutation (abbreviated Q/R) hypothesis, which considers 1 Cor 14:34–35 to be a Corinthian slogan that Paul refutes by two strong questions contained in verse 36. In addition to restating a special reading of verse 36 due to the two disjunctive particles ἤ that introduce the questions of verse 36, Wilson intensifies the Q/R hypothesis by reading 1 Cor 14:34–35 in light of Tertullian’s *Against Marcion*. Wilson suspects that it was Tertullian who introduced a chauvinistic reading of 1 Cor 14:34–36. Here I argue that Wilson misreads Tertullian, and I demonstrate that the interpretation of the syntactical function of the disjunctive particles as argued by the defenders of the Q/R hypothesis is untenable.

Introduction

In the majority of the Pauline manuscripts, 1 Cor 14:34–35 follows 1 Cor 14:33b. The Greek New Testament of the Nestle Aland and United Bible Societies also places 1 Cor 14:34–35 (the *mulier taceat* pericope) in this usual place—after verse 33. In modern translations of the New Testament, the *mulier taceat* pericope is likewise found between verse 33 and verse 36. However, advocates of the so-called Corinthian slogan theory or quotation/refutation (abbreviated Q/R) hypothesis are of the opinion that the *mulier taceat* pericope has been misread.

The text in question as reflected in NA²⁸ is as follows:

33b Ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις τῶν ἀγίων 34 αἱ γυναῖκες ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις σιγάτωσαν οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν, ἀλλ’ ὑποτασέσθωσαν, καθὼς καὶ ὁ νόμος λέγει. 35 εἰ δέ τι μαθεῖν θέλουσιν, ἐν οἴκῳ τοὺς ἰδίους ἀνδρας ἐπερωτάτωσαν· αἰσχρὸν γάρ

ἐστὶν γυναικὶ λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ. 36 ἢ ἀφ' ὑμῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν, ἢ εἰς ὑμᾶς μόνους κατήντησεν.¹

The Q/R hypothesis considers 1 Cor 14:34–35 to be a quotation from some Corinthian men who were aiming to restrict women's participation during the *ecclesia* gatherings. This hypothesis considers verses 34–35 to be an integral part of the discourse of 1 Cor 14 written (or, more precisely, used) by Paul. Verse 33b is generally excluded from the Q/R hypothesis. According to the supporters of the Q/R hypothesis, Paul's refutation is discernible in the presence of the two disjunctive particles (ἢ ... ἢ) in verse 36: ἢ ἀφ' ὑμῶν ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ἐξῆλθεν, ἢ εἰς ὑμᾶς μόνους κατήντησεν. Paul uses these two disjunctive particles to construct rhetorical questions as refutations of the misogynistic Corinthian provocations. The proponents of the Q/R hypothesis are convinced that the first particle ἢ in verse 36 should be translated into English with the exclamation "What?!" because "Paul's rebuke (v. 36) is unambiguous."² The Q/R hypothesis thus serves as a means to "save" Paul from a misogynist perspective by attributing that perspective to (1) some Corinthians whom Paul quotes and refutes and (2) a later misreading of the pericope by the church fathers.

In his article "Recasting Paul as a Chauvinist within the Western Text-Type Manuscript Tradition: Implications for the Authorship Debate on 1 Corinthians 14.34–35,"³ Joseph Wilson strengthens the arguments brought by other scholars in favor of the Q/R hypothesis with respect to the debate about the authenticity of 1 Cor 14:34–35. He argues that Tertullian introduces an incorrect, chauvinistic reading of 1 Cor 14:34–36.

Wilson delineates two stages in the development of an incorrect understanding of what Paul wrote in 1 Cor 14:34–36. The first stage consisted of the addition of the Pastoral Epistles to the *Corpus Paulinum*, or more specifically, the addition of 1 Tim 2:12–14. First Timothy 2:12 shares the idea and the vocabulary of the *mulier taceat* pericope. It excludes women

1. Note that the NA²⁸ reproduces vv. 33b–36 as a single paragraph contrary to data provided by the external evidence where 1 Cor 14:34 starts the *mulier taceat* paragraph. See Alesja Lavrinoviča, "1 Cor 14.34–5 without 'In All the Churches of the Saints': External Evidence," *NTS* 63 (2017): 370–89.

2. Joseph Wilson, "Recasting Paul as a Chauvinist within the Western Text-Type Manuscript Tradition: Implications for the Authorship Debate on 1 Corinthians 14.34–35," *Religions* 13.5 (2022): 1–18, here 5. Open access at <https://doi.org/10.3390/rel13050432>.

3. Wilson, "Recasting Paul as a Chauvinist."

from teaching on the basis of (1) the order of creation and (2) the perpetual culpability all women share with the first woman. Wilson explains that the presence of 1 Tim 2:12–14 in the Pauline corpus occasioned the misreading of 1 Cor 14:34–35 and thus obscured Paul’s rhetorical maneuver therein.

The second stage, which reinforced the incorrect understanding of 1 Cor 14:34–35, was the transposition of verses 34–35 to the end of 1 Cor 14. Wilson states that “sectarians pulled Paul’s words from their context.”⁴ The actual meaning and force of the rhetorical refutation in 1 Cor 14:36 was abandoned when the Corinthian slogan (vv. 34–35) was separated from the refutation (v. 36). According to those who defend the Q/R hypothesis, Paul, in fact, advocated for the participation of women in ministry when he wrote 1 Cor 14:34–36. He takes on the misogynistic views of certain Corinthian men and refutes them. Paul’s liberating message for women participation—contained in 1 Cor 14:34–36 according to defenders of the Q/R hypothesis—came to be gravely misinterpreted because of the relocation of verses 34–35 to the end of the chapter 14.

According to Wilson, Tertullian is the first exegete to misread, misunderstand, and misinterpret the *mulier taceat* pericope. Successive church fathers, theologians, and ecclesiologists followed this incorrect reading of 1 Cor 14:34–35. After the Apostolic Constitutions (ca. fourth century) were written, “the corrupted Western text-type largely went extinct. But the damage was done in terms of ‘conventional wisdom’ about Paul, too late to decelerate the growth of male-supremacist institutional culture.”⁵

There is nothing substantially new in Wilson’s argument. This is what constitutes the so-called egalitarian interpretation of the *mulier taceat* pericope. Wilson’s original contribution, however, is his analysis of Tertullian, *Marc.* 5, where Tertullian references 1 Cor 14:34–35. In this brief note, I want to challenge the idea that a particular rhetorical reading of a Greek particle significantly changes the interpretation of the *mulier taceat* pericope. The Q/R hypothesis argues from Greek morphology but ignores the context. Furthermore, I would like to contest some of Wilson’s reading of Tertullian along with another interpretation that he advances (and which is characteristic of the Q/R hypothesis).

4. Wilson, “Recasting Paul as a Chauvinist,” 7.

5. Wilson, “Recasting Paul as a Chauvinist,” 12.

1. The Dating and Content of P46

Before we turn to the displacement of verses 34–35 and Tertullian’s text, it is necessary to clarify a few things about the minor steps of Wilson’s text-critical argumentation, specifically the appeal to P. Chester Beatty 2 (P46) related to Wilson’s first stage that led to a misreading of our passage: the addition of the Pastoral Epistles to the *Corpus Paulinum*. In an attempt to dismiss the interpolation theory and exclude any relationship of dependence between 1 Cor 14:34–35 and 1 Tim 2:12–25 or their common ideological origin, Wilson enlists the character and dating of P46 to argue that 1 Cor 14:34–35 cannot depend on 1 Tim 2:12–25, contra, for example, Gordon Fee.⁶ Wilson writes: “I nonetheless doubt the existence of an interpolator dependent upon the work of the Pastor, because verses 34–35 are likely substantially older than 1 Timothy 2.12, based on the greater diversity and antiquity of manuscript evidence.”⁷ The argument about manuscript evidence and antiquity is too daring, because there is no Pauline manuscript earlier than P46; therefore, there is no external evidence to testify to the existence of verses 34–35 before that. P133, which contains the fragments of 1 Timothy, likewise dates to the third century. Wilson himself mentions that the Pastoral Epistles were written around the second century, but so could verses 34–35 be. There is no manuscript evidence that would demonstrate that verses 34–35 are substantially older than 1 Timothy.

Yet the absence of the Pastorals in P46 does not mean that they did not exist in the second century; it simply means that the Pastorals were not a part of the specific collection of the Pauline Epistles in that particular papyrus codex. Tertullian wrote *Adversus Marcionem* in 207–208 CE, and he already refers to 1 Timothy this early. The five books of *Adversus Marcionem* thus appear to predate P46 or at least coexist with it. Moreover, we do

6. Wilson, “Recasting Paul as a Chauvinist,” 6 and 15 n. 8. Fee’s remark that the gloss of 1 Cor 14:34–35 may have been an attempt “to reconcile 1 Cor. 14 with 1 Tim. 2” is ambiguous and does not specify whether it is the idea he endorses or just mentions. The idea here seems to imply at least a common origin of both passages if not their interdependence. See Gordon Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 699 n. 6. A few pages later, however, Fee proposes that the person who wrote 1 Cor 14:34–35 as a gloss on the pages of the Pauline manuscript might have been “someone who, probably in light of 1 Tim. 2:9–15, felt the need to qualify Paul’s instructions even further.” The ideological dependence of 1 Cor 14:34–35 on 1 Timothy seems to be implied here. See Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 706.

7. Wilson, “Recasting Paul as a Chauvinist,” 6.

not have any other Pauline manuscript prior to P46 to verify the antiquity of 1 Cor 14:34–35. The claim that the passage in verses 34–35 is substantially older than the Pastorals cannot be maintained on the basis of the dating of P46. There are no data to prove or disprove this notion. Furthermore, the dating and content of Codex Vaticanus, as evoked by Wilson along P46, has no relevance to the present discussion. Arguments based on the date of codices cannot disprove the basic premise of the interpolation theory that verses 34–35 entered the text early on, during the process of the collection of the letters written by and attributed to Paul. This process took place before our earliest physical evidence: P46. There is no evidence to conclude with certainty when exactly the *mulier taceat* pericope was written.⁸ Was it introduced before, after, or at the same time as the composition of the Pastorals? Even if one dismisses the interpolation theory, we still have no data prior to the third-century codex P46. Only theories can be proposed about the first two centuries and the shape of the *Corpus Paulinum* at the time.

2. The Displacement of Verses 34–35

Wilson employs the passage from Tertullian to explain how the misinterpretation of the famous *mulier taceat* pericope begins with Tertullian reading that pericope at the end of chapter 14. The very first task, then, would be to test and see whether Tertullian or Marcion had verses 34–35 at the end of the chapter.

Insofar as the structure of Tertullian's polemical discourse against Marcion is concerned, Tertullian does indeed deal with the text of verses 34–35 toward the end of chapter 14. He groups 1 Cor 14:21 and verses 34–35 together under the gifts of the Spirit in 1 Cor 14. This does not mean, however, that Marcion's or Tertullian's manuscript had verses 34–35 immediately after verse 21. Since no manuscript preserves a version of Marcion's New Testament, we cannot verify the order of the paragraphs that would have appeared therein. For that reason, scholars attempt to work in reverse and reconstruct Marcion's text from Tertullian. The reliability of the reconstructed text of Marcion's New Testament thus depends on the reliability and accuracy of the text's transmission and, ultimately, on the degree of

8. The same can be said about any other paragraph of the *Corpus Paulinum*. A great trust in the faithfulness of the copyists who copied the New Testament documents in general and the so-called authentic letters of Paul in particular is what predominates Pauline scholarship and still forms a default premise of textual criticism.

Tertullian's accuracy while engaging with the text of Marcion and the text of the New Testament in a particular way.

In his article, Wilson discusses the works of Jason BeDuhn and Ulrich Schmid devoted to the reconstruction of the New Testament text used by Marcion and concludes that, in spite of their different approaches to reconstruction, "both reconstructions of 1 Corinthians 14 conclude with v. 35, like 'Western' redactions."⁹ While Wilson's observation is correct, the conclusion he makes is not. In their attempts to reproduce Marcion's text from that of Tertullian, BeDuhn and Schmid both place the pericope of 1 Cor 14:34–35 between 1 Cor 14:21, 25, 26¹⁰ and 1 Cor 15:1. This is because Tertullian does not quote or refer to any other passage from 1 Cor 14. In other words, the data in Tertullian, *Marc.* 5.8 are insufficient for BeDuhn and Schmid to reconstruct the exact New Testament text of Marcion.¹¹ We can conclude only that Marcion had a text that displays characteristics of what came later to be known as the Western text-type, but we cannot conclude that Marcion's text is Western at 1 Cor 14 simply because verse 35 happens to be the very last text Tertullian mentions before chapter 15. Wilson disagrees with Schmid's claim¹² that we cannot be fully certain that Marcion's text contained verses 34–35 at end of the chapter and yet fails to substantiate his disagreement with evidence. Nothing in *Marc.* 5.8 supports the claim that both Marcion and Tertullian used the Western text-type of 1 Cor 14, even if other passages may expose Tertullian's use of Old Latin. Old Latin, after all, was a Latin dialect Tertullian used.

3. Problems with Wilson's Use of Tertullian

In his article, Wilson does not analyze the Latin text of Tertullian. By not consulting the original language of the treatise, Wilson risks misinterpreting Tertullian. In fact, words that Tertullian attributes to Paul, Wilson ascribes to Marcion.

9. Wilson, "Recasting Paul as a Chauvinist," 8. See Jason BeDuhn, *The First New Testament: Marcion's Scriptural Canon* (Farmington: Polebridge, 2013), 233–42; Ulrich Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos: Rekonstruktion und historische Einordnung der marcionitischen Paulusbriefausgabe*, AZNT 25 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1995), 1:325.

10. BeDuhn's reconstruction includes 1 Cor 14:26. This, however, does not change the fact that neither author includes any additional verses before or after vv. 34–35. See BeDuhn, *First New Testament*, 240.

11. BeDuhn, *First New Testament*, 240; Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 134.

12. Schmid, *Marcion und sein Apostolos*, 134.

In the Latin version of *Marc.* 5.8 (vv. 10–11) cited below, Tertullian repeatedly uses the implied pronoun “he” without clearly specifying the referent in any particular instance. The Latin text under discussion is as follows:

10. Quod et si in lege scriptum esse commemorat “*in aliis linguis et in aliis labiis*” locuturum Creatorem, cum hac commemoratione charisma linguarum confirmat, nec hic potest uideri alienum charisma Creatoris praedicatione confirmasse. 11. Aequae praescribens silentium mulieribus in ecclesia, ne quid discendi duntaxat gratia loquantur—ceterum prophetandi ius et illas habere iam ostendit, cum mulieri etiam prophetanti uelamen imponit—, ex lege accipit subiciendae feminae auctoritatem, quam, ut semel dixerim, nosse non debuit nisi in destructionem.¹³

Peter Holmes translates the text as follows:

[10] When he mentions the fact that “it is written in the law,” how that the Creator would speak with other tongues and other lips, whilst confirming indeed the gift of tongues by such a mention, he yet cannot be thought to have affirmed that the gift was that of another god by his reference to the Creator’s prediction. [11] In precisely the same manner, when enjoining on women silence in the church, that they speak not for the mere sake of learning (although that even they have the right of prophesying, he has already shown when he covers the woman that prophesies with a veil), he goes to the law for his sanction that woman should be under obedience. Now this law, let me say once for all, he ought to have made no other acquaintance with, than to destroy it. (*Marc.* 5.8.10–11)¹⁴

13. René Braun, *Tertullien, Contre Marcion*, vol. 5, SC 483 (Paris: Cerf, 2004), 189–90. The Latin text of *Adversus Marcionem* and its translations can be accessed on the website “The Tertullian Project: A Collection of Material Ancient and Modern about the Ancient Christian Latin Writer Tertullian and His Writings,” https://www.tertullian.org/articles/evans_marc/evans_marc_11book5.htm.

14. The text cited here includes a few more lines than what Wilson cites of Holmes in his article. See Peter Holmes, trans., *The Five Books of Quintus Sept. Flor. Tertullianus against Marcion* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1870), 410–11. Cf. Wilson, “Recasting Paul as a Chauvinist,” 8.

Holmes makes the pronoun “he” explicit in his translation. Due to the lack of the name of the referent, the reader presumes that the citation “it is written in law” was written by Paul; hence, the person whom Tertullian implies throughout the passage is the apostle. Other translators, as we shall see below, go even further and offer more clarity by supplying the name of the referent behind the implied pronoun “he.”

Wilson refers to Holmes’s translation but reads Marcion into the pronoun “he” in the final sentence of the passage: “Second, he [Tertullian] expressed surprise that Marcion did not delete these verses. Finally, Tertullian treated only these two verses out of order (at vv. 21–26) while otherwise uniformly adhering to canonical verse order in discussing 1 Corinthians 14.”¹⁵ Holmes’s interpretation cannot be supported by the larger context of Tertullian’s text. First of all, there is no basis for a claim that Tertullian “treated only these two verses [1 Cor 14:34–35] out of order.” In fact, in *Marc.* 5 in general Tertullian does not strictly follow the verse order, especially in *Marc.* 5.7–8, where he discusses various topics and groups texts out of canonical verse order. Here Tertullian focuses on the law, which appears in 1 Cor 14:21 and 34. This seems to be the reason he treats these two passages together.

Furthermore, Tertullian does not express surprise about Marcion; rather, he is referring to Paul. Ernest Evans, for instance, translates *Adversus Marcionem* by amplifying Tertullian’s polemical accent in his English translation and inserts the phrase “you suppose,” which directly addresses Marcion. Evans’s interpretation is faithful to the pragmatics of the text, because at least four times in book 5 Tertullian implies the second-person pronoun “you” when speaking against Marcion’s ideas. If Marcion is addressed as “you,” the pronoun “he” in Evans’s translation can only be interpreted as a reference to Paul, which is quite evident due to the repetition of “he” in our text (bold mine):

[10] And as **he** puts it on record that it is written in the law that the Creator will speak with other tongues and other lips, since with this reference he confirms <the legitimacy of> the gift of tongues, here again **he** cannot be supposed to have used the Creator’s prophecy to express approval of a different god’s spiritual gift. [11] Once more, when **he** enjoins upon women silence in the church, that they are not to speak, at all events with the idea of learn-

15. Wilson, “Recasting Paul as a Chauvinist,” 8.

ing—though **he** has already shown that even they have the right to prophesy, since **he** insists that a woman must be veiled, even when prophesying—it was from the law that **he** received authority for putting the woman in subjection, that law which, let me say it once for all, <you suppose> **he** had no right to take note of except for its destruction.¹⁶

Interestingly, Stephen Waers in his remark on this passage departs from the interpretation of Evans (to whom he attributes the citation) and explicitly interprets the pronoun as a reference to Marcion by writing his name in the square brackets. Waers writes: “And as he [Marcion] puts it on record that it is written in the law that the Creator will speak with other tongues and other lips.”¹⁷ This interpretation runs contrary to the grain of the text and its pragmatics, because Maricon did not write the epistle to the Corinthians to be credited for the reference to law.

The German translation by Volker Lukas is amplified to include biblical references. Lukas identifies the quote from Isa 28 in 1 Cor 14 and marks it as a citation. Lines 10 and 11 share the same structure, and there is little doubt that the German pronoun “er” refers to Paul:

10. Wenn **er** nun aber auch in Erinnerung ruft, dass im Gesetz geschrieben steht, der Schöpfer werde “in anderen Zungen und mit anderen Lippen” (Jes 28,11; vgl. 1 Kor 14,21) reden, so gilt: Wenn **er** durch diesen Rückverweis die Gnadengabe der Zungenrede für gut befindet, kann es auch an dieser Stelle nicht den Anschein haben, dass er durch einen Spruch des Schöpfers die Gnadengabe eines ‘anderen’ für gut befunden hat. 11. In gleicher Weise trifft Folgendes zu: Wenn **er** den Frauen vorschreibt, in der Gemeindeversammlung zu schweigen, damit sie nicht irgendetwas über den bloßen Zweck des Lernens hinaus sprächen (vgl. 1 Kor 14,34f)— im Übrigen zeigte **er** bereits auf, dass auch jene das Recht haben, prophetisch zu reden, als er nämlich auch der prophetisch redenden Frau vorschreibt, sich zu verschleiern (vgl. 1 Kor 11,5)—, so empfängt **er** aus dem Gesetz die Autorität, der Frau die unterordnete

16. See Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem*, ed. and trans. Ernest Evans (Oxford: Oxford University Press 1972), 561. Here and in the following block citations I mark the pronouns and the nouns in bold for emphasis.

17. See Stephen Waers, *Monarchianism and Origen’s Early Trinitarian Theology* (Leiden: Brill 2022), 30.

Stellung zuzuweisen (vgl. Gen 2,18; 3,16; vgl. 1 Kor 14,34); um es ein für alle Mal gesagt zu haben: **Er** hätte des Gesetz nicht kennen dürfen, außer zum Zweck, es zu vernichten.¹⁸

In the languages dealt with in this note, pronouns are normally anaphoric; that is, their reference has already been established earlier in the discourse. A person or a thing that is described as “he,” “she,” or “it” is usually named in the beginning of communication. In oral communication, speakers can be more flexible and can clarify whom or what they are talking about by naming a person or a thing after expressing their initial reaction. This kind of flexibility cannot be taken for granted in a written discourse that demands more complex syntactic and semantic effort from a writer. Tertullian employs rhetoric and irony in his writing, and it can be helpful to read the Latin discourse several times to better understand what is being communicated in the text. There is no reason to think that Tertullian mentions Marcion with a third-person singular pronoun “he” without mentioning Marcion’s name in the preceding context.

The French translation of Eugène-Antoine de Genoude, for comparison, is more hermeneutical, as it freely mentions the apostle (French *l’apôtre*) three times where the Latin text only implies the third-person masculine singular:

[10] Le don des langues atteste par ce souvenir que le Créateur devait parler en d’autres langues et par d’autres lèvres, et il est impossible que **Papôte** ait établi par sa prédication d’autre grâce que celle du Créateur. [11] Lorsque **Papôte** dit encore: « Que les femmes se taisent donc dans l’église, s’agit-il même de parler pour s’instruire, » (au reste, il a montré plus haut qu’elles avaient le droit, de prophétiser, lorsqu’il leur enjoit de voiler leur tête pendant qu’elles prophétisent,) **Papôte** ne fait qu’emprunter à la loi ancienne la soumission imposée à la femme. Encore un coup, il n’a dû connaître cette loi que pour la détruire.¹⁹

18. Tertullian, *Adversus Marcionem—Gegen Markion IV*, text and trans. Volker Lukas, FC 63.4 (Freiburg: Herder, 2017), 961.

19. Tertullien, *Ceuvres de Tertullien*, trans. into French by Eugène-Antoine de Genoude, 2nd ed., 3 vols. (Paris: Vivès, 1852), 1:336.

René Braun, who provides the Latin text along with a more recent French translation in *Sources Chrétiennes*, translates the Latin text in a similar way by mention of the apostle:

10. Mais si d'autre part l'**Apôtre** rappelle qu'il est écrit dans la Loi que le Créateur parlerait «*en d'autres langues et avec d'autres lèvres* », par ce rappel il confirme le charisme des langues, sans cependant pouvoir passer ici pour avoir confirmé, par une annonce du Créateur, le charisme d'un « autre » dieu!

11. Également, quand il prescrit le silence aux femmes dans l'assemblée et interdit qu'elles parlent sinon pour s'instruire de quelque chose—au reste qu'elles ont, elles aussi, le droit de prophétiser, il l'a déjà montré quand il impose le voile même à la femme qui prophétise—, c'est de la Loi qu'il reçoit l'autorité qui le fait soumettre la femme : cette Loi, pour le dire une bonne fois, il n'aurait dû la connaître qu'afin de la détruire!²⁰

Braun's understanding and translation do not depart from that of de Genoude. Braun mentions the apostle only once in our text: in line 10 of *Marc.* 5.8 (contra Waers). In doing so, Braun interprets “the apostle” as the referent of the implied “he,” even for the line 11.

Wilson offers his readers an interpretation of Tertullian's text contrary to that offered by most translators and interpreters of this text. Tertullian does not refer to Marcion in the text that Wilson uses as his principal argument in defense of the Q/R hypothesis. It is evident from the English translations of Holmes and Evans, as well as French and German translations, that Tertullian refers to the apostle Paul when using the third-person singular pronoun “he” in the Latin text of *Marc.* 5.8.²¹

20. Braun, *Tertullien, Contre Marcion*, 189–90.

21. Additionally, the church historian August Neander decidedly interprets Tertullian citing the prescription of the apostle Paul: “Praescribens (Paulus Apostolus) silentium mulieribus in ecclesia, ne quid discendi duntaxat gratia loquantur.” See August Neander, *History of the Planting and Training of the Christian Church: Antignosticus, or, Spirit of Tertullian*, 2 vols. (London: Bohn, 1851), 335 n. 3.

Conclusion

The problems with the Q/R hypothesis in general and with some of Wilson's arguments can be summed up as follows:

1. There is no manuscript evidence to support the claim that verses 34–35 are substantially older than 1 Timothy. We deal with the texts that go back to the first two centuries, of which we have no factual, external evidence. Methods other than manuscript evidence should be evoked in the debate of dependency and interrelatedness of the two texts.
2. Tertullian does not interpret the text of the New Testament epistles verse by verse. Tertullian has a topical structuring of his book, which is recognizable by a clear thematic introduction (*nunc de spiritalibus dico*) and conclusion (*sed ut iam a spiritalibus recedamus*).²² In lines 10 and 11 of *Marc.* 5.8, Tertullian groups together 1 Cor 14:21 and 14:34 because of the mention of the law.
3. The data are not sufficient to conclude that either Tertullian or Marcion possessed a manuscript of the New Testament with 1 Cor 14:34–35 at the end of the chapter instead of the position attested by the majority of manuscripts. For that reason, the claim that Tertullian misread the *mulier taceat* pericope and popularized an incorrect interpretation of it is unfounded.
4. The Latin text of Tertullian in *Marc.* 5.8 refers to the apostle Paul and not to Marcion, contra Wilson's interpretation.

22. Braun, *Tertullien, Contre Marcion*, 182, 190.