THE RHETORIC OF HONOUR AND SHAME IN 1 CORINTHIANS 1–6

by

DEREK MICHAEL MCNAMARA

submitted in accordance with the requirements
for the degree of

DOCTOR OF LITERATURE AND PHILOSOPHY

in the subject of

BIBLICAL STUDIES

at the

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH AFRICA

PROMOTER: PROF P J J BOTHA

AUGUST, 2008

SUMMARY

The subject and scope of this dissertation is Paul's use of honour and shame language in 1 Cor 1–6. The methodology applied is a modified socio-rhetorical criticism as developed by George A. Kennedy.

Two interrelated aspects of first century Corinthian culture will also be examined in connection with Paul's rhetoric in 1 Cor 1–6; that of the patron-client relationship and the role of honour and shame in that relationship and in the larger society. It will be argued that Paul's rhetorical argument in 1 Cor 1–6 is heavily based upon the social values of honour and shame.

This study will examine 1 Cor 1–6 in three sections. The first section to be examined will be that of 1:1–2:5. Paul begins this section by presenting Jesus as the super-patron who is over and above all the members of the congregation. This presentation of Jesus rebukes the patronal based factionalism and it also elevates Paul to the unique status as that of apostle and proclaimer Jesus.

The second section to be examined will be 1 Cor 4. In this section Paul continues to reduce the status of the patrons as he elevates his own status. By the end of this section Paul seeks to re-establish himself not only as the apostle and proclaimer of Jesus, but also as the Corinthians' father through the gospel.

The third section to be examined will be 1 Cor 5–6. In this section it will be argued that Paul addresses three issues in connection with patronal abuse; that of the incestuous man in 1 Cor 5, the abuse of the law courts in 6:1–10, and immoral banquets in 6:11–20.

Key Terms: Rhetorical criticism, honour and shame, patron and client, patronage, clientele, early Christianity, Corinth, theology of Paul, leadership, group conflict.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION – REVIEW OF LITERATURE – METHODOLOGY

1.1 Introduction

This initial chapter is divided into five parts. First, a review of literature will examine a select sampling of the major modern scholarly trends in 1 Corinthians. This review will begin with the work of F. C. Baur on his two-party thesis and conclude with the recent work of Richard Horsley on Christianity and Roman imperial society. Second, a brief rationale for examining Paul's use of honor[1] and shame rhetoric in 1 Cor 1–6 will be suggested. Third, the three interwoven concepts of rhetoric, honor and shame, and the patron-client relationship will be examined in order to determine their influence on the social and rhetorical framework of 1 Cor 1–6. Fourth, a methodology of rhetorical criticism that will be used to examine 1 Cor 1–6 will be outlined. Fifth, in the final section a short conclusion to this chapter will be presented along with a plan of investigation for the study.

1.2 Review of Literature

1.2.1 Introduction

Modern scholarly analysis of 1 Corinthians is generally seen to have as its watershed the work of F. C. Baur. Thus, that seems to be the most obvious place to begin a review of literature. In broad terms the general trend of scholarly investigation into the Corinthian correspondence from Baur to the present has been from a *history of religions*, to *Gnosticism* (both Hellenistic and Jewish), and since the early 1970s, the scholarly focus or investigation has been predominantly focused on the *socio-historical*

[1.] This study will use American English spelling as found in *The New Oxford American Dictionary* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005).

framework of the Corinthian correspondence. As noted this review will examine a select sample of the works that have been both influential and represent the development of scholarly work in the Corinthian correspondence.

1.2.2   F. C. Baur: Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ[2]

In 1797 J. E. C. Schmidt published an argument that suggested that one of the central ideas that lay behind much of the New Testament was a struggle between the followers of Peter and the followers of Paul.[3] In 1831 Ferdinand Christian Baur published a lengthy article on "the Christ party in the Corinthian community, the opposition of Petrine and Pauline Christianity in the early church, the apostle Peter in Rome."[4] Baur, working from Schmidt's thesis, suggested that 1 Cor 1:12 refers to two groups that were divided over a single issue. This issue, according to Baur, was a Pauline (Gentile) Christianity, and a Petrine (Jewish) Christianity, with the Apollos group on Paul's side and the Christ group on Peter's side. The fact that this article, and other articles by Baur on this theme, is still regularly cited in discussions on the divisions in Corinth is an indication of the influence Baur has had on Pauline studies.

Werner Kümmel challenged Baur's thesis on a series of points,[5] but the one that is perceived as being the most influential in resulting in the dismissal of Baur's thesis is Kümmel's charge that Baur's exegesis was determined by the Hegelian model of history.[6] Baur's two-party thesis of the conflict between Petrine and Pauline Christianity, eventually being synthesized in second-century catholic Christianity, reflects Baur's Hegelian views. Baur's radical criticism of the New Testament came under sustained criticism,[7] and Baur's arguments are now rarely accepted, with the

---

[2.] F. C. Baur, *Paul, The Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings; a Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity* (ET of 2nd ed.; London: Williams & Norgate, 1873).

[3.] J. E. C. Schmidt, *Bibliothek für Kritik und Exegese* (1797–1803).

[4.] F. C. Baur, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des paulinischen und petrinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom," *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 4 (1831): 61–206.

[5.] Werner Kümmel, *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems* (trans. S. M. Gilmour and H. C. Kee; Nashville: Abingdon, 1972), 162–68.

[6.] Michael D. Goulder, *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001), 6.

[7.] J. B. Lightfoot's work on Baur is detailed in Stephen Neill and N. T. Wright, *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861–1986* (2d ed; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988), 33–60.

exception that in recent years Baur's thesis has been reworked by Michael Goulder.[8]

1.2.3 Johannes Munck: The Church Without Factions[9]

In a 1959 essay titled "The Church Without Factions; Studies in 1 Corinthians 1–4" Johannes Munck contests Baur's view that the problem in Corinth was between Pauline and Petrine Christianity. Instead, Munck contends that Paul was addressing a problem of bickerings in the congregation, rather than various factions or parties that had theological and ethical views. Munck sees the divisions that Baur argues for as later developments in the church and are not part of the problems addressed in 1 Corinthians.

A central point of Munck's argument is the distinction between σχίσμα (*division*) and αἵρεσις (*faction*).[10] "Paul therefore describes the conditions that he is combating not as factions but as bickerings, arising because the individual church members profess as their teacher Paul, Apollos, Cephas, or Christ, and excluding the others."[11] In the second part of his essay, Munck argues that if the problems of 1 Cor 1–4 were indeed connected with factions then one would expect to hear of these factions again in 1 Corinthians.

> If the first four chapters of 1 Corinthians really deal with four different factions, to which the greater number of the Church members attached themselves, we should necessarily expect to hear of those factions elsewhere in the letter. But the letter's commentators do not think that any reference to factions are found outside 1–4.[12]

While the first four sections of Munck's essay are a critique of Baur's Pauline/Petrine Christianities, the rest of Munck's essay focuses on the cause of the bickerings in Corinth. Here, Munck suggests that the core cause of the bickering in Corinth is related to the Corinthians having an underlying Hellenistic view of wisdom which lead to a misunderstanding of the gospel, the Christian leaders, and their own position.[13] Munck's essay is important because of its critique of Baur, and also because of its introduction of Hellenistic views and practices into the discussion of 1 Cor 1–4. In fact, Munck may be described as a forerunner of the recent trend to read 1 Corinthians

---

[8.] Goulder, *Competing Mission*.

[9.] Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (trans. Frank Clarke; London: SCM, 1959), 135–67.

[10.] Munck, *Salvation of Mankind*, 135–36.

[11.] Munck, *Salvation of Mankind*, 1.

[12.] Munck, *Salvation of Mankind*, 139.

[13.] Munck, *Salvation of Mankind*, 154.

in light of the wider Greco-Roman culture as seen in the work of Welborn,[14] Clark,[15] and Winter.[16]

1.2.4 Walter Schmithals: The Corinthian Christology[17]

Walter Schmithals argues that the various problems Paul addressed in Corinth are in fact tied to the singular issue of Jewish Gnosticism, a heresy brought into the Corinthian community from outside. Schmithals examines the phrase "αναθεμα ᾽Ιηουν" (*Let Jesus be cursed*!) as used in 1 Cor 12:3 and questions how this curse could be uttered during a Christian service of worship. Schmithals suggests, "Thus they were Gnostics who rejected a close connection between the heavenly Pneuma-Christ and the man Jesus. They apparently held the teaching that Christ had taken up residence in Jesus at his baptism, yet without thereby having been bound up with the flesh of the latter."[18] Schmithals draws a parallel from Celsus' debate with Origen where Origen reports of Gnostics who "admit no one to their fellowship who has not first cursed Jesus."[19]

Schmithals' view of the Corinthians' Christology is rejected because it is anachronistic.[20] This can be seen by the way he draws parallels to "ἀνάθεμα ᾽Ιησοῦς" with statements from Celsus (his literary activity falls between the years 175 and 180) and Valentinus (mid second century).[21]

1.2.5 C. K. Barrett: Christianity at Corinth[22]

In his 1964 essay C. K. Barrett returns to the four groups mentioned in 1 Cor 1:12 and argues that there were four actual groups in Corinth. Barrett steers to the middle ground

---

[14.] Laurence L. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth: First Corinthians 1–4 and Ancient Politics," in *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistles* (Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1997), 1–42.

[15.] Andrew D. Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6* (Leiden: Brill, 1993).

[16.] Bruce W. Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influences of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001).

[17.] Walter Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians* (trans. John E. Steely; Nashville: Abingdon, 1971).

[18.] Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 127.

[19.] Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 128.

[20.] Edwin M. Yamuchi, "Gnosis, Gnosticism," in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, 350–54.

[21.] R. McL. Wilson, "How Gnostic were the Corinthians?" *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972): 65–74.

[22.] C. K. Barrett, "Christianity at Corinth," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 46 (1964): 269–97.

between the views of Baur, who argued for two groups, and Munck who postulated there were bickerings but not schisms:

> Perhaps the strongest argument for regarding the words ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ as indicating the existence of a fourth group is that when we have eliminated from 1 Corinthians everything that can reasonably be ascribed to a Paul-group, an Apollos-group, and a Cephas-group, there remains a well-defined body of opinion distinct from the views of the first three groups, consistent with itself and explicable in the context of events in Corinth.[23]

One of the strengths of Barrett's article is that it represents a critical survey of key scholarship issues of the 1950s and 1960s pertaining to Corinthian Christianity.[24]

1.2.6   Nils A. Dahl: Paul and the Church at Corinth[25]

In a 1967 essay Nils Dahl agrees with his contemporaries in rejecting Baur's reconstruction of Christianity in Corinth.[26] However, Dahl disagrees with Munck's treatment of 1 Cor 1–4, and how these chapters function within the letter as a whole.[27] Dahl faults Munck for only dealing with 1 Cor 1–4. Dahl's analysis of 1 Cor 1–4 arrives at the following four conclusions:

> (1) The section of 1 Cor 1:10–4:21 is correctly, if not exhaustively, characterized as an apology for Paul's apostolic ministry.

> (2) The quarrels at Corinth were mainly due to the opposition against Paul.

> (3) Probably the quarrels were occasioned or at least brought into the open by the letter and the delegation which were sent to Paul.

> (4) The section has a clear and important function within the total structure of 1 Corinthians. Before Paul could answer the questions raised, he had to overcome both false appraisals and false objections, and to reestablish his apostolic authority as the founder and spiritual father of the whole church at Corinth.[28]

Fee, in his commentary, agrees with Dahl that the majority of the Church in Corinth was at odds with Paul.[29] Adams and Horrell suggests that more recent

---

[23.] Barrett, "Christianity at Corinth," 264.

[24.] Edward Adams and David G. Horrell, *Christianity at Corinth, the Quest for the Pauline Church* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004), 80.

[25.] Nils A. Dahl, *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 1977).

[26.] Dahl, *Studies in Paul*, 40–41.

[27.] Dahl, *Studies in Paul*, 43.

[28.] Dahl, *Studies in Paul*, 55.

[29.] Gordon G. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987), 6.

interpreters "tended to see the opposition to Paul as coming from a smaller section of the congregation, albeit a particularly powerful and influential one."[30]

1.2.7   Gerd Theissen: Social Stratification in the Corinthian Community[31]
In four of the essays presented in his book, published in 1970, Gerd Theissen presents Corinth as an example of the urban, Roman world. Working from this model Theissen shows how it lends social arrangement to the Corinthian Christian community. Theissen presents the Corinthian church as diverse, stratified, and divided at a number of points. Those divisions which Theissen singles out for evaluation (the Lord's Supper, eating meat sacrificed to idols, the support of itinerant missionaries and of Paul himself) are not merely the consequences of theological differences. Rather, Theissen suggests, they are the consequences of the social stratification of the Corinthian church.

A foundation passage in Theissen's work is 1 Cor 1:26, *Consider your own call, brothers and sisters: not many of you were wise by human standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth*. Theissen says of this passage "If Paul says that there were not many in the Corinthian congregation who were wise, powerful and wellborn, then this much is certain: there were some."[32] Theissen evaluates four areas that would suggest evidence of the elites in the Corinthian congregation. These are references to offices,[33] houses,[34] services rendered,[35] and travel.[36] Theissen takes these references and then compares them with the seventeen persons named in connection with Corinth. He concludes this comparison by stating, "Of the seventeen persons (including one group) listed, nine belong to the upper class according to the criteria discussed above," and, "The result is clear, the great majority of the Corinthians known to us by name probably enjoyed high social status."[37]

Having arrived at this conclusion, Theissen then evaluates five areas of divisions within the church in Corinth as being connected with the congregation's social stratification. First, he cites the problems surrounding the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor 11 "all that is certain is that at the Lord's Supper there emerged social differences; a split

---

[30.] Adams and Horrell, *Christianity at Corinth*, 86.
[31.] Gerd Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth* (trans. John H. Schütz; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982).
[32.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 72.
[33.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 79–83.
[34.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 83–87.
[35.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 87–91.
[36.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 91–94.
[37.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 95.

between *the have*s and *the have nots*."[38] Second, while not discussing the situation in much detail, Theissen suggests that the various sections on giving (1 Cor 9, 16; 2 Cor 10–12) reflect "that the spokesmen of the Corinthian parties, that is, protagonists among the followers of other missionaries, belonged to the upper class."[39] Third, Theissen mentions the abuse of the law courts in 1 Cor 6 and that "Such litigation would hardly be undertaken by those who have no property."[40] Fourth, Paul's discussion of wisdom and knowledge throughout the Epistles "is sufficient to recognize that in Corinth 'the wise' and others who do not belong to that group are in opposition to one another, and that the 'wise' and the 'gnostics' are more likely to be found in the upper strata."[41] Fifth, Paul's advice to slaves in 1 Cor 7:21ff. indicates that there were slaves in the congregation and this would indicate the degree of internal social stratification.[42]

Theissen's essays are important for two reasons. First, they brought the sociological study of early Christianity to a new prominence. Second, they were highly influential in setting the basis of the *new consensus* that Christianity was composed of Christians from all social strata.[43]

1.2.8 *Anthony Thiselton: Realized Eschatology at Corinth*[44]

While C. K. Barrett[45] and F. F. Bruce[46] address the possibility that the problems in Corinth can be connected with eschatological fulfillment, neither attempt to address this view in detail. A 1978 article entitled "Realized Eschatology at Corinth" by Anthony Thiselton remedied this lacuna. In his article, Thiselton addresses E. Earle Ellis's critique of the realized eschatological view.[47] Thiselton addresses Ellis's three objections to a Corinthian realized eschatology as the cause of the problems in Corinth. First, Thiselton agrees with Ellis that the situation of 1 Cor 15 is not connected with a realized eschatology but "the existence in Corinth of people who denied the resurrection

---

[38.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 96.

[39.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 97.

[40.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 97.

[41.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 98.

[42.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 98.

[43.] Adams and Horrell, *Christianity at Corinth*, 97–98.

[44.] Anthony C. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology at Corinth," *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 510–26.

[45.] C. K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (London: A&C Black, 1968), 109.

[46.] F. F. Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians* (London: Oliphants, 1971), 49–50.

[47.] E. Earle Ellis, "Christ Crucified," in *Reconciliation and Hope. New Testament Essays in Atonement and Eschatology* (ed. R. Banks; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974), 69–75.

of the body, people for whom the doctrine of the ἀνάστασις νεκρῶν was an impossible and superfluous notion."[48]

In addressing Ellis's third critique, the apparent disconnect between Paul's own preaching and teaching at Corinth and the Corinthians' eschatology,[49] Thiselton writes, "We may admit that the Corinthians, in stressing a realized eschatology, probably felt they were legitimately developing Paul's own insights."[50]

Finally, Thiselton addresses Ellis's argument that 1 Cor 4:8 (*Already you have all you want! Already you have become rich! Quite apart from us you have become kings! Indeed, I wish that you had become kings, so that we might be kings with you!*) is the lynch pin of the realized eschatological argument. Thiselton disagrees with Ellis and states "the eschatological approach pinpoints a single common factor which helps to explain an otherwise utterly diverse array of apparently independent problems in Corinth."[51] Thiselton also argues that the Corinthians' over-realized eschatology lead to an "enthusiastic view of the Spirit."[52] Thus, Thiselton argues, an over-realized eschatology lead to errors about the gifts and work of the Holy Spirit, and these two tendencies converged and created the situation in Corinth that Paul addresses. This is the area which received the greatest examination by Thiselton. He argues through a series of issues from 5:1–11:1 illustrating how the Corinthian over-realized eschatology was the cause of this problem.[53] He also postulates that the abuses of the Lord's Supper were tied to "'sitting down in the Kingdom,' and feasting at the eschatological banquet of the Messiah."[54]

Thiselton's article is noteworthy due to the fact that it is considered the definitive argument for the influence of realized eschatology at Corinth. However, the realized eschatology argument has not been seriously challenged,[55] rather it has been eclipsed by attempts to understand the problems at Corinth as being related to the Greco-Roman background of the church. In fact, in his recent commentary on 1 Corinthians, Thiselton states that while he stands by his conclusion that the issues at

---

48. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology," 510.
49. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology," 511.
50. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology," 512.
51. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology," 512.
52. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology," 512.
53. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology," 515–20.
54. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology," 521.
55. John M. G. Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 47 (1992): 58.

Corinth were not a random set of problems, he concedes that his earlier views should be combined with more recent emphasis on the wider secular context.[56]

1.2.9   Richard Horsley: Gnosis in Corinth[57]

In his 1981 essay, Richard Horsley argues that the Corinthian religious outlook can be explained when read against a Hellenistic Jewish sapential background. In this article he develops a view put forward by others, most notably that of Birger Pearson.[58]

Horsley's argument follows the following major lines: First, an acknowledgement of the thesis that the Corinthians were Gnostics was losing ground.[59] Second, "that it is becoming increasingly clear that Hellenistic Jewish speculation about and devotion to Wisdom forms the background to the Corinthians' obsession with *sophia* which Paul addresses in 1 Cor 1–4."[60] Third, Horsley develops a reconstruction of Jewish sapential wisdom based on the works of Philo and the *Wisdom of Solomon*. This reconstruction follows a three-fold hypothesis. First, knowledge is almost always directly related to God. Second, knowledge is parallel or similar to sophia. Third, and more precisely, "knowledge is the particular religious and theoretical context of sophia, i.e. the ontological and especially soteriological knowledge of divine teaching supposedly derived from the Scripture."[61] Working from this reconstruction, Horsley surmises, "These three aspects of Hellenistic Jewish knowledge are all directly relevant to the Corinthian situation and may help us discern more precisely how the 'strong' Corinthians understood their gnosis."[62] To this reconstruction of Hellenistic Jewish wisdom Horsley then argues that Paul "is repeatedly taking up language of the Corinthians in his arguments against their principles and self-understanding."[63]

The key passage for Horsley is 1 Cor 8:4 *Hence, as to the eating of food offered to idols, we know that "no idol in the world really exists," and that "there is no God but*

[56.] Anthony C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (NIGTC; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 40.

[57.] Richard A. Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8.1–6," *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 32–52.

[58.] Birger Pearson, *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism* (SBLDS 12; Atlanta: Scholars, 1973).

[59.] Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth," 33.

[60.] Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth," 32–33.

[61.] Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth," 35.

[62.] Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth," 35.

[63.] Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth," 43.

one." Horsley argues that this quote is a Corinthian slogan and it contains two statements, both of which show evidence of Hellenistic Jewish wisdom. Horsley argues of the first statement, *God is one* "is the basic Jewish confession that God is one. Its creedal character appears in a variety of Hellenistic Jewish literature, such as Pseudo-Sophocles."[64] He argues of the second statement, *an idol is nothing at all in the world*, "For εἴδωλον as used here in the sense of a false god was the product of Hellenistic Jewish translation and development of the Jewish (biblical) critique of heathen gods, and has no meaning like this in pagan Greek."[65] In concluding Horsley notes that "mounting skepticism" concerning gnosis in Corinth has resulted in "the Corinthians being called, somewhat vaguely, 'proto-Gnostics.'"[66] Horsley offers the suggestion that "we can be more precise about the nature of the Corinthian gnosis. It has emerged from a Hellenistic Jewish gnosis which it closely resembles in every discernible respect."[67]

Horsley's article on Gnosis in Corinth may be described as the last attempt to explain the situation of 1 Corinthians along the lines of Gnosticism, albeit Hellenistic Jewish gnosis. Horsley's work in this area has suffered a remarkably similar fate to that of Thiselton's "Realized Eschatology." It has not been seriously challenged, rather it has been eclipsed by the more recent studies focusing on the Greco-Roman framework of Corinthian Christianity. In fact, Horsley's own subsequent work has emphasized the setting of the Corinthian community within and against Roman imperial society.[68]

1.2.10 Jerome Murphy-O'Connor: St Paul's Corinth[69]

In a series of three essays, first published in 1983, Jerome Murphy-O'Connor uses literary and archaeological means to offer insight into various social aspects of *St. Paul's Corinth* that may shed light on Paul's communication with the Corinthian church. His first essay examines the problems surrounding the Eucharist in 1 Cor 11:7–34. Working from the premise that the Corinthian church had no public meeting place and thus would have to have met in homes of the members, Murphy-O'Connor

---

[64.] Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth," 36.
[65.] Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth," 37.
[66.] Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth," 51.
[67.] Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth," 51.
[68.] Richard A. Horsley, "1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul's Assembly as an Alternative Society," in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* (ed. Richard A. Horsley; Harrisburg: Trinity, 1997), 242–52.
[69.] Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology* (3rd ed; Good News Studies, 6; Collegeville: Liturgical, 2002).

examines the villa at Anaploga, the only Roman home in the area of Corinth that can be attributed to the time of Paul. According to social conventions of the time gatherings would have limited the guests "to the public parts of the house, namely, the entrance area, the *atrium* (*courtyard*), the *triclinium* (*dining room*) and the toilet."[70] The *triclinium* of the villa at Anaploga measures 5.5 x 7.5 meters, and the *atrium* 5 x 6 meters. Murphy-O'Connor compares this villa with other villas from the same period and concludes that the villa at Anaploga follows the typical dimensions for the period. He concludes that the average *triclinium* could hold no more than nine diners, and the average *atrium* would hold between thirty or forty people.[71] Next, working from the names listed in the New Testament as being associated with the church in Corinth, Murphy-O'Connor estimates "it would be more realistic, therefore, to think in terms of between forty and fifty as a base figure for the Christian community at Corinth."[72]

He concludes, "this would imply that a meeting of the whole church was rare due to the fact that it would have been too awkward."[73] Thus, the church met in subgroups and "this would go a long way toward explaining the theological divisions within the church."[74] on the occasions when the whole church did meet together (1 Cor 14:23), the church would be divided into two groups; those who met in the *triclinium* and the overflow who met in the *atrium*. Murphy-O'Connor offers a probable reconstruction of the situation that lead to Paul addressing the conditions surrounding the Eucharist:

> The host must have been a wealthy member of the community, so he invited into the *triclinium* his closest friends among the believers who would have been of the same social class, and from whom he might expect the same courtesy on a future occasion. The rest could take their places in the *atrium*, where conditions were greatly inferior.[75]

Thus, in this first essay Murphy-O'Connor suggests the size of the villas in Corinth had no small part to play in both the theological divisions of the church, and the abuses surrounding the Eucharist. In the following two essays Murphy-O'Connor again uses literary and archaeological means to reconstruct a possible social framework that had direct bearing on Paul's Corinthian correspondence. First, he ties the temple of Asclepius to Paul's discussion of the meat offered to idols in 1 Cor 8–10, and he also

---

70. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 178.
71. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 180–82.
72. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 182.
73. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 183.
74. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 183.
75. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 183.

suggests that Paul's use of the "one body many parts" imagery may be tied to the temple of Asclepius' terra cotta ex-votos.[76] In his final essay Murphy-O'Connor examines the trade of the tent-maker and lays a foundation for better understanding Paul's work and ministry in Corinth. It may also shed light on the low status Paul may have had in the eyes of the Corinthian elite.[77] Murphy-O'Connor's work continues the move away from the *history of religions* approach that emphasizes examining religious texts and looking for parallels in Gnosticism and the mystery religions. Instead, he focuses on trying to recreate a picture of everyday life in Rome and reading 1 Corinthians from a social perspective.[78]

1.2.11 Laurence L. Welborn: Discord in Corinth[79]

In a 1987 essay, Laurence Welborn continues reading 1 Cor 1–4 through the lens of the Greco-Roman socio-rhetorical background. What is distinctive about his essay is his argument that the situation in 1 Cor 1–4 is best understood against a background of socio-political factionalism.

Welborn, with such words as σχίσμα, ἔρις, ζῆλος and μερίζω, argues that the situation in Corinth is that of disputing political parties. "The terms with which σχίσμα is associated make it clear that it is neither a religious heresy nor a harmless clique that the author has in mind, but factions engaged in a struggle for power."[80] "It is a power struggle, not a theological controversy, that motivates the writing of 1 Corinthians 1–4."[81] Welborn then suggests that the power struggles within the congregation were political in nature. He demonstrates how there was no generally accepted name for political parties in antiquity, but the political parties were named after the individuals whose interests they served.[82] He examines various examples of this practice and concludes, "A member of a faction, whether in the assembly, the theater, or the school, identified himself and expressed his adherence by means of a formula that consisted of a personal pronoun, the verb to be (expressed or implied), and the genitive of a proper

---

76. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 186–91.
77. Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 192–98.
78. Adams and Horrell, *Christianity at Corinth*, 129–30.
79. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 1–42.
80. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 3. The view on the schism as neither a religious nor a harmless clique has been challenged by Christof Strüder. Christof W. Strüder, "Preferences not Parties: The Background of 1 Cor 1,12," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* (2003): 431–55.
81. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 7.
82. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 9.

name."[83] This, Welborn contends, is the formula Paul uses in 1 Cor 1:12 (ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ).

Welborn suggests that the specific political issue involved tension between the rich and the poor, "the bondage of the poor to the rich is the breeding ground of factions."[84] He cites references from ancient literature, "When we turn to accounts of ancient literature, we find that tensions between rich and poor are a constant feature."[85] He also cites various passages from 1 Corinthians to show the congregation was composed of both rich and poor. However, while Welborn argues that the specific issue was the bondage of the poor to the rich, the leaders of the various parties would have been the rich. The real party leaders are thus local Christians (Chloe, Crispus, Gaius, and Stephanas) who seek to legitimate their power by appealing to renowned figures in the church.[86]

Welborn then suggests that while the issue may have been the bondage of the poor to the rich, the faction leaders are not truly interested in addressing the plight of the poor, rather they use the plight of the poor as a means of gaining power. "The point is simply that neither in 1 Corinthians nor in ancient literature in general is there evidence of the poor creating factions of their own. Rather, the tensions between the rich and the poor always present in στάσις (*discord*) are exploited by rich aristocrats in their contest for control of the state."[87] However, at the end of this argument Welborn suggests that Paul was not trying to defuse the situation but rather using it to bolster his own faction, "By expressing solidarity with the despised and oppressed Paul sought, like a Greek politician of old, to 'bring the δῆμος into his faction' (Herodotus *Hist.* 5.66)."[88]

In the next section, 1:17–2:5, Welborn argues that Paul uses σοφία simply as rhetoric, "The σοφία that Paul fears will undermine the community is none other than rhetoric."[89] Welborn describes this rhetoric as "the rhetoric of political factionalism." In contrast, Welborn suggests that the σοφία of 2:6–3:3 is not rhetoric but rather *gnosis*, "The vocabulary and conceptual shift suddenly and unmistakably to the realm of the

---

83. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 16.
84. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 18.
85. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 18.
86. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 24.
87. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 28.
88. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 28.
89. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 30.

mystery religions,"[90] He argues that this *gnosis* serves political factionalism, "Whoever has studied the history of civil strife at Rome knows that religious knowledge was constantly manipulated by the ruling elite, in whose hands control of the priestly college lay, for the benefit of one faction in rivalry with another.[91] In the final section of his essay, 4:1–21, Welborn presents Paul as the self-styled bringer of concord to the Christians in Corinth.[92]

Welborn does present a plausible reconstruction of the framework pertaining to 1 Cor 1–4. He continues in the vein of scholarship that attempts to read 1 Corinthians from a social perspective; specifically a socio-political perspective. Welborn's essay is important in that it is one of the earliest works to use rhetorical analysis, and it might even be described as the beginnings of socio-rhetorical analysis. Yet, there are two intertwined concerns with Welborn's essay. First, I fear it suffers from what may be described as a type of rhetorical parallelomania or selective sampling.[93] Welborn cites a word used in 1 Cor 1–4 and finds select political parallels and then he attaches a fixed meaning to the word being examined.[94] Second, it may be argued that Welborn fails to deal with the *internal* rhetoric of 1 Cor 1–4. This may be best illustrated with his treatment of σοφία as noted above. Welborn arrives at two different conclusions concerning Paul's use of σοφία (*rhetoric* in 1:17–2:5 and *religious gnosis* in 2:6–3:3). His conclusions are found outside 1 Cor 1–4 and are then superimposed upon 1 Cor 1–4.

1.2.12 Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza: Rhetorical Situation[95]

One of the underlying challenges of trying to reconstruct the framework in Corinth that led Paul to write 1 Corinthians is that the primary source used in the reconstruction is 1 Corinthians. Yet, we would do well to remember that 1 Corinthians is not an unbiased description of the problems in the Corinthian church; rather 1 Corinthians is Paul's careful reshaping and addressing the problems to fit his rhetorical strategy. A second challenge is that New Testament scholars typically read 1 Corinthians as a *canonical*

---

90. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 32.
91. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 34.
92. Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 36–42.
93. Samuel Sandmel, "Parallelomania," *Journal of Biblical Studies* 81 (1962): 2–13.
94. D. A. Carson, *Exegetical Fallacies* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996), 43–44.
95. Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians," *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 386–403.

text, and uncritically accept Paul's claims of *apostolic authority*.[96] However, a cursory reading of the Corinthian correspondence would suggest that the Corinthians themselves did not view Paul as having apostolic authority, nor would they have viewed his letters as carrying canonical authority.

In her 1987 article, Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza attempts to address these two challenges. She asks, "How then can we utilize rhetorical criticism in order to read a historical text in such a way that we move from the 'world of the text' of Paul to the actual world of the Corinthian community."[97] Fiorenza answers her question by proposing a four stage approach towards rhetorical critical analysis. First, identify "the rhetorical interests and models of contemporary interpretation." Second, "delineate the rhetorical arrangement, interests and modifications introduced by the author." Third, "establish the rhetorical situation of the letter." Fourth, reconstruct "the common historical situation and symbolic universe of the writer/speaker and the recipients/audience."[98]

Fiorenza takes these four stages and examines 1 Corinthians. In the first stage, Fiorenza employs reader-response criticism to distinguish between the actual writer/reader and the implied writer/reader. Fiorenza suggests, in a section entitled *Contemporary Interpretations*, that scholarship had traditionally read 1 Corinthians as a canonical text. Yet, this is not the way in which the Corinthians would have received Paul's letter. "In other words, does Paul's power of persuasion rest on his presumed authority or did it have the same effect in the historical situation in which such canonical authority cannot be presupposed."[99] This discussion is closely connected with two of Fiorenza's arguments later in her article. First, Fiorenza argues that Paul was not *re-establishing* his authority, but rather he was seeking to establish "his authority as the sole founder and father of the Corinthian community."[100] Second, Fiorenza's reconstruction of the situation in Corinth was that of the Christian community writing to various teachers for their views on different matters. Paul writes to the Corinthians, "in order to secure this interpretation he had to argue why they should follow his instructions and not those of others if these turned out to be different to his own."[101]

_____

[96.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 390.
[97.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 388.
[98.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 388.
[99.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 390.
[100.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 397.
[101.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 398.

In the second stage, *The Rhetorical Arrangement of 1 Corinthian*s, Fiorenza suggests that 1 Corinthians should be read as *deliberative* rhetoric.[102] This is in contrast to Wüellner who argues that 1 Corinthians is *epideictic* or *demonstrative* rhetoric,[103] and Dahl who views it as *forensic* or *judicial* rhetoric.

In the third stage, *Rhetorical Situation*, Fiorenza works from the premise that 1 Corinthians is deliberative rhetoric and proceeds to reconstruct the rhetorical situation. In her reconstruction, she suggests that women must have had influence and leadership in the Corinthian Church.[104] Paul writes to establish his authority as the sole founder and father of the Corinthian community. Fiorenza also argues that in "1 Corinthians Paul introduces the vertical line of patriarchal subordination not only into the social relationship of the *ekklesia*, but into its symbolic universe as well by arrogating the authority of God, the 'father', for himself."[105]

In the fourth stage, *Historical Reconstruction and Theological Assessment*, Fiorenza takes the previous three stages and builds a historical framework of the situation which prompted Paul's writing 1 Corinthians. She suggests that the Corinthians had debates and discussions over how the "pre-Pauline baptism formula of Gal 3:28" (*There is neither Jew nor Greek, slave nor free, male nor female, for you are all one in Christ Jesus*) had a bearing on the Christian community in Corinth.[106] Fiorenza suggests that the "no longer male and female" in particular was the cause of much debate and discussion. The Corinthians wrote to various missionaries to seek their advice on this issue. Paul's response is 1 Corinthians.

The strength of Fiorenza's article is that she develops a critical rhetorical analysis methodology that moves beyond parallelomania or selective sampling. Added to this is a serious attempt to deal with the rhetoric *within* the text of 1 Corinthians and the rhetoric *of* 1 Corinthians. Fiorenza's suggestions that the Corinthians would not have viewed Paul as having apostolic authority or his correspondence as being canonical are insightful. Her rhetorical reconstruction of 1 Corinthians is plausible. Yet, her article is not without concerns. First, her main premise concerning the "pre-Pauline baptism formula of Gal 3:28" and especially "no longer male and female" as the

---

[102.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 393.

[103.] Wilhelm Wüllner, "Hermeneutics and Rhetorics: From 'Truth and Method' to 'Truth and Power'," *Scriptura* 3 (1989): 1–54.

[104.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 395.

[105.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 397.

[106.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 397–8.

principle cause of the debate and discussion among the Corinthians seems forced and unsubstantiated. The rhetorical situation pertaining to Gal 3:28 is too far removed from that of 1 Corinthians to be used without first validating its connection. This leads to a second concern. While 1 Corinthians is indeed Paul's reshaping and addressing the problems to fit his rhetorical strategy, and while 1 Corinthians would not have been perceived as canonical by the Corinthians, 1 Corinthians remains the principle source for reconstructing the situation in Corinth. Thus, reconstructions of the actual situation in Corinth should be *more* restrained by 1 Corinthians rather than *less* restrained.

1.2.13 Margaret MacDonald: Women Holy in Body and Spirit[107]

In this 1990 article Margaret MacDonald argues that one of the underlying issues that Paul addresses in 1 Corinthians is that of women and celibacy. She cites and uses as foundational to her argument the work of D. R. MacDonald[108] on Gal 3:26–28 and its possible connection with the Dominical Saying recorded in the Gospel of the Egyptians, "when you tread upon the garment of shame and when the two are one and the male with the female neither male nor female (Clement of Alexandria *Strom*. 3.13.92)."[109] Margaret MacDonald contends that the problems in 1 Cor 11:12-16

> involves the activity of pneumatic Corinthian women who, during ecstatic worship, believed that they had transcended sexual differences. These women symbolized their status by becoming like men; they removed their veils— symbols of their inferiority and subordination which characterized their day to day living.[110]

MacDonald also cites Richard Horsley's connection between celibacy and ecstatic experiences of worship in Paul's world as seen in Philo's description of the ascetic sect, the *Therapeutae*.[111] Weaving these elements together (The Dominical Saying, 1 Cor 11, and the *Therapeutae*), MacDonald suggests, "As they worshiped, women were inspired to symbolize their new status by removing their veils. When the ritual ended, the fact the male was with the female meant they should avoid sex altogether."[112] MacDonald then reads 1 Cor 7 from the view that the issue is not that of

---

[107.] Margaret MacDonald, "Women Holy in Body and Spirit: The Social Setting of 1 Corinthians 7," *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 161–81.

[108.] D. R. MacDonald, *There is no Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominican Saying in Paul and Gnosticism* (HDR 20; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 69–72.

[109.] MacDonald, "Body and Spirit," 165.

[110.] MacDonald, "Body and Spirit," 166.

[111.] MacDonald, "Body and Spirit," 168–9.

[112.] MacDonald, "Body and Spirit," 170.

dealing with immorality, but rather Christian women choosing celibacy as a way of life connected with their *realized eschatology*.[113] However, Paul "could not agree with these opponents that the old universe had already been replaced by a world purely spiritual in nature, nor that celibacy was vital to the spiritual perfection of the entire community."[114]

In the second part of the article, MacDonald examines Paul's response to this view of celibacy. She suggests that Paul's response was shaped by three concerns. First, some might fail in their celibacy and fall into immorality. "In light of their extremist tendencies, it is likely that Paul is worried that those who seek a celibate life, and who are not thus gifted, might be so anxious in their efforts that they will become distracted from their devotion to the Lord and might even fall prey to immorality."[115] Second, MacDonald suggests that Paul may also be concerned about the impression the Corinthians' style of ecstatic worship would have upon unbelievers and the church's evangelistic mission "to embrace the whole world."[116] Third, Paul may also have been anxious about how the community's sexual/marriage practices would have been perceived in Corinthian society. "The ascetic efforts of the Corinthian community members took place in a society where the question of whether or not to marry was one which raised considerable controversy."[117] In light of this, MacDonald reminds us of the political importance of family and children to the Romans.

In her conclusion, MacDonald suggests that Paul is addressing the issue of celibacy and how it affects those within the congregation and how it would be perceived outside the congregation. She suggests that over time, this tension lead to the "gradual trend in the early centuries of the church to squeeze women out of leadership roles and to define more clearly their position in the patriarchal household."[118]

MacDonald's essay might be described as a *gender-sensitive* social historical reading. While gender-sensitive readings have opened up viable new readings of 1 Corinthians, one sometimes wonders whether the gender-sensitive reading proposed by MacDonald reflects the actual practices of first century Corinth or whether they represent latter twentieth century and early twenty first century academia. MacDonald's

---

[113.] MacDonald, "Body and Spirit," 173.
[114.] MacDonald, "Body and Spirit," 173.
[115.] MacDonald, "Body and Spirit," 174.
[116.] MacDonald, "Body and Spirit," 175–6.
[117.] MacDonald, "Body and Spirit," 176.
[118.] MacDonald, "Body and Spirit," 181.

social insights regarding both the Roman praise of marriage and suspicion of celibacy, as well as to how *outsiders* would have viewed the ecstatic worship of the women, are worth remembering. However, her inclusion of Gal 3:38 along with the Dominical Saying, appear to be tenuous due to the fact that she assumes a connection rather than demonstrating a connection between Gal 3:38 and 1 Corinthians.

In contrast to many who seem to regard Paul as a misogynist, MacDonald refrains from this caricature. Instead, she presents Paul as being sensitive to the situation and offering a solution which attempts a sensitive balance. MacDonald writes "the Deutero-Pauline writings and writings of the Apostolic fathers are far more determined to communicate the importance of a believing wife's subjection to her husband in the household than are Paul's writings."[119]

1.2.14 Michael Goulder: Σοφία in 1 Corinthians[120]

In 1991 Michael Goulder resurrected the ghost of F. C. Baur and the thesis that the core problem in Corinth, and much of the New Testament, was that of two conflicting Christianities, namely Pauline Christianity and Petrine Christianity. In fact, much of Goulder's work may be described as shoring up the weaknesses in Baur's work and addressing various critiques against Baur. Werner Kümmel criticized Baur for his Hegelianism, and Wilhelm Lütgert criticized Baur's view on the basis that the Corinthian letters show no interest in the questions raised by the Judaizers in Galatians and Romans.[121] Goulder also admits that there are problems with certain aspects of Baur's thesis, "Baur thought that σοφία was Greek wisdom and the Resurrection doctrine was Greek, and he gave a quite unsatisfying explanation of χριστοῦ."[122] Goulder addresses these issues as he develops an argument that moves from Greek gnosticism to Jewish wisdom. Goulder's main argument is that σοφία should be seen as a reference to Torah.[123]

[119.] MacDonald, "Body and Spirit," 181.

[120.] Michael D. Goulder, "Σοφία in 1 Corinthians," *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 516–34.

[121.] Goulder, "Σοφία in 1 Corinthians," 6.

[122.] Goulder, "Σοφία in 1 Corinthians," 527.

[123.] "Judaism sounded more attractive in Greek ears when presented as a σοφία a wise way of life, based on revealed truth about God, honourable and leading to honour, rather than as νόμος, a set of divine rules with severe penalties attached. My proposal is that σοφία carries this meaning in 1 Cor 1–3, a way of life in accord with *torah*." Goulder, "Σοφία in 1 Corinthians," 521.

Goulder's reconstruction of the situation in Corinth may be summarized as follows. There were Jews in the Corinthian church, who, along with like-minded Gentiles, following a visit by Peter, or one of his disciples, formed a Petrine faction in Corinth. These Corinthian Petrine Christians invoked rulings on *halakha* from Scripture and from angelic visions; they perceived the kingdom of God as a present reality and they appealed to the authority of Peter, which is described by Paul as *boasting in*. They also developed an ascetic view of sexual relations. Their view of the present kingdom of God lead them to deny any future resurrection.[124]

Goulder followed this article with two books on the same theme. The first, *St. Paul verses St. Peter: A Tale of Two Missions*, is a general overview analysis of the "Two Mission" theory.[125] This work moved beyond the Corinthian correspondence to other New Testament texts perceived by Goulder to support the Two Mission theory. In his second book, *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth*, Goulder returns to the Corinthian correspondence with much more depth of analysis and detailed refutation of both Baur's and his own critics.[126]

No doubt there were some conflicting missions in the early church. The situation outlined in Acts 15 clearly addresses conflict resulting from Jewish and Gentile missions. The conflict in the Galatian and Roman churches also appear to have more than a little connection with Jewish-Gentile issues. Goulder sees the Two Mission theory as the *master-key* to open every lock. This underlying premise of Goulder, that a single theory or a set of circumstances can explain all New Testament texts is, at the least, optimistic.

John Barclay's article on Corinth and Thessalonica points out that while these two churches have the same founder, Paul, they are in the same general geographical area, and they are close in time. Yet, there are fundamental differences between the churches. Barclay's article warns of the danger of making assumptions of similarities about the Pauline churches and "not to subscribe to the false assumption that all Paul's churches were of the same stamp."[127]

---

[124] Goulder, "Σοφία in 1 Corinthians," 533–4.

[125] Michael D. Goulder, *St. Paul and St. Peter: A Tale of Two Missions* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994).

[126] Goulder, *Competing Mission*.

[127] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 73.

1.2.15 John Barclay: Thessalonica and Corinth . . . .[128]

In 1992, John Barclay wrote an article comparing Paul's epistles to the churches in Thessalonica and Corinth. He points out that there are striking differences between the churches in Thessalonica and Corinth, yet they have some things in common. Both of these churches were established by Paul on his first mission trip to Greece, Acts 16–18. Paul wrote to the Thessalonians while he was engaged in his mission work in Corinth. Thus, the churches in Thessalonica and Corinth are close in time, geographical region, and they have the same founder.

Barclay suggests three core ideas concerning Paul's letters to the Thessalonians. First, "the tone of 1 Thessalonians is that of positive reinforcement, not rebuke or correction."[129] Second, the church was apocalyptic in perspective. Third, "If the symbolic world of the Thessalonian church is decidedly apocalyptic, its social context is dominated by conflict."[130] Barclay continues by suggesting that the cause of the Thessalonians' harassment can be connected to "the offensive abandonment by the Thessalonians of traditional religious practices as they turned from 'idols' to 'the true and living god.'"[131] Paul encouraged the Thessalonians to think of all non-believers as outsiders and these outsiders are described in derogatory terms. "Thus, on the one hand, the Thessalonians' apocalyptic perspective will encourage them to embrace social alienation as normal."[132] "On the other hand, every experience of conflict serves to validate the apocalyptic symbols which the Thessalonian Christians have adopted and to give such symbols vivid and visible meaning. Here, then, apocalyptic symbols and social dislocation maintain and reinforce each other."[133] As Barclay's essay is a contrast between Thessalonica and Corinth, he reminds us in his Thessalonica summation, "In this case we know nothing about the social status of the Thessalonians."[134]

While we know nothing of the social status of the church in Thessalonica, we do know that a lot of their conflict was with outsiders. The reverse may be said of the church in Corinth. Concerning conflict with outsiders in Corinth Barclay notes, "one of the most significant, but least noticed features of the Corinthian church life is the

---

128. John M. G. Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 47 (1992): 57–72.

129. Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 51.

130. Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 52.

131. Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 53.

132. Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 54.

133. Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 55.

134. Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 56.

absence of conflict in the relationship between Christians and 'outsiders.'"[135] "Clearly, whatever individual exceptions there may be, Paul does not regard social alienation as the characteristic state of the Corinthian church."[136] In fact, it would appear that the Corinthians enjoyed both social acceptability and integration. "As Theissen has shown, these people must be not only of some social status, but also sufficiently integrated into Corinthian society to be strongly disciplined to raise any objections on the grounds of religious scruple."[137] Barclay suggests that the Corinthians also had a different view of Christian faith than that of Paul and the Thessalonians. This, according to Barclay, is tied to their non-apocalyptic view which some have termed "realized" or "over-realized" eschatology. "But the Corinthians apparently see nothing pitiable about the present, because their non-apocalyptic perspective anticipates no radical disjunctions in the future."[138]

Barclay also suggests that there is a fundamental difference between Paul and the Corinthians in the way they viewed the church.

> Paul still paints the starkest contrast between the church and the world…. The Corinthians, however, seem to understand the social standing of the Church quite differently. Paul's vision is of a church community, where members are open to the world but nonetheless forever conscious of the difference between "insiders" and "outsiders," and where the intense relationship among members of the family make belonging to the church the core of their existence.[139]

Barclay considers the causes of factors which influenced the Corinthians' interpretation of faith. He acknowledges that, "the social status of the dominant minority in the Corinthian church is certainly a factor of some significance."[140] He suggests that it was the Corinthians' particular theology which lead to their social acceptability and continued integration. "In the first place, the Corinthian focus on knowledge and possession of the Spirit creates a distinction from the mass or ordinary people, but a *distinction without a sense of hostility*."[141] "Second, Corinthian theology correlates well with the practice of *differentiation without exclusivity*."[142] "Finally, their religious ethos permits *involvement in the church which does not entail significant*

[135.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 57.
[136.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 58–9.
[137.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 58.
[138.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 65.
[139.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 60.
[140.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 68.
[141.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 69.
[142.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 70.

social and moral realignment."[143] Thus, "their perception of their church and of the significance of their faith could correlate well with a life-style which remained fully integrated in Corinthian society."[144]

Barclay ends his article with two concluding statements that are worth repeating. First, "This study of the divergent development of these two Pauline churches has shown how misleading it is to generalize about 'Pauline Churches.'"[145] Second, "After a period of intense study of the social status of Paul's converts, it is high time to explore further the question of social interaction—and to take care in so doing not to subscribe to the false assumption that all Paul's churches were of the same stamp."[146]

Barclay's essay is important for three reasons. First, it focuses on the social relations between Christians and non-Christians and how these relations are tied to the congregation's view of itself. Second, it demonstrates the need to avoid generalizing about the "Pauline churches" or assuming that Corinth was a "typical" example. Third, Barclay demonstrates the vital need to first read each of Paul's letters in their own socio-rhetorical setting before they are inserted and/or applied to a different socio-rhetorical setting.

1.2.16 John Chow: Patronage and Power[147]

In his dissertation, published in 1992, John Chow examines how the patronage structure of Rome and the Empire may have shaped the Corinthian congregation. This dissertation follows the trend of examining the Corinthian correspondence from a socio-historical perspective. Chow takes Theissen's claims a step further and argues that powerful patrons in Corinth were also patrons in and of the church.

In chapter 1, Chow examines the evidence of patronage in Corinthian society in general. In chapter 2, Chow moves from the general to the specific as he examines the personal and patronal relationships in the Corinthian church. In chapter 3, Chow offers a reconstruction of Paul's opponents as consisting of four patrons. The powerful patron, the rich patron, the political patron, and the priestly patron. In the final chapter Chow examines Paul's response to the practices of these four patrons. Chow connects the

---

[143.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 70.
[144.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 71.
[145.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 72.
[146.] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 73.
[147.] John K. Chow, *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth* (JSNTSup; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).

powerful patron with 1 Cor 6:1–11 and the abuse of the law courts. "With regard to the structure of the legal system in the early Empire, it has been successfully shown that it tended to serve the interest of the governing elite."[148]

Chow suggests that the unnamed "immoral man" of 1 Cor 5:1–13 was a wealthy patron, who married his step mother after the death of his father so as to keep the family fortune intact. "In Paul's day, material interests, which might include money and power, rather than sex and affection, seem to have a bigger role to play in the establishments of a marital relationship."[149] Chow bolsters his argument for the immoral man being a rich and powerful patron with two observations. First, this would explain why this man was not prosecuted for his illegal actions.[150] Second, the congregation's being "puffed up" may have more to do with the patron's wealth and power than his incest. Their pride in having such a rich and powerful patron may have been the reason they failed to deal with his incest. Who would want to dishonor a powerful patron who could provide protection and benefaction to the church?[151]

Chow turns his attention to the political patron as he examines the passages generally relating to εἰδωλόθυτος (*something offered to a cultic image/idol*)[152] in 1 Cor 8–10 and specifically εἰδωλολάτρης (*image-worship, idolatry*)[153] in 10:1–22 and Chow examines why leading members of the church were involved with the "pagan cultic meals." Chow suggests two reasons as to why the rich and powerful patrons of the Corinthian church might have continued to participate in another cult's sacrifices and meals. First, based on the socio-political function of eating, it has been suggested that the Corinthians ate with pagan friends because they wanted to have fun and did not want to give up their former friends.[154] Second, Chow suggests that the ambitious patrons may have participated and even lead imperial feasts as a way to ingratiate themselves to both the prominent people of Corinth.[155]

[148.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 128.

[149.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 137.

[150.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 140.

[151.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 140.

[152.] "εἰδωλόθυτος" BAGD 280.

[153.] "εἰδωλολάτρης" BAGD 280.

[154.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 146–7.

[155.] "In Corinth, a Roman colony, it would seem especially important to express one's loyalty to the Roman masters by organizing or participating in activities such as the imperial cult. To put it another way, for these ambitious people, the eating in imperial feasts certainly would not commend them to God, but it would commend them to the powerful elites in Corinth." Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 156.

Chow connects the enigmatic phrase of 1 Cor 15:29 (*Otherwise, what will those people do who receive baptism on behalf of the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why are people baptized on their behalf?*) to the priestly patron. Chow makes this connection based on three elements. First, the religious rites and their practices by the idolaters who claimed to have knowledge (1 Cor 8:1, 4). Second, the possible similarity of those who put their trust in religious sacraments (1 Cor 10:1–22). Third, Paul's use of τινες in 15:34, τινα in 5:1 and τις in 6:1. "As argued in our previous discussion, the immoral man, the plaintiff and the idolaters were plausibly the powerful people in the church. If so, there are reasons to believe that those who were among the deniers of the resurrection and who underwent baptism, presumably to secure benefits for the dead, could possibly be the powerful few in the Church (1 Cor 1.26)."[156] Chow's reconstruction of the first three patrons seems plausible. However, the reconstruction of the priestly patron in 1 Cor 15 seems implausible. Chow takes the indefinite τις and attempts to make it definite. Also, the context of 1 Cor 8 and 10 seems too far removed from 1 Cor 15 to make the close connection Chow attempts to make.

In concluding, Chow argues that, "Paul certainly sought to assert his authority in the Church."[157] However, Chow differs from Fiorenza, who suggests that, "Paul's authority was used in an oppressive way."[158] Chow argues that, "Paul's authority was used to challenge the strong for their lack of care for others."[159]

1.2.17 Justin Meggitt: The Social Status of Erastus[160]

In a 1996 article, Justin Meggitt challenges the view that the Erastus mentioned by Paul in Rom 16:23 was also a leading figure of the urban elite of Corinth. Connecting the Erastus of Rom 16:23 with the elite of Corinth has been used as one of the chief pieces of evidence in support of the "new consensus."[161] Typically there are two reasons for suggesting Erastus was part of the urban elite. The first is the descriptive phrase Paul uses of Erastus in Rom 16:23, Ἔραστυς ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως (*the city treasurer*).

[156.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 163.
[157.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 187.
[158.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 397.
[159.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 187.
[160.] Justin J. Meggitt, "The Social Status of Erastus (Rom. 16:23)," *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996): 218–23.
[161.] The *New Consensus* suggests that Christianity was characterized by a broad social and geographical dispersion. It was first coined by Malherbe. Abraham J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977), 31.

The second is the well known and often cited Corinthian inscription discovered by the archaeologist J. H. Kent in 1929 of an *aedilis* named Erastus who paid for part of the paving of Corinth's marketplace.[162]

Meggitt's challenge to the Erastus connection is done in four stages. First, he suggests that the dating of the inscription is more problematic than has often been presumed.[163] Second, he notes that while the term ὁ οἰκονόμος τῆς πόλεως may have been used of a "powerful civic functionary," there are also various examples of the phrase being used of people who "held much more menial roles and possessed far less socio-economic standings."[164] Third, Meggitt argues that the name Erastus was a "relatively common name."[165] Fourth, he notes that part of the inscription is broken and may have originally borne the name *Eperastus*.[166] Meggitt continues his challenge to the new consensus in his book, *Paul, Poverty and Survival*.[167]

Overall, Meggitt's challenge to the new consensus appears to have made little impact. Robert Jewett, in his recent commentary on Romans, discusses the Erastus inscription and he notes Meggitt's challenges to the date. However, Jewett concludes, "both the inscription and Rom 16:23 refer to his civil office in roughly identical terms and enhance the likelihood that the same person was in view."[168]

1.2.18 Richard Horsley: Paul's Assembly as an Alternative Society[169]

In this 1997 article Richard Horsley examines 1 Corinthians from a socio-political perspective. He suggests that patronage is not only a social phenomenon, but also a religious political phenomenon. Horsley also suggests that Christianity was not only a religious movement but it was also a religious political movement. "In that context, then, we can perceive how at several points in 1 Corinthians, Paul articulates ways in which the assembly of saints is to constitute a community of a new society alternative to the dominant imperial society."[170]

[162.] John H. Kent, *Corinth 8.3 The Inscriptions 1926–1950* (Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1966), 99–100.

[163.] Meggitt, "Erastus," 221.

[164.] Meggitt, "Erastus," 221.

[165.] Meggitt, "Erastus," 221–2.

[166.] Meggitt, "Erastus," 222–3.

[167.] Justin J. Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty and Survival* (Studies of the New Testament and Its World; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000).

[168.] Robert Jewett, *Romans* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007), 982.

[169.] Horsley, "A Case Study," 242–52.

[170.] Horsley, "A Case Study," 244.

Horsley presents five arguments in support of his thesis. First, Horsley argues that the smaller household-based communities are not the structure of a religious cult but "a nascent social movement composed of a network of cells based in Corinth but spreading more widely into the province of Achaia."[171] Second, these household assemblies were autonomous in nature as a means to isolate them from the imperial Roman world. Their autonomy was a means to enable them to "(a) maintain ethical purity and group discipline in stark opposition to the injustice of the dominant society, but also (b) it should handle its own disputes in absolute independence of the established courts."[172] This autonomy is seen by Horsley to have some bearing on the situation in 1 Cor 6:1–11 and the discussion of the use and abuse of the Corinthian law courts. "The law and the courts in the Roman empire were instruments of social control, a vested interest of the wealthy and powerful elite which operated for their advantage over that of those of lesser status."[173]

Third, Paul's instructions concerning eating food sacrificed to idols would have isolated them from the "fundamental forms of social relations in the dominant society."[174] However, Horsley notes that "religions in the ancient Roman world did not consist of personal belief and was often inseparable from political, economic and other social forms."[175] Fourth, Horsley suggests that Paul argues that the Corinthian Christian assemblies should "embody economic relations dramatically different from those in Roman imperial society."[176] This is seen in Paul's instructions concerning the use of the law courts and Paul's refusal of Corinthian patronage.

Fifth, Horsley sees in Paul's instruction concerning the collection further evidence of the Corinthian assemblies being an alternative society to Roman imperial society. "Paul's instructions concerning the collection indicate that the network of assemblies had an 'international' political-economic dimension of assemblies diametrically opposed to the tributary political economy of the empire."[177]

Horsley's work, and the work of the *Paul and Politics group*, is important in that both suggest the close relationship between religion and politics. It also points out the biases we may have, such as the ingrained view of separation of church and

---

[171.] Horsley, "A Case Study," 245.
[172.] Horsley, "A Case Study," 246.
[173.] Horsley, "A Case Study," 246.
[174.] Horsley, "A Case Study," 247.
[175.] Horsley, "A Case Study," 247.
[176.] Horsley, "A Case Study," 249.
[177.] Horsley, "A Case Study," 251.

state/politics, which may impede our reading of 1 Corinthians. This connection is examined in more detail by the Paul and Politics group.[178]

1.2.19 Conclusion

The work of Edwin Judge published in 1960[179] has not only challenged the view of Adolf Deissmann and lead to the new consensus concerning the social stratification of the early church, but it may also be described as the forerunner of new approaches of examining the New Testament. These would include the ground breaking work of Gerd Theissen on the social stratification in the Corinthian congregation. Abraham J. Malherbe and Wayne A. Meeks developed Theissen's approach into a deeper and more detailed awareness of social and status differences in ancient Greco-Roman society and the Christian churches. More recently the works of John Chow, Andrew Clark, and Bruce Winter have focused on the social stratification within the Corinthian congregation and especially how the patron-client relationship and patronal networks of the surrounding society shaped the relationships within the Corinthian congregation.

The 1969 work of James Muilenburg may be viewed as the pivotal event which introduced (or reintroduced) rhetorical criticism as a distinct approach to reading Scripture.[180] In 1984 George Kennedy outlined a methodology to examine the New Testament texts through the principles of classical rhetoric. Kennedy's method may be described as a foundation for rhetorical criticism to build upon. However, rhetorical criticism has now moved beyond Kennedy's method and while "rhetoric" can be found in various approaches the term has become somewhat amorphous. For example the work of Duane Watson[181] stays close to the conventions of classical rhetoric while Horsley and Welborn move beyond these conventions and engage in socio-political rhetorical analysis. More recently there have been various attempts to formulate a socio-rhetorical approach that engages aspects of either the social-scientific criticism or

---

[178.] Richard A. Horsley, ed., *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000).

[179.] E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century: Some Prolegomena to the Study of New Testament Ideas of Social Obligation* (London: Tyndale, 1960).

[180.] James Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 1–18.

[181.] Duane F. Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter* (SBLDS 104; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988).

the social history to rhetorical criticism. Examples of social-rhetorical approaches can be seen in the work of Vernon Robbins[182] and Ben Witherington.[183]

Thus, it may be stated, the general trend of scholarly investigation into the Corinthian correspondence from Baur to the present has been from a *history of religions*, to *Gnosticism* (both Hellenistic and Jewish), and since the early 1970s, the focus has been predominantly focused on the *socio-historical* framework of the Corinthian correspondence.

1.3   Rationale For The Study

The recent works of scholars such as Clarke, Chow, Saller, Horsley, Malina, deSilva, Winter, and Witherington, to name but a few, have demonstrated the pervasive presence of patronal networks within the Roman Empire. These scholars have also shown that closely connected to the patron networks were the social values of honor and shame. Chow has demonstrated the dominant role of patronage within Corinth and Clarke has successfully shown the first six chapters of 1 Corinthians displays evidence of secular leadership within the congregation. This study will continue in the vein of Chow and Clarke's works on patronage in Corinth, but it will focus more specifically on the role of the social values of honor and shame in Paul's rhetoric as he addresses the patronal abuses within the congregation. This study will be a detailed and close reading of 1 Cor 1–2:5 and 3:1–6:20.

Bruce Malina argues that honor and shame are pivotal values of the first century world.[184] First Corinthians has more than its share of honor and shame references. In addressing the complex and somewhat enigmatic issue of "head coverings" in 1 Cor 11 Paul shapes much of his argument with honor and shame language. In vv. 5–6 Paul states, *Any man who prays or prophesies with something on his head disgraces* (καταισχύνω) *his head, but any woman who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled disgraces* (καταισχύνω) *her head.* In vv. 14–15 Paul concludes his discussion on the matter with honor and shame language. *Does not nature itself teach you that if a man*

---

182. Vernon K. Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide of Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation* (Harrisburg: Trinity, 1996).

183. Ben Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995).

184. Bruce J. Malina, *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 27–57.

wears long hair, it is degrading (ἀτιμία) *to him, but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory* (δόξα)?[185]

In 1 Cor 12 Paul addresses the use and abuse of spiritual gifts and in vv. 22–24 he employs honor and shame language,

> On the contrary, the members of the body that seem to be weaker are indispensable, and those members of the body that we think less honorable (ἄτιμος) we clothe with greater honor (τιμή), and our less respectable (ἀσχήμονα) members are treated with greater respect (εὐσχημοσύνη); whereas our more respectable (εὐσχήμων) members do not need this. But God has so arranged the body, giving the greater honor (τιμή) to the inferior (ὑστερέω) member.

Paul also employs a rhetoric of honor and shame in 1 Corinthians without using specific words of honor and shame. An example of Paul's rhetoric of honor that does not use words of honor would include his concluding statement on the issue of the abusive use of the courts in 1 Cor 6:11, *But you were washed, you were sanctified, you were justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God*. Paul outlines three areas in which the Corinthians have been honored by Jesus. An example of Paul's rhetoric of shame that does not use words of shame would be Paul's concluding imperative in 5:13, "*Drive out the wicked person from among you*."[186] Thus, it would appear that honor and shame are indeed integral parts of Paul's rhetoric in 1 Corinthians.

Since the late 1960s rhetorical criticism has been reintroduced and has gained much popularity as a form of biblical criticism. In recent years much work has been done in analyzing ancient rhetorical theory and its relationship to and influence upon the New Testament. For example, George Kennedy argues that 2 Cor 10–13 is judicial rhetoric.[187] John Fitzgerald argues that 2 Cor 10–13 is deliberative rhetoric.[188] However, Brian Peterson argues, "It is clear that 2 Cor 10–13 cannot simply and exclusively be identified with any one species of rhetoric."[189]

[185.] Unless otherwise noted quotes from Scripture will be from the NRSV.

[186.] The shaming of the incestuous man will be addressed in much greater detail in chapter 4.

[187.] George A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984), 93.

[188.] John T. Fitzgerald, "Paul, the Ancient Epistolary Theorists, and 2 Corinthians 10–13: The Purpose and Literary Genre of a Pauline Letter," in *Greek, Romans and Christians* (ed. David L. Balch, et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 193–94.

[189.] Brian K. Peterson, *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth* (SBLDS 163; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998), 143.

These examples highlight both the positive use and the shortcomings of using ancient rhetorical theory as a comparative template in examining the Corinthian epistles. No doubt, familiarity with ancient rhetorical theory is a tremendous help in gaining an understanding of the literary and rhetorical background of the Corinthian correspondence. However, there appears to be a tendency among some to mechanically force the Corinthian epistles into a rigid mold of one of the three species of ancient rhetorical theory.[190] While there is much debate as to which species of rhetoric Paul employs in 1 Corinthians, there is consensus that all rhetoric is an attempt to persuade. This work will examine how Paul uses a rhetoric of honor and shame to address the various issues in 1 Cor 1–6 and to persuade the Corinthians to follow his instructions.

1.4 The Socio-Rhetorical Framework of 1 Corinthians 1–6

1.4.1 Rhetoric

In Paul's first letter to the church in Corinth he claims in 2:1, *When I came to you, brothers and sisters, I did not come proclaiming the mystery of God to you in lofty words or wisdom.* Also, in 2:4 he states, *My speech and my proclamation were not with plausible words of wisdom.* These statements pertaining to Paul's use of *lofty words and wisdom* have proved the topic of much discussion on Paul's use of rhetoric. Some have argued that Paul has rejected rhetoric, while others argue that Paul's statements are in themselves rhetoric.[191] Rhetoric has an interesting and rich history. In this chapter the beginnings of rhetoric will be discussed as well as its dominant presence in the first century. This will be followed by a discussion on the fall and rise of rhetoric in biblical studies, and the various new methods of rhetoric criticism. Connected to this will be a discussion on Paul's education and his knowledge and use of rhetoric.

Rhetoric does not occur in a vacuum. While rhetoric may be a universal feature of expression, composition, and communication, each society has its own cultural nuances that shapes its own particular rhetoric.[192] In the Mediterranean world of the first century there are two interrelated cultural aspects that will be examined. The first is

---

[190.] For an examination of Paul's use of Ancient Rhetorical theory, see R. Dean Jr. Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul* (rev. ed.; Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 1999).

[191.] Garland points out that a few scholars have dealt with the irony of Paul using rhetoric to undermine rhetoric. David E. Garland, *1 Corinthians* (Baker Exegetical Commentary; Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003), 58.

[192.] George A. Kennedy, *Comparative Rhetoric* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998).

that of the patron-client relationship. Paul's statement in 1 Cor 1:26, *Consider your own call, brothers and sisters: not many of you were wise by human standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth*, may be an indication that within the Corinthian congregation there existed a small but powerful group that were part of the Corinthian aristocracy. The patron-client relationship will be examined first in its Roman framework, then from its presence in Roman Corinth, and finally from its presence within the Corinthian congregation.

The second cultural aspect to be examined is that of the function of honor and shame. Honor and shame are considered by some to be core values of the Mediterranean world.[193] Honor and shame will be examined from its wider cultural perspectives and from its use in both the Old and the New Testaments. Honor and shame will also be examined in connection with the patron-client relationship. Paul ends 1 Cor 6, his discussion on sexual purity, with a double reference to honor, v. 20 *For you were bought with a price* (τιμή); *therefore glorify* (δοξάζω) *God in your body*.

The role of rhetoric, the patron-client relationship, and honor and shame will be examined from their general framework in this chapter. They will form a central part of the approach that will be used to examine 1 Cor 1–6 and Paul's rhetoric of honor and shame.

1.4.1.1 Rhetoric: Beginnings

Rhetoric, and its cognates in other languages, is derived from the Greek word ῥήτορικη, the art or technique of a ῥήτωρ, or public speaker. The word first appears in Plato's dialog *Gorgias*,[194] written in the second decade of the fourth century B.C.E..[195] While Plato provides us with the first use of the word, the concept, indeed the practice, is found much earlier than the fourth century B.C.E.. Even though the Homeric poems are set in Greek society before the introduction of writing, they contain elements of rhetoric. The tension and the verbal contests between Agamemnon and Achilles form a major theme of the *Iliad*. "Menelaus is described as speaking rapidly, clearly, and simply, while Odysseus bursts out in a veritable storm of oratory (*Il.* 3.212–4). Nestor is

---

[193.] Malina, *The New Testament World*, 27–57.

[194.] For an examination of Gorgias and Plato's role in rhetoric, see Robert Wardy, *The Birth of Rhetoric: Gorgias, Plato and Their Successors* (Issues in Ancient Philosophy; London: Routledge, 1998).

[195.] George A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999), 1.

garrulous, but his words are compared to honey" (*Il.* 1.247–52).[196] Concerning this aspect of the Homeric works, Lawson-Tancred observes, "It is, in fact, a noteworthy feature of the poem how relatively Homer, in writing an heroic epic, finds it necessary to concentrate on the actual course of the fighting. Scenes of physical violence are interspersed with episodes of human or divine persuasion."[197]

While the Homeric epics offer many insights into the early use of rhetoric in fiction, the birth of democracy gave rise to the creation of the first classical handbooks on public speaking. According to reports based on a lost work of Aristotle, Greeks in Sicily devised persuasive ways to defend themselves in legal disputes. Sicily adopted the Athenian democracy in 467 B.C.E.. It appears a gifted Sicilian, Tisias or Corax,[198] taught simple techniques, for a fee, for persuasive presentation and argumentation. These simple techniques were written down and made their way to Athens.

In Athens, any male citizen over the age of twenty-one could address the political assembly. In the law courts men involved in the proceedings, as either prosecutors or defendants, were normally expected to speak on their own behalf. Thus, rhetorical skill was vital to one's social position and even protection. Perhaps the best example of how rhetorical skill was vital in Athens can be seen in the life of Pericles. Pericles may well be described as being the most influential person in Athens in the fifth century B.C.E.. The years from 446 to 429 have been called the Periclean Age.[199] If Thucydides' accounts of Pericles' speeches can be trusted, Pericles had a genius for playing to the self-esteem of the ordinary Athenians and presented himself as the ideal *strategos* (*general*). So much so that Pericles was re-elected to the position for fifteen years in succession.[200]

The formation of the Delian League brought new wealth to Athens.[201] It paid for

---

[196.] Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 5–7.

[197.] Hugh Lawson-Tancred, "Introduction," in *The Art of Rhetoric* (London: Penguin, 1991), 2.

[198.] Thomas Cole, "Who Was Corax?" *Illinois Classical Studies* 16 (1991): 65–84.

[199.] Everett Ferguson, *Backgrounds of Early Christianity* (3rd ed.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 8.

[200.] Charles Freeman, *Egypt, Greece and Rome: Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004), 251.

[201.] The Athenian League was a confederacy of ancient Greek states led by Athens and based on the island of Delos. It was founded in 478 B.C.E. to combat Persia, its members included Aegean states and islands; Athens supplied commanders and assessed tributes of ships or money. It achieved a major victory in 467 – 466 when its fleet drove out Persian garrisons on the southern Anatolian coast. After 454 its leaders moved the treasury to Athens for safekeeping, used it to rebuild the city's temples, and treated the league as the Athenian empire.

the new temples on the Acropolis and it also was instrumental in the formation of the new middle-class of merchants and artisans. The merchants and artisans obtained their wealth from building and sustaining the Athenian fleet, and from the construction boom. This *nouveau riche*, eager to have the doors of influence opened to their sons, had both the means and the desire to hire instructors to teach their sons the art of rhetoric.[202] These factors help explain why Athens became the center of rhetoric.

In the highly creative period of the sixth, fifth, and fourth centuries B.C.E. Greek thinking sought to examine the nature of rhetoric. Kennedy suggests this examination resulted in three broad approaches to rhetoric, which may be termed *technical* rhetoric, *sophistic* rhetoric, and *philosophical* rhetoric. Technical rhetoric is closely connected with the rhetorical handbooks and has its genesis in the Greek democracies of Syracuse and Athens. Technical rhetoric was primarily concerned with public address. Aristotle identified three aspects of the speech situation: speaker, speech, and audience (*Rhet.* 1.3.1). Technical rhetoric focuses primarily on the speech rather than the speaker or the audience. Kennedy suggests that technical rhetoric is the "art of persuasion." He also goes on to suggest that "Technical rhetoric of the fifth and fourth centuries in Greece is the ancestor of Latin manuals of rhetoric, including Cicero's *On Invention* and *Rhetoric for Herennius*."[203]

Sophistic rhetoric emphasizes the speaker rather than the speech or the audience. The sophist Gorgias was one of its earliest practitioners, as was Isocrates, who carried this strand of rhetoric to its full development. This sophist rhetoric was revived by the Romans in the period known as the Second Sophistic.[204] Some aspects of sophistic rhetoric would include presenting the speaker as a model orator who leads the people towards the fulfillment of societal ideals. It may include elements of deliberative and epideictic rhetoric, and it was commonly used in ceremonial settings.[205] Pericles' funeral speech is an example of sophistic rhetoric, and it is also often referred to as the Funeral Oration.[206]

Most league members sided with Athens in the Peloponnesian War, which diverted the league from its Persian campaign. After defeating Athens in battle in 405, Sparta disbanded the league in 404.

[202.] Freeman, *Egypt, Greece and Rome*, 247–69.

[203.] Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 13–14.

[204.] "By the second century AD rhetoric reappears in Greece as part of the revival by Greeks of their traditional cultural skills, but with the specific aim of representing cities before the emperor in the hope of gaining his patronage." Freeman, *Egypt, Greece and Rome*, 296.

[205.] Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 14.

[206.] Freeman, *Egypt, Greece and Rome*, 267–8.

Philosophical rhetoric emphasizes the validity of the message and the effect on the audience. Kennedy argues that philosophical rhetoric began with Socrates' objection to technical and sophistic rhetoric, and it may be seen in Plato's dialogues. Philosophical rhetoric has strong elements of logic, ethics, and political theory. Since it emphasizes the validity of the message to the audience, its species was deliberative. However, while Kennedy points out these three strands of rhetoric, he also notes that these strands overlapped in application, "Aristotle's *Rhetoric* is a classic work in the philosophic rhetoric, but it also contains much technical rhetoric. Cicero's dialogue *On the Orator* attempts a synthesis of all three traditions."[207]

Pogoloff does not discuss the role of technical rhetoric. Instead he suggests that the contest was primarily between the philosophical rhetoric of Plato and the sophistic rhetoric of Isocrates. In this battle, which Pogoloff describes as the battle for education and culture, Plato and philosophical rhetoric were defeated, Isocrates and sophistic rhetoric are the victors.[208] Yet, Pogoloff agrees with Kennedy that Isocrates' sophistic rhetoric included technical and philosophical rhetoric and that Isocrates' rhetoric spread throughout the Hellenistic world and Rome.

Isocrates brought together and developed the various strands of Hellenistic rhetoric (technical, sophistic, and philosophical) in his educational system. Successors to Isocrates' school flourished and became the basis of most education of the Hellenistic world and eventually of Rome as well. This widespread dominance of rhetoric in Hellenistic *paideia* (in both senses of education and culture) means that we can reconstruct that culture with a certain degree of confidence.[209]

There is also an overlap between the three strands of rhetoric and the three species of rhetoric. Greco-Roman rhetoric consisted of three species: judicial, epideictic, and deliberative. Judicial rhetoric was the rhetoric of the law courts, "in which the orators (a defender and an accuser) would attempt to affix blame or establish innocence concerning some action that had happened in the past."[210] Epideictic was the rhetoric of funerals which "praised the virtuous and censured the vicious."[211] Epideictic rhetoric's "time reference is in the present since persons and things are praised and

---

[207.] Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric*, 15.

[208.] Stephen M. Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians* (SBLDS 134; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992), 50.

[209.] Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 41–42.

[210.] David A. deSilva, *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews"* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 41.

[211.] deSilva, *Hebrews*, 41.

blamed for things they are doing."[212] Deliberative rhetoric was the rhetoric of the political assembly, and was used in the formulation and presentation of "speeches used to promote or dissuade a certain course of action."[213] Deliberative rhetoric's time reference is future since advice is generally given on future things.[214]

From the Greeks rhetoric passed to the Romans.[215] Republican Rome in the first century B.C.E., much like fifth century Athens, was an ideal city for rhetoric to gain a foothold. "Once again there was an electorate to be swayed, or in the law courts, a jury to be convinced."[216] Cicero was the master of Roman Republic rhetoric.[217] His mastery of rhetoric is evidenced in the fact that he was the first man to achieve political office because of his skills as an orator rather than a soldier. The fact that Cicero achieved the highest level of political office is further evidence of his rhetoric ability (he was elected Consul in 63 B.C.E.). Cicero wrote a history of rhetoric and made his own major contributions to the field. His *De inventione rhetorica* was the principal authority on rhetoric for a thousand years. In another substantial contribution, *De oratore*, he described rhetoric as "the art of arts." "His *Philippics* (44–43 B.C.E.) are the last great set of deliberative speeches before the coming of the empire eclipses political oratory."[218]

1.4.1.2 Rhetorical Criticism: Rhetoric Lost and Found[219]

Burton Mack presents a succinct and convincing argument that the New Testament documents were read from the very beginning as rhetorical compositions.[220] While

---

[212.] Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style*, 10.

[213.] deSilva, *Hebrews*, 40.

[214.] Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style*, 10.

[215.] For an overview of the role of rhetoric in Rome, see William J. Dominik, ed., *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature* (London: Routledge, 1997).

[216.] Freeman, *Egypt, Greece and Rome*, 296.

[217.] John T. Kirby, "Ciceronian Rhetoric: Theory and Practice," in *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature* (ed. William J. Dominik; London: Routledge, 1997), 13–31.

[218.] Freeman, *Egypt, Greece and Rome*, 296.

[219.] For an outline on the renaissance of rhetoric in biblical studies, cf. Dennis L. Stamps, "Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament: Ancient and Modern Evaluation of Argumentation," in *Approaches to New Testament Study* (ed. Stanley E. and David Tombs Porter; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995), 129–69; Brian K. Peterson, *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth*, 12–31; Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 7–35.

[220.] "From the beginning it was taken for granted that the writings produced by early Christians were to be read as rhetorical compositions. Origen, for example, or Augustine, knew no other school for making sense of written compositions but the school of rhetoric. One can follow the rhetorical reading of the New Testament through the Middle Ages and into the early period of the Reformation, where, for instance Martin Bucer and Heinrich Bollinger simply

rhetoric may have been one of the principal tools, if not the principal tool, for reading the New Testament documents, a significant shift occurred pertaining to how rhetoric was viewed, and thus how rhetoric readings of the New Testament declined. By the nineteenth century rhetoric came to be understood only as "stylistic ornamentation with figures of speech."[221] Brian Peterson has demonstrated that the trend towards the decline of rhetoric as a method of reading Paul's works can be seen in the scholarly works of the late nineteenth century.

> This trend can be seen in Eduard Norden's blistering attack against this approach in his *Die antike Kunstprosa vom IV. Jahrhundert vor Christus bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*.[222] Norden criticizes Wilke and Blass for using rhetorical categories from classical studies to examine the writings of the New Testament; he felt that biblical scholars had here overstepped their bounds, and that measured by the standards of classical rhetoric, the letters of Paul fell short, despite their rhetorical impact that even Norden had to admit.[223]

The work of Adolf Deissmann was also highly influential in removing rhetorical criticism as a methodology for evaluating the New Testament. Deissmann saw the works of the New Testament as being closer in form to the simple papyri than classic rhetoric.[224]

In his article on "Rhetoric and Oratory" F. C. Grant suggests that all the writers of the New Testament were insulated from classical rhetorical influence due to their predominantly lower class origins, and by their "Semitic, biblical, Greco-Jewish" predispositions against rhetoric which they viewed as a "conjurer's bags of tricks for amazing the hearers or persuading the court."[225] This would suggest that Grant was taking Paul's statements in 1 Corinthians at face value and that Grant was unaware of both Paul's rhetoric and elements of classic rhetoric.

---

assumed that Paul should be read through the eyes of Quintilian. Then, for the most of the periods of critical scholarship as well, the rhetoric of the New Testament writings was explored as a matter of course." Burton L. Mack, *Rhetoric and the New Testament* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 10.

[221.] Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 11.

[222.] Eduard Norden, *Die antike Kunstprosa vom IV Jahrhundert vor Christus bis in die Zeit der Renaissance* (Leipzig: Teubner, 1898).

[223.] Brian K. Peterson, *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth*, 10.

[224.] "The New Testament was not a product of the colorless refinement of an upper class. On the contrary, it was, humanly speaking, a product of the force that came unimpaired, and strengthened by the Divine presence, from the lower class. This reason alone enabled it to become the book of all mankind. . . . The New Testament has become the Book of the People because it began by being the book of the People." Adolf Deissmann, *A Study in Social and Religious History* (2nd ed; trans. W. Wilson; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1926), 144–45.

[225.] F. C. Grant, "Rhetoric and Oratory," *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 4:75–78.

This decline and misunderstanding of rhetoric has seriously affected readings of 1 Corinthians. Stephen Pogoloff,[226] in discussing Paul's use of σοφία in 1 Cor 1–4, suggests that many scholars in the past, such as Walter Schmithals,[227] Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer,[228] Richard Horsley,[229] and Ulrich Wilckens[230] miss Paul's argument because "they normally assume so far as σοφία λόγου refers to rhetoric, it means 'cultivating expression at the expense of matter. . . the gift of the mere rhetorician'."[231]

The Presidential address to the SBL in 1968 by James Muilenburg may be viewed as the watershed event which introduced (or reintroduced) rhetorical criticism as a distinct approach to reading Scripture. Muilenburg began by praising Herman Gunkel and form criticism. However, he suggests that form criticism had come to an impasse, chiefly because of the excesses of source analysis. He offered a new criticism that might help get beyond the impasse,

> The aspect of all these works which seems to me most fruitful and rewarding I should prefer to designate by a term other than stylistics. What I am interested in, above all, is in understanding the nature of Hebrew literary composition, in exhibiting the structural patterns that are employed for the fashioning of a literary unit, whether in poetry or in prose, and in discerning the many and various devices by which the predications are formulated and ordered into a unified whole. Such an enterprise I should describe as rhetoric and the methodology as rhetorical criticism.[232]

Muilenburg suggests three main interests pertaining to rhetorical criticism and how a passage might be analyzed; these are literary composition, structural patterns, and literary devices. However, he did not explain how these three terms fit under stylistics, nor did he explain why he chose the term rhetoric. Since Muilenburg's address, rhetorical criticism has developed into a "full-fledged biblical discipline but one that is practiced in different ways."[233] In broad terms, the two main practices of rhetoric criticism may be described as viewing *rhetoric as persuasion* or viewing

---

[226.] Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 8.

[227.] Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*.

[228.] Archibald Robertson and Alfred Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1914).

[229.] Richard A. Horsley, "Wisdom of Word and Words of Wisdom in Corinth," *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 39 (1977): 224.

[230.] Ulrich Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit* (Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1959), 20.

[231.] Robertson and Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 5.

[232.] Muilenburg, "Form Criticism and Beyond," 8.

[233.] Phyllis Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994), 32.

rhetoric as stylistics. Or to put it another way; is rhetoric criticism an analysis of the *form* of the text or the *function* of the text?

Trible describes the two views of rhetoric, "The differences related to two distinct, though not incompatible, understandings of rhetoric: the art of composition and the art of persuasion."[234] "Rhetoric as the art of composition derived from the Sophists, especially Isocrates, and continued with Quintilian and the church fathers. Interest lay in artful speech, particularly in structure (*dispositio*) and style (*elecutio*)."[235] "The second understanding defines rhetoric as the art of persuasion. Beginning with Aristotle, it has prevailed throughout the centuries. How a speaker or writer shapes discourse to affect an audience sets the interest."[236] Thus, Trible's two descriptions of recent rhetoric criticism are remarkably similar to Kennedy's descriptions of ancient sophistic rhetoric and philosophical rhetoric.

David Aune, working off the premise of R. D. Anderson,[237] suggests:

> There are two foci of rhetorical criticism: (1) structural rhetoric (macrorhetoric or architectonic rhetoric), which is concerned with identifying the form or genre of a text and its division into parts, and (2) textual rhetoric (microrhetoric or stylistic rhetoric), focusing on style and the developments of argumentation. The latter is more directly useful for exegesis, since it focuses on the argumentation of the text.[238]

Trible, in her book *Rhetoric Criticism*,[239] cites three examples of scholars who have analyzed the Hebrew Scriptures from the perspective of rhetoric criticism as composition. These are Jack Lundbom's work on Jeremiah,[240] Toni Craven's work on Judith,[241] and Anthony Ceresko's work on Samuel.[242] She then cites five examples of scholars who have used rhetoric as persuasion for their method. These are Yehoshua

---

[234.] Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 32.

[235.] Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 32–33.

[236.] Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 41.

[237.] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 26.

[238.] David E. Aune, *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament & Early Christian Literature & Rhetoric* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003), Rhetoric Criticism.

[239.] Trible, *Rhetorical Criticism*.

[240.] Jack R. Lundbom, *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric* (SBLDS 18; Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975).

[241.] Toni Craven, *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith* (SBLDS 70; Chicago: Scholars Press, 1983).

[242.] Anthony R. Ceresko, "A Rhetorical Analysis of 'David's Boast' (1 Samuel 17:34–37): Some Reflections on Method," *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 47 (1985): 58–74.

Gitay on Isaiah 40–48,[243] Richard Clifford on Second Isaiah,[244] John Barton on the Prophets,[245] David Clines on Job,[246] and Dale Patrick and Allen Scult on Job.[247]

Aune goes beyond the two foci of rhetoric (form and function) and suggests that since 1970 rhetoric criticism has developed into two separate types of criticism, (1) diachronic rhetorical criticism and (2) synchronic rhetorical criticism. Critics who use diachronic rhetorical criticism "regard rhetorical as an aspect of historical criticism and try to understand the rhetorical features of early Christian discourse within the context and categories of Greco-Roman rhetoric.[248] The works of Betz,[249] Mitchell,[250] and Anderson[251] fall into diachronic rhetorical criticism. Yet, while Mitchell[252] and Anderson[253] both use diachronic rhetorical criticism they come to quite different conclusions concerning Paul and his use of rhetoric in 1 Corinthians.

[243.] Yehoshua Gitay, *Prophecy and Persuasion: A Study of Isaiah 40–48* (Bonn: Linguistica Biblica, 1981).

[244.] Richard Clifford, *Fair Spoken and Persuading: An Interpretation of Second Isaiah* (New York: Paulist, 1984).

[245.] John Barton, "History and Rhetoric in the Prophets," in *The Bible as Rhetoric* (ed. Martin Warner; London: Routledge, 1990), 51–61.

[246.] David J. A. Clines, "Deconstructing the Book of Job," in *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility* (ed. Martin Warner; London: Routledge, 1990), 65–80.

[247.] Dale Patrick and Allen Scult, *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation* (JSOTSup 82; Sheffield: Almond, 1990).

[248.] Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of Literature & Rhetoric*, Rhetorical Criticism.

[249.] H. D. Betz, *Galatians; A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermenia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979), xv.

[250.] Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 6–17.

[251.] "In conclusion, Paul's characterisation of his own preaching in 1 *Ep.Cor.* 1–4 should not be interpreted against the specific background of Graeco-Roman rhetorical theory. Although rhetoric may have formed part of a more general background to Paul's comments, these chapters in themselves say virtually nothing concerning Paul's view on rhetorical theory and practice." Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 276.

[252.] "This investigation, through an exegetical study of the language and composition of 1 Corinthians, with particular utilization of the method of historical rhetorical criticism, has argued that 1 Corinthians is a unified deliberative letter which throughout urges unity on the divided Corinthian church. . . . Therefore, the first conclusion of this investigation is that 1 Corinthians is deliberative rhetoric, a conclusion offered both against those who would assign it to one of the other rhetorical species (forensic or epideictic) and against those who would consider the letter to be loosely arranged instruction or paraenesis without adherence to any logical or rhetorical scheme." Margaret M. Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 296.

[253.] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 276.

Critics who use synchronic rhetorical criticism "reinterpret Greco-Roman rhetorical tradition as a subset of literary criticism."[254] Kennedy regards Greco-Roman rhetoric, and specifically Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, as an attempt to organize and describe universal rhetorical categories.[255] Synchronic rhetoric criticism would also include the *New Rhetoric* of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca[256] which emphasizes "modes of human communication and argumentation generally."[257] The works of Wire[258] and Winter[259] on 1 Corinthians follows synchronic criticism.

Thus, while rhetorical criticism has reentered the world of biblical critical scholarship it has not reached a definitive form. The discussion pertaining to what is rhetoric is as old as rhetoric itself. Plato and Gorgias debated the nature and function of rhetoric over 2,400 years ago, and there are no signs that this debate will be settled any time soon. It is ironic that while rhetoric is concerned with both persuasion and communication when pressed too far it eludes definition. Thus, it would appear, that all attempts to succinctly define rhetoric fails to persuade or communicate.

1.4.1.3 Paul and Rhetoric

Central to the discussion of rhetorical criticism is the discussion on Paul's training in rhetoric and Paul's use of rhetoric in 1 Corinthians.[260] Dean Anderson has examined Galatians, Romans, and 1 Corinthians from the perspective of "rhetorical textual analysis" and concludes that Paul had no specific knowledge of ancient rhetorical theory, "His upbringing and more especially, the stylistic niveau of his writings do not suggest that he spent much time studying rhetorical or literary theory."[261] The discussion of Paul being trained in the theory of rhetoric is highly problematic and often circular in its reasoning. The core of Anderson's argument is the premise that ancient rhetorical theory has guidelines, rigid guidelines, and since Paul does not follow these

---

[254.] Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of Literature & Rhetoric*, 417.

[255.] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 10–11.

[256.] Chaïm Perelman and Lucy Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation* (trans. John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver; Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969).

[257.] Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of Literature & Rhetoric*, 417.

[258.] Antoinette Clark Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction Through Paul's Rhetoric* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990).

[259.] Bruce W. Winter, *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement* (2d ed; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002).

[260.] For a recent and detailed discussion on Paul's use of rhetoric in Romans, cf. Jewett, *Romans*, 23–46.

[261.] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 290.

rigid guidelines he was not trained in ancient rhetorical theory. Mitchell also works from the premise that ancient rhetorical theory was employed with rigid or mechanical application. However, in contrast to Anderson, she argues that Paul was indeed trained in rhetorical theory and he employed deliberative rhetoric in composing 1 Corinthians, and thus she interprets 1 Corinthians from this perspective.[262] Fiorenza also argues that Paul uses deliberative rhetoric in 1 Corinthians.[263] Wilhelm Wüllner[264] and Raymond Humphries[265] argue that Paul used epideictic rhetoric in 1 Corinthians to reaffirm views already held. Dieter Betz, who pioneered the practice of determining the species of rhetoric used in Paul's letters, identified Galatians as judicial rhetoric.[266]

In this discussion of Paul's training in rhetoric, the recent work of Teresa Morgan offers an interesting perspective. She draws a vital distinction between those who were formally educated and those who used this education in public life or tertiary education. She challenges the assumption that those who had some form of formal education automatically produced written work that consciously or mechanically followed rhetorical forms.[267]

Dale Martin, in his intriguing book *The Corinthian Body*, avoids an in-depth discussion of ancient rhetoric theory. He simply gives a passing acknowledgement to the work of Mitchell and accepts 1 Corinthians as deliberative rhetoric.[268] Instead he suggests that Paul had some training in rhetoric and that 1 Cor 1–4 follows the form of a *homonoia* (*concord*) speech.[269] Carl Classen argues that while traditional rhetoric will help to explain Paul's work, he adds a few precautions to guard against employing a

---

[262] Margaret M. Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 296.

[263] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 36–40.

[264] Wüllner, "Hermeneutics."

[265] Raymond Humphries, "Paul's Rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 1–4," Ph.D dissertation (Graduate Theological Union, 1979), 110.

[266] Betz, *Galatians*, 24.

[267] Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998).

[268] Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 39.

[269] "In spite of his disavowals of the use of rhetoric, Paul's arguments in 1 Cor 1–4 shows rhetorical finesse and the power that proves beyond any doubt that he had received some kind of rhetorical training. He uses the structure of a *homonoia* speech to urge the Corinthian church to unite; and the form his argument takes, focusing so consistently on status, makes it clear that the factionalism of the church was due to division based on status differences in the church." Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 38.

rigid or mechanical comparison of Paul's letters and ancient rhetoric theory.[270]

Antoinette Clark Wire also avoids painting Paul into the corner of one of the three species of rhetoric and suggests that, "the question whether Paul composed with conscious rhetoric technique or analyzed in retrospect the way he had spoken can be set aside. His argument can be the focus of this study and the proper and sufficient access point to his audience."[271] Wire suggests reading 1 Corinthians not through the lens of one of the three species of rhetoric but reading 1 Corinthians as "textual rhetoric." "The arguments Paul uses repeatedly in 1 Corinthians qualify as textual rhetoric, as argumentative features characteristic of this particular text."[272]

Bruce Winter, working from a papyrus from Oxyrhynchus,[273] tells a colorful story of a young man, Neilus, in Alexandria who finds himself facing both a shortage of money and a shortage of sophists' schools. Neilus overcomes the challenges presented by these shortages by attending the public declamations and using them as an "additional way of enhancing rhetorical skills."[274] Winter takes this colorful story as a jumping off point to argue that the Second Sophist movement has some connection to the situation addressed by both Philo's writings in Alexandria and Paul's letters to the Corinthians. In comparing Paul and Philo Winter suggests that both had literary rhetoric ability, but "Paul lacked facility in 'rhetorical delivery' for 'ecclesial rhetoric,' something that Philo did not, as his leadership of the Jewish embassy to Gaius bore witness."[275]

Paul's education in rhetoric remains an enigma. While Tarsus had a school of rhetoric there is no direct evidence that Paul attended it.[276] Paul's time in Jerusalem

---

[270.] "But one will also find that the structure of this letter differs fundamentally from the 'idea' structure of a *logos* as recommended by rhetorical theory. The address is followed by what one might call an *exordium* ("introduction"); but its unusual elements must be taken as a warning that what follows is not one of the three traditional types of *logos* distinguished by rhetorical theory; indeed neither a judicial or a deliberative nor a demonstrative type of speech would have been appropriate here, as Paul is neither addressing a court of law from which he expects a verdict at the end, or an assembly which will pass a resolution, let alone praising an individual or a group. . . . It is not surprising that the categories of ancient rhetoric fail us with respect to the structure of this epistle, because it is an epistle, and they were not made nor meant to fit such kinds of composition." Carl Joachim Classen, *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament* (Boston: Brill, 2002), 23.

[271.] Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, 2.

[272.] Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, 12.

[273.] *P.Oxy.* 2190

[274.] Winter, *Philo and Paul*, 10–20.

[275.] Winter, *Philo and Paul*, 252.

[276.] S. E. John, "Tarsus and the Apostle Paul," *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 15.4

under the tutelage of Gamaliel did not automatically exclude some knowledge of Greek rhetoric.[277] The story of Neilus does suggest that Paul could have learned some elements of rhetoric from his early days in Tarsus, his time in Jerusalem, and during his travels. Christopher Forbes argues that Paul did indeed have rhetoric skills which he may have gained in his travels and preaching career or he may have acquired them during his formal education, "at least at the level of the *grammatici*, or the rhetorical school."[278] In this area Richard Longenecker suggests, "the forms of classical rhetoric were 'in the air' and Paul seems to have used them almost unconsciously for his own purposes—as much as he used the rules of Greek grammar."[279]

Paul's education in rhetoric remains an enigma. All we have to evaluate Paul's rhetoric ability are his letters. While familiarity with ancient rhetorical theory and conventions are invaluable tools in reading Paul's letters, care must be taken not to superimpose ancient rhetoric theory on 1 Corinthians. In this area, Anderson provides an important word of caution when he notes that rhetorical theory was designed to help men write speeches, not, in the first place, to analyze them.[280]

To return to the statement of Wire, 1 Cor 1–6 will be read as textual rhetoric. She defines textual rhetoric as, "argumentative features characteristic of this particular text."[281] Two closely connected characteristics of the first century Mediterranean world will be examined to see if they are argumentative features characteristic of the textual rhetoric of 1 Corinthians. The first characteristic is the use of honor and shame. The second characteristic is the function of the patron-client relationship.

1.4.2   Honor and Shame

(1980): 105–13.

[277.] Willem C. van Unnik, *Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth* (London: Epworth, 1962).

[278.] Christopher Forbes, "Comparison, Self-Praise and Irony: Paul's Boasting and Conventions in Hellenistic Rhetoric," *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 4.

[279.] Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians* (Word Biblical Commentary 41; Thomas Nelson, 1990), cxiii.

[280.] "One important caution ought to be borne in mind. Rhetorical theory was designed to help men *write* speeches, not, in the first place to analyse them. We need therefore, to be careful in applying such theory retrogressively for the purpose of analysis. Many of the theorists themselves admitted that practice was often removed from theory. This consideration should highlight the need for a certain sobriety in our analysis and also the need to couple our use of rhetorical theory with knowledge of contemporary rhetorical practice." Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 290–91.

[281.] Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, 12.

1.4.2.1 *"The Social Framework*

Since the middle of the 1970s a growing trend in critical approaches in Second Temple studies has been various attempts to read the texts through what may be termed a "social framework." These attempts would include social-scientific criticism, literary criticism, and social-rhetorical criticism. There appears to be some agreement that elements of these critical approaches may be complimentary, and thus these critical approaches may be merged to form a complimentary approach. However, there is also an argument that these critical approaches are incompatible and should not be used together.

In an article discussing the relationship between social-scientific, literary and rhetorical interpretation of texts Pieter Craffert writes, "from the circle of literary critics the idea that literary and social-scientific or historical approaches are complementary to each other has reached some kind of popular status."[282] Mark Powell, a narrative critic, suggests that while literary, and social-scientific or historical approaches cannot be used simultaneously; they should be used "side by side in a supplementary fashion. They might even be viewed as necessary complements, each providing information that is beneficial to the other."[283] David Gowler, a rhetorical critic notes, "Only a merger of narrative-critical, anthropological, and other approaches facilitate the profound stylistic, artistic, and ideological perspicacity that we need for a dialogue with these texts."[284] John Elliott, a social-scientific critic, adds his voice to the argument that critical approaches should be integrated, "With the gradual maturation of these newer criticisms, it now seems an appropriate time to pursue the issue of methodological integration."[285]

However, Bruce Malina, a social-scientific critic, contends that since social-scientific and literary or rhetorical criticisms emerge from different theoretical and philosophical roots they are mutually exclusive and cannot be considered complementary.[286] Richard Rohrbaugh, a social-scientific critic, also argues against

---

[282.] Pieter F. Craffert, "Relationships Between Social-Scientific, Literary, and Rhetorical Interpretation of the Texts," *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 26 (1996): 45.

[283.] M. A. Powell, *What is Narrative Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 98.

[284.] D. B. Gowler, "Hospitality and Characterization in Luke 11:37–54: A Socio-Narratological Approach," *Semeia* 64 (1993): 213–51.

[285.] John H. Elliott, *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993), 100.

[286.] Bruce J. Malina, "Rhetorical Criticism and Social-Scientific Criticism: Why Won't Romanticism Leave Us Alone?" in *Rhetoric, Scripture and Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference* (S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht; Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1996), 72–101.

integrating social-scientific and literary criticism on the basis that literary critics separate the text both from the author's intentions and the historical and cultural matrixes of production, and this, for Rohrbaugh, implies a brake with a fundamental assumption of social-scientific criticism.[287]

Three critical approaches that examine the social framework of Second Temple texts and which also pertain to this study are social-scientific criticism, social history, and socio-rhetorical criticism. Social-scientific interpretation is practiced by Bruce Malina,[288] Jerome Neyrey,[289] Richard Rohrbaugh,[290] and John Elliott,[291] and is defined by Stephen Barton, "Whereas historical criticism focuses diachronically on relations of cause and effect over time, social-scientific criticism focuses synchronically on the way meaning is generated by social actions related to one another by a complex web of culturally-determined social systems and patterns of communications."[292] Since social-scientific critics use models relating to the relationship between patrons and clients and the social setting of honor-shame this study will be primarily informed by social-scientific models.

Social history criticism, also referred to as cultural anthropology,[293] is practiced by Gerd Theissen,[294] Wayne Meeks,[295] Bruce Winter,[296] and Ronald Hock,[297] to name

---

[287.] Richard L. Rohrbaugh, "Social Scientific and Literary Criticism: What is at Stake?" *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 49 (1993): 331.

[288.] Malina, *The New Testament World*.

[289.] Jerome H. Neyrey, *Paul in Other Words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990).

[290.] Richard L. Rohrbaugh, *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996).

[291.] Elliott, *Social Scientific Criticism*.

[292.] Stephen C. Barton, "Social-Scientific Criticism," in *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 277.

[293.] "Since we do not meet ordinary early Christians as individuals, we must seek to recognize them through the collectivities to which they belonged and to glimpse their lives through the typical occasion mirrored in the texts. It is in the hope of accomplishing this that a number of historians of early Christianity have recently undertaken to describe the first Christian groups in ways that a sociologist or anthropologist might." Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of The Apostle Paul* (2nd ed.; New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000), 2.

[294.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*.

[295.] Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*.

[296.] Bruce W. Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens* (First-Century Christians in the Graeco-Roman World; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).

[297.] Ronald F. Hock, *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980).

but a few. Social history can be difficult to define and often appears to be an eclectic selection of possibly related data narrativized into a background. Meeks notes, "I take my theory piecemeal, as needed, where it fits. This pragmatic approach will be distasteful to the purist; its effect will be many rough edges and some inconsistencies. Nevertheless, given the present state of social theory and the primitive state of its use by students of early Christianity, eclecticism seems the only honest and cautious way to proceed."[298] This study will make use of works done by the above mentioned social historians and others, particularly when such works offer insight on the role of the patron-client relationship and the use of honor and shame language.

1.4.2.2 Socio-Rhetorical Approaches

Three scholars have used the term "socio-rhetorical" in their recent work, Vernon Robbins, Ben Witherington, and David deSilva. However, just as there is a disagreement between social-scientific critics and social historians there is also disagreement concerning what constitutes a "socio-rhetorical" approach. This problem is compounded by the fact that there is no consensus concerning which social approach or which rhetorical approach to use in formulating a socio-rhetorical approach.

Vernon Robbins, in his socio-rhetorical guide, writes "the goal of socio-rhetorical interpretation is to bring skills we use on a daily basis into an environment of interpretation that is both intricately sensitive to detail and perceptively attentive to large fields of meanings in the world in which we live."[299] Undoubtedly, one of the strengths of Robbin's guide is that he argues for developing a multidisciplinary approach to the text. Robbins gives examples of five "textures of the text", which include the inner texture, the intertexture, the social and cultural texture, the ideological texture, and the sacred text. However, upon reading Robbins' guide it would appear that his guide suggests using too many tools for reading the text. This can be illustrated by that fact that Robbins not only suggests five textures of the text but he also outlines sub categories under each texture. Robbins also renames and reclassifies various aspects of pre-existing well established methodological approaches in his own unique way. This may be seen in the manner in which he outlines "cultural intertexture," "social intertexture," "historical intertexture" under intertexture rather than under social and

---

[298.] Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, 6.

[299.] Robbins, *Exploring the Texture of Texts*, 2.

cultural texture. Robbins' socio-rhetorical critical approach ends up being too broad to use in a disciplined manner for this study.

Since publishing *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* Ben Witherington has gone on to write numerous commentaries that include the term socio-rhetorical in the title. However, it is quite difficult to determine what Witherington means by socio-rhetorical because, while he does broadly define the term, he goes to write that his socio-rhetorical commentaries are intended "for a general audience that includes college and seminary students, pastors, and lay persons." In his various socio-rhetorical commentaries Witherington draws upon various aspects of social-scientific criticism, social history, and rhetoric but there is no consistent methodology. The end result of Witherington's approach appears quite similar to Meeks' "piecemeal theory."[300] No doubt Witherington's goal of writing for a general audience is admirable, however, the end result is that Witherington's socio-rhetorical method ends up being elusive for academic purposes.

David deSilva has also produced a socio-rhetorical study on the Epistle to the Hebrews. This commentary is part of the same series that Witherington wrote for Eerdmans. However, in contrast to Witherington's commentaries, deSilva has clearly defined his socio-rhetorical method.[301] In many respects deSilva's approach is remarkably similar to Wire's "textual rhetoric."

Presently, the disparity in these three socio-rhetorical approaches has rendered the approach usable for this study. No doubt "socio-rhetorical approaches to the text have the potential of providing new lenses for reading and understanding the text. However, in the evolution of this approach clarity is needed to define with greater specificity what the terms "socio" and "rhetorical" mean.

1.4.2.3 Defining Honor and Shame

One social aspect of the Mediterranean world that is receiving growing attention is the role of honor and shame. "The social values of honor and dishonor were foundational to first century culture whether Roman, Greek or Egyptian."[302] In fact, some suggest that honor and shame may be one of the dominant values, if not the dominant value, of the Mediterranean world. "Anthropologists describe these phenomena in terms of a value

---

[300.] Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, 6.
[301.] deSilva, *Hebrews*, 389–80.
[302.] David A. deSilva, *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry Formation* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 125.

considered dominant in Mediterranean culture, namely *honor*."[303] When describing honor and shame as a dominant value in the Mediterranean world, this would also include the world of Ancient Israel. Saul Olyan has shown that the values of honor and shame existed in the Israelite culture, particularly in light of the concept of reciprocity exchange between the suzerain and vassal in a covenant.[304]

Pilch and Malina do not examine the covenant aspect of honor and shame to the same degree as Olyan, yet they do cite many examples of honor and shame being used throughout the Hebrew Scriptures.[305] The *blessings* and *curses* of Deut 28 would certainly fall into the theme of covenant reciprocity, and when the *blessings* and *curses* are read against a background of honor and shame new insights may be gained. Bruce Malina describes honor in the following manner;

> From a symbolic point of view, honor stands for a person's rightful place in society, a person's social standing. The honor position is marked off by boundaries consisting of authority, gender status, and location on the social ladder. From a functionalist point of view, honor is the value of a person in his or her own eyes plus the value of that person in the eyes of his or her social group. Honor is a claim to worth along with the social acknowledgement of worth. The purpose of honor is to serve as a sort of social rating that entitles a person to interact in specific ways with his or her equals, superiors, and subordinates, according to the prescribed cultural clues of the society.[306]

In Paul's letter to the Philippians we are given a glimpse of what a first century Jew would have considered as honorable. In Phil 3:5–6, Paul outlines seven characteristics that would have been held by the Jewish community of great honor and would have marked Paul (Saul) close to the top of the social ladder. These are: (1) *circumcised on the eighth day*, (2) *a member of the people of Israel*, (3) *of the tribe of Benjamin*, (4) *a Hebrew born of Hebrews*, (5) *as to the law, a Pharisee*, (6) *as to zeal, a persecutor of the church*, (7) *as to righteousness under the law, blameless*. The fact that

---

[303.] Bruce J. Malina and Jerome H. Neyrey, "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (ed. Jerome H. Neyrey; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 25.

[304.] "Covenant ideologies shaped profoundly both social and political relations in ancient Israel and its environment. Though scholars have paid little attention to the place of honor and shame in covenant dynamics, honor and shame were clearly components of a larger complex of ideas relating to covenant, a complex characterized by notions of reciprocity. Just as covenant love and covenant loyalty were reciprocal, even between suzerain and vassal, so was honor in a covenant setting." Saul M. Olyan, "Honor, Shame, and Covenant Relations in Ancient Israel and Its Environment," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1996): 217.

[305.] John J. Pilch and Bruce J. Malina, eds., *Handbook of Biblical Social Values* (Updated ed; Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000), 108–9.

[306.] Malina, *The New Testament World*, 52.

Paul outlines *seven* characteristics of Jewish honor may be a rhetorical device of Paul used to indicate the completeness of Jewish honor.

Honor and shame are very closely connected; they are two sides of the same coin. deSilva describes shame:

> The meaning of shame is somewhat more complicated. If honor signifies respect for being the kind of person and doing the kinds of things the group values, shame signifies, in the first instance, being seen as less than valuable because one has behaved in ways that run contrary to the values of the group. The person who puts personal safety above the city's well-being fleeing from battle, loses the respect of society. His worth is impugned; he "loses face"; he is disgraced and viewed as a disgrace. In a second sense, however, shame can signify a positive character trait, namely a sensitivity to the opinion of the group such that one avoids those actions that bring disgrace. Out of shame of this kind, a woman refuses an adulterous invitation; a soldier refuses to flee from battle.[307]

Again turning to Paul's letter to the Philippians we are given a glimpse of Jewish shame. As noted in Phil 3:5–6 Paul outlines his achievement in gaining complete honor, yet in vv. 7–8[308] Paul takes this complete Jewish honor and *loses* it. Paul uses loss three times in these two verses, no doubt to intensify the shame. Finally he treats this Jewish honor as *"rubbish."* This purposeful losing and treating as rubbish things of Jewish honor is indeed behaving in a way that runs contrary to the values of Jewish society. In fact, Paul purposefully intensifies Jewish shame by using σκύβαλον (a noun used of *rubbish* and of *human excrement*)[309] in describing how he regarded his achieved Jewish honor.

What can be seen in both Malina's description of honor and deSilva's description of shame is that honor and shame are group values. However, what specifically constitutes honor and shame vary from group to group.

> They are really high context words whose context must be deduced from actual social behavior. In other words, one can readily say that where honor is the highest value, public humiliation is a fate worse than death, one must still describe what in a given group or society counts as honorable behavior.[310]

Thus, while honor and shame are pivotal values of the Mediterranean world, what is honorable and what is shameful is determined by different groups. Turning

---

307. David A. deSilva, *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity; Unlocking New Testament Culture* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000), 20.

308. Phil 3:7–8, *Yet whatever gains I had, these I have come to regard as loss because of Christ. More than that, I regard everything as loss because of the surpassing value of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord. For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things, and I regard them as rubbish, in order that I may gain Christ.*

309. "σκύβαλον" BAGD 932.

310. Pilch and Malina, *Handbook of Biblical Social Values*, 108.

again to Phil 3 it can be seen that what is honorable to the Jewish community is not the same as what is honorable to the Christian community. Paul outlined seven items that were considered honorable to the Jewish community. What is considered honorable to Paul the Christian is knowing Christ.

Halvor Moxnes provides a short list of terms used for honor and shame that occur in the New Testament. Words for honor τιμή and τιμάω and their cognates are commonly used of humans. They can also be used in praise of God, most commonly together with other terms like δόξα. Words for shame and dishonor are αἰσχρός and ἀτιμία and their cognates. Boasting was often seen as a demand for public recognition for honor καύχημα. Honorable relationships were indicated by the terms "sons" and "daughters."[311] In Phil 3:2 Paul speaks of *boasting in Christ*. As previously discussed this boasting is in contrast to Jewish circumcision. Honor and shame may be evoked even when specific words of honor and shame are not present. Paul's use of loss and rubbish σκύβαλον in Phil 3:8 contains a strong element of shame. In the same verse the turn of phrase, *the surpassing value of knowing Christ Jesus my Lord*, is undoubtedly connected with honor.

deSilva has demonstrated that within a society there are open competing views of honor and shame which may be described as the rhetoric of the majority culture and the rhetoric of the minority culture.[312] Paul's argument in Phil 3:2–11 contains elements of this minority/majority honor/shame struggle, and in Paul's rhetoric he portrays the Jewish community as the majority and the Christian community as the minority. In v. 2

[311.] Halvor Moxnes, "Honor and Shame," in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 23–4.

[312.] "For a minority culture to survive in a situation of cultural pluralism, it had to develop an alternate arena for the fulfillment of its members' desire for honor, their *φιλοτίμα*. Honor is now defined in terms of the minority culture's traditions and values; those who do not share these definitions are set aside as shameless, or as errant. The negative opinion which such people might have of the group and its members carries no weight - it rests on error, and the representative of the minority culture can look forward to his or her vindication when the extent of that error is revealed. Rather, the group members are called to have concern for the opinion of a higher court, whether it be of nature, of the governing principle, of Zeus, or of the God of Israel. The members of the minority culture form a social counterpart to this higher court, and it is in their eyes that a member is challenged to seek honor and eschew falling into disgrace. Honor and Shame become powerful tools for social engineering, for maintaining group boundaries, values, and commitments in a world of competing cultures and arenas in which to gain recognition. Indeed in the transvaluation of dominant cultural norms and the rejection of the applicability of society's standards, the use of the language of honor and shame in minority groups often lead to an escalation of tension between the group and society." David A. deSilva, *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews* (SBLDS 140; Atlanta: Scholars, 1995), 143.

Paul begins by describing his Jewish adversaries with a series of three escalating terms of shame: (1) *Beware of the dogs,*[313] (2) *beware of the evil workers,* (3) *beware of those who mutilate the flesh*! Paul follows his three-fold shameful description with a series of four terms of Christian honor (1) *For it is we who are the circumcision,* (2) *who worship in the Spirit of God and* (3) *boast in Christ Jesus and* (4) *have no confidence in the flesh--.* It is obvious from this reading that the core issue in Paul's rhetoric of shame is physical circumcision. He describes the Jewish circumcision advocates as *dogs* and *evil workers* and he will not call what they do circumcision; rather it is a *mutilation of the flesh*.[314] In contrast, he describes the Christian community as being the "true" circumcision and this is evidenced in the manner of their worship and the focus of their boasting. This *boasting* (καυχάομαι) *in Christ* is followed by its negative counterpart, *having no confidence in the flesh*. Thus, Paul is contrasting Jewish circumcision and Jesus Christ. His argument is crafted for the Christian community in Philippi. His goal is that they would eschew physical circumcision. His argument is crafted in the language of honor and shame. First he presents physical circumcision in a derogatory and shameful manner. Second, he presents Christ Jesus as the source of Christian honor and the antithesis to Jewish circumcision. It is also worth noting that when Paul begins his list of seven aspects of Jewish honor the first item he mentions is "circumcised on the eighth day." No doubt Paul's use of the language of honor and shame would have led to "social engineering" and the "maintaining of group boundaries" and to an "escalation of tension" between the Christian community in Philippi and those who advocated physical circumcision.

1.4.2.4 Ascribed and Achieved Honor

While honor is essentially public recognition of one's social standing, Halvor Moxnes describes the two ways in which it comes:

[313.] "In Graeco-Roman society dogs were considered despicable, unclean animals that savaged for their food. Jews used the term insultingly to refer to Gentiles. Moreover, 'dogs' was used to derogate particularly unsavory Israelites." Stephen E. Fowl, *Philippians* (The Two Horizons New Testament Commentary; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005), 145. Mark Nanos challenges the view that Jews called Christians dogs and that this lead to the reverse insult where Christians called Jews dogs. Mark Nanos, "Paul's *Reversal* of Jews Calling Gentiles 'Dogs' (Philippians 3:2): 1600 Years of an Ideological Tales Wagging an Exegetical Dog," *Biblical Interpretation* (Forthcoming).

[314.] Paul also employs a play on words, *mutilation* is κατατομή, while *circumcision* is περιτομή.

One's basic honor level, usually termed *ascribed honor*, is inherited from family at birth. Each child takes on the general honor status that the family possesses in the eyes of the larger group, and therefore ascribed honor comes directly from family membership. It is not based on something the individual has done. By contrast, honor conferred on the basis of virtuous deeds is called *acquired honor*. By its very nature acquired honor may be either gained or lost in the perpetual struggle for public recognition. Since the group is so important for the identity of a Mediterranean person, it is critical to recognize that honor status comes primarily from group recognition.[315]

In Paul's Jewish seven-item honor list of Phil 3:5–6 there are elements of both ascribed and achieved honor. The first four items are items of ascribed honor; (1) *circumcised on the eighth day*, (2) *a member of the people of Israel*, (3) *of the tribe of Benjamin*, (4) *a Hebrew born of Hebrews*. The final three items would be acquired honor; (5) *as to the law, a Pharisee*, (6) *as to zeal, a persecutor of the church*, (7) *as to righteousness under the law, blameless*.

Paul exchanged this combined Jewish ascribed/achieved honor for the Christian's acquired/achieved honor. In vv. 8a–9 Paul describes the Christian honor in terms of ascribed honor and achieved honor. The statement, *For his sake I have suffered the loss of all things, and I regard them as rubbish, in order that I may gain Christ and be found in him*, is achieved honor, and it is based on the actions of Paul. However, the statement, *not having a righteousness of my own that comes from the law, but one that comes through faith in Christ, the righteousness from God based on faith*, is ascribed honor because it is based not on Paul's actions but the actions of God. Paul compares the types of righteousness he has experienced in his life and their corresponding honor values. Paul's achieved Jewish righteousness had as its source Paul's keeping of the law, but now Paul's ascribed Christian righteousness has as its source faith in Christ and is the righteousness from God. Thus in this comparison it is Paul's new righteousness in Christ that has the higher value since its source is God.

Paul's letter to the Philippians, and particularly 3:2–10, indicates that Paul was adept at employing a rhetoric of honor and shame. This Philippian rhetoric of honor and shame displays elements of two groups with conflicting views of honor and shame. The conflict is between Jewish and Christian honor and shame values. It also contains clear examples of ascribed honor and achieved honor. It also indicates that honor and shame were dominant values of the early Christian communities. In a world of competing honor and shame values Paul's rhetoric of honor and shame is shaped and reinforced by the Christian community's relationship to Jesus.

[315.] Moxnes, "Honor and Shame," 20.

Paul's first letter to the church in Corinth employs much use of honor and shame. In dealing with the "head covering" issues in chapter eleven Paul uses a rhetoric of honor and shame.[316] In the matter of "head coverings" Paul begins with strong references to shame. In v. 4 he begins by stating what is shameful for a man. *Any man who prays or prophesies with something on his head disgraces his head* (καταισχύνω). In v. 5 he states that the opposite is a matter of shame for a woman. *But any woman who prays or prophesies with her head unveiled disgraces* **(**καταισχύνω**)** *her head--it is one and the same thing as having her head shaved*. Paul continues this rhetoric of shame in the next verse. *For if a woman will not veil herself, then she should cut off her hair; but if it is disgraceful* (αἰσχρός) *for a woman to have her hair cut off or to be shaved, she should wear a veil*. In Paul's concluding comments on this matter he again evokes shame and honor. In v. 14 Paul again frames the issue of the woman's head covering against the backdrop of the man. *Does not nature itself teach you that if a man wears long hair, it is degrading* (ἀτιμία) *to him*. Following the manner in which Paul begins this discussion the reader/hearers would now expect Paul to restate his premise that not wearing a head covering is shameful for a woman. However, Paul inverts his rhetoric and states that wearing a head covering is a matter of honor, v. 15 *but if a woman has long hair, it is her glory?*(δόξα) *For her hair is given to her for a covering*. While this argument will not be examined in more detail it does demonstrate one occurrence of Paul's use of shame in 1 Corinthians.

1.4.3   Patronage
1.4.3.1 Patronage in Rome
Seneca speaks of the giving and receiving of benefactions as the "practice that constitutes the chief bond of human society," (*Ben*. 1.4.2). deSilva describes the patron-client relationship as "the basic building block of Greco-Roman society. In a society where a minority of people controlled the majority of the resources, the patron-client relationship was the path to both well-being and improving one's lot in life."[317] Saller notes, "If a man's *clientela* was indicative of his current status, his potential for mobility depended on the effectiveness of his patrons, whose wealth and political connections could be indispensable."[318] At its basic level, the patron gave his client

---

[316.] For a discussion on whether ἀκατακάλυπτος should be translated as "veil" or "uncovered," see Fee, *First Corinthians*, 508–10.

[317.] David A. deSilva, "Patronage," *Dictionary of New Testament Background*: 766–71.

[318.] Richard Saller, *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire* (Cambridge:

protection, monetary gifts, and perhaps awards him an office. The main responsibility of the client was to publicly honor his patron. Conversely, the result of failing to honor one's patron was to be shamed by the patron. Shaming could take various manifestations. Seneca emphasizes the importance of reciprocity:

> No matter what the issue of former benefits has been, still persist in conferring them upon others; this will be better even if they fall unheeded into the hand of the ungrateful; for it may be [that] either shame or opportunity or example will one day make these grateful. (*Ben*. 1.2.4)

It may be hard for the modern person to grasp the concept of the patron-client relationship that existed in the Roman world of the first century. At least two aspects of the modern West may contribute to our discomfort with the patron-client relationship. The first is the prevalent rhetorical device used in the modern West which asserts that advancement comes through education, hard work, and past success. However, while the modern West may not have a structured patron-client system, the naïve person eventually realizes that advancement may also be connected to "who you know." The second is our modern idealized view of politics. Again, there is more than a touch of rhetoric in this area. We are repeatedly told that every voice is equal and every person can run for and hold the highest political office in the land. Yet, the doorways that lead to the corridors of power are often barred shut to those without the right connections. Again, only the naïve believe that political advancement can be achieved without having a powerful patron.

It may well be that every society has some type of a patron-client system. What makes the patron-client system of Rome unique is how it was structured and accepted. Richard Saller, in his invaluable work *Personal patronage under the early Empire*, demonstrates that the patron-client relationship was of considerable importance in political, legal, social and economic affairs. Saller argues that a person's social status and power was reflected in the size of his clientele. While a patron's current standing was established by his clientele, his potential for upwards mobility depended on the power of his patrons, their connections, and their willingness to render him aid.[319]

The patron-client relationship may have no small part in the running of the Roman Empire. It would certainly explain how such a large empire was governed by so small an administration.[320] Patronage held the Empire together, perhaps even with

---

Cambridge University Press, 1982), 205.

[319.] Saller, *Personal Patronage*, 203.

[320.] Richard A. Horsley, "Patronage, Priesthood and Powers: Introduction," in *Paul and Empire* (ed. Richard A. Horsley; Harrisburg: Trinity, 1997), 88–89.

greater force than the might of the legions. The patron-client structure was ideal for ruling the Empire, and for the administration of subjugated lands. The benefits of Roman patronage and the desire to receive these benefits (and to avoid the penalties of failing Caesar) was so great that local leaders would enforce the will of Rome on their own people. This in turn reinforced the spread of the empire as the patron-client structure freed up the legions to subjugate other areas.[321]

In the Empire the chief patron was Caesar. Robert Jewel correctly notes that Augustus's *Res Gestae* lists his public honor in extraordinarily extensive detail.[322] In the Empire, patronage was the path to power. Caesar appointed men to office not on the basis of their education or résumé, but rather on the basis of their connection to Caesar. In concluding a chapter titled "the emperor and his court" Saller notes:

> The most successful emperors were those like Augustus, who were able to utilize skillfully the offices, honors, statuses and administrative decisions at their disposal to produce cohesion in a web of personal exchange relationships extending from themselves. Awareness of this led Seneca, Dio of Prussia and others to point out to emperors that it was not merely a part of their role but in their self-interest to act as good patrons distributing their *beneficia*. I have argued that it would be an oversimplification to imagine the emperor patronizing each individual in the web directly. Rather it was more accurate to think that the emperor entrusted the loyalty of an inner circle of friends with his *beneficia* and they granted them resources to build their own clientèles whose loyalty was thus indirectly secured.[323]

1.4.3.2 Patronage and Corinth

A monument made in the first century C.E. in Corinth to honor Julius Spartiaticus[324] sheds valuable light on the patronage in Corinth.[325] While Spartiaticus was a patron to one of the tribes in Corinth, he was also a client of the Roman emperor.[326] This then would indicate that the emperor's web of personal exchange relationships extended into Corinth. John Chow, in his work *Patronage and Power: A study of social networks in Corinth*, has convincingly demonstrated that Roman Corinth was a city in which "the

---

[321.] Efrain Agosto, "Patronage and Commendation, Imperial and Anti-Imperial," in *Paul and the Roman Imperial Order* (ed. Richard A. Horsley; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2004), 103.

[322.] Robert Jewett, "Paul, Shame, and Honor," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003), 554.

[323.] Saller, *Personal Patronage*, 78.

[324.] G. W. Bowersock, "Eurycles of Sparta," *The Journal of Roman Studies* 51, Parts 1 and 2 (1961): 112–18.

[325.] A. B. West, Latin Inscriptions 1896-1926. Corinth: Results VIII.2 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press), no. 68.

[326.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 38–39.

common people, the local notables, the Roman officials, and in a way the Emperor, may also be seen as interlocking nets of patrons and clients.[327]

In Rom 16:1–2 Paul refers to Phoebe as both a διάκονος of the church of Cenchreae and a προστάτις of many, including Paul. Ernst Käseman has argued "a προστάτις could not take on legal functions."[328] However, Edwin Judge has cited a papyrus from 142 B.C.E. which refers to a woman being appointed the legal προστάτις of her fatherless son.[329] C. E. B. Cranfield points out that Paul uses both of these terms as reasons why the Church in Rome should aid Phoebe. Cranfield makes a distinction between the feminine form προστάτις and the masculine προστάτης arguing that the feminine form would not have carried the technical legal sense of the masculine. "However, while it is possible that the word is here used in its most general sense of 'helper', it seems quite probable that we should be justified in supposing that its choice implies that Phoebe was possessed of some social position, wealth and independence."[330] Ramsay MacMullen's survey has demonstrated that women made up "a fifth of all rescripts addresses" and "perhaps a tenth of the protectors and donors that *collegia* sought out were women."[331] Thomas Schreiner suggests that the term "helper" is to be preferred to "patron." He argues that women could not serve as legal patrons in the same sense that men did. Schreiner also points out that attempts to view Phoebe as a leader or president fail to notice the connection between Paul's instruction to "help" (παρίστημι) Phoebe and her role as a "helper" (προστάτις).[332] Further research into the role of female "patrons" is undoubtedly needed.

In examining the power of the patrons, Chow has identified four patrons in 1 Corinthians. First, the *powerful patron* of 1 Cor 6:1 who has strong connections in the local courts and thus uses the "ungodly" legal apparatus of Corinth to gain more status and power.[333] Second, the *rich patron* of 1 Cor 5 who marries his step-mother to keep

---

327. Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 81.

328. Ernst Käsemann, *Commentary on Romans* (trans. G. W. Bromiley; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980), 411.

329. Edwin A. Judge, "Cultural Conformity and Innovation in Paul: Some Clues from Contemporary Documents," *Tyndale Bulletin* 35 (1984): 21.

330. C. E. B. Cranfield, *Romans 9–16* (International Critical Commentary; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 782–3.

331. Ramsay MacMullen, "Women in Public in the Roman Empire," *Historia* 29 (1980): 211.

332. Thomas R. Schreiner, *Romans* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), 788.

333. Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 123–30.

his father's estate intact.[334] Third, the *political patron* of 1 Cor 8 who was obligated to offer sacrifices in connection with feasts to honor the Roman emperors.[335] Fourth, the *priestly patron* of 1 Cor 15:29, who conducted the baptismal rite of the dead.[336]

Taking quite a different view of patronage and the church in Corinth is Efrain Agosto. He compares Paul's statements of recommendations to the Greco-Roman letters of recommendation. In the Greco-Roman letters of recommendation it is usual to read of a patron commending his client to an even more powerful person. If the letter of commendation was successful, both the client and letter writing patron would benefit from an elevation of status. Paul's letters of commendation follow some of the stylistic structure of the typical patron-client letters of commendation. However, Agosto argues that Paul's letters of commendation are less about status and more about mutual edification, so that the communities of believers could resist and survive the imperial power. Agosto also suggests that "Paul was actually undermining the traditions of Roman patronage, power and the imperial order."[337]

Murphy-O'Connor offers a probable reconstruction of the situation that leads to Paul addressing the conditions surrounding the celebration of the Eucharist in 1 Cor 11. His reconstruction does not directly suggest that the patron-client relationship was part of the problem, yet it does suggest that the issue was connected with social-stratification within the church.[338] In 1 Cor 9 Paul enters into a lengthy argument concerning his rights as an apostle. In vv. 9–12a Paul makes a series of arguments that he does deserve a reward, yet he gave up this right to claim financial support from the church (9:12). Yet, more than simply giving up this right to receive financial rewards, Paul worked (v. 6), but more than describing himself as a laborer, Paul intensified his rhetoric in v. 19 by presenting himself as a slave. Chow argues that Paul was challenged by the rich

---

[334.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 130–41.

[335.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 130–41.

[336.] "First, it looks very likely that some relatively powerful patrons were behind the problems in the church discussed above.… Secondly if the various arguments presented above are correct, it would appear that there was a group of people in the church who, through lawsuits, marriage or social fellowship with powerful leaders in the colony, constantly sought to gain more, including possessions, power and honor." Chow acknowledges that the obscurity of the reference in 15:29 contains a degree of plausibility. Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 147–66.

[337.] Agosto, "Patronage and Commendation, Imperial and Anti-Imperial," 123.

[338.] "The host must have been a wealthy member of the community, so he invited into the triclinium his closest friends among the believers who would have been of the same social group, and from whom he might expect the same courtesy on a future occasion. The rest could take their places in the atrium, where conditions were greatly inferior." Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 183.

patrons of the church in Corinth, and that 1 Cor 9 is Paul's defense of his refusal to accept financial support from the patrons.[339] Hock has shown that the philosophers of Paul's day obtained support in four ways. They are *(1) charging fees,(2) entering the house of the rich and powerful, (3) begging and (4) working*. Hock argues that the Corinthian situation involved two of the options; Paul working to support himself, and his opponents entering the household of well-to-do Corinthians.[340] Hock's view further illuminates how the issue of patronage was an integrated issue in Paul's correspondence to the Corinthians.

Working off Chow's and Hock's arguments it would appear that while Paul was not opposed to receiving aid from Corinthians such as Phoebe, Paul was very cautious not be become a client of any of the powerful men in Corinth. This would indicate that there was enough of a difference between receiving help from a προστάτις and a προστάτης.[341] Paul does not want to be perceived as just another philosopher who is controlled by the purse strings of a wealthy male patron. It may well have been that Paul's resistance to becoming a client of a Corinthian may have led to him being rejected by some in Corinth. Perhaps Paul's reference in 2:1 to his *not coming with eloquence or superior wisdom* may reflect the patrons' rejection of Paul.[342]

Patronage was a dominant feature of Roman Corinth. Patronage was also part of the Christian community in Corinth. Indeed, it is closely connected with the issues that Paul addresses in his letters. This issue will be examined in the first six chapters of 1 Corinthians. In 1:1–9 Paul presents Jesus as the super-patron. In 1:10–4:21 Paul attempts to reassert himself as the apostle to the church. In 1 Cor 5–6 Paul addresses three core issues that grew out of patron abuses.

[339.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 108.

[340.] Hock, *Social Context*, 52–65.

[341.] This study will assume a nuanced difference between receiving help from a προστάτις and a προστάτης and using male pronouns to refer to patrons will reflect this difference.

[342.] E. A. Judge, representing the *new consensus*, writes, "Far from being a socially depressed group, then, if the Corinthians are at all typical, the Christians were dominated by a socially pretentious section of the population of the big cities. Beyond that they seem to have drawn on a broad constituency, probably representing the household dependants of the leading members. Certainly the phenomenon lead to constant differences among the Christians themselves, and helps explain the persistent stress on using membership in an association of equals to justify breaking down the conventional hierarchy of the household. The interest of the owner and patron class is obvious in this. It was they who sponsored Christianity to their dependants." E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern*, 60.

1.4.3.3 Patronage: Honor and Shame

Demonsthenes in his *De corona* rebukes (shames) his audience by not honoring those who have helped them in the past, "But you are so ungrateful and wicked by nature that, having been made free out of slavery and wealthy out of poverty by these people, you do not show gratitude towards them but rather enriched yourselves by taking action against them" (*Cor.* 131). John Elliot describes the relationship of the patron and client:

> The client in this relationship remains under the power (*potestas*) and within the *familia* of the patron for life (as in the case of manumitted slaves.) He or she owes the patron a variety of services (*obsequium*) and is obligated to enhance the prestige, reputation, and honor of his or her patron in public and private life.[343]

However, while Elliot connects honor with the client's obligation to his patron, he fails to discuss the client's failure in this area.

deSilva has demonstrated that one of the key terms used of the relationship between the patron and client was grace (χαρίς).[344] Grace was used of the willingness of a patron to grant a benefit to an individual or a group. Grace was used not only of the willingness to give a gift, but also for the gift that was given. Grace was used of the proper response of the recipient of the gift towards the giver, namely gratitude. Seneca uses this three-fold concept of grace when describing the image of the three goddesses as the three "graces." (*Ben.* 1.3.2–5) Working from this model of grace deSilva writes, "The proper response toward a patron is gratitude: offering loyalty, testimony and service to the patron. Reciprocity is such a part of this relationship, that failure to return grace (*gratitude*) for grace (*favor*) results in a breach of the patron-client relationship. God's favor seeks a response of faithfulness and service from God's clients."[345] Failure to show grace (*gratitude*) to one's patron was considered one of the worst crimes since the Graces were considered goddesses.[346]

The author of Hebrews in Heb 10:29–31 provides a clear example of a client acting in an ungrateful manner towards his patron. In this case the patron is God. This shameful behavior of the client is reciprocated by the patron. The author of Hebrews

---

[343.] John H. Elliott, "Patronage and Clientage," in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation* (ed. Richard L. Rohrbaugh; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996), 149.

[344.] deSilva, *Honor, Patronage*, 104–19.

[345.] deSilva, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 136.

[346.] "The ingrate committed a crime against the gods, humanity, and ultimately himself, while the person who returned grace for grace embodied the highest virtues of piety and justice and was valued for contributing to the forward movement of the danger of grace on which so much depended." deSilva, *Honor, Patronage*, 110–11.

uses three interrelated descriptions of the client acting in an ungrateful manner. (1) *How much worse punishment do you think will be deserved by those who have spurned the Son of God*, (2) *profaned the blood of the covenant by which they were sanctified*, (3) *and outraged the Spirit of grace*? Following this description of the client's ingratitude is a three-fold shaming of the client by the patron. First, the author of Hebrews uses two quotes of shame, and the third act of shame by the patron is not fully described and thus lets the imagination of the client draw the terrifying implication. (1) "*Vengeance is mine, I will repay*." And again, (2) "*The Lord will judge his people*." (3) *It is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God*.

Chow convincingly argues that in 1 Cor 5 the unnamed immoral or incestuous man was actually one of the city's leading aristocrats and a rich and powerful patron.[347] Paul's instructions to the Corinthians is that they should expel this incestuous man. Paul uses various elements of shame in 1 Cor 5, but the shame reaches its crescendo in v. 13 *"Drive out* (ἐξαίρω) *the wicked person* (πονηρός) *from among you*." No doubt more than shame is at work in both Heb 10:29–31 and 1 Cor 5. However, shame is a central theme in both. This would suggest that the issues of patronage and the rhetoric of honor and shame are interconnected in 1 Corinthians and worthy of further investigation.

1.5   Method

Betz's work on Galatians is important due to the fact it was the first attempt to apply modern rhetorical analysis to a New Testament text.[348] However, Betz failed to describe a methodology for rhetoric criticism.[349] George Kennedy, in his influential book, *New Testament Interpretation through Rhetoric Criticism*, provided a much needed and well used methodology.[350] Kennedy describes the goal of rhetorical analysis as "the discovery of the author's intent and of how that is transmitted through a text to an audience."[351] A modified form of Kennedy's methodology will be used in examining Paul's rhetoric of shame in 1 Cor 1–6. Kennedy's methodology follows five steps:[352]

[347.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 130–41.
[348.] This may be see in Betz's rhetorical outline of Galatians. Betz, *Galatians*, 16–23.
[349.] Brian K. Peterson, *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth*, 23.
[350.] George Kennedy's rhetorical criticism methodology has been used by Brian K. Peterson, *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth*, 23–25, and by Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style*, 8–28.
[351.] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 12.
[352.] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 3–38.

1.5.1   (1) Determine the Rhetorical Unit

The basic view here is that the unit must form a complete persuasive unit. It may vary in size from a single pericope to a complete book. First Corinthians 1–6 will be examined as the rhetorical unit.[353] While it is common to analyze 1 Cor 1–4 as a unit,[354] 1 Cor 5–6 will also be examined in relation to 1 Cor 1–4. The working premise is that in 1 Cor 1–3 Paul addresses the problem of division arising from the patrons and their house churches. In 1 Cor 4 Paul attempts to regain his authority over the Corinthians. Paul, in 1 Cor 5–6, addresses three additional problems directly related to patronal influence and activities in the Corinthian congregation. In the following three chapters of this study each of these sections will be examined in detail. However, the beginning of each chapter will discuss the social, literal, and rhetorical aspects of each section so as to demonstrate that it is a complete persuasive unit and that it can be examined as such.

1.5.2   (2) Analyze the Rhetorical Situation

In this step the goal is to define the background situation that prompted the response. Kennedy notes that "the concept of rhetorical situation was first promulgated by Lloyd F. Bitzer."[355] Lloyd Bitzer defines the rhetorical situation as ". . . a complex of persons, events, objects and relations presenting an actual or potential exigence which 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."[356] Kennedy's adaptation of Bitzer's rhetorical situation has been uncritically followed by Watson in his dissertation.[357]

The same may be said of Fiorenza and Wire. Both approach 1 Corinthians with a high degree of suspicion concerning Paul's presentation of the actual situation in Corinth. Fiorenza distinguishes between the "history argumentation situation" and the

---

[353.] Andrew Clarke examines 1 Cor 1–6 as a rhetorical unit. Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*.

[354.] The following works view 1 Cor 1–4 as a rhetorical unit, Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*; Brian K. Peterson, *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth*, 144; David G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 131; A. Duane Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation: An Investigation of 1 Cor. 1–4 in the Life of Greco-Roman Rhetoric* (SNTS; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994).

[355.] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 34.

[356.] Lloyd Bitzer, "The Rhetorical Situation," *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 6.

[357.] Watson, *Invention, Arrangement and Style*, 8, 29–32.

"implied or inscribed rhetorical situation" which for Fiorenza is the actual situation in Corinth and Paul's rhetorical presentation of it.[358] Wire rejects the "hermeneutic of trust" that accepts Paul's presentation of the situation in Corinth as he describes it. She argues that Paul was in fact trying to conceal the true nature of the events at Corinth. Wire attempts to bring to the fore what Paul attempts, in his rhetoric, to suppress. Adam and Horrell make an insightful observation on both Fiorenza's and Wire's merging of a "hermeneutic of suspicion" and "the rhetorical situation" as they write, "Can one be deeply suspicious of the view of the situation portrayed in the text and yet remain hopeful of being able to reconstruct from the same text the situation as it really was?"[359]

However, Stamps argues that Bitzer's/Kennedy's rhetorical situation has been followed somewhat slavishly.[360] Stamps notes, "In recent years as rhetorical criticism has gained popularity, the historical situation or the epistolary occasion has been renamed or reclassified as 'the rhetorical situation.'"[361] Stamps renames the rhetorical situation the *entextualised* situation which he insists "is not the historical situation which generates the text and/or which the text responds to or addresses; rather, at this level, it is the situation embedded in the text, and created by the text, which contributes to the rhetorical effect of the text."[362]

Vorster, commenting on Paul's letter to the Romans, makes a compelling argument when he argues that Kennedy's adaptation of Bitzer's rhetorical situation "is the optimistic assumption of the ontological *existence* of situation as a factual entity which can indeed be known, that is, a situation which can exist objectively and independently from observation."[363] Vorster does not reject attempts to establish a rhetorical situation, rather he suggests the "rhetorical situation should not be seen as consisting of objective matters of fact, but should be located within a wider context, that of culture, formed by the linguistic power of people."[364]

---

[358] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 192.
[359] Adams and Horrell, *Christianity at Corinth*, 37.
[360] Dennis L. Stamps, "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation: The Entextualisation of the Situation in New Testament Epistles," in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference* (ed. S. E. Porter and Olbricht T. H.; Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1993), 197.
[361] Stamps, "Rethinking," 193.
[362] Stamps, "Rethinking," 199.
[363] J. N Vorster, "The Context of the Letter to the Romans: A Critique on the Present State of Research," *Neotestamentica* 28 (1994): 139.
[364] Vorster, "The Context of the Letter to the Romans," 144.

Adams and Horrell note that most contemporary scholars do in fact attempt to use Paul's correspondence to reconstruct, to some degree, the historical situation at Corinth. They write,

> The underlying assumption here is that the task of historical reconstruction is necessary to the interpretation of the letter. This historical reconstruction of the situation that prompted the letter to be written has traditionally - at least since the rise of historical criticism - been seen as crucial to the exegesis of any New Testament text, especially the Pauline letters.[365]

Thus, when considering the "rhetorical situation" it must be stated that 1 Corinthians is not a detailed accurate objective description of the problems in Corinth; if such a thing could even exist. First Corinthians is Paul's carefully crafted response to the problems in Corinth, as Paul perceived them to be problems. Paul shapes both his description of the various problems and his solutions to these problems to suit his own rhetorical goals. However, this study will work from the premise that neither 1 Corinthians nor any text is created in a vacuum. When all is said and done, the reality is that the primary tool that is available to help fill the vacuum is 1 Corinthians.

The working premise pertaining to the subjective rhetorical situation for this study is that after Paul left Corinth the Christians from the elite class began to structure the congregation along the societal lines of the patron-client relationship. Barclay addresses this problem by comparing and contrasting Paul's letters to the church in Thessalonica and the church in Corinth. He concludes that one of the core differences is that while the church in Thessalonica is apocalyptic the church in Corinth is secular, "their perception of their church and of the significance of their faith could correlate well with a life-style which remained fully integrated in Corinthian society."[366] The rhetorical situation would also include the elite patrons' prejudice against Paul and a rejection of his role as an apostle.

Closely connected to the rhetorical situation is the role of Paul's Corinthian audience as counterpart to his rhetorical intentions. Due to constraints of scope and space this avenue of study will not be fully pursued in this study. However, this is an important area for further dedicated research in its own right.

One aspect pertaining to Paul's audience will briefly be addressed as it is addressed in greater detail in another section of this study. E. A. Judge, the first proponent of what has now become known as the new consensus, suggested that the early urban Christian churches were mixed and compromised of socially diverse

---

[365] Adams and Horrell, *Christianity at Corinth*, 39.
[366] Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 71.

members.[367] Paul's statement in 1 Cor 1:26 "not many of you were wise by human standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth" prompted Theissen to note. "If Paul says that there were not many in the Corinthian congregation who were wise, powerful and wellborn, then this much is certain: there were some."[368] Thus, this study will assume that Paul's Corinthian audience was composed of socially diverse members. This theme is dealt with in more detail in chapter 2 in section 2.2 "Slogans and Σοφία" and in section 2.7.2 "The Second Inclusio, Boast in the Lord, 1:26–31."

1.5.3   (3) Determine the Species of Rhetoric

At this point there will be a modification to Kennedy's methodology. Kennedy suggests that determining the species of rhetoric can be crucial in understanding the unit. He outlines the three classical species of rhetoric along with brief characteristics of each so as to aid in the process of determining the specific species.[369] While there have been many attempts to examine various New Testament documents through one of these three species of classical rhetoric there is a growing consensus that none of these species appear in pure form in the New Testament documents. Thus, attempting to separate a complex and diverse text such as 1 Cor 1–6 into one of these species may not be fruitful. At best, it may be conceded that a section of a rhetorical unit may be predominantly characterized by one of the three species of rhetoric. This may be seen in 1 Cor 4:1–5 where it may be argued that Paul employs forensic or judicial rhetoric as he employs judicial language and imaginary. However, in vv. 8–13 Paul changes gear and employs a *peristasis* catalogue which, according to John Fitzgerald, is part of Paul's *letter of admonition* in 1 Cor 1:10-4:21. This then would imply that Paul's *peristasis* catalogue may be categorized as deliberative rhetoric.[370] However, if Kennedy's guidelines for determining the rhetoric species of the unit is followed then the question arises; is 1 Cor 4 judicial or deliberative rhetoric? Or perhaps, is chapter four

---

[367.] "Far from being a socially depressed group, then, if the Corinthians are at all typical, the Christians were dominated by a socially pretentious section of the population of the big cities. Beyond that, they seem to have drawn on a broad constituency, probably representing the household dependents of the leading members." E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern*, 60.

[368.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 72.

[369.] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 36–37.

[370.] John T. Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence* (SBLDS 89; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 117.

deliberative rhetoric being served by judicial rhetoric, or vice versa?[371] This would suggest, that while Kennedy's suggestion to determine the rhetoric species has been an invaluable aid in returning scholars to reading the New Testament texts in light of rhetorical theory, that Kennedy's suggestion is, in the end, too simplistic of a methodology to deal with the complexity of the New Testament texts.

In this study 1 Cor 1–6 will not be determined according to the three species of ancient rhetorical theory. This is due to the premise that while Paul may have been familiar with ancient rhetorical theory he did not follow it mechanically. It is also based on Anderson's insightful premise that rhetorical theory was designed to help men *write* speeches, not analyze them.[372] Classen correctly observes, "It is not surprising that the categories of ancient rhetoric fail us with respect to the structure of this epistle, because it is an epistle, and they were not made nor meant to fit such kinds of composition."[373]

The *New Rhetoric* of Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca attempts to leave the three species of classical rhetoric aside and instead propose that arguments could be examined using techniques of argument. Wire utilizes these techniques of argument as she groups various aspects of the rhetorical characteristics of 1 Corinthians.[374] However, it must be noted, that Wire goes beyond simply grouping 1 Corinthians according to these techniques of argument. She examines each rhetorical unit of 1 Corinthians with a special focus on women. Wire's work on 1 Corinthians rejects structural rhetoric in favor of textual rhetoric.[375] She provides an interesting illustration to explain her use of textual rhetoric:

> Just as a child can speak her native tongue correctly without schooling, so a man can sell a horse or a conviction very persuasively without reflecting on how he does it. In Paul's case the data we have is this persuasion itself. Even his reflections on his own speaking and how it is received are an integral part of his effort to persuade. So the question whether Paul composed with conscious rhetorical technique or analyzed in retrospect the way he had spoken can be set aside. His argument can be the focus of this and the proper and sufficient access point to his audience.[376]

The proper and sufficient access point to Paul's audience will be the textual rhetoric of honor and shame in 1 Cor 1–6. Returning to Aune's view of textual rhetoric

---

[371.] This section of 1 Corinthians will be analyzed in greater detail in chapter three of this study.

[372.] Anderson, *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*, 290–91.

[373.] Classen, *Rhetorical Criticism*, 23.

[374.] Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, 12–38.

[375.] Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of Literature & Rhetoric*, Rhetoric Criticism.

[376.] Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, 2.

"The latter is more directly useful for exegesis, since it focuses on the argumentation of the text." Thus study will take on the format and appearance of an extended exegesis of 1 Cor 1–6. Attention will be paid to social-scientific and social-historical studies that focus on the patron-client relationship and the role of honor and shame in that relationship. These chapters will be divided into their rhetorical units. Each unit will be analyzed through the lens of textual rhetoric. In effect each unit will be examined verse by verse to discover the textual rhetoric of that unit. This will also allow the reader to observe how Paul builds his argument in that unit and how the social values of honor and shame are employed in Paul's rhetoric.

1.5.4   (4) Analyze Invention, Arrangement, and Style

Invention is the composition of argumentation by *ethos*, *pathos*, or *logos*. Arrangement is the ordering of structural elements as the *exordium* (an introduction and preparation of the audience), the *narratio* (stating the case briefly), the *propositio* (a brief summary), the *probatio* (proving the case), and the *peroratio* (summing up). Style includes how various figures of speech are utilized.[377]

However, there is much debate and variation among scholars concerning the arrangement of Paul's letters. Porter provides a valuable representative overview of the various arrangements of Paul's letter by recent scholars.[378] He also suggests three reasons for the various arrangements. First, "a mix of Greek and Roman categories, often combined in ways not found in the handbooks themselves."[379] Second, "the amount and kind of material placed within the categories often varies significantly. The defense offered for the categories that are used are often in terms of the perceived function of the particular section of the letter."[380] Third, "When analyzing the Pauline letters, any rhetorical analysis must come from the fact that the Pauline letters are first and foremost letters, no matter what other category of analysis into which they may fit."[381]

Thus, a knowledge of ancient rhetoric theory's use of invention, arrangement, and style can be a profitable tool in interpreting Paul's letters. However, caution must

---

[377.] For a list of stylistic features in Paul's letters, consult Stanley E. Porter, "Paul of Tarsus and His Letters," in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.–A.D. 400* (ed. Stanley E. Porter; 2001), 576–84.

[378.] Porter, "Paul of Tarsus and His Letters," 541–61.

[379.] Porter, "Paul of Tarsus and His Letters," 561.

[380.] Porter, "Paul of Tarsus and His Letters," 561.

[381.] Porter, "Paul of Tarsus and His Letters," 561.

be used not to force 1 Cor 1–6 into a mechanical or slavish reconstruction of invention, arrangement, and style. Again, textual rhetoric will be the primary species of rhetoric used to examine 1 Cor 1–6, and textual rhetoric will also be used to evaluate the invention and arrangement of 1 Cor 1–6.

1.5.5   (5) Evaluate Rhetorical Effectiveness

Kennedy notes, "at the end of the process of analysis it will be valuable to look back over the entire unit and review its success in meeting the rhetorical exigence and what its implications may be for its speaker or audience." The conclusion of this study will consider the effectiveness of Paul's rhetoric of shame in 1 Cor 1–6.[382]

1.6   Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the valuable and ongoing contributions that social-scientific, social-historical, and rhetorical approaches have made to the field of biblical studies. Particular attention has been paid to the patronal networks and the social values of honor and shame that existed within the Empire, Corinth, and the Corinthian congregation. Kennedy's rhetorical criticism has been outlined and adapted with modifications as the underlying textual rhetorical methodology that will be employed in examining 1 Cor 1–6.

Chapter two of this study will examine Paul's argument in 1 Cor 1:1–2:5 from a textual rhetorical perspective paying particular attention to the patron-client relationship and its relationship to the factionalism within the congregation. Attention will also be paid to Paul's use of the language and function of honor and shame in addressing the factionalism. It will be argued that Paul begins by introducing Jesus as the super-patron over the whole congregation and in so doing Paul shames the Corinthians for their local patronal factionalism.

Chapter three will demonstrate that 1 Cor 4 is Paul's attempt to regain a position of power over the Corinthian congregation. In 1 Cor 4 Paul appeals to the ultimate tribunal, his suffering, and his position as father of the Corinthians in his attempt to gain power. This position of power is vital for Paul to reestablish so that he can address the abuses of the powerful in chapters 5–6. It will be demonstrated that Paul continues to employ a rhetoric of honor and shame in 1 Cor 4.

[382.] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 38.

Chapter four of this study will focus on 1 Cor 5–6 and examine how Paul addresses the three issues of incest, law court abuses, and sexual immorality. It will be argued that these three issues of 1 Cor 5–6 are connected to the powerful patrons in the congregation.

The fifth and final chapter will briefly review the findings of this study and consider the effectiveness of Paul's rhetoric of honor and shame in 1 Cor 1–6.

CHAPTER 2

1 CORINTHIANS 1:1–2:5

2.1   Introduction

This chapter will examine Paul's argument in 1 Cor 1:1–2:5 from a textual rhetorical perspective paying particular attention to the social aspects of the patron-client relationship and the social values of honor and shame.[1] Central to 1 Cor 1:1–2:5, and to Paul's argument in 1 Cor 1–6, are the slogans of 1:12 ("*I belong to Paul*," or "*I belong to Apollos*," or "*I belong to Cephas*," or "*I belong to Christ*"). It will be argued that these slogans demonstrate that the Corinthian congregation was composed of house churches which met in the homes of elite patrons and that these slogans were part of a status competition between the house churches as each tried to advance its own patron's status.

It will also be argued that in 1 Cor 1:1–11 Paul lays a foundation that will enable him to address the factional slogans of v. 12. In this foundation Paul identifies Jesus, himself, and the Corinthians in terms that will facilitate his central rhetorical goals. Specifically, Paul presents Jesus as the super-patron who is over and above all other patrons, he presents himself as an apostle of Jesus, and Paul addresses the Corinthians as clients of Jesus. Paul, using a series of rhetorical questions in vv. 13–17, deals directly but briefly with the problem of factionalism. These rhetorical questions have a tone of shame in that they highlight the inconsistency the Corinthian patronal based factionalism creates with the patronage the Corinthians have received from Jesus. These rhetorical questions also function to set up a series of three *inclusi* in vv. 18–2:5. In 1:18–25, the first *inclusio*, Paul begins the first phase of erecting a boundary as he contrasts insiders and outsiders and presents two competing views of the message of the cross. To the outsiders, the cross is foolishness, while to the insiders, the cross is the

---

[1.] For a discussion on why 1 Corinthians 1–6 is examined as a rhetorical unit and why 1–2:5 is examined as a section within this unit see the section titled "The Rhetorical Unit."

power of God. In 1:26–31, the second *inclusio*, Paul continues to erect the boundary as he moves his argument from a contrast between the insiders and outsiders to a contrast between the time when the majority of the Corinthians were shamed outsiders and their new status as honored insiders. In 2:1–5, the third *inclusio*, Paul solidifies the boundaries between the insiders and the outsiders as he returns to the theme of his preaching, and how it is viewed by insiders and outsiders. Each *inclusio* begins with an opening affirmation and a conclusion that is directly tied to the affirmation.

In these *inclusi* Paul moves his argument from a direct attack on factionalism into a comparison between the *cross of Christ* and the words of *eloquent wisdom*. It will also be argued that these three *inclusi* incorporate honor and shame language as they present Jesus as the super-patron, Paul as the apostle and teacher who honors Jesus by proclaiming the shameful message of Christ and him crucified, and the Corinthians as the clients who have been honored by Jesus.

2.2 Slogans and Σοφία

Paul's use of σοφία in 1 Cor 1–4 has provided much scholarly discussion and a variety of opinions on the precise nature of σοφία. Walter Schmithals connects Paul's use of σοφία with gnosticism.[2] Wilhelm Wüllner connects Paul's use of σοφία in 1 Cor 1–3 with what he calls "haggadic homily genre."[3] W. O. Fitch suggests that the slogans of 1:12 "reflects the points of view which came into conflict at Antioch: those namely of the Jerusalem church, or a section of it."[4] James Davis emphasizes the human character of Paul's use of σοφία and links σοφία λόγου with both Israel's failure to perceive God's activity in their situation and the Corinthians' failure to perceive God's activity in the cross of Christ.[5] Ben Witherington,[6] Bruce Winter,[7] Duane Litfin,[8] Gordon Fee,[9] and David Garland[10] connect σοφία λόγου with Greco-Roman rhetoric. Pogoloff

---

[2.] Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 141–55.

[3.] Wilhelm Wüllner, "Haggadic Homily Genre in 1 Cor. 1–3," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89 (1970): 199–203.

[4.] W. O. Fitch, "Paul, Apollos, Cephas, Christ," *Theology* 74 (1971): 18–24.

[5.] James A. Davis, *Wisdom and Spirit: An Investigation of 1 Cor. 1:18–3:20 Against the Background of Jewish Sapiential Traditions in the Greco-Roman Period* (Lanham: University of America Press, 1984), 72–74.

[6.] Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 46–48.

[7.] Winter, *Philo and Paul*, 185–86.

[8.] Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology*.

[9.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 64.

[10.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 55–58.

suggests that οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου should be translated as *sophisticated speech*,[11] and BAGD suggests σοφίᾳ λόγου in 1 Corinthians is *cleverness in speaking*.[12] Thiselton, commenting on Paul's use of οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου in v. 17, correctly suggests that Paul means "not by manipulative rhetoric."[13]

Paul's rejection of rhetoric has lead Litfin to argue that it was Paul's deficiencies in eloquence that caused some of the Corinthians to reject him.[14] However, Garland has taken a differing view as he points out that a few scholars have dealt with the irony of Paul's rhetoric to undermine rhetoric.[15] Pogoloff notes that Paul demonstrates rhetorical sophistication in his letters, yet Pogoloff concludes that Paul is in fact rejecting the cultural values wedded to rhetoric, not rhetoric itself.[16] Duane Litfin argues that Paul employed rhetoric as his servant, not as his master.[17] The result being that Paul "can at once attack rhetoric and employ it in that very attack."[18] Commenting on Paul's rhetoric against rhetoric Collins succinctly describes the irony as he notes,

> Even Paul's denial that he uses rhetorical technique, lest the cross of Christ be deprived of its power, is a rhetorical device. Ancient rhetors frequently used demurrals and veiled apologies in order to win the goodwill of their audiences or disarm their opponents (e.g. Isocrates, *Nicocles*, or *The Cyprians* 45). In any event, the language of the first paragraph in the body of Paul's letter is laced with terms and expressions commonly used in Hellenistic political rhetoric.[19]

Laurence Welborn, working from the premise that 1 Cor 1–4 is strikingly similar to speeches on concord and is essentially political rhetoric, contends the slogans of 1:12 demonstrate a struggle for power within the Corinthian congregation. He notes, "The terms with which σχίσμα is associated make it clear that it is neither a religious heresy nor a harmless clique that the author has in mind, but factions engaged in a

---

[11.] Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 109.

[12.] "σοφία" BAGD 934.

[13.] "On this basis Paul may well mean *not by manipulative rhetoric*. Indeed, this might well be the best translation, except it imposes on the English reader the interpretive judgments of the translator and makes the translation narrower and more specific than the Greek itself. Here is one of many cases where the fine line between interpretation and translation becomes virtually impossible to sustain. This kind of examination offers one of many instances which encourage the serious student of NT to learn Greek thoroughly, in order to arrive at a firsthand judgment on so complex an issue." Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 143–44.

[14.] Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology*, 274.

[15.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 58.

[16.] Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 121.

[17.] Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology*, 345–46.

[18.] Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 120.

[19.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1999), 76.

struggle for power."[20] Working from this perspective, Welborn, using select political parallels, suggests that the slogans of 1:12 are used by four factions in this struggle for power. "The real party leaders are thus local Christians (Chloe, Crispus, Gaius, and Stephanas) who seek to legitimate their power by appealing to renowned figures in the church."[21]

John Chow, in examining the role of patronage and power in Corinth, draws a close connection between rhetoric and the socially powerful and rich, and in so doing he also draws a parallel that fits well with Paul's statements in 1:17 and 1:26.[22] This would also reinforce the view that central to Paul's arguments in 1 Cor 1–4 is sophistic rhetoric. However, Chow takes this connection between the rich and powerful in Corinth and rhetoric and considers the role of patronage in the church in Corinth. Working from the argument of Peter Marshall that Apollos was a teacher who accepted patronage of the rich and powerful in the church,[23] Chow examines Paul's refusal to accept financial support from the Corinthian church and suggests that Paul's refusal leads to his defense of his apostleship in 1 Cor 9:1–8. [24] Bruce Winter also draws a close connection between the slogans of 1:12, factionalism and sophistic rhetoric.[25] Andrew Clarke contends that the slogans of 1:12 are connected with secular leadership

---

[20.] Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 3. The view on the schism as neither a religious nor a harmless clique has been challenged by Strüder, "Preferences not Parties".

[21.] Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 24.

[22.] "It is our thesis that perceived deficiencies in Paul's preaching, when measured against Greco-Roman eloquence, precipitated the difficulties in Corinth. These were the deficiencies which prompted a section of the Corinthian congregation to declare their independence from him." Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 105.

[23.] Peter Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987).

[24.] "It is likely that Paul's conflict with some of the Corinthians resulted partly from Paul's refusal to accept money from the church which, in effect, constituted a violation of the convention of friendship or patronage and which would therefore be seen by some at least to bring dishonor to the rich patrons in the church. The divisions at the Lord's table probably reflected something of the same distinctions between patrons and inferiors. It may also be assumed that the tensions in the church were caused or exacerbated to some extent by competition among patrons in the church." Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 188–89.

[25.] "The reason for the Corinthians' intense response to Paul and others has been explained by the precedent created for followers of the sophists with their commitment and zealousness to a particular teacher. Just as one enrolled in the school of a sophist or became their zealous follower and admirer at public declamations, so too the newly baptized would receive instruction from their Christian teacher. Where household baptisms occurred, the coming of a teacher into that social unit certainly had its cultural precedent in the sophistic movement. It seems reasonable to explain the nexus between leaders, parties and baptism in this way." Winter, *Philo and Paul*, 192–3.

rather than theological differences.[26] Timothy Carter, using the socio-anthropological models Mary Douglas developed in analyzing four different ideal types of culture,[27] argues that the Corinthian congregation was not a "united congregation but rather suffered from the problem of rival factions."[28]

While the works of Welborn, Chow, Winter, Clarke, and Carter draw on different sources and progress in different directions, they share a common perspective that v. 12 is not a matter of theological differences but rather the slogans of v. 12 demonstrate evidence of factionalism, patronage, and sophistic rhetoric. Jewett correctly but briefly notes that the claims of "party allegiance" contain implicit claims of superior honor.[29]

In 1 Cor 3:4 Paul returns to the slogans. However, here he uses the slogans as a means of validating his depiction of the Corinthians as "infants" (νήπιος) in 3:1–3. Paul then proceeds to offer a view of Apollos and Paul as co-workers rather than competitors in vv. 5–9. Paul ends chapter three by citing all four names used in the slogans of 1:12. However, in 3:21–22, he presents himself, Apollos and Cephas not as slogans to be cited by competitive factions but as "mere" men (ἄνθρωπος) belonging to the whole community. Then, Paul presents the Corinthians as belonging to Christ. There is a contrast between the competitive slogans of 1:12 (ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ

---

26. "Regarding the "Corinthian parties", it has been possible to see that a wrong assumption of many commentators is that the distinctions between the groups are principally theological. Here it has been demonstrated that the basis of the parties is the secular practice of aligning oneself with someone of established status and reputation in order to advance one's own status. This has been clearly seen in the dynamics of patronage, politics, and sophistic practices. As a result of the common assumption, attempts to distinguish between the groups and define their beliefs has been wrongly founded." Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 107.

27. Mary Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (3rd; London: Routledge, 2003).

28. "Use of the model lends support to the view that Corinth was not a united church, but rather suffered from the problem of rival factions. The model also suggests that this rivalry found concrete social expressions in a competition for followers, as the local leaders of these factions attempted to minimize the numbers of their adherents at each other's and at Paul's expense. Admittedly, the letter itself contains no direct evidence that leaders were competing for followers in this way, and this analysis has had to rely to an uncomfortable extent on Douglas's portrayal of the 'Big Men' in New Guinea. Nevertheless, there is a close correspondence between these 'Big Men' societies and what we can glean from the Corinthian situation from Paul's letters. Furthermore, this scenario carries a strong degree of cultural credibility within Paul's own first-century context. Thus, while a lack of direct evidence of necessity means that this reading of the letter must remain unproven, nevertheless it may be considered plausible." Timothy L. Carter, "'Big Men' in Corinth," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 66 (1997): 69.

29. Jewett, "Paul, Shame, and Honor," 557.

ʾΑπολλῶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ) and the new slogan (ὑμεῖς δὲ Χριστοῦ). Paul's use of the Corinthians' slogans in 1:12 and his new counter slogan in 3:23 would suggest that 1 Cor 1:10–3:23 forms one rhetorical unit within the larger unit of 1 Cor 1–6.

Paul refers to Apollos twice more in 1 Corinthians, in 4:6 and in 16:12.[30] Both times Paul presents his relationship with Apollos as being cooperative rather than competitive.[31] In 4:6 Paul refers back to his discussion of his relationship with Apollos in 1 Cor 3 as a model of following the scripture, *Nothing beyond what is written*. In 16:12 Paul notes that he has in fact strongly encouraged Apollos, *our brother*, to visit Corinth, but it was Apollos who was not willing to visit Corinth.[32]

Paul also refers to Cephas twice more in 1 Corinthians, in 9:5 and in 15:15. In both these references Paul argues that he is both equal to and cooperative with Cephas. In 1 Cor 9 Paul argues that he is a full apostle with all the rights of an apostle. However, the fact that Paul did not take any monetary reward from the Corinthians may have been cited by his opponents as evidence of his weak ability as a speaker and to undermine his role as an apostle. Paul may not have taken money from any of the Corinthian patrons so as not to be perceived as a client of any Corinthian patron.[33] As Paul argues for his rights as an apostle in v. 5 he argues that he has the same rights as the other apostles, *Do we not have the right to be accompanied by a believing wife, as do the other apostles and the brothers of the Lord and Cephas?*

In 1 Cor 15 Paul devotes much energy to the issue of the resurrection. In vv. 1–11 he attempts to re-establish the centrality of the doctrine of the resurrection. In vv. 1–4 Paul reminds the Corinthian congregation that the foundation to their original belief is the resurrection of Jesus. In vv. 6–11 Paul emphasizes the commonality of the witness to and the preaching of the resurrection among the apostolic community, and again Paul singles out Cephas in v. 5. Thus, throughout the rest of the epistle, Paul counters the competitive slogans of 1:12 both directly and indirectly.

[30.] Joop F. M. Smit, "'What is Apollos? What is Paul?' In Search for the Coherence of First Corinthians 1:10–4:21," *Novum Testamentum* 44 (2002): 231–51.

[31.] For a review of Montefiore's view that Hebrews was written from Ephesus by Apollos to the Corinthian church between 52–54, see L. D. Hurst, "Apollos, Hebrews, and Corinth: Bishop Montefiore's Theory Examined," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 38 (1985): 505–13.

[32.] Thiselton suggests, "Paul's anxieties about Timothy's reception may have owed something to some preferences in some quarters for a visit from Apollos instead." Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 1332.

[33.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 172–74.

Various scholars have examined the slogans of 1:12 with the goal of identifying Paul's opponents in Corinth. Collins is of the minority view when he writes, "the so-called slogans are not slogans used by various groups among the Corinthians. They are caricatures created by Paul."[34] The majority view is that the slogans do indeed represent actual parties in Corinth. However, there has been much debate pertaining to the nature of the parties the slogans referred to. Thiselton provides a succinct overview of the scholarly discussion pertaining to the nature of the Corinthian parties.

> This point remains important since in 1831 F. C. Baur purposed a speculative but influential theory based on the assumption that the "Christ party" at Corinth inclined towards a quasi-Judaizing opposition to claims for gospel freedom and emancipation from the law put forward by a supposed "Paul party." In the second half of the twentieth century, by contrast, a series of writers, including J. Munck and N. A. Dahl, argued that these groups were not "parties" or "factions," but cliques gathered around certain personalities or reflecting a certain ethos. During the 1990s several writers, including L. L. Welborn and Margaret M. Mitchell, perceived a "political" dimension that reflected a power struggle for influence within the church, supported by a use of rhetorical confrontation. This complements rather than excludes Munck's approach.[35]

Welborn goes as far as to suggest actual names "The real party leaders are thus local Christians (Chloe, Crispus, Gaius, and Stephanas) who seek to legitimate their power by appealing to renowned figures in the church.[36] More recently, David Hall has argued that these factional slogans are disguised references to other unnamed leaders or teachers.[37] Hall argues that these unnamed teachers were "teachers who had come to Corinth from elsewhere."[38] However, rather than suggesting that Paul's opponents were outside teachers, Chow suggests Paul's opponents were the local Corinthian patrons.[39] Clarke is also of the view that Paul's opponents in Corinth were the local patrons.[40]

[34.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 73.

[35.] Anthony C. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians: A Shorter Exegetical & Pastoral Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006), 39.

[36.] Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 24.

[37.] David R. Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 4–25.

[38.] Hall, *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*, 3.

[39.] "First, it looks very likely that some relatively powerful patrons were behind the problems in the discussion above, whatever the theological view they actually espoused. . . . Secondly, if the various arguments presented above are correct, it would appear that there was a group of people in the church who, through lawsuits, marriage, or social fellowship with the powerful leaders in the colony constantly sought to gain more, including possessions, power and honour." Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 166.

[40.] "It has become apparent that leadership in the Graeco-Roman world was extremely expensive and therefore also élitist—the tall order expected of such leaders could only be fulfilled by a narrowly defined group. In order to be involved in high positions of responsibility, it was a necessary pre-requisite to be among the wise, well-born and powerful. Leadership, even

Pertaining to the identity of Paul's Corinthian opponents is the discussion on the old and new consensus. In this discussion New Testament scholarship has passed through three phases.[41] Broadly speaking, the first phase or the old consensus viewed the social status of the earliest urban Christian churches as being composed of people from the lower class. Adolf Deissmann's research on the papyri lead him to conclude that the Greek of the New Testament was that used by the ordinary people.[42] In the second phase E. A. Judge, the first proponent of what has now become known as the new consensus, suggested that the early urban Christian churches were mixed and comprised of socially diverse members.[43]

The third phase began in the early 1970s, "from the 1970s to the present there emerged a general recognition of widespread variations of social status."[44] Gerd Theissen, commenting on the views of both Deissmann and Judge, writes, "both views are probably correct, . . . the Corinthian congregation is marked by internal stratification. The majority of the members, who come from the lower classes, stand in contrast to a few influential members who come from the upper class."[45] First Corinthians 1:22 (*not many of you were wise by human standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth*) is cited by Theissen in support of the new consensus. "If Paul says that there were not many in the Corinthian congregation who were wise, powerful and wellborn, then this much is certain: there were some."[46]

William Baird in a short but convincing article summarizes the complexity of both the first Corinthian epistle and various scholarly attempts to demonstrate the evidence of factionalism throughout the epistle. Baird concludes by suggesting that

---

prospective leadership, was very much on show and had to prove itself (principally in financial terms). Leaders had to make an impact on those they lead in order to be elected by them, and this could only be done by making a good impact, often through benefactions. One of the main reasons for pursuing leadership in the city was the inevitable accompanying honour and esteem that would be received." Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 39.

[41] Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 48.

[42] Adolf Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East* (rev. ed.; trans. Lionel Strachen; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2004).

[43] "Far from being a socially depressed group, then, if the Corinthians are at all typical, the Christians were dominated by a socially pretentious section of the population of the big cities. Beyond that, they seem to have drawn on a broad constituency, probably representing the household dependents of the leading members." E. A. Judge, *The Social Pattern*, 60.

[44] Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 48.

[45] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 69.

[46] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 72.

precise identification of the factions is not possible.[47] For the purposes of this study Baird's conclusion will be followed.

In conclusion, the primary focus of this work will be a rhetorical critical analysis of Paul's use of the social values of honor and shame in 1 Cor 1–6. However, rhetoric does not occur in a vacuum. Both honor and shame are community values. Thus, by necessity, there is a close connection between the socio-historical background of 1 Cor 1–6 and Paul's rhetoric of honor and shame. Particular attention will be paid to the relationship between the patron and his client and the role of honor and shame in this relationship.

Based on the above discussion, and the recent work on the socio-historical setting of 1 Corinthians, it will be taken that there were four factions in Corinth, and that each faction was competing with the other three factions. However, it is beyond the scope of this study to identify the precise identification of the factional leaders. The four slogans Paul mentions are both identifying slogans and competitive slogans. Since Paul does acknowledge that his information comes from Chloe's household, it would be quite odd for Paul to then give evidence of these quarrels by quoting a series of fictitious slogans. It is assumed that each faction is a house church, meeting in the home of a wealthy patron. In 1 Cor 1–3 Paul addresses this factionalism, yet, in so doing, Paul also begins to undermine the influence of his opponents.

2.3   The Rhetorical Unit

George Kennedy suggests that the first step in rhetorical criticism is to determine the rhetorical unit to be treated.[48] First Corinthians 7:1 begins with περὶ δέ (*now concerning*), a term used by Paul to signify a new topic for discussion.[49] In this work it will be argued that 1 Cor 1–6 revolve around the central theme of patronage. In 1:1–9, Paul's greeting and thanksgiving, Jesus is presented as the super-patron, and Paul

---

[47.] "The attempt to find three or four groups on the basis of 1:12 is mistaken. To be sure, the followers of Cephas may have played some role in regard to sacrificial food, but chaps. 1–4 are concerned primarily with the problem of loyalty to leaders. Moreover, Paul himself is not precise about the factions. He frequently uses the term τινες (4:18; 6:11; 8:7; 15:12, 34). Apparently, he does not describe his "opponents" by name. The Corinthians know who they are; the exegetes cannot be sure." William Baird, "'One Against the Other': Intra-Church Conflict in 1 Corinthians," in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul & John* (ed. Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa; Nashville: Abingdon, 1990), 131.

[48.] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 33.

[49.] John Coolidge Hurd, *The Origins of 1 Corinthians* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983), 90–91; Margaret M. Mitchell, "Concerning Περὶ δέ in 1 Cor," *Novum Testamentum* 31 (1989): 229–56; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 498.

presents himself as the apostle of Jesus Christ, while the Corinthians are described as the clients of Jesus. In 1:10–3:23 Paul addresses the divisions within the Corinthian congregation. The divisions are in no small part due to the interwoven aspects of patronal competition and sophistic rhetoric between the house churches. Paul's use of the Corinthians' slogans in 1:12 and his new counter slogan in 3:23 would suggest that 1 Cor 1:10–3:23 forms one rhetorical unit within the larger unit of 1 Cor 1–6.[50] In 1 Cor 4 Paul attempts to reestablish his place of authority over the Corinthians. In 1 Cor 5–6 he addresses three issues that are connected to the abuses of the patrons. First, in 1 Cor 5, Paul addresses the incestuous patron who has married his stepmother. Second, in 6:1–11, Paul addresses the powerful patrons who are using the law courts to defraud. Third, in 6:12-20, Paul addresses the immoral patrons.

Litfin calls 1:4–9 the thanksgiving and 1:10–2:5 the central passage.[51] Stamps suggests 1:4–9 is the thanksgiving, 1:10–17 is the statement of purpose, 1:18–25, 1:26–31, and 2:1–5 are "discrete sections which provide an initial argument."[52] Conzelmann sees 1:4–9 as the *proemium* (*thanksgiving*); 1:10–17 as the survey of the problem; and 1:18-2:5 as the first argument.[53] This chapter will examine 1:1–2:5 as one rhetoric unit incorporating the greeting in vv. 1–3, the thanksgiving in vv. 4–9, the *propositio* in v. 10, the *narratio* in vv. 10–17, and the three boundary setting *inclusi* in 1:18–2:5.

In vv. 1–10 Paul focuses on the role of Jesus as patron, the Corinthians as clients, and Paul's role as an apostle. In vv. 11–17 Paul focuses on the actual existence of divisions within the Corinthian church. In 1:8–2:5 Paul has three interrelated arguments (*inclusio*); central to each argument is the concept of boundaries that existed between *insiders* and *outsiders*, and the contrast of how honor and shame is established and viewed between *insiders* and *outsiders*. Paul, in vv. 18–25, depicts the message of the cross as foolishness to the outsiders *who are perishing*, but to the insiders it is *the power of God*. In vv. 26–31 Paul presents the message of the cross as the means by which God has chosen to bring outsiders of all status levels inside, and the cross is also the means by which God shames the proud social elites. Finally, in 2:1–5, Paul focuses

---

50. "Scholars are unanimous in their opinion that 1 Cor. 10–4:21 forms a rounded and coherent unit within the first letter of Paul to the church in Corinth." Smit, "What is Apollos?" 231.

51. Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology*, 178–81.

52. Dennis L. Stamps, "The Christological Premise in Pauline Theological Rhetoric: 1 Corinthians 1:4–2:5 as an Example," in *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible* (ed. Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002), 447.

53. Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians* (trans. James W. Leitch; Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 25–39.

on his own ministry of proclaiming Christ crucified to the Corinthians, and he pays particular attention to the delivery of his message. The theme of *outsider/insiders* is carried over from the two previous *inclusi*. To outsiders Paul's message was weak, but to insiders it is a *demonstration of God's power*.

First Corinthians 1:1–2:5 will be examined from the perspective that the species of rhetoric that Paul employs in 1 Cor 1–6 is textual rhetoric. Wire defines textual rhetoric,

> Just as a child can speak her native tongue correctly without schooling, so a man can sell a horse or a conviction very persuasively without reflecting on how he does it. In Paul's case the data we have is this persuasion itself. Even his reflections on his own speaking and how it is received are an integral part of his effort to persuade. So the question whether Paul composed with conscious rhetorical technique or analyzed in retrospect the way he had spoken can be set aside. His argument can be the focus of this and the proper and sufficient access point to his audience.[54]

First Corinthians will be examined with particular focus being paid to the variables and facets of the patron-client relationship and the social values of honor and shame. In this chapter 1:1–2:5 will be examined in detail, due to the fact that it is foundational to 1 Cor 1–6 and the fact that Paul uses numerous direct references to honor and shame.

2.4   Greeting and Thanksgiving, 1:1–8

2.4.1   *Paul's Greeting, 1:1–3*

Essentially, Paul's greeting to the Corinthian congregation[55] is identical to the typical Hellenistic letters with its three parts: the identification of the sender, the identification of the addressee, and a greeting.[56] However, Paul adapts the greeting to meet his overall

---

[54.] Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, 2.

[55.] For an interesting overview of Paul's initial work with the church in Corinth, see Margaret E. Thrall, *The Initial Attraction of Paul's Mission in Corinth and of the Church He Founded There*, in *Paul, Luke and the Greco-Roman World* (ed. Alf Christophersen, et al.; JSNTSup 217; T&T Clark, 2002), 59–73.

[56.] For a discussion of the literary aspects of Paul's greeting in 1 Cor 1:1–3, cf. Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 41–45; Stanley K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity* (Library of Early Christianity 5; Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1988); Randolph E. Richards, *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004); Terence Y. Mullins, "Greeting as a New Testament Form," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 87 (1968): 418–26; Judith M. Lieu, "'Grace to You and Peace': The Apostolic Greeting," *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 68 (1985): 162–78; W. G. Doty, "The Classification of Epistolary Literature," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 31 (1969): 183–99; Pieter J. J. Botha, "Letter Writing and Oral Communication in Antiquity:

rhetorical strategy in 1 Cor 1–6. Central to Paul's rhetorical strategy is that of identity. Thus, in vv. 1–3 Paul follows the standard Hellenistic greeting format. However, in vv. 1–3, Paul carefully identifies himself, the Corinthians, and Christ Jesus in ways that set the stage for the rest of the epistle.

Paul identifies himself as the sender, but he also includes an *intitulatio*, the Hellenistic equivalent to the modern signature block which includes the title of the person who is writing and suggesting the capacity in which he is writing.[57] Paul employs the *intitulatio* to affirm that he is an apostle of Jesus. Paul adds one more item to his identification as the sender when he includes the term *by the will of God*. In contrast, Sosthenes is only a *brother*. No doubt Paul uses this term of contrast to reinforce his claim to be an apostle of Christ Jesus. Parkin makes an insightful observation relating to Paul's *intitulatio* as he notes,

> We suggest that from the beginning Paul was conscious of his apostleship, but did not refer to it in the prescripts of letters written before his position was challenged. Once the challenge had been made he made his position clear at the very beginning of his letters by stating his relationship with Christ. This pattern persisted even when the term servant or prisoner was used instead of apostle.[58]

In 1 Cor 2:1–4 Paul mentions the content of his message, *Christ and him crucified*, and the presentation of his message, *weakness and in fear and in much trembling*, and his speech *and my proclamation were not with plausible words of wisdom*. No doubt Witherington is correct when he writes that Paul's comments in 2:1–4 are connected to the cultural practice wherein "the audience was expected to evaluate a rhetorical speech and compare it to others."[59]

There is a contest for Paul's identity, and this contest is best demonstrated in the two descriptions of Paul found in 1:1 and 2:1–5. First Corinthians 2:1–5 indicates that Paul's Corinthian opponents viewed Paul as a weak rhetor. However, Paul's argument in both 2:1–5 and 1:1 is that his identity is not shaped by his public speaking ability but

---

Suggested Implications for the Interpretation of Paul's Letters to the Galatians," *Scriptura* 42 (1992): 17–34; Linda L. Belleville, "Continuity or Discontinuity: A Fresh Look at 1 Corinthians in the Light of First-Century Epistolary Forms and Conventions," *Evangelical Quarterly* 59 (1987): 15–37; R. L. Archer, "The Epistolary Form in the New Testament," *Expository Times* 68 (1951): 296–98; Peter Artz, "The 'Epistolary Introduction Thanksgiving' in the Papyri and in Paul," *Novum Testamentum* 36 (1994): 27–46.

[57.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 43.

[58.] Vincent Parkin, "Some Comments on the Pauline Prescripts," *Irish Biblical Studies* 8 (1986): 99.

[59.] Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 124.

by his relationship to Jesus Christ. In 2:1–5 he is a preacher (καταγγέλλω) of Christ crucified, and in 1:1 he is an apostle (ἀπόστολος) of Jesus Christ.

After defining himself on his own terms in v. 1, Paul continues to follow the Hellenistic structure and includes an *adscriptio*, in which he identifies the recipients of the letter.[60] Paul does so in an elaborate manner. He identifies the recipients in four stages:

(1) *to the church of God that is in Corinth*,

(2) *to those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus*,

(3) *called to be saints*,

(4) *together with all those who in every place call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, both their Lord and ours*.

The opening identification *church* (ἐκκλησία) finds no parallels in contemporary literature. Pseudo-Demetrius identified twenty-one epistolary genres. Paul's epistles do not fit in any of these genres. This has lead Thomas Olbricht to suggest that Paul created a new epistolary genre, the *ecclesial letter*, in which Paul employs *church rhetoric*.[61] As M. Luther Stirewalt correctly notes, "It must be said that neither in form nor function, nor style can Paul's letters be contained in one category."[62]

Paul employs a word play in the second and third stage of identifying the recipients, *those who are sanctified* (ἁγιάζω) *in Christ Jesus, called to be saints* (ἅγιος). Gordon Fee correctly suggests that *"saints"* contains too many misleading connotations to be of value."[63] Instead he opts for the term *holy people*. Using the concept of holiness would highlight Paul's word play, *those who are **made holy** in Christ Jesus, called to be **holy people***. This ἁγίαζω/ἅγιος word play contains a double reference to honor; both ascribed and achieved honor. Acquired honor is achieved by virtuous deeds, and ascribed honor comes from family or group membership.[64] The Corinthians' ascribed

---

[60.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 43.

[61.] Thomas H. Olbricht, "An Aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Thessalonians," in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians* (ed. David L. Balch, et al.; Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990), 226.

[62.] Stirewalt goes on to note, "A person of authority writing communal letters on subjects dealing with faithful adherence to the gospel, polity, ethics, and so on is not writing in a category limited to the maintenance of friendship, the sending of information or a request, and the exchange of greetings. Nor does a person of dedicated ministry and deep personal relationships write only from a detached position on subjects limited to the administration of a jurisdictional unit. Paul's letters fit exclusively in neither normative classification, yet both left their influence on him." M. Luther Jr. Stirewalt, *Paul, the Letter Writer* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 26.

[63.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 32.

[64.] Malina and Neyrey, "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts," 27–29.

honor comes from being made holy in Christ Jesus, while their achieved honor comes from their embracing their calling to be holy people. Thus, Paul uses a rhetoric of honor in identifying the Corinthians. They have been honored by Jesus when he made them holy. Therefore they should honor Jesus by reciprocating and living as holy people.[65] Paul uses ἅγιος in the opening of other letters (e.g. Rom 1:7; 2 Cor 1:1; Phil 1:1) and the honor values discussed above might well apply in those occurrences. However, the rhetorical situation of each letter and the immediate context of the word play within each letter would have to be examined to determine the rhetorical usage.

One particular nuance of Paul's usage of the ἁγιάζω/ἅγιος word play in this context is that there is a touch of irony in Paul's synonymous use of ἅγιος to identify the Corinthians. A reading of the epistle shows that holiness is not one of their principle characteristics. This sets up a contrast between 1:1–9—the greeting and the thanksgiving—which focuses primarily on honor, and the rest of the epistle which focuses primarily on shame. The implication being that while Jesus has honored the Corinthians, the Corinthians have failed to reciprocate.

Having established the mutual but not equal relationship that the Corinthians and Paul have with God and Jesus, Paul finally makes reference to the lordship of Jesus, *Together with all those who in every place call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, both their Lord and ours*.[66] This reinforces the idea that the Corinthian congregation was not a self-contained autonomous group.[67] Rather, it was part of an integrated community of believers under the lordship of Jesus, and as such they would be required to follow their Lord's apostle.

Paul also makes another word play when using the term *together with all those everywhere who call on the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, both their Lord and ours*. He identifies the Corinthians with the phrase *called* (κλητός) *to be holy people*. This echoes the manner in which Paul identifies himself in v. 1, *called* (κλητός) *to be an apostle*. Paul is called to be an *apostle* of Jesus Christ, the Corinthians are called to be *holy people* by Jesus Christ, and *all who call* (ἐπικαλέω) *on the name of Jesus Christ*. Thus, while Paul and the Corinthians have both been called in Jesus, and both call on

---

[65.] Blomberg, takes the counter view, "Sanctified in verse 2 does not mean *'made* holy' as often in Paul, but separated apart from God. It is virtually synonymous with the next phrase '*called* to be holy.'" Craig Blomberg, *1 Corinthians* (NIV Application Bible; Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994), 36.

[66.] Paul Beasley-Murray, "Romans 1:3f: An Early Confession of Faith in the Lordship of Jesus," *Tyndale Bulletin* 31 (1980): 147–54.

[67.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 74.

the name of Jesus, there is an important distinction. Paul is called to be an *apostle* of Christ Jesus, the Corinthians are called to be *holy people*.

Paul's phrase *the name of our Lord Jesus Christ* is a vital part of Paul's rhetoric of honor and shame in 1 Cor 1–6. Paul employs this phrase four times in the letter. Here in the salutation it is used with honor, while in 1:10; 5:4; and 6:11 it is used with shame. In 1:10 Paul uses the phrase in setting the stage for the lengthy discussion related to the σχίσμα (*divisions*) in the church. In 1 Cor 5:4 Paul uses this phrase in prompting the Corinthians to shame the incestuous man. In 1 Cor 6:11 Paul uses this phrase in closing his argument on the abusive practices of the powerful patrons in the law courts.

This four-stage identification triangulates the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians. The relationship between Paul and the Corinthians is based upon their respective relationships with God. Paul, at this stage of 1 Corinthians, does not overtly claim any authority over the Corinthians. Rather, he emphasizes his relationship with God. Paul does not emphasize his relationship with the Corinthians, rather he outlines the Corinthians' relationship to God. The church in Corinth belongs to God, and this is the same God who has willed Paul to be an apostle.[68] Thus, it would appear that Paul argues, if the church in Corinth truly belongs to God it will accept Paul's apostleship. This same line of reasoning can be applied to the Corinthians' relationship with Jesus. While the Corinthians are sanctified *in Christ Jesus* and called to be saints, Paul is called to be an apostle *of Jesus Christ*. The premise is clearly established that Paul has a unique calling as an apostle which places him in a position of authority over the Corinthians.[69] Thus, from the very beginning of the epistle Paul uses subtle argumentation and word plays to establish his place of authority over the Corinthians.

Paul ends the greeting with a blessing, *Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.* William Orr and James Walters comments on *grace* and *peace* illustrate a common treatment of these terms in the Pauline epistles:

> Paul appears to have modified the Greek greeting (chairein) and the Hebrew (šhālom) into a combination which is found in all his letters. It probably means to indicate that the Christian society is a new order composed of gentiles and

---

[68.] Chow suggests that the phrase τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ (*to the church of God*) is Paul's way of insisting that the Church belongs not to the wealthy, or to the *patrons* or to some self-styled inner circle of *spiritual people who manifest gifts* but to God. Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 113–90.

[69.] "The extensive use of ἀπόστολος in documents relating to persons of merit engaged in administrative service probably encouraged New Testament use of the noun, thus in effect disavowing associating with the type of itinerant philosophers that evoked the kind of pejorative term applied by Paul's audience Ac 17:18." "αποστολος" BAGD 122.

Jews who have received the privileges and blessings of both cultures, and these come from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.[70]

However, Stanley Porter convincingly contends that "there is little substantive evidence from Greek letters of the time that superscriptions with 'peace' were used as a convention that Paul might have borrowed." Instead, Porter suggests that Paul created this blessing "to emphasize the comprehensive word of God, it is one of gracious giving and forgiveness for previous hostility."[71] Garland views Paul's uses of *grace* and *peace* as being anti-imperial. "Again this greeting is subversive. The peace offered by God through Jesus Christ rivals that of the peace established and propagated by the emperor, who is passed off as the world's greatest savior and benefactor."[72]

David deSilva closely connects grace with patronage. "Grace was used of the willingness of a patron to grant a benefit to an individual or a group. Grace was used not only of the willingness to give a gift, but also for the gift that was given. Also, grace was used of the proper response of the recipient of the gift towards the giver, namely gratitude."[73] As deSilva correctly notes,

> The proper response toward a patron is gratitude: offering loyalty, testimony and service to the patron. Reciprocity is such a part of this relationship, that failure to return grace (gratitude) for grace (favor) results in a breach of the patron-client relationship. God's favor seeks a response of faithfulness and service from God's clients.[74]

Central to Paul's greeting is the lordship of Jesus Christ. The word κύριος (*lord*) may also have some connection with patronage.[75] This is reinforced by the use of the term ἐπικαλέω (*call*), which has deep theological meaning in both the Old and New

---

[70.] William F. Orr and James A. Walther, *1 Corinthians* (The Anchor Bible 32; New York: Doubleday, 1976), 143; for similar discussions on *grace* and *peace*, see Alan F. Johnson, *1 Corinthians* (InterVarsity NT Commentary 7; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004), 38; Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians* (Abingdon NT Commentaries; Nashville: Abingdon, 1998), 40–41; Simon J. Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993), 36; Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 33; Darrell Doughty, "The Priority of χάρις," *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972–73): 163–80; Lieu, "The Apostolic Greeting".

[71.] Stanley E. Porter, "Paul in Acts and Letters," *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*: 698.

[72.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 30.

[73.] deSilva, *Honor, Patronage*, 104–19.

[74.] deSilva, *Introduction to the New Testament*, 136; cf. Daniel Arichea, "Translating 'Grace' (Charis) in the New Testament," *The Bible Translator* 29 (1978): 210–206; John Nolland, "Grace as Power," *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986): 26–31.

[75.] Lampe provides a brief overview of God and Christ as patrons in the Pauline literature. Peter Lampe, "Paul, Patrons, and Clients," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003), 505–7.

Testaments.[76] However, it was also used of clients appealing to their patrons.[77] Garland suggests Paul's use of *Lord Jesus* is anti-imperial.[78]

From the very beginning of 1 Corinthians Paul presents Jesus as the patron over and above Caesar; Jesus is the ultimate or super-patron. Jesus has blessed the Corinthians with grace, peace, and holiness, and the Corinthian church belongs to God. However, the situation which prompted Paul to compose 1 Corinthians is not one where there is competition between Jesus and Caesar. Instead the competition is between Paul and the local patrons, and between the house churches of the local patrons. Thus, in identifying Jesus as Lord, Paul not only denies this title to Caesar, he also denies it to the patrons in Corinth. Since Paul evokes the lordship of Jesus throughout his writings it would be advantageous to examine the literature to determine what is common and what is distinctive to each letter concerning the lordship of Jesus. Unfortunately such a study is beyond the scope of this work. Suffice it to say, that since patronage and patronal factionalism play a specific role in 1 Corinthians this study will focus on Paul's rhetorical usage of Jesus as Lord or Jesus as super-patron. Paul refers to Jesus as Lord throughout his other letters and to some degree the patron-client and honor values discussed above might well apply in those occurrences. However, the rhetorical situation of the letter and the immediate context of the word play would have to be examined to determine the rhetorical usage.[79]

Essentially, Paul's greeting is similar to the typical Hellenistic letters with its three parts: the identification of the sender, the identification of the addressee, and a greeting. In Paul's greeting he identifies himself, the Corinthians, and Christ Jesus with terms of honor. Paul is honored because he is an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God. The Corinthians are honored because they belong to God, they were made holy by Jesus, and they are called to be holy. Jesus Christ is honored because he is both lord and patron; lord and patron of both Paul, the Corinthians, and the larger church. Jesus is the

---

[76.] This quote comes directly from Joel 3:5.

[77.] It is used in Paul's "appeal to Caesar" in Acts 25:11; 26:32; 28:19.

[78.] "When the greetings in Paul's letters are compared synoptically, the slight variations reveal some of the concerns that occupy him in writing the letter. In this letter Paul emphasizes the unity of the one church of God, which is set apart and holy and integrally bound to all across the world who call upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ. Corinth is a Roman colony established to spread Roman ideology, but the church in Corinth is God's. By identifying Jesus as Lord, he subtly denies this title to Caesar." Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 24.

[79.] Lampe suggests that, "An analogy can be drawn between the patron-client model and the relationship that Christ has with Christians." Lampe presents a broad overview of the Pauline letters that would support this view. Lampe, "Paul, Patrons, and Clients," 505–7.

patron who has blessed the Corinthians with grace, peace, and holiness. In fact, it would appear that in a climate of competition between the Corinthian patrons Paul presents Jesus as the greater patron or the super-patron due to the greater gifts he has given.

2.4.2 The Thanksgiving, 1:4–9

Just as Paul follows the conventions of Hellenistic writing in the greeting, he also follows these established conventions in the thanksgiving.[80] However, just as Paul modifies the greeting, Paul also modifies the thanksgiving to meet his rhetorical strategy.[81] Recent attention has focused on Paul's use of the *exordium* of Greco-Roman rhetoric as a means to obtain the *captatio benevolentiae* (*good will*) of his audience.[82] Collins discusses the rhetorical intent of Paul's thanksgiving:

> Because Paul gives thanks to God for the gifts given to the community his expressions of thanksgiving function rhetorically as a kind of *captatio benevolentiae*. They capture the goodwill of the readers and are designed to make them more attentive to what will follow in the body of the letter. In this respect Paul's expressions of thanksgiving function in a way similar to the proemium (*exordium*) of a Hellenistic speech whose purpose was to attract the interest and goodwill of the audience.[83]

In the greeting of 1:1–3 Paul identifies himself, the Corinthians, and Jesus in a way that is central to his rhetorical strategy. Paul continues this rhetorical defining in the *exordium* or thanksgiving. However, the focus is now on Jesus as the patron and the Corinthians as clients. Thiselton suggests that in contrast to the expected thanksgiving form, Paul employs his own distinct form. One distinct aspect being, "his lack of self-preoccupation with his own situation or his own welfare in contrast to that of the addressees."[84] However, since Paul is an apostle of Jesus Christ, the more he praises Jesus and presents Jesus as the greater or super-patron, the more Paul reinforces his own position.[85]

[80.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 25.

[81.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 87.

[82.] *Captatio benevolentiae* is a Latin phrase meaning "fishing for goodwill." Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of Literature & Rhetoric*, Captatio benevolentiae 89; cf. also *Opening Formulas* in David E. Aune, *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment* (Library of Early Christianity 8; Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1987), 184–86; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 31–32.

[83.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 58.

[84.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 87.

[85.] Graham Shaw argues that Paul's claims to authority are in fact divisive. Graham Shaw, *The Cost of Authority: Manipulation and Freedom in the New Testament* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 62–63.

The first item that Paul gives thanks for is that the Corinthians *have been given* (δίδωμι) *the gift of grace* (χάρις) *of God in Christ Jesus*. In Paul's writings χάρις is a central concept that most clearly expresses his understanding of the salvation event.[86] However, χάρις is also used of the patron-client relationship, especially to indicate the superiority of the patron over the client.[87] In fact, Paul may well be using χάρις of the salvation event which is the means by which Jesus became their patron. In a status focused society, the patron achieved his status over his client by the giving of gifts. Pilch and Malina comment,

> To survive in some meaningful way in such societies, patronage emerged to the mutual satisfaction of both parties: clients had their needs met, especially in fortuitous and irregular situations, while patrons received grants of honor and the accolades of benefaction. . . . Clients in this system know that their relation to patrons is highly unequal; patrons have much higher status and greater power resources. Patrons provide their favors (grace) and help in exchange for items of a qualitatively different sort; material for immaterial, goods for honor and pride, force for status support, and the like.[88]

In v. 5 Paul identifies two particular gifts that Jesus has *enriched* (πλουτίζω) the Corinthians with, *all speech* (λόγος) and in *all knowledge* (γνῶσις). Λόγος and γνῶσις play a central part to Paul's discussion in 1 Corinthians and has received much scholarly attention.[89] Λόγος is used by Paul seventeen times in 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 1:5, 17f; 2:1, 4 (x2), 13; 4:19f; 12:8 (x2); 14:9, 19:9 (x2), 36; 15:2, 54). Louw and Nida indicate *the act of speaking*, *speak*, and *speech* convey the semantic range of λόγος. Pogoloff suggests that λόγος in 1 Corinthians was *the speech of performance*.[90] Thiselton suggests that in 2:1 Paul is rejecting the practices of a Sophist rhetorician[91] who uses λόγος as a tool of manipulative and audience dominated rhetoric. "As for me, when I came to you brothers and sisters, I did not come with high sounding rhetoric or a display of cleverness in proclaiming to you the mystery of God."[92]

[86.] χάρις in *TDNT* 9:393. χάρις had three meanings in the patron-client relationship. It referred to the "favor" of the patron and the "gift" itself, and the "gratitude" of the client. David A. deSilva, *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourses and New Testament Interpretation* (Collegeville: Liturgical, 1999), 11.

[87.] My understanding is informed by "χάρις" BAGD 1079; "a beneficent disposition toward someone, *favor, grace, gracious care/help, goodwill*. Of a different order and spirit is the subset of reciprocity known as Roman patronage, in which superiority of the donor over the client is clearly maintained."

[88.] Pilch and Malina, *Handbook of Biblical Social Values*, 152–53.

[89.] Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*. For a discussion on gnosticism and Corinth see, Wilson, "Gnostic"; Richard A. Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth"; Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*.

[90.] Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 98–236.

[91.] Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 15.

[92.] Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 50.

It would appear that in 1 Cor 1–4, when Paul uses λόγος, he almost always qualifies it, and he also contrasts two types of λόγος. Thus, in 1:17 Paul speaks of σοφία λόγου, (*eloquent wisdom*) and in 1:18 he speaks of ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ (*the message of the cross*). In 4:19 and in 4:20 there is the contrast between the talk and power of the arrogant men and the kingdom of God. The only time λόγος is not qualified or contrasted is in 1:5. This would indicate that Paul's argument is focused on two combating types of λόγος; the proclamation of the cross and kingdom of God over and against the proclamation of the Sophist arrogant men.

Γνῶσις is used ten times in 1 Corinthians, (1 Cor 1:5; 8:1 x2, 7, 10f; 12:8; 13:2, 8; 14:6) but this is the only occurrence in 1 Cor 1–6. Barrett suggests that γνῶσις was closely related to σοφία (*wisdom*) but "there is a different shade of meaning in the word σοφία (and σοφός) every time it occurs." However, of knowledge (γνῶσις) he suggests, "is most often used in a plain, non-technical sense."[93] If Barrett is correct in suggesting that γνῶσις was closely related to σοφία (and σοφός) then Paul's arguments in 1–4, and particularly in 1–2, is again between two competing types of σοφός/σοφία the wisdom of the world/the wisdom of the rulers of this age (1:20; 2:6) and the wisdom of God/the wisdom of the mature (1:2; 2:6). No doubt the particular nuances of λόγος and γνῶσις will be addressed by scholars for years to come. The underlying premise accepted by scholars is that speech and knowledge were highly valued by the Corinthians.[94]

Central to Paul's thanksgiving rhetoric is the affirmation that these highly valued gifts have been given by Jesus. In this foundational reference to λόγος and γνῶσις Paul subtly claims the authority to define λόγος. Since λόγος is a gift from Jesus, the super-patron, and since Paul is an apostle of Jesus, then Paul is uniquely and singularly qualified to define the correct usage of λόγος. This subtle claim to define λόγος is undergirded by Paul's not so subtle reminder in v. 6 of his role in bringing and confirming the message of Christ. Conzelmann suggests that, "ἐβεβαιώθη 'has been confirmed' is a Hellenistic form of expression that has an eye to the founding and development of the community."[95] Collins suggests that "in the NT 'testimony'

[93.] C. K. Barrett, "Christianity at Corinth," in *New Testament Essays* (London: SPCK, 1972), 6–14.

[94.] This premise is seen in the works of David Prior, *The Message of 1 Corinthians* (The Bible Speaks Today; Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1985), 24. Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 91; Brian K. Peterson, *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth*, 59; Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology*, 14.

[95.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 27.

(*martyrion*) has become virtually a technical term for the proclamation of the gospel."[96] However, there may be an intentional touch of ambiguity being used by Paul as he purposefully blurs the line of how this strengthening is being done.[97] Paul uses ambiguity as a means of including himself as the apostle of Jesus Christ in the process of confirmation while not forcing the issue.

In vv. 4–6 Paul uses three passive aorist verbs *given* (δίδωμι), *enriched* (πλουτίζω), and *strengthen* (βεβαιόω)*.* In v. 5 Paul uses πᾶς (*all*) three times (in every *way you have been enriched in him, in all speech and knowledge of every kind*). This triple use of passive verbs along with the triple use of πᾶς reinforces Paul's presentation of Jesus as the super-patron and the Corinthians as clients.

In vv. 7–8 Paul moves from the past patronal work of Jesus to the future or eschatological[98] work of Jesus: *the revealing of Jesus* in v. 7 and *the day of Jesus* in v. 8. This future work of Jesus also carries strong patronal references and may be seen as that of a patron coming to visit and evaluate the behavior of clients who are living in a distant city. Paul's argument moves from the past work of Jesus (*you have been blessed*), through the present work of Jesus (*he will strengthen you to the end*) to the future revealing of Jesus (*you may be blameless*). Woven among the past, present, and future work of Jesus are the three benefits the Corinthians enjoy as clients of Jesus.

In v. 7 the first benefit the Corinthians enjoy as clients of Jesus is that while they wait for the revealing of the Lord Jesus they can be assured that they do not lack any gift. This assurance is developed from Paul's argument in vv. 4–6. It is unfortunate that many English translations translate χαρίσματι as *spiritual gifts*. John Calvin[99] and Gordon Fee[100] suggest that the use of *gift* in 1:7 should be understood in connection with salvation rather than the popular charismatic gifts of 1 Cor 12–14. In contrast, Richard Oster suggests that the gift in 1:7 refers to the gifts given by God to facilitate the Corinthians' calling.[101] While Oster seeks to view *gift* in the context of the greeting,

---

[96.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 62.

[97.] The NIV suggests that Paul's preaching is the means of confirmation, *because our testimony about Christ was confirmed in you*. The NRSV renders an ambiguous translation, *just as the testimony of Christ has been strengthened among you.*

[98.] For a discussion on Paul's eschatology and the Corinthians' realized eschatology, cf. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology"; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 95–105; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 63–67.

[99.] John Calvin, *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians* (trans. J. W. Fraser; Calvin's New Testament Commentaries; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960), 22.

[100.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 42.

[101.] Richard E. Oster, *1 Corinthians* (The College Press NIV Commentary; Joplin: College Press, 1995), 47.

it may be that Paul is connecting the χαρίσματι of v. 7 with his use of χάρις in v. 3 and v. 4. Thus, the central focus is less on the nature of the gifts and more on the relationship between the giver of the gifts and the recipients of the gifts. There is a rhetorical contrast between the triple use of πᾶς in v. 5 and the three negative terms μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ (*you are not lacking in nothing*) in v. 7. Since Jesus has given the Corinthians all blessings they are not lacking any spiritual blessings. Rather, what they need is to wait for the revealing of the Lord Jesus Christ.

In v. 8 Paul moves from the past work of Jesus to the future work of Jesus. The second benefit the Corinthians enjoy under the patronage of Jesus is that he will confirm them (βεβαιόω). However, Paul has already used this word in describing the work of Jesus in v. 6. Just as Paul was somewhat ambiguous concerning the manner in which Jesus would confirm them in v. 6, this subtle ambiguity is carried in v. 8. It also allows Paul to suggest that he was a vital part of confirming or strengthening the Corinthians as he continues to proclaim the foolishness of the cross. Thus, while Paul is clear that Jesus will confirm them by his preaching, he is ambiguous, at this point, as to the content of that preaching. However, he will remove the ambiguity and address the content of his preaching in v.17 when he begins to speak of the cross.

In v. 8 Paul refers to a third benefit the Corinthians enjoy under the patronage of the Lord. The final aspect of Jesus' patronal work is that of providing complete legal protection and keeping the Corinthians *blameless* (ἀνέγκλητος). While the client owed his patron honor and respect, "the patron in turn owed his client legal protection and at times financial assistance."[102] The Greek word ἀνέγκλητος carries a range of meanings including: *blameless, irreproachable, and unimpeachable.*[103] Thiselton cites an interesting note from the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*[104] of C.E. 20–50 wherein "a woman who has been deserted by her husband claims she is *blameless*."[105] Oster correctly connects ἀνέγκλητος with judicial or forensic imagery, "The doctrine of blamelessness of believers (cf. Col 1:22) arises from the forensic imagery of accusations in the courtroom of God's justice and the culpability of his saints."[106]

[102.] James S. Jeffers, *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament Era: Exploring the Background of Early Christianity* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999), 17.

[103.] James H. Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources* (Reprint; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997), 40.

[104.] *POxy* 2.281.12.

[105.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 101.

[106.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 48.

While the Corinthians wait for the day and revealing of their patron, they are called to behave as faithful clients. Paul motivates them to do so by reminding them of three benefits they have with Jesus as their patron: (1) they do not lack any gift, (2) Jesus will strengthen to the end, (3) he will provide them with complete legal protection. They are motivated to be faithful clients because they have been blessed by their patron, they are being blessed by their patron, and they will be blessed by their patron.

In v. 9 Paul brings his thanksgiving to a close. Paul began his thanksgiving in v. 4 with a reference to God's grace which was given to the Corinthians in Christ Jesus. Now Paul ends his thanksgiving with a reference to God's trustworthiness and the Corinthians' fellowship with Jesus. Paul asserts the trustworthiness (πιστός) of God, and he applies it specifically to the relationship between the Corinthians and Jesus. It is this *trustworthy* God who has *invited* (καλέω) the Corinthians into fellowship with Jesus. This is Paul's fourth use of κλητός and its cognates in v. 1–9. In v. 1 he uses κλητός of his being called to be an apostle by the will of God. In v. 2, he uses κλητοῖς ἁγίοις in referring to the Corinthians' calling to be holy. Again, in v. 2, Paul uses a participle form of ἐπικαλέω in making the connection between the Corinthian congregation and the larger body of believers who call on the name of the Lord Jesus. Directly or indirectly, Paul uses κλητός and its cognates in vv. 1–9 in connection with honor. Whether it is the honor God has bestowed upon Paul and the Corinthians, or the honor the Corinthians are called to render to Jesus as they live holy lives.

Regarding fellowship Collins notes, "the term *koinōnia* is an abstract form in which the emphasis may lie on the relationship of those in fellowship."[107] Since the main body of the thanksgiving has outlined the work of Jesus as the super-patron of his Corinthian clients, the trustworthiness of God pertains to Jesus' patronage. Paul is evoking the trustworthiness of God to reinforce his rhetoric that Jesus is the super-patron.

One final aspect of vv. 7–9 that needs to be noted is Paul's triple reference to Jesus as Lord (κύριος). In v. 7 Paul assures the Corinthians that they lack no gift as they wait for the revealing of *our Lord* (κύριος) *Jesus Christ*. In v. 8 Paul assures the Corinthians that Jesus *will strengthen them to the end*, and he will also protect them *on the day of our Lord* (κύριος) *Jesus Christ*. In v. 9 Paul assures them that God's trustworthiness reinforces their fellowship with his son, *Jesus Christ our Lord* (κύριος).

[107.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 66.

The central theme of Paul's thanksgiving is the work of Jesus as the Corinthians' super-patron. Paul thanks God because Jesus has given them all gifts, that the testimony of Jesus has been confirmed in them, that they lack no gift, that they will be strengthened until the end, and that they will be blameless on the day he returns. Jesus' patronage is connected with both the grace of God and the trustworthiness of God. The thanksgiving focuses directly on the patronal activity of Jesus, and subtly on the apostleship of Paul. There is no mention of the works of the Corinthians in the thanksgiving. In contrast, Paul does include works of the Thessalonians in the thanksgiving of that letter, 1 Thess 1:2–3, *We always give thanks to God for all of you and mention you in our prayers, constantly remembering before our God and Father your work of faith and labor of love and steadfastness of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ.* The Corinthians are merely passive recipients of Jesus' patronage.

2.4.3 Conclusion

One of the first results of this rhetorical analysis of Paul's opening argument in vv. 1–9 is that it is quite dense, much more like poetry than prose. There is much repetition of words. This can be seen with such words as κύριος and κλητός. Paul's rhetoric contains both direct and subtle elements. It is direct in dealing with the role of Jesus as patron and the role of the Corinthians as clients. Paul uses subtle rhetoric when dealing with his role as an apostle. While Paul does claim to be an apostle, he does not qualify to the Corinthians what an apostle is. Rather, he simply carries out the role of an apostle, as he understands it. Sifting through and unraveling Paul's dense opening can be quite tedious work. However, it is a vital part of the process of rhetorical analysis, especially if the goal is to follow the textual rhetoric of Paul's letter.

Paul's greeting and thanksgiving are centered on defining the role of the main characters in the Corinthian congregation. The main character is Jesus; he is the super-patron. Paul refers to Jesus as κύριος five times. The Corinthians are the clients of Jesus who have been blessed with *all* gifts. Paul is the apostle of Jesus Christ to the Corinthians. Paul's rhetoric in vv. 1–9 is a rhetoric of honor. Jesus has honored the Corinthians. While never directly mentioned, the clear implication for the Corinthians is that they are called to honor Jesus, their super-patron.

2.5   Paul's Appeal, the *Propositio*, 1:10

In v. 10 Paul moves from the *exordium* and states his *propositio*; his appeal. Ben Witherington succinctly describes the function of the *propositio*,

In Greco-Roman rhetoric the *propositio* is the thesis statement of the entire discourse. In a deliberative discourse it is the main advice the rhetor wants his hearers to heed and is followed by arguments to persuade the audience to follow the course of action the rhetor recommends. Between these two elements may be a short narration of the facts that lead to the rhetor speaking or writing as he does, but such a *narratio* is not required in a deliberative discourse. Nevertheless, Paul chooses to include a brief one (vv. 11–17).[108]

Paul's appeal is based on the lordship and patronage of Jesus which he has emphasized in vv. 1–9. Paul has carefully and emphatically used both the introduction and the *exordium* to remind the Corinthians that Jesus is their super-patron; Paul is the apostle of Jesus and the Corinthians are clients of Jesus. Thus, the appeal for *no divisions* is to be read as an obligation the Corinthians owe their patron.

There is a new element to Paul's appeal in that he evokes a familial relationship with the Corinthians by using the vocative brothers (ἀδελφός). Paul evokes the brotherly motif quite often in 1 Cor 1–6.[109] However, Paul modifies his use of this brotherly language to facilitate his argument. In 1:10 through 4:6 Paul's use of *brother* in describing his own relationship with the Corinthians is that of a sibling; perhaps even an older sibling appealing to his younger siblings. This is seen in 3:1 where he describes his Corinthian brothers as infants in Christ. However, in 4:15 Paul refers to himself as their father (πατήρ) in Christ. In 1 Cor 5–6 Paul again uses *brother,* however, now it is used exclusively of the mutual relationship the Corinthians have with each other. Paul's use of ἀδελφός does not evoke egalitarianism; rather it appears that Paul's emphasis is non-factional mutuality. Andrew Clarke has succinctly clarified this vital distinction.[110]

Kennedy notes the chiasmus is a tradition of Jewish speech and when it is used

---

[108.] Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 94. According to Dahl, Paul's use of παρακαλέω indicates he is setting forth the main purpose of his letters, "expressing what he wants the addressees to do." Dahl, *Studies in Paul*, 46.

[109.] 1 Cor 1:1, 10, 11, 26; 2:1; 3:1; 4:6; 5:11; 6:5, 6 (2), 8.

[110.] "While there is a widespread suspicion of hierarchical structures in the church today, it is tempting to adopt ἀδελφός and imbue it with notions of equality which are common to sibling relationships in Western society today. A closer look at papyrological and literary sources, however, demonstrated that ἀδελφός language does not presuppose egalitarianism. Indeed, it is precisely this relationship between brothers which can bring into sharp and painful relief the distinctions in status which nature and inheritance have endowed. It is brotherly love which holds together the relationship between brother, notwithstanding such inequalities. Brotherly love is concerned with mutuality rather than equality." Andrew D. Clarke, "Equality or Mutuality? Paul's Use of 'Brother' Language," in *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting* (ed. P. J. Williams, et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 163–64; cf. Alanna Nobbs, "'Beloved Brothers' in the New Testament and Early Christian World," in *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting* (ed. P. J. Williams, et al.; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004), 143–64.

it embraces more than style.[111] Paul's appeal in v. 10 takes the form of a chiastic arrangement with the emphasis on *no divisions*.[112] This can be seen by the way Paul uses αὐτός once in A (ἵνα τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες) and twice in A' (ἦτε δὲ κατηρτισμένοι ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ νοῒ καὶ ἐν τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ). The thought of A is also repeated in A'.

> A *that all of you be in agreement*
>> B *and that there be no divisions among you,*
> A' *but that you be united in the same mind and the same purpose*.

Thus, Paul is not appealing to his Corinthian siblings that they be in agreement or of the same mind in all areas. Rather, the specific area of agreement, mind, and purpose that Paul is appealing for is *no divisions* (σχίσμα). Central to Paul's discussion is his use of the word σχίσμα. While this appeal may be read as an appeal underlying the whole of 1 Corinthians,[113] it is certainly to be read as the foundation for 1 Cor 1–6.

2.6   The *Narratio, 1:11–17*

The *narratio* is the statement of facts that explain the *propositio*. Again, in v. 11, Paul uses the vocative *brothers* (ἀδελφός). Paul begins the *narratio* in v. 11 by mentioning that Chloe's household is the source of his information pertaining to the *quarrel*s (ἔρις) in the Corinthian church. However, translating ἔρις as *quarrels* may tone down the intensity of the disputes to which Paul is referring.[114] The combination of σχίσμα and ἔρις suggests that the congregation in Corinth was divided into factions which engaged in contentious rivalries.

Paul, in v. 12, then outlines the specific nature of the σχίσμα and ἔρις, *What I mean is that each of you says, "I belong to Paul," or "I belong to Apollos," or "I belong to Cephas," or "I belong to Christ*." Welborn provides an insightful observation when he notes, "A member of a faction, whether in the assembly, the theater, or the school, identified himself and expressed his adherence by means of a formula that consisted of a personal pronoun, the verb to be (expressed or implied), and the genitive of a proper

---

[111.] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 12.

[112.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 53.

[113.] John R. Lanci, *A New Temple in Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery* (New York: Peter Lang, 1997), 52.

[114.] Welborn, arguing that ἔρις is "a hot dispute, the emotional flame that ignites whenever rivalry becomes intolerable," cites Paularch's use of ἔρις in describing the situation in Rome when Caesar has crossed the Rubicon. "The ἔρις was between two groups, those who were pleased at Caesar's coming and those who were in fear and distress." Laurence L. Welborn, *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistles* (Macon: Mercer University Press, 1997), 3–4.

name."[115] This is the formula Paul uses in 1 Cor 1:12 (ἐγὼ μέν εἰμι Παύλου, ἐγὼ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Κηφᾶ, ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ).

Paul uses a three step approach in identifying the problem in Corinth, and with each step Paul increases the shame. In v. 10 he appeals to the brothers for no σχίσμα. In v. 11 he identifies to his brothers the presence of hot disputes (ἔρις). In v. 12 Paul cites the four σχίσμα and the ἔρις, the contention or hot disputes between the factions over their various names. These σχίσμα and ἔρις violate the familial bond the Corinthians share, and these σχίσμα and ἔρις also violate their duties as clients of their patron Jesus.

Paul follows these four slogans in v. 13 with a series of three rhetorical questions, in a chiastic structure,[116] each of which expects a negative reply.

> A *Has Christ been divided*?
>>   B *Was Paul crucified for you*?
> A' *Or were you baptized in the name of Paul*?

With these three questions Paul continues to increase his use of shame in the *narratio*. The first question compares the divisions and quarrel of the clients with the nature of Christ. Again, Welborn suggests that Paul's phrase μεμέρισται ὁ Χριστός (*is Christ divided*?) contains a political connotation. "The customary term for 'party' in Greek is μερίς."[117] This first question would be a rebuke of the faction which used the slogan ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ and it would also be a rebuke of the Corinthian factionalism as a whole.

With the second and third questions, Paul compares himself negatively with Christ and the Corinthians' baptism into Christ. In so doing Paul distances himself from the ἐγὼ εἰμι Παύλου faction and he also levels a double shame on that faction.[118] However, Paul does not say anything negative about Apollos or Cephas in this initial refutation of the Corinthian σχίσμα and ἔρις. Rather, he elevates the role of Christ and reduces his own status. Paul uses the third question to lead into a discussion of the Corinthians whom he has baptized. The focus being that he limited those whom he baptized and, thus, can further distance himself from the ἐγὼ δὲ Χριστοῦ party.[119]

[115.] Welborn, "Discord in Corinth," 16.

[116.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 76.

[117.] Welborn, *Politics and Rhetoric*, 4.

[118.] Richard Carlson writes, "Accordingly, by reminding the Corinthians of what did not happen in their baptism (i.e., they were not uniquely baptized by Paul so as to form a unique belonging to Paul), Paul points them to the unifying reality achieved in the sacred story of the cross. Hence, baptism itself is not the unifying reality, but baptism inaugurates one into the unifying reality that God inaugurated in the cross of Christ." Richard P. Carlson, "The Role of Baptism in Paul's Thought," *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 260.

[119.] Garland suggests that Paul mentions Crispus and Gaius because "these two wealthier men were at the root of the controversy as leaders of house churches." Garland, *1*

First Corinthians 1:17 (*For Christ did not send me to baptize but to proclaim the gospel, and not with eloquent wisdom, so that the cross of Christ might not be emptied of its power*) is Paul's transition between the *narratio* and the contrast between wisdom and power in 1:18–25. In closing the *narratio,* Paul continues to identify himself on his own terms. This is in contrast to the Corinthians' use of Paul's name as a factional slogan in 1:12, and their describing him as a weak and trembling preacher in 2:3. In 1:1 he identifies himself as an apostle of Jesus. Now Paul presents himself as one sent by Christ to proclaim the gospel. Paul, by using the noun ἀπόστολος in 1:1 and the verb ἀποστέλλω in 1:17, reinforces both his position of authority in Christ and his role as a faithful client of Christ. This is Paul's first usage of the *cross of Christ* in 1 Corinthians.[120] Thus far, Paul has avoided referring to the cross and the crucifixion of Jesus. While Paul does use the cross in his second deliberative question of v. 13, he connects the cross to himself rather than to Christ, though the allusion to Christ is surely implied.[121] No doubt in Roman Corinth the cross was a symbol of shame.[122] Thus before Paul deals with this topic of *Christ crucified* he first presents Jesus in vv. 1–9 as the super-patron who has honored his Corinthian clients by enriching them in every way.

Paul brings *eloquent wisdom* (σοφία λόγου) and the proclamation of the cross into direct conflict. It is a conflict between two competing views of honor and shame. This conflict is seen in the three following arguments that Paul makes. In each argument Paul compares two conflicting views of honor and shame. In 1:18–15, Paul contrasts two competing views of the cross: those who view the message of the cross as foolishness and those who view it as the power of God. In 1:26–31, Paul contrasts the wise, influential, and noble by human standards with the foolish, weak, and lowly that

---

Corinthians, 54.

[120.] Mitchell makes a compelling argument that *cross* is Paul's rhetorical shorthand for the gospel. Margaret M. Mitchell, "Rhetorical Shorthand in Pauline Argumentation: The Function of 'The Gospel' in the Corinthian Correspondence," in *Gospel in Paul: Studies in Corinthians, Galatians and Romans* (ed. Ann Jervis and Richardson; JSNTSup 108; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994), 65.

[121.] "It would appear that Paul used the cross as a metonymy for the gospel itself." David A. Ackerman, *Lo, I Tell You a Mystery: Cross, Resurrection, and Paraenesis in the Rhetoric of 1 Corinthians* (Princeton Theological Monograph Series 54; Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2006), 47; cf. Robert G. Hammerton-Kelly, *Sacred Violence: Paul's Hermeneutic of the Cross* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 65; cf. Raymond Pickett, *The Cross in Corinth: The Social Significance of the Death of Jesus* (JSNTSup 143; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997).

[122.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 92; For texts and discussion on crucifixion, cf. Martin Hengel, *Crucifixion: In the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross* (trans. John Bowden; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977).

God has chosen. In 2:1–5, Paul returns to his message of the cross and the manner of its presentation and compares it with *the lofty words of wisdom* (ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας).

The central theme in the *narratio* is the σχίσμα and the ἔρις of the party factionalism. David Ackerman makes a compelling argument that party factionalism is closely connected to the central problem in the Corinthian congregation, which was spiritual immaturity.[123] The principle characters are the Corinthians and Paul. The Corinthians are rebuked for their factionalism which has shamed Jesus their patron. Paul, on the other hand, presents himself as the mature brother who refuses any connection with the Corinthians' factionalism. Paul does not use honor or shame language of himself, but there is a subtle self-honoring in portraying himself as a faithful apostle to Jesus, who refuses to engage in behavior that would shame Jesus. Thus far there has been a two-stage development in Paul's argument. In vv. 1–10 Paul focuses on the role of Jesus as patron. In vv. 11–17 Paul focuses on the existence of factions within the Corinthian church.

2.7   Insiders and Outsiders, 1:18–2:5

Central to Paul's argument in 1:18–2:5 is the theme of competing views of honor and shame between *the insiders* (οἱ ἔσω) and *the outsiders* (οἱ ἔξω),[124] between the majority culture of the larger Corinthian community and the minority culture of the Corinthian church.[125] deSilva suggests that within a society there are often competing views of honor and shame, which may be described as the rhetoric of the majority culture and the rhetoric of the minority culture.[126] This conflict between the majority culture and the

---

[123.] "According to 1:17, his primary task during his first stay in Corinth was to preach the gospel. He clarifies this by stating that he did not preach with "clever words of wisdom" in order that he might not render the message of the cross "powerless" or "meaningless" because of his outstanding wisdom or rhetorical ability. This thought introduced the basic comparison that he deals with in 1:18-4:21 and undergirds much of his argument in the rest of the letter. Simply stated, he puts the best that humanity has to offer—"in wisdom of word" (v. 17) against the best God has to offer—"the word of the cross" (v. 18). His basic message to the Corinthians is that living a life of folly and weakness according to the model of the cross could lead them to spiritual maturity and communal solidarity. How this is actually to be worked out in the community is where the maturity will take place." Ackerman, *Lo, I Tell You a Mystery*, 39.

[124.] For a detailed examination of *the insiders* (οἱ ἔσω) and *the outsiders* (οἱ ἔξω) in 1 Cor 5–6, see Margaret M. Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 112–16.

[125.] For a discussion on social organizations and their boundaries, see Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, 84–110.

[126.] "For a minority culture to survive in a situation of cultural pluralism it had to develop an alternative arena for the fulfillment of its members' desire for honor, their φιλοτίμα.

minority culture is also addressed by Barclay as he suggests that there is a fundamental difference between Paul and the Corinthians in the way they viewed the church.[127]

Thus, part of Paul's challenge in 1:18–2:5 is to create a sense of differentiation between the Corinthian congregation and the larger Corinthian community. A central factor in creating this sense of difference between insiders and outsiders is that of how these two groups have different and competing views of honor. Commenting on the different views of honor between groups, Malina writes, "What might be deviant and shameful for one group in one locality may be worthy and honorable for another. Yet, all groups are concerned about their honor."[128] In 1:18–2:5 Paul attempts to create a boundary between the Corinthian church and the larger Corinthian community, and an integral part of creating this boundary is Paul's use of honor and shame language and imagery. It would appear that Paul argues for this boundary due to the fact that not having one has resulted in the rise of factions and viewing the message of the cross as foolishness. Not having this boundary has also undermined Paul's status and authority as an apostle of Jesus.[129]

1 Corinthians 1:18–2:5 is composed of three connected arguments, each one being its own *inclusio*. In 1:18–25, the first *inclusio*, Paul begins the first phase of erecting a boundary as he contrasts insiders and outsiders and presents two competing

---

Honor is now defined in terms of the minority culture's traditions and values: those who do not share these definitions are set aside as shameless, or as errant. The negative opinion which such people might have of the group and its members carries no weight -- it rests on error, and the representative of the minority culture can look forward to his or her vindication when the extent of that error is revealed. Rather, the group members are called to have concern for the opinion of a higher court, whether it be of nature, of the governing principle, of Zeus, or of the God of Israel. The members of the minority culture form a social counterpart to this higher court, and it is in their eyes that a member is challenged to seek honor and eschew falling into disgrace. Honor and Shame become powerful tools for social engineering, for maintaining group boundaries, values, and commitments in a world of competing cultures and arenas in which to gain recognition. Indeed, in the transvaluation of dominant cultural norms and the rejection of the applicability of society's standards, the use of the language of honor and shame in minority groups often leads to an escalation of tension between the group and society." deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 143.

[127.] "Paul still paints the starkest contrast between the church and the world.… The Corinthians, however, seem to understand the social standing of the Church quite differently. Paul's vision is of a church community, where members are open to the world but nonetheless forever conscious of the difference between "insiders" and "outsiders", and where the intense relationship among members of the family make belonging to the church the core of their existence." Barclay, "Thessalonica and Corinth," 60.

[128.] Malina and Neyrey, "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts," 26.

[129.] Clarke examines 1 Cor 1–6 from the perspective of *belonging* to secular society and how this *belonging* shaped both the Corinthian factions and Paul's response. Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 90–95, 106–7.

views of the message of the cross. To the outsiders, the cross is foolishness, while to the insiders, the cross is the power of God. In 1:26–31, the second *inclusio*, Paul continues to erect the boundary as he moves his argument from a contrast between the insiders and outsiders to a contrast between the time when the majority of the Corinthians were shamed outsiders and their new status as honored insiders. In 2:1–5, the third *inclusio*, Paul solidifies the boundaries between the insiders and the outsiders as he returns to the theme of his preaching, and how it is viewed by insiders and outsiders.

Each *inclusio* begins with an opening affirmation and a conclusion that is directly tied to the affirmation. This can be demonstrated from the first *inclusio*,

> 1:18 *For the message about the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God.*

> 1:25 *For God's foolishness is wiser than human wisdom, and God's weakness is stronger than human strength.*

Between the opening affirmation and the conclusion are a series of interwoven arguments and proofs which Paul employs as he endeavors to persuade the Corinthians to accept both his opening affirmation and his conclusion.

As deSilva has pointed out, a common feature of the rhetoric of minority cultures is to appeal to a court of higher opinion for validation and honor, and often the court of higher opinion is God.[130] Thus, it is interesting to note that Paul ends the first statement of the first *inclusio* (1:18) in the manner as he ends the last statement of the third *inclusio* (2:5), with references to the power of God. Not only does this suggest that while each *inclusio* is a self-contained argument, and together they form a larger rhetoric unit or demonstration, [131] it also indicates that Paul continually appeals to the court of higher opinion; the power of God. Appealing to this court of higher opinion is an integral part of Paul's creating a vivid distinction between the insiders and the outsiders.

2.7.1 The First Inclusio, The Power of the Cross, 1:18–25

Structurally, this *inclusio* is composed of an opening and closing statement which are closely related, and two arguments which connected the opening and closing statements.

[130.] deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 143.

[131.] While scholars see evidence of Paul's rhetoric structure in 1 Cor 1–4, there is a great deal of variety in how this rhetoric is reconstructed. Compare the outlines of Collins and Witherington to see a sample of this reconstruction variety. Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, vii-x; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, vi-ix.

v. 18: Opening statement, foolishness and power
vv.19–21: God's wisdom and man's foolishness
vv. 22–24: God's power and man's weakness
v. 25: Closing statement, foolishness and power

In this *inclusio*, Paul refers to a cross section of humanity who are *outsiders*. He speaks of those who are perishing: the wise man, the scholar, the philosopher of the age, and he refers to the generic wisdom of the world. He divides humanity into two broad groups—Greeks and Jews and their respective response to the message of the cross. However, while Paul refers to a large cross section of people this is not Paul's audience. Paul's audience are the insiders, the church of God in Corinth. Paul's argument is crafted so as to develop a sense of identity that holds them together and create a barrier between them and the larger Corinthian community. It is an "us/we" verses "them/they" argument in which "we" view the message of the cross as the power of God, while "they" view the message of the cross as foolishness. Each of Paul's statements in this section falls into an "us/we" or "them/they" comparison.

Central to Paul's comparative argument between the insiders and the outsiders is the theme of the competing social status values of honor and shame.[132] While the insiders honor the message of the cross, the outsiders view the message of the cross as foolishness. In a series of five interlocking statements Paul shames the outsiders five times, once in each statement, for their foolishness in rejecting the cross. In comparison Paul honors the insiders twice, once in the first statement and once in the fifth and final statement. deSilva comments,

> Part of Paul's re-socialization of the believers involves drawing the sharp contrast between the "wisdom of the world" and "the wisdom of God"—thus excluding those who have not come to embrace God's wisdom in the crucified in the court of reputation. . . . He also seeks to motivate the believing community to function as a court of reputations to impose sanctions of shaming as well as conferring upon one another the honor with which God has gifted them (cf. 1 Cor 5:1–11; 2 Cor 2:3–11).[133]

If 1:10 is the thesis statement for 1 Cor 1–6, then 1:18 is the thesis statement for this *inclusio, for the message about the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God*. The outsiders are perishing, while the insiders are being saved. The outsiders view the message of the cross as foolishness (μωρία), while the insiders view the cross as the power of God. The outsiders shame the

---

[132.] "As has been thoroughly explored, Paul's terminology in verses 26–31 is full of status significance." Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 61.

[133.] David A. deSilva, "'Let the One Who Claims Honor Establish That Claim in the Lord': Honor Discourse in the Corinthian Correspondence," *Biblical Theological Bulletin* 28 (1998): 64.

cross by viewing it as foolishness; they, in turn, are shamed in that they are perishing. Foolishness is Paul's refrain of shame in this section; he uses foolishness (μωρία, μωραίνω, μωρός) five times. Since the insiders honor the cross in that they view it as the power of God, they are in turn honored in that they are being saved.[134]

Paul sets the contrast between the insiders and the outsiders according to his persuasive strategy. He does not directly address those in the congregation who emphasize eloquent wisdom or who view the message of the cross as foolishness, rather he applies a general principle and allows the Corinthians to make the specific application. However, Paul not so subtly helps the Corinthians to make the specific application by framing the two competing views of the cross in terms of honor and shame, namely *foolishness* and *power*.

The general principle is stated first in the negative and then it is restated in the positive. The negative, *the message about the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing*, refers to the outsiders. They have rejected the cross because it is foolish to them, with the result being that they are perishing. However, the deeper reference that Paul is making is to those among the Corinthians who may be tempted to adapt the message of the cross on the basis that it is foolishness. The positive message, *the cross is the power of God to us who are being saved*, also contains a double reference. First, it is a reference to those who have embraced the cross and were saved. Second, it is a reference to those who continue to embrace the cross and are being saved.

The applications that the Corinthians are undoubtedly to make from this statement is that, first, they are insiders and they have already embraced the message of the cross as God's power which saves. Second, to emphasize eloquent wisdom in place of the cross is to return to the same mind set as the outsiders who see the cross as foolishness. Third, since those outside the congregation see the cross as foolishness they are perishing, while those inside the congregation who see the cross as foolishness may also be perishing.

Paul's next statement in v. 19 (*For it is written, "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the discernment of the discerning I will thwart."*) is the second argument of five, and it is unexpected. What is unexpected is the way Paul brings a quote, the actual words of God, from the Hebrew Scriptures into his argument against human wisdom.

[134.] For a discussion on Paul and 1 Corinthians as a discourse on power, see Elizabeth A. Castelli, "Interpretations of Power in 1 Corinthians," *Semeia* 51 (1991): 197–222.

Collins notes that this is most likely a quote from the LXX of Isa 29:14.[135] Garland also views this quote as coming from Isa 29:12, "Paul puts and exclamation point on his argument by citing Isa 24:14."[136] Christopher Stanley suggests that Paul's use of this quote, and other quotes, would have been understood by his audience contingent upon their level of knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures. Stanley constructs three audiences and proposes their respective understanding of Paul's quote. Stanley's three audiences are the *informed* audience, the *competent* audience, and the *minimal* audience.[137]

No doubt those who put stock in human wisdom and viewed the message of the cross as foolishness would also have rejected the Hebrew Scriptures as foolishness. Yet, this only goes to emphasize Paul's point and draws a heightened contrast between those who trust in the cross and those who trust in human wisdom.[138] By citing this reference Paul continues to erect his barrier between the insiders and the outsiders.

Paul's use of this quote is a two-fold attack against human wisdom. Paul uses both the medium (the Hebrew Scriptures) and the message (*"I will destroy the wisdom*

[135.] Collins suggests four general principles about Paul's OT citations. "(1) Paul cites Scripture frequently where Hellenistic writers or rhetoricians might have appealed to some classic authority, and most often Paul chooses to quote from Isaiah (both in 1 Corinthians and other epistles). (2) Paul generally quotes from the LXX. But he may sometimes depend on a minority textual tradition: it is not always a loose quotation from the LXX text that we know. (3) Paul sees the scriptures as "actualized" in the context of his own situation and Corinth. (4) Paul sometimes ascribes OT references to God as applying to Christ as Lord, and usually takes note of the original context." Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 94–96.

[136.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 63.

[137.] "For the "informed audience," the answer could be found by recalling the original context of the Isaiah quotation. There, the speaker is clearly the God of Israel, and the term "wise" and "intelligent" are applied sarcastically to those in Israel who believe that they can hide their evil deeds from God and deceive the deity by their outward forms of worship. . . . The *competent* audience would have been unfamiliar with the original context of the quotation of v. 19 since Paul makes no obvious reference to any other features of the original passage. . . . With this limited Biblical knowledge, the competent audience would have reasoned to the same conclusions about the relation of the quotation to v. 18 as the informed audience had. In fact, their ignorance of the original audience might have given them an advantage in understanding the passage because they would not have been mislead by the way Paul shifts the reference of the terms "wise" and "intelligent" from insiders to outsiders. . . . For members of the "minimal audience" the meaning of the quotations would have remained fairly puzzling until they encountered the interpretive keys that Paul provides in v. 20." Christopher D. Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 80–82.

[138.] Paul appears to be drawing a parallel between Israel's foolishness in Isaiah 29, namely consulting Egypt, and the Corinthians' foolishness of consulting the "wise." B. J. Oropeza, "Echoes of Isaiah in the Rhetoric of Paul: New Exodus, Wisdom, and the Humility of the Cross in Utopian-Apocalyptic Expectations," in *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse* (ed. Duane F. Waston; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002), 87–112.

of the wise, and the discernment of the discerning I will thwart.") to shame the outsiders; those who view the cross as foolishness. This quote also echoes the content of v. 18. God's power is evoked in that he is presented as both a *destroyer* and a *frustrator* of the wise and intelligent. Paul employs a word play in v. 18 when he uses a middle participle form of ἀπόλλυμι (*those who are perishing*) and in v.19 he uses a future of ἀπόλλυμι (*I will destroy*).[139] With this quote Paul begins using a literary technique that he will continue to use throughout 1 Cor 1–4. This technique is that of changing terms depending on one's point of view. Whether one is an insider or an outsider determines one's view of what constitutes honor and shame, what is foolishness and what is wise. Paul's statements in v. 25 concerning *the foolishness of God* is perhaps the best known example of this transposing point of view. Paul as an insider in shaping an argument for insiders will take the arguments of the outsiders and reword them and use them against the outsider. Thus, in this quote, the *wisdom of the wise* and the *discernment of the discerning* is wisdom and discernment as determined by the outsiders.

After asserting that God will destroy and thwart the wise and discerning, Paul follows this quote in v. 20 with four questions, *Where is the one who is wise? Where is the scribe? Where is the debater of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?* The first three questions are parallel questions and this is an example of *repetitio* (*repetition*) or *expolitio*.[140] Each of the questions begins with the interrogative ποῦ (*where*), and this rhetorical device is an *anaphor* (repetition of an initial expression).[141] Various suggestions have been offered concerning Paul's uses of σοφός (*wise*), γραμματεύς (*scribe*), and συζητητής (*debater*).[142] These three terms refer to

---

139. Stanley convincingly argues, "Perhaps Paul knew that he could not appeal to his own authority at this point in the letter without arousing objections from those who questioned his authority. Since his rhetorical strategy required him to adopt a conciliatory tone of the beginning of the letter, he had to find another way to lead authority to his argument. His solution was to cite a verse from the authoritative Jewish Scriptures that showed the God of Israel speaking on his side. From there, he could proceed to unpack the meaning of the quotation, albeit in a rather roundabout way, in the ensuing verses." Stanley, *Arguing with Scripture*, 83.

140. Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 103.

141. Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of Literature & Rhetoric*, Anaphore.

142. Martin Hengel suggests that these three terms οφός, γραμματεύς, and συζητητής correspond to the Hebrew *hākām*, *sôpēr*, and *dôrēs*, and are an autobiographical reminiscence of Paul's studies as a Pharisee. Martin Hengel, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (trans. Rowland Deines; Philadelphia: Trinity, 1991), 42. J .B. Lightfoot and Fee both suggest that they refer to the Greek philosopher, the Jewish scribe and a general expression inclusive of both roles. J. B. Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul* (London: Macmillan, 1895), 159; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 70–71. David Garland contends that these three terms refer to professional experts

outsiders whose wisdom God will destroy and whose discernment God will thwart.

The first three questions set up the final question *Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?* By using the adverb οὐχί Paul is asking a leading question which expects an affirmative answer from the insiders.[143] Paul is asking the insiders to take a stand with God against the outsiders. With this fourth question and Paul's use of *God*, Paul links the quote of v. 19 with the first three questions of v. 20. This fourth question connects with the previous verse and the quote from Isa 29:14. Paul does not explain the connection, he simply makes it, and in so doing he creates somewhat of an expectation in the reader/audience.

Verse 21 (*For since, in the wisdom of God, the world did not know God through wisdom, God decided, through the foolishness of our proclamation, to save those who believe*) is Paul's answer to the fourth question he posed in v. 20. While the question expects an affirmative answer Paul now demonstrates why an affirmative answer is appropriate. Paul's major premise is that God's wisdom is greater than the world's wisdom because God's wisdom renders the world's wisdom futile in its ability to know God. This is Paul's application of how God destroys and thwarts the wisdom and discernment of the wise.

Paul's minor premise is that since the world's wisdom cannot come to a knowledge of God, God overcomes the world's wisdom through proclamation. Paul adds a touch of sarcasm when he describes his proclamation as foolishness—a sarcastic jab at the outsiders. However, Paul argues, since his proclamation is empowered by God's wisdom and is instrumental in salvation, his proclamation was not foolishness. Paul wraps up this argument by closely connecting the proclamation with salvation, which leads back to his statement in v. 18, *but to us who are being saved it is the power of God*. Thus, in v. 18 Paul states that the proclamation is the power of God to those who are saved (σώζω), and in v. 21 the proclamation is the wisdom of God to save (σώζω).

The argument continues the insider and the outsider comparison. The outsiders do not know God because God's wisdom thwarts them. Whereas the insiders both know God and are saved by the *foolishness* of proclamation. Paul's sarcastic use of *foolishness* works on the basis of this insider/outsider comparison. What the outsiders

_____

and thus is skewing those who *derive their status from their expertise*. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 65.

[143.] οὐχὶ is an interrogative word in questions that expect an affirmative answer.

view as foolishness is really wisdom to the insiders. This insider/outsider comparison is rife with honor and shame coloring. The insiders are honored by God in that they have the wisdom and power of God and they are honored by God's deciding or pleasure (εὐδοκέω) to save them. In contrast, the outsiders are shamed as their wisdom is depicted as foolishness. Though not stated, it is implied through the opening statement of v. 18 and the progression of the argument that the outsiders are shamed in that they are not saved.

It is worth noting that, in this section, Paul continues his reluctance to claim any direct power or status over the Corinthian Christians. He continues to emphasize God's wisdom and God's power in the proclamation of the cross of Christ. Thus, Paul continues to present himself as the faithful client who carries out his duties as an apostle (1:1) in proclaiming the gospel (1:17). However, since the proclamation is the wisdom and power of God, and since Paul is the one who proclaims, this invariably positions Paul in a place where he does indeed have a unique position of status over the Corinthians.

In vv. 19–21 Paul attempts to create a barrier between the Corinthian community of Christians and the larger Corinthian community. Paul uses a series of intertwined steps in erecting this barrier which includes using a quote from the Hebrew Scriptures in v. 19, using a leading question, and by making the questions an *us and God* verses *them* in v. 21, and finally the manner in which Paul answers the question in v. 22. Woven through this section are references and allusions to honor and shame, in which honor (wisdom and salvation) is bestowed on the insiders, and shame (foolishness and perish/destroy) is used of the outsiders.

In the second argument, vv. 22–24, Paul continues his insider/outsider argument, but with an unexpected twist. Now he breaks humanity into two broad groups, namely Jews and Greeks/gentiles. This allows Paul to continue the comparison between wisdom and foolishness and it also allows Paul to reintroduce the power of God theme first mentioned in v. 18. Paul begins in v. 22 by first introducing the outsiders, *Jews* and *Greek*s, and what they focus on, *the Jews demand signs*, *the Greeks desire wisdom*. The theme of wisdom is not new, but Paul's connecting it with the Greeks is.

In v. 23 Paul begins by comparing the insiders to the outsiders by using the phrase ἡμεῖς δὲ (*but we*). In v. 17 Paul uses the first person singular of his being sent by Christ to preach the gospel. In v. 23 he moves to the emphatic plural ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν (*but we preach*). This would suggest that Paul assumes, or for the sake of

this argument he assumes, that the Corinthian Christians have accepted his argument of vv. 19–20. Paul also intensifies the content of the message that is central to his whole insider/outsider contrast. In v. 17 he uses the infinitive of εὐαγγελίζω (*to proclaim the gospel*), in v. 18 he speaks of Ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ (*the message of the cross*). In v. 21 he refers to τοῦ κηρύγματος (*what was preached*). But now he states ἡμεῖς δὲ κηρύσσομεν Χριστὸν ἐσταυρωμένον, (*we proclaim Christ crucified*).

Paul moves back to the outsiders and contrasts their response to the message of Christ crucified, which is *a stumbling block to the Jews*, and *foolishness to the Gentiles*.[144] Both these responses, *stumbling block* and *foolishness*, are terms of shame. However, σκάνδαλον is an intense shame. It is interesting that in v. 22 Paul refers to the message of the cross with intense language and he also uses the most intense shame response *but we proclaim Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews*.[145]

In v. 24 Paul returns to the insiders, but he now describes these insiders with two phrases, αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς, Ἰουδαίοις τε καὶ Ἕλλησιν, (*but to those who are called, Jews and Greeks*). Paul is referring to those who were once outsiders, *Jews* and *Greek*s, but are now insiders, *those who are called*. In this transition from outsiders to insiders they have undergone a radical transformation in how they view the message of Christ crucified. The transformation for the Greek is from wisdom, viewing the message of Christ crucified as foolishness, but now viewing the message of Christ crucified as the wisdom of God. The transformation for the Jews is from signs, viewing the message of Christ crucified as a scandal, but now viewing Christ (and the message of Christ crucified) as the power of God.

In v. 25 Paul brings this *inclusio* to a close. It sums up the core of what he has argued in this section. In the first phrase, *God's foolishness is wiser than man's wisdom*,

---

[144.] Collins suggests that Paul's change from Ἕλληνες in v. 22 to ἔθνεσιν in v. 23 "may be due to his diatribal invective against dependence on Hellenistic wisdom. In the Hellenistic era it was common for *Hellēn* to be used with a sense of some social superiority. It was used of those who spoke the Greek language, had an education and shared the Greek culture. These were in a class distinct from the barbarian (cf. Rom 1:14). The suggestion of hybris attached to 'Hellenes' makes the choice of this term appropriate in a letter written to a community within which the problematic element is a group of people who are puffed up with pride as a result of the knowledge they possess." Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 106.

[145.] Charles Wanamaker, discussing Christ as the divine agent in Paul, notes, "The fundamental theological problem, however, for Paul and the other early Christians lay in the meaning of Jesus' death. As Paul himself says in I Cor. 1.23 'Christ crucified, to the Jews a scandal and to the Gentiles foolishness'. The meaning of the death of Jesus was not immediately obvious and required considerable theological reflection on the part of the early Christians in order to endow the event with divine significance." Charles Wannamaker, "Christ as Divine Agent in Paul," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 39 (1986): 525.

Paul sums up the first argument in vv. 19–21. The cross is the means by which God has destroyed and thwarted the wisdom of the wise and discerning in v. 19. The cross is the means by which God has made foolish the wisdom of the world in v. 20. The cross is the means by which God renders the wise of the world unable to know him, and the cross is the means by which God saves those who believe, v. 21. In the second phrase, *God's weakness is stronger than human strength*, Paul sums up the new material pertaining to the Jews in the second argument of vv. 22–24. The cross is the power by which God has called the Jews.

Verse 25 also forms a close parallel to v. 18. Both verses have two clauses, with the first clause of v. 18 being echoed in the first clause of v. 25, and the second clause of v. 18 being echoed in the second clause of v. 25.

> 18a *For the message about the cross is foolishness to those who are perishing*,
> 25a *For God's foolishness is wiser than human wisdom*,
> 18b *but to us who are being saved it is the power of God*.
> 25b *and God's weakness is stronger than human strength*.

Central to Paul's arguments in vv. 18–25 is a contrast between insiders and the outsiders, how they view wisdom and foolishness, power and weakness. Paul's argument is not crafted to convince the outsiders to become insiders, rather it is crafted to remind the insiders of what they are supposed to believe, namely Christ crucified. Paul continuously weaves elements of honor and shame through this argument. The insiders are described with terms of honor, and the outsiders are described with terms of shame.

> Although Paul had professed that he did not use cleverness of speech in his proclamation of the gospel (v. 17) his exposition of the message of the cross is fraught with powerful literary and rhetorical devices. The passage is characterized not only by its use of consistent parallelism but also by the techniques of the rhetorical question, comparison and contrast, repetition, *paronomasia*,[146] gradation, and irony. Its method of argument is that of the enthymene.[147] Paul's direct mode of address echoes the Stoic diatribe. In sum, the message of the cross is phrased in powerful rhetoric.[148]

[146.] "Play upon words which sound alike," Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of Literature & Rhetoric*, Paronomasia.

[147.] Aristotle defined an enthymeme as a rhetorical syllogism, *Rhet*. 1.2.8; 2.24.1. For a detailed discussion on the nature and function of the enthymeme, cf. Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of Literature & Rhetoric*, Enthymeme. For an examination of Paul's use of enthymemes in 1 Corinthians, see Anders Eriksson, "Enthymemes in Pauline Argumentation: Reading Between the Lines in 1 Corinthians," in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts* (ed. Anders Eriksson, et al.; Emory Studies in Early Christianity; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2002), 243–59.

[148.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 91.

2.7.2   The Second Inclusio, Boast in the Lord, 1:26–31

In the second *inclusio*, vv. 26–31, Paul continues this outsiders/insiders comparison. However, the focus now becomes one of time in that Paul compares the time when they were outsiders and their present status as insiders. Thus, the argument in vv. 26–29 flows along the lines of both outsiders/insiders and then/now. Central to this comparison are strong elements of honor and shame with the basic argument being, then you were shamed outsiders, but now you are honored insiders. This *inclusio* also includes two imperatives, which are the first and last words, *consider* (Βλέπω) and *boast* (καυχάσθω). Structurally, this *inclusio* is composed of contrasting opening and closing statements and a central argument which focuses on God's work of choosing:

v. 26: What you **were**

vv.27–29: God chose (x3)

vv. 30-31: What you **are**

Paul begins this *inclusio* with the imperative consider (βλέπω) your call (κλῆσις). The *call* may be a reference to their station in life,[149] (*vocation* or *profession*) or the *call* of the gospel proclamation. Paul has already used κλητός in 1:1–2, first to establish his status and vocation as an apostle. Second, to encourage the Corinthians by reminding them that they are *called to be saints*. Paul, in 1:24, also uses κλητός in reference to the call of the gospel proclamation to the generic αὐτοῖς δὲ τοῖς κλητοῖς (*those who are called*). When compared to 1:24 it would appear that now in 1:26 Paul is moving from a generic audience, those who God has called, to a specific reference, the Corinthians.

The NIV takes a present verb (Βλέπω) and translates it as if it were an aorist. It also takes a noun (κλῆσις) and translates it as a verb, thus *brothers, think of when you were called*. This translation leads the reader to think that Paul is talking about the call connected with the gospel proclamation. In contrast, the NRSV simply reads *Consider your own call*, and this retains the sense of ambiguity. In light of the fact that Paul uses a present imperative rather than an aorist, it would seem that Paul may also be referring to the social status of the majority of the Corinthian Christians.

What was their social status? It is obvious that the majority of the Corinthian Christians were not among the social elite. However, there were some among the

---

[149.] This appears to be the manner in which Paul uses κλῆσις in 1 Cor 7:20.

Corinthian Christians who were very well connected.[150] The three terms *wise* (σοφός)*, powerful* (δυνατός), and *noble birth* (εὐγενής) were used in Corinth as badges of honor and status among the social elite.[151] It was usually inferred from this passage that the vast majority of Christians were of lowly social status.[152] Winter,[153] along with E. E. Bowie,[154] suggests that the terms σοφός*,* δυνατός, and εὐγενής were used of those instructed by the sophists, and that the σοφός are the sophists whose parents are δυνατός, and εὐγενής. Thiselton demonstrates that this view is confirmed from ancient sources.[155] deSilva has also shown how these qualities embody an honor discourse in which honor is perceived to be dependent on the public evaluation of specific social groups.

Paul has already argued that human wisdom is lacking. Thus when he uses the phrase *not wise by human standards* we are not expecting him to speak in complimentary terms. The structure of the sentence would also suggest that the phrase κατὰ σάρκα (*according to the flesh*) is implied after each adjectival clause;

οὐ πολλοὶ Σοφοί κατὰ σάρκα
οὐ πολλοὶ δυνατοί (κατὰ σάρκα)
οὐ πολλοὶ εὐγενεις (κατὰ σάρκα)

The consensus is that the Corinthian community was composed of members from both the social elite and the lower echelon of society. In this verse Paul refers to both groups.[156] However, Paul begins with the familial vocative brothers (ἀδελφός). Central to Paul's argument in 1 Cor 1–4 is his defining the Corinthian community of faith with terms of familial mutuality rather than terms of upper and lower echelon class structure.[157]

[150.] "If Paul says that there were not many in the Corinthian congregation who were wise, powerful, and wellborn, then this much is certain: there were some." Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 72.

[151.] In an article on intertextuality, O'Day argues "The Corinthian triad of wise/powerful/noble birth derives directly from the Jeremian triad of wise/strong/rich in Jer 9:22." Gail O'Day, "Jeremiah 9:22–23 and 1 Corinthians 1:26–31 A Study in Intertextuality," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 264.

[152.] For a summary of the consensus views, see Horrell, *The Social Ethos*, 91–101; Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 69–120.

[153.] Winter, *Philo and Paul*, 189.

[154.] E. L. Bowie, "The Importance of the Sophists," *Yale Classical Studies* 27 (1982): 29–59.

[155.] Plutarch, *Mor.* 58C; Diogenes Laertius, *Orations*, 29–32, Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 182.

[156.] Leander E. Keck, "God the Other Who Acts Otherwise: An Exegetical Essay on 1 Cor 1:26–31," *Word & World* 16 (1996): 440.

[157.] Clarke, "Equality or Mutuality."

In vv. 27–28 Paul uses a series of three parallel statements which focus on the twin themes of God's choosing (ἐκλέγω) and shaming; the shame being connected with what God has not chosen. However, in the first two parallel statements in v. 27, there is a close connection with the concepts of foolish/wise and weak/strong and the themes of the first *inclusio* of 1:17–25.

> 18a *For the message about the cross is **foolishness** (μωρία) to those who are perishing,*
> 25a *For God's **foolishness** (μωρός) is wiser than **human wisdom** (σοφός),*
> 27a *But God chose what is **foolish** (μωρός) in the world to shame the **wise** (σοφός);*
> 18b *but to us who are being saved it is the **power** (δύναμις) of God.*
> 25b *and God's **weakness** (ἀσθενής) is stronger than **human strength** (ἰσχυρός).*
> 27b *God chose what is **weak** (ἀσθενής) in the world to shame the **strong** (ἰσχυρός).*

Thus, in v. 27 there is a double reference to God's shaming. In the first instance Paul refers to the first *inclusio* of vv. 18–25 and his argument that the message of Christ crucified is the means that God has chosen to shame the wise and strong. In the second instance, Paul refers to v. 26 and the not many wise and powerful people, the people of low status, that God has chosen and that this now also shames the wise and strong.

In v. 28 Paul moves to the third parallel statement which uses God's choosing and shaming. However, this choosing and shaming has no direct connection with the previous *inclusio*. Rather, it connects directly with the third term of the social elite that Paul used in v. 26, the εὐγενής (*noble birth*). Thus, in v. 28 the contrast is between the εὐγενής (*noble birth*) and the ἀγενής (*not of noble birth, base born, low*). Yet, Paul does not repeat the term εὐγενής in v. 28 as he repeated the terms *wise* (σοφός) and *powerful* (δυνατός) of v. 26 in v. 27. Rather, Paul uses the phrase τὰ ὄντα (*things that are*) as a synonym of εὐγενής.

Paul intensifies both the contrast between the εὐγενής and the ἀγενής and the shame in v. 28 as he uses three terms to refer to the Christians of low social status, (1) τὰ ἀγενῆ τοῦ κόσμου (*the low born of the world*), (2) καὶ τὰ ἐξουθενημένα (*the despised*), (3) τὰ μὴ ὄντα (*the things that are not*). In this contrast, Paul does not use the phrase *And God does not shame* (καταισχύνω) as he used in v. 27. Rather, Paul takes the shame to a new intensity by using a new term of shame καταργέω (*to reduce to nothing*), and by reducing the three terms *wise* (σοφός)*, powerful* (δυνατός), and *noble birth* (εὐγενής) to simply *the things that are* (τὰ ὄντα).

In v. 29 Paul draws the first conclusion in this second *inclusio*; *so that no one*

might boast (καυχάομαι) in the *presence of God*.[158] Moxnes has demonstrated that "boasting was often seen as a demand for public recognition of honor."[159] Paul's argument in vv. 26–28 is that God is the one who both chooses and thus honors the foolish, the powerless, and the base born. In so doing God shames the wise, the powerful and noble born. This conclusion refers back to the slogans used in 1:12. Paul will again use the reference as a negation of boasting (καυχάομαι) in 3:21. In 3:21–22 the boasting not to be done is in reference to human leaders such as Paul, Apollos, or Cephas. Paul also employs a word play by using σάρξ (*flesh*) v. 26 and v. 29. In v. 26 κατὰ σάρκα is translated by the NRSV as *human standards*, while in v. 29 πᾶσα σὰρξ is translated as *in the presence*. However, keeping Paul's use of σάρξ in v. 26 consistent with v. 29 would result in the phrase, *so that no one might boast in human standards before God*. This would support the view of Chow and Clarke that the factional slogans of 1:12 appear to have been used by the Corinthian Christian patrons as a means of house church competition. In this choosing God brings about a new equality in the Christian community. He takes those whom society views as base born and he honors them. God takes those whom society views as noble born and from society's perspective he shames them. The result being that those who were at opposite ends of the social spectrum are now equal in status before God.

The argument of vv. 26–29 is crafted directly for the members of the Christian community who are from society's lower level. Paul argues that their honor and status comes not from which house church they attend, or from which Corinthian patron they are indebted to, or from which slogan they use. Paul's argument is that their honor and status in the Christian community is based on the fact that God chose them. However, the argument of vv. 26–29 is also indirectly addressed to the members of the Christian community who are from society's upper level. It is a subtle rebuke of their boasting and the use of the house church slogans to gain honor and status in the Christian community. Status in the Christian community is based on whom God chooses, not on society's view of who is wise, powerful, and well born. The wise, powerful, and well born must not boast in themselves and their social status since God has shamed them.

[158.] For an examination of the role of boasting in rhetoric, see Duane F. Watson, "Paul and Boasting," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003), 77–100; Duane F. Watson, "Paul's Boasting in 2 Corinthians 10–13 as Defense of His Honor: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis," in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts* (ed. Anders Eriksson, et al.; Emory Studies in Early Christianity; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2002), 260–75.

[159.] Moxnes, "Honor and Shame," 24.

The foolish, powerless, and base born must not boast in their Corinthian patrons since God has both shamed these patrons and God has honored the base born by choosing them. Paul has already used the ideas of wisdom and power quite extensively before v. 26. However, it is interesting that Paul has used wisdom in a negative manner and connected it with human wisdom, (cf. 17, 18, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25). In contrast, Paul has used power in a positive manner and connects it with divine power, (cf. 17, 18, 24, 25).

In vv. 30–31 Paul moves his argument away from shame towards honor. In v. 30 Paul emphasizes the new status all the Corinthians have in Christ, and in v. 31 Paul emphasizes the correct response of all the Corinthians to their new status. On translating v. 30, Thiselton notes, "Almost no modern English translation of v. 30 follows the precise structure of the Greek, because the one-for-one rendering of each preposition, noun, and verb, would lead to ambiguity or even the possibility of misunderstanding."[160]

Verse 30 is composed of three clauses;

It is because of him that you are in Christ.[161]
Christ became for us the wisdom of God.
(who is) *righteousness and sanctification and redemption*.

The first clause summarizes the work of God's triple choosing and honoring as outlined by Paul in vv. 27–28. The second clause goes back to the previous *inclusio*, vv. 18–25, and especially v. 24 (*but to those who are the called, both Jews and Greeks, Christ the power of God and the wisdom of God*). Paul summarizes the change of mind the Jews and Greeks (*we*) had in embracing Christ as the wisdom of God. The third clause is an epexegetical clause and develops God's wisdom as mentioned in the second clause. The three terms (*righteousness*, *sanctification*, *redemption*) also function as a contrast to the three terms of v. 26 (*wise*, *powerful*, *noble born*).[162]

The insiders, the new community of faith in Jesus, are not structured along the lines of the outsiders' view of honor/shame, wise/foolish, and powerful/weak, noble birth/base birth. Rather, all the members of the community share common characteristics of being honored and chosen by God and being in Christ. This change of

---

160. Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 99.

161. Thiselton suggests that, "most translations and commentators restructure the English for the Greek, e.g., NRSV, *He is the source of your life in Christ Jesus*; NIV, *It is because of him that you are in Christ Jesus*." Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 189. *By his act you are in Christ Jesus*, Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 49. *But you are related to God in Christ Jesus*, Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 50. *For him you are in Christ Jesus*, Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 90. *It is a gift from him that you are in Christ Jesus*, Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 46.

162. For a discussion on the various views pertaining to these terms, cf. Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 190–95.

honor/shame values necessitated a change in mind concerning wisdom. However, Paul argues that they have embraced Jesus as the wisdom of God, and as a result they now have new honor status in Christ, in righteousness, sanctification, and redemption.

With *righteousness* Paul is subtly urging the Corinthians to embrace this gift and act in a righteous manner, namely, to stop causing factions. The same would be true for *sanctification*. Not only are they sanctified, but they are called to be sanctified in v. 2. *Redemption* is especially humbling, a term used of people sold into slavery, now applied to the Corinthian Christians from an elite background. Thiselton, commenting on the specific relationship between wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption suggests,

> But given (1) the **wisdom-folly** contrast (even recognizing the role of divine action versus human achievement here) it is not at all fanciful or artificial to correlate further (2) *weakness* (i.e. lack of *social influence and status*) with **righteousness** in the sense of "being of accepted status"; (3) *being despised*, with **sanctification** (in the sense of having access to privileged places as on who "belongs"); and (4) *the nothings* (those of no account) with **redemption** (as being transferred from a position of no account to one of dignity and freedom).[163]

In v. 31 Paul moves from the honor the Corinthians have received from Jesus, to the honor they should reciprocate to Jesus. Verse 31 contrasts with v. 29. In v. 29 boasting on the basis of the outsiders' view of honor is condemned by Paul because God has shamed (καταισχύνω) and nullified (καταργέω) the wise, powerful, and noble born. In v. 31 boasting based on Paul's view of honor is encouraged. It is the boasting of the insiders whom God has honored by choosing them to be in Christ, who have Christ as their wisdom of God, and who have been blessed by Christ with righteousness and sanctification and redemption. Again, this reference to boasting refers back to the use of slogans mentioned in 1:12. Paul replaces the boasting based on the outsiders' view of honor with a boasting based on the insiders' view of honor; boasting in the name of the Lord.

2.7.3   *Paul's use of Honor and Shame in vv. 26–31*

Shame (καταισχύνω) is used twice in v. 27, once of wisdom and once of power. But Paul changes to a more intense form of shaming or nullification (καταργέω) of the things that are. Three things emphasized were wisdom (σοφός), power (δυνατός), and noble birth (εὐγενής). These are completely abolished by the Cross. The result of God's shaming of wisdom, power, and the intense shaming of *noble birth*, is the total removal

---

[163.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 191.

of any person's boasting, both the patrons who boasted because they possessed these characteristics and the clients who boasted in their patrons who possessed these characteristics.

Jesus, as the super-patron of the Christian community, has given them the gifts of *salvation*, *all speech*, and *all wisdom*, and he is the one who has the power to make them *blameless* at his revelation. The Corinthians, as clients, were under the obligation of gratitude to behave in such a manner as to honor their patron. However, their rejection of the cross does not honor him. In such a situation the typical and expected response of the patron would be to shame his clients. Their emphasis on *wisdom, power, and noble birth* was a central cause in both the factions and dishonoring their patron. The patron would have no choice but to shame them by removing their source of honor.

Paul ends this section with another reference to Jesus as a patron, in that he now gives his clients wisdom, righteousness, sanctification, and redemption. These divine gifts replace the human standards of cleverness, influence, and noble birth. Once the Corinthians receive these gifts they no longer boast about themselves, rather they now boast in their patron. The whole of 1 Cor 1 moves to this point which is a choice of shame on the Corinthians' part. They can choose what the world honors, namely wisdom, power, and noble birth. However, this course will lead to them being shamed by their patron. Or they can choose what their patron honors and receive the shame of the world.

2.7.4   The Third Inclusio, A Demonstration of God's Power, 2:1–5

In the third *inclusio*, 2:1–5, Paul continues this outsiders-insiders comparison but now the focus returns to the message of the Christ crucified and, more specifically, Paul's proclamation of Christ crucified.[164] This third *inclusio* is strikingly similar to the first *inclusio* of vv. 18–25. The themes of wisdom (σοφία), power (δύναμις) and Christ crucified are central to both. Paul ends the first statement of the first *inclusio* (1:18) and he ends the last statement of the third *inclusio* (2:5) with a reference to the power of God. The third *inclusio* also shares the theme of weak/weakness (ἀσθενής in 1:27, ἀσθένεια in 2:3) with the second *inclusio*. The second and third *inclusio* also begin with the vocative *brothers* (ἀδελφός) in the opening affirmation. Swearingen compares Paul's defense to Socrates defense, "Paul begins 1 Corinthians 2, like Socrates' self-

---

[164.] For an overview of Paul's preaching ministry, cf. Stanley K. Stowers, "Social Status, Public Speaking and Private Teaching: The Circumstances of Paul's Preaching Activity," *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 59–82.

defense as recounted in Plato's *Apology* with an anti-rhetorical *epitaphilos logos*."[165]
This *inclusio* is Paul's validation of his preaching in that he connects it with the first
inclusio's theme that the message of the cross is the power and wisdom of God. In the
second *inclusio*, Christ is the means of the Corinthians' new status as honored insiders
enjoying *righteousness, holiness,* and *redemption,* and Christ is the one whom they
now boast in. However, to facilitate this change of status it was necessary for Paul to
preach Christ crucified. In validating Paul's preaching and Paul himself as an apostle of
Christ, this *inclusio* has strong parallels to the *narratio* of 1:17.[166]

> *For Christ did not send me* (οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλέν), 1:17.
> *When I came to you brothers* (Κἀγὼ ἐλθὼν πρὸς ὑμᾶς), 2:1.
>
> *To preach the gospel* (ἀλλὰ εὐαγγελίζεσθαι,), 1:17.
> *To proclaim the mystery of God* (καταγγέλλων ὑμῖν τὸ μυστήριον),2:1.
> *My speech and my proclamation* (καὶ ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου), 2:4.
>
> *Not with eloquent wisdom* (οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου), 1:17.
> *Not with lofty words of wisdom* (οὐ καθ ὑπεροχὴν λόγου ἢ σοφίας), 2:1.
> *Not with plausible words of wisdom,* (οὐκ ἐν πειθοῖ[σ] σοφίας), 2:4.
> *Not on human wisdom* (μὴ ἦ ἐν σοφίᾳ ἀνθρώπων), 2:5.
>
> *The cross of Christ* (ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ), 1:17.
> *Christ and him crucified* (Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ τοῦτον ἐσταυρωμένον), 2:2.

These parallels would suggest that there is also a parallel between *empty*
(κενόω) of 1:17 and *demonstration* (ἀπόδειξις) of 2:4. Paul's use of ἀπόδειξις in 2:4 is
somewhat surprising due to the fact that the term is part of the technical language of the
rhetorical schools.[167] This surprise is compounded by Paul's use of πίστις in 2:5, which
is also a technical rhetorical term. Collins ties these two technical terms together and
suggests that Paul is showing the Corinthians both his knowledge of rhetoric and his
rhetorical skills. "In this context what he affirms is that he spoke the way he did with
the result (*hina* with subjunctive; BDF 369.3) that the proof of his arguments to the

---

[165.] C. Jan Swearingen, "The Tongues of Men: Understanding Greek Rhetorical Sources for Paul's Letters to the Romans and 1 Corinthians," in *The Tongues of Men*, in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts* (ed. Anders Eriksson, et al.; Emory Studies in Early Christianity; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2002), 240.

[166.] Litfin notes the parallelism of 1:7 and 2:4–5, but he does not fully develop it. Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology*, 277.

[167.] "Despite his own lack of formal rhetorical training (cf. 2 Cor 11:16) Paul is using the technical language of the rhetorical schools (*apodeixis*). His is the language of rhetorical appeal, the language of persuasion, demonstration, and power. Aristotle had described rhetoric as the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatsoever (see *Art of Rhetoric* 1.1., specifically 1.1.14)." Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 120.

Corinthians derived not from human wisdom but from the very power of God."[168] Thus, in 1:17, Paul argues that preaching the gospel with eloquent wisdom would invalidate (κενόω) the cross of its power. In 2:4 Paul argues that his speech and message was validated (ἀπόδειξις), not by plausible words of wisdom, but by the spirit and power.[169] The end result being that the Corinthians' faith/proof is in the power of God. Concerning Paul's use of these terms Timothy Lim suggests,

> In 1 Cor. 2:4 Paul is not rejecting rhetoric altogether, but that specific emphasis and practices of the Corinthian preachers to employ human words of wisdom in preaching. For to Paul the preaching of the Gospel is not dependent upon human techniques of eloquence, but upon the demonstration of the Spirit and power. This does not mean that devices and strategies of rhetoric are not to be used in preaching, but that they should be confined to their proper limits.[170]

While Lim is no doubt correct that Paul is not rejecting rhetoric altogether, he fails to notice Paul's twist of irony. Paul, while denying his use of sophistry three times in this *inclusio*, constantly displays both his knowledge of rhetorical terms and his rhetoric skills. Thus, in 2:2 Paul is not limited by his education or ability to preaching the message of *Jesus Christ, and him crucified* with lofty words of wisdom. Rather, Paul deliberately chose (κρίνω) not to use lofty words or wisdom, but to preach Christ crucified.[171] This then would indicate that Paul's weakness, fear, and much trembling of 2:3 was not due to his sophistic inabilities, but rather his deliberate choice to present his message of the cross to the Corinthians knowing they had a strong bias towards lofty words or wisdom.[172]

While 2:1–5 does have close parallels to the *narratio* of 1:17 and the two previous *inclusio*, there is a new element in this third *inclusio*. Paul focuses not only on the content of his message, but also on the delivery of his message. In a city steeped in

---

[168.] "It is quite conceivable, however that Paul is not using faith *pistis*, "faith," in its usual theological sense. *Pistis* is a technical rhetorical term. Used to designate a rhetorical demonstration, it is the Greek equivalent of Quintilian's *probatio*, "proof". In 2:1-5 Paul is dealing with rhetoric and shows his knowledge not only of rhetorical skills but also of rhetorical terms." Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 121.

[169.] Clark Oke argues that ἀπόδειξις is not a reference to a demonstration or proof. Clark C. Oke, "Paul's Method not a Demonstration but an Exhibition of the Spirit," *The Expository Times* 67 (1955): 85–86.

[170.] Timothy H. Lim, "Not in Persuasive Words of Wisdom, but in the Demonstration of the Spirit and Power," *Novum Testamentum* 29 (1987): 148.

[171.] This would also explain the statements of 2 Corinthians, 10:1 *I myself, Paul, appeal to you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ--I who am humble when face to face with you, but bold toward you when I am away!*-- and 10:10 *For they say, "His letters are weighty and strong, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible.*"

[172.] Garland points out that a few scholars have dealt with the irony of Paul's using rhetoric to undermine rhetoric. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 58.

sophistic rhetoric describing a public speaker with such terms as *weakness* (ἀσθένεια), *fear* (φόβος) and *much trembling* (τρόμος) would be shameful. While these terms may have been terms Paul's opponents used against him, the fact that Paul embraces these terms and uses them to describe his delivery has Paul engaging in self-shaming behavior. Thus, there is a double shame, the content of Paul's message is shameful and the delivery of Paul's message is shameful.

This is the same contrast that Paul uses in the first two *inclusio*; it is the contrast between the insiders and the outsiders. In the first *inclusio* the contrast is between the insiders and the outsiders and how they view the message of Christ crucified. The insiders view it as the wisdom and power of God while the outsiders view it as foolishness and weakness. In the second *inclusio* the contrast is between the status of insiders and the outsiders. For the insiders their status is in Christ and their righteousness, sanctification, and redemption, while the outsiders' status is in wisdom, power, and noble birth. In this third *inclusio* the contrast is between how insiders and outsiders view Paul's delivery, to outsiders it is characterized by weakness, fear, and much trembling, but to the insiders it is the demonstration and proof of God's power.[173]

In this *inclusio,* Paul presents himself as the faithful client of Jesus Christ. Paul makes a connection between his being called to be an apostle of Jesus in 1:17, his being sent to preach Jesus also in 1:17, and his arrival and preaching of Christ in Corinth 2:1–2. Paul argues that even the method of his delivery was an honoring of Jesus. He purposely refrained from using lofty words or wisdom (2:1, 4). Rather, he focused on Christ and him crucified (2:2). This strategy resulted in Paul's delivery being ridiculed (2:3), but this also resulted in the Corinthians' faith/proof resting on the power of God (4:5).

Paul, presents himself as a faithful client who is willing to endure the shame of the world so that Christ, his patron, would be honored and the Corinthians would trust Christ, not Paul's or any other person's sophistic rhetoric.[174] Ackerman writes, "Paul creates a world view in his letter which contradicts typical perceptions: power from

---

[173.] "Paul is almost saying that the Corinthians were not persuaded by his preaching abilities but *in spite of* them." John B. Pohill, "The Wisdom of God and Factionalism: 1 Corinthians 1–4," *Review and Expositor* 80 (1983): 325.

[174.] "Therefore, this is the final point of his argument - the Corinthian parties cannot praise any apostle for these qualities." Peter Lampe, "Theological Wisdom and the 'Word About the Cross': The Rhetorical Scheme in 1 Corinthians 1–4," *Interpretation* 39 (1990): 127.

weakness and wisdom from folly." [175] Thus, with this final *inclusio* Paul validates both the content and the delivery of his preaching. Paul also repudiates sophistic rhetoric which has been a key factor in the factionalism of 1:12.[176]

2.8   Conclusion

At the very beginning of his first epistle to the Corinthians Paul begins by laying a foundation that will remain central to his argument throughout I Cor 1–6. In vv. 1–9 Paul forcefully identifies Jesus as the patron of the Corinthian congregation. In fact, Jesus is the super-patron in that the gifts and protection that he bestows on the Corinthians surpass all other gifts and protection. Paul also describes the Corinthians as the clients of Jesus. They are the recipients of Jesus' gifts and protection. Paul also states, that as clients, their obligation to the patron Jesus is to live in a manner that honors him. The patron-client relationship between Jesus and the Corinthians as well as the concept of honor reciprocity is encapsulated in v. 2, *those who are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints.*

Also found in vv. 1–9 is Paul's description of his relationship to both Jesus and the Corinthians. Paul's authority over the Corinthians has been challenged by the Corinthian elite. Paul's response to this challenge, is first, to emphasize the nature of Jesus' patronage to the Corinthians. Second, Paul emphasizes his status as an apostle of Jesus. Thus, as Paul stresses the superlative nature of Jesus' patronage to the Corinthians, he intrinsically and purposefully attempts to reinforce his own authority over the Corinthians. This is subtle in 1:1–2:5, but in 4:15 Paul will argue openly for his authority over the Corinthians on the basis that he is their father through the gospel of Jesus Christ.

[175.] "Paul creates a world view in his letter which contradicts typical perceptions: power from weakness and wisdom from folly. If the Corinthians wanted to be in the map of true power and wisdom, they had to begin living according to this view. Paul seeks to shame them into accepting this position of weakness in order that they might experience the power of God. They needed to live according to the absurdity and foolishness of the gospel so that they might be empowered by the Spirit. Living according to the paradox of the cross is the true position of strength for Paul because it is where the power of God's spirit is allowed to work. The position of humility, submission, and reliance upon God, though seen as weakness from the world's perspective, opens the way for believers to experience the very power of God. In the cross creates a radical new man of the cosmos that alters human perceptions and experiences." Ackerman, *Lo, I Tell You a Mystery*, 75.

[176.] "It is our thesis that perceived deficiencies in Paul's preaching, when measured against Greco-Roman eloquence, precipitated the difficulties in Corinth. These were the deficiencies which prompted a section of the Corinthian congregation to declare their independence from him." Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology*, 274.

In vv. 10–17 Paul begins to address the problem of the Corinthians' competitive slogans. The core problem is that of patronal competitive factionalism within the congregation. The evidence would suggest that the various house churches were in a status driven competition against each other. Each house church sought to honor and increase the status of their house church patron, who would have been a member of the Corinthian elite. Paul's initial argument is that these slogans and their patronal factionalism dishonor their super-patron Jesus who was crucified for them. Paul also quickly distances himself from the *I am of Paul* party. Thus, Paul again stresses Jesus' patronage and his own faithful obedience to Jesus.

After introducing the problem of status driven patronal factionalism within the Corinthian congregation Paul uses a series of three *inclusi* to shame the Corinthians for engaging in this competitive factionalism. In the first *inclusio*, 1:18–25, Paul compares the message of the cross with eloquent wisdom (σοφία). Through a series of arguments, Paul shames eloquent wisdom and honors the message of the cross. This would suggest that Paul perceives that embedded within the Corinthian slogans of v. 12 and the patronal factionalism is a mind-set of honoring eloquent wisdom. This first *inclusio* ends with Paul's affirmation, *For God's foolishness is wiser than human wisdom, and God's weakness is stronger than human strength*. Thus, Paul argues, with God backing him up, that human wisdom, which is intrinsically part of the patronal factionalism, is deeply flawed.

In the second *inclusio*, 1:16–32, Paul outlines how the congregation is in fact a new community with new standards of honor and shame. God, in his choosing and through the shameful message of the cross, has honored and changed the status of the lowly of Corinthian society. However, in this *inclusio* Paul also shames the elite, the house church leaders, the *wise*, the *powerful*, the *noble born* of Corinthian society. The result of this honoring of the shamed and shaming of the honored is, *so that no one might boast in the presence of God*. This is a reference to the inappropriate boastings of 1:12. However, Paul quickly adds that the Corinthians can in fact boast, but now their boasting must be in Jesus, their super-patron. He is their source of life and he is wisdom from God. Paul concludes this *inclusio* by replacing the Corinthians' three claims of status (the *wise*, *powerful*, the *noble born)* with three Christian status claims (*righteousness, sanctification*, and *redemption*).

In the third *inclusio*, 2:1–5, Paul turns to his speech and proclamation. Paul established in the first two *inclusi* that the message of the cross is the power and wisdom of God and it is also the means by which God chooses the lowly and shames

the wise/powerful/well born. Thus, the message of the cross is now tied to the new boasting the Corinthians should engage in. With these principles in place Paul now addresses the criticism of his critics, namely that he did not use *lofty words of wisdom*; he was a unpolished rhetor. Paul's response to this criticism is to embrace its shame, and then to reverse it. Paul draws a contrast between the *lofty words of wisdom* and *his proclaiming the mystery of God*. To emphasize this point Paul contends that he purposely decided not to use *lofty words or wisdom* but rather *to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ, and him crucified.* In the first two *inclusi* Paul argues that the message of the cross is shameful. But now Paul argues that his presentation of the message of the cross is shameful. However, Paul ends this third *inclusio* by arguing that this double shame was done *so that your faith might rest not on human wisdom but on the power of God*. Paul closes this third *inclusio* in the same manner that he closed the *narratio* in 1:17, by referring to the cross of Christ as the power of God. Thus, in this final *inclusio*, Paul again presents himself as the faithful apostle of Jesus who is willing to preach a shameful message in a shameful way so that he might honor Jesus and receive honor from Jesus.

In the three *inclusi* there is also a strong sense of Paul's attempting to erect a barrier between the insiders and the outsiders. The insiders and the outsiders have competing views of honor and shame. This is best seen in the two views of the cross. The outsiders see the cross as foolishness and Paul's preaching of the cross unsophisticated. In contrast, the insiders view the cross as the wisdom and power of God, and Paul's preaching as a demonstration of the Spirit's power. Thus, the patronal factionalism of 1:12 indicates that the Corinthians were in fact behaving like outsiders rather than insiders.

Paul's solution to the patronal factionalism is to argue for a new perception among the Corinthians regarding the nature of the Corinthian community. For Paul, the Christian community in Corinth has only one patron, that is Jesus Christ. Christ is the patron of the community because of the gifts he has given them and the protection he affords them. The Corinthians are all clients under Jesus, and there are no patrons over each other. This community honors the message of the cross because it is the wisdom and power of God and because it is the means by which God chose them and made them members of this new community. This new community now boasts exclusively in the Lord. Paul enjoys a special relationship with the community because he is the apostle of Jesus their patron, and because he is a faithful messenger who trusts in the unsophisticated message of Christ and him crucified.

CHAPTER 3

1 CORINTHIANS 4

3.1   Introduction

In 1 Cor 1–3 Paul addresses the single issue of patronal factionalism. In 1 Cor 5–6 Paul addresses the three issues of incest, law court abuses, and sexual immorality. It will be argued that these three issues of 1 Cor 5–6 are closely connected to the powerful patrons in the congregation. However, before Paul addresses these three issues he first endeavors to regain a position of power, namely the power of a father. Thus, it will be argued that 1 Cor 4 is Paul's attempt to regain a position of power so that he can address the abuses of the powerful patrons in 1 Cor 5–6. This chapter will continue to utilize textual rhetoric which focuses on the style and the developments of argumentation.[1]

Paul attempts to gain his position of power through a series of interconnected arguments. These interconnected arguments are outlined as follows:

The Ultimate Tribunal, 4:1–5

Do Not Go Beyond What is Written, 4:6–7

Kings and Criminals, 4:8–13

A Letter of Recommendation, 4:14–16

Timothy, the Apostle's Apostle, 4:17–21

These five arguments will be examined from the perspective of textual rhetoric*,* with a special focus on Paul's use of the social values of honor and shame. While honor and shame have been central to Paul's argument in the first three chapters, now, in 1 Cor 4, Paul employs a new aspect to his argument, namely that of "staying in one's proper place." It will be demonstrated that this "staying in one's proper place" will form a core theme of Paul's five arguments in 1 Cor 4. Thus, "staying in one proper's place"

[1.] Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of Literature & Rhetoric*, Rhetoric Criticism.

also forms part of the central theme of the chapter and is foundational to Paul's attempt to reestablish himself to his proper place of authority, which is that of apostle of Jesus Christ and father of the Corinthian Christians.

3.2   The Ultimate Tribunal, 4:1–5

Paul begins this section by defending his ministry and by making a forensic apology. Collins writes,

> Once again Paul turns to a reflection on his own ministry. The passage is replete with forensic language, the language of the courtroom. "Judging" (vv. 3, 4, 5), being found trustworthy (v. 2), knowing of something that could be held against oneself (v. 4), "being acquitted" (v. 4), "bringing to light" (v. 5), " making intentions manifest" (v. 5), and "commendation" (v. 5) bespeak the setting of a courtroom.[2]

deSilva has demonstrated that there is a distinct difference between how honor and shame is achieved and ascribed in the dominant culture and in the minority cultures. He cites examples from both Greco-Roman philosophical writings and Jewish literature to demonstrate how minority cultures establish and maintain their honor and shame in contrast to and often in competition with the dominant culture. deSilva argues that one of the central arguments of the minority culture is an appeal to a court that is higher than the court and opinions of the dominant culture; it is an appeal to the court of God.[3]

Paul, in v. 1, uses two words, *servant* (ὑπηρέτης) and *steward*[4] (οἰκονόμος), to describe himself and Apollos. Οἰκονόμος is used only here by Paul, and it was typically used to describe "one who functions as a helper, frequently in a subservient role."[5] In contrast, ὑπηρέτης was a position of great responsibility, and even honor.[6] This honor is

---

[2.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 167.

[3.] "Honor is now defined in terms of the minority culture's traditions and values: those who do not share these definitions are set aside as shameless, or as errant. The negative opinion which such people might have of the group and its members carries no weight—it rests on error, and the representative of the minority culture can look forward to his or her vindication when the extent of that error is revealed. Rather, the group members are called to have concern for the opinion of a higher court, whether it be of nature, of the governing principle, of Zeus, or of the God of Israel. The members of the minority culture form a social counterpart to this higher court, and it is in their eyes that a member is challenged to seek honor and eschew falling into disgrace." deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 143.

[4.] "But the NIV recognizes that today *steward* is too often associated with waiters on board ships, and translates *those entrusted with (secret things)*. Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 336.

[5.] "ὑπηρέτης" BAGD 1030.

[6.] "οἰκονόμος" BAGD 597; "1. manager of a household or estate, *(house) steward, manager* 2. *public treasurer, treasurer* 3. one who is entrusted with management in connection with transcendent matters, *administrator*."

made all the greater due to the fact that the secret things of God were the items entrusted to Paul and Apollos. Thus, with these two words Paul continues to present himself and Apollos as faithful clients, who are servants and stewards, who were willing to humble themselves before their patron. Yet, this humbling resulted in their receiving a position of status and honor from the patron. No doubt these *secret things* refer back to Paul's discussion in 3:6–16. Bassler writes,

> Paul thus had two serious problems to address—a general overvaluation of human leadership in the community and a criticism of undervaluation (by some) of his own ministry and gospel. Furthermore, he had to address these problems in such a way that his solution to one did not exacerbate the other. Paul resolved this dilemma by focusing on the servant ministry of the apostles. As mere *servants* of God they are not to be evaluated above their master (3:5–9), but as servants *of God* they are answerable only to the master and not to human critics.[7]

In v. 2 Paul notes that the core quality demanded of a steward is trustworthiness (πιστός). That is, he must be trusted to carry out the requirements of his office. There is nothing new here, Paul is simply restating a basic principle concerning stewards that his audience would have been well aware of. Thus, Paul is not teaching new information, rather he is laying the premise that he will build upon. Yet, in v. 3, before Paul even attempts to justify or defend his tenure as a steward he immediately clarifies who will judge his faithfulness as a steward. Paul declares that it is a little thing (ἐλάσσων, superlative, *it is the least thing*) that he is examined or questioned by the Corinthians, or any human court. Indeed, Paul will not even question himself about his faithfulness as a steward. Paul's repeated use of ἀνακρίνω (*examine* or *question*) suggests that he is indeed drawing on a judicial or a tribunal concept.[8]

In v. 4, the NRSV translation accurately conveys Paul's use of courtroom language. *I am not aware of anything against myself, but I am not thereby acquitted.* Paul clarifies what he means by the previous statement (*I do not even judge myself*). He is not saying he is beyond examination, rather, he has indeed examined himself and is not aware of anything against himself. However, Paul states that his own self-perception of innocence is not enough for an acquittal (δικαιόω). The only one who can examine Paul's service as a steward and the only one who can pass judgment on him is his Lord.

[7.] Jouette M. Bassler, "1 Corinthians 4:1–5," *Interpretation* 4 (1990): 180.

[8.] "ἀνακρίνω" BAGD 66; "1. to engage in careful study of a question, *question, examine,* 2. to conduct a judicial hearing, *hear a case, question,* 3. to examine with a view to finding fault, *judge, call to account, discern.*"

Yet, if Paul does not care about the Corinthians' judgment of him, why even write this apology? The answer would appear to be that Paul is carefully portraying himself as the humble client/servant/steward who is in full submission to his patron. So much so, that while he will examine (ἀνακρίνω) himself, he did not even acquit (δικαιόω) himself. In so doing he raises the standard of faithfulness to the patron for all clients. Paul also challenges the Corinthians to be more concerned about the patron than each other, with regards to judgment. However, not only does Paul present himself as the model client, who is worthy to imitate, he also removes himself, his message, and the presentation of his message from any critique by the Corinthians. This is a very well crafted argument. Paul uses an established premise (*Now it is required that those who have been given a trust must prove faithful*) and he applies it to himself to establish his faithfulness as a steward and to remove himself from the Corinthians' critique.

In v. 5, as Paul wraps up this section (ὥστε), he commands (the imperative of κρίνω) the Corinthians to follow the principle he has just established, namely, *clients do not examine* (ἀνακρίνω) *or judge* (κρίνω). Paul adds two reasons to encourage the Corinthians to follow his command.[9] The first reason deals with the ability of the patron to make a thorough examination of his clients (*who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the heart*). Paul, in keeping with his elevation of Jesus in 1 Cor 1, once again presents Jesus as the super-patron by presenting him with supernatural examining abilities; specifically, Jesus can bring to light what is hidden in darkness and will expose the motives of men's hearts. Thus, part of Paul's appeal to a higher court is this higher court's ability to perform a more detailed examination. Garland notes,

> Praise bestows honor, blame heaps dishonor. . . . In the Corinthian context, we may infer that the congregation went to extremes in bestowing praise on individual teachers or leaders for their wisdom while berating others. It resulted in the friction dividing the church. Paul intends to drive home the point that ultimate praise comes from God in the judgment, and it is the only praise that matters.[10]

The second reason deals with the benefaction of the patron, who will give ἔπαινος (*praise, commendation*) to his clients. Paul does not say it, but the implication is that the patron will give praise to his faithful clients/stewards. This is all the more heightened by the fact that the patron is able to thoroughly examine and expose the motives of all his clients. Thus, Paul is subtly warning the Corinthians to refrain from

---

[9.] It is interesting that Paul switches from ἀνακρίνω to κρίνω, possibly signifying that the Corinthians had gone beyond examining and had passed judgment on Paul.

[10.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 129.

examining and judging him because Jesus will thoroughly examine them. Those who follow Paul's imperative will receive the praise (ἔπαινος) of the patron. Though not stated, the opposite is surely implied, those who reject Paul's imperative and continue to examine and judge him will receive shame from Jesus.

In conclusion, woven throughout vv. 1–5 are references to the legal area and forensic rhetoric. Paul is indeed appealing to a higher court as the basis for his evaluation and his honor. Paul begins this section by describing himself as a lowly servant and as a faithful steward; he ends this section with praise. There is no direct reference to shame, rather, there is an implied allusion. Faithful servants will be praised, while unfaithful servants will be shamed. Faithful stewards are trustworthy in that they hold on to the message of Christ and refuse to take the patron's role as examiner and judge. Conversely, unfaithful servants depart from the message of Christ and go beyond their role as clients when they examine and judge other clients.

3.3 "Do Not Go Beyond What Is Written," 4:6–7

First Corinthians 4:6 has proved to be both a challenge and a puzzle to scholars.[11] This is caused by two interrelated aspects of v. 6. First, Paul's use of μετασχηματίζω (*apply* or *disguise*) poses a challenge in determining whether Paul means *to apply* or *to disguise*.[12] A second challenge is presented when trying to discern to whom or to what does the phrase *Nothing beyond what is written* refer. Wagner notes,

> In 1 Cor 4.6 Paul abandons the figurative speech he has been using and reveals to the Corinthians the purpose of his previous discussion of the relationship between Apollos and himself: . . . Unfortunately, for the point of view of most modern interpretations the words have tended to conceal more than they reveal.[13]

[11.] For an overview of the discussion on μετασχηματίζω, see David R. Hall, "A Disguise for the Wise: μετεσχημάτισμος In 1 Corinthians 4.6," *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 143–49; Morna D. Hooker, "'Beyond the Things Which Are Written': An Examination of 1 Cor. 4:6," *New Testament Studies* 10 (1963): 127–32; Benjamin Fiore, "'Covert Allusion' in 1 Corinthians 1–4," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985): 85–102; A. Legault, "'Beyond the Things That Are Written' (1 Cor. 4:6)," *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971): 227–31; J. M. Ross, "Not Above What is Written: A Note on 1 Cor 4:6," *Expository Times* 82 (1971): 215–17; John Strugnell, "A Plea for Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament, with a Coda on 1 Cor 4:6," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 543–58; F. N. Colson, "μετεσχημάτισα In 1 Corinthians 4:6," *Journal of Theological Studies* 17 (1916): 380–83; J. Ross Wagner, "'Not Beyond the Things Which Are Written': A Call to Boast Only in the Lord (1 Cor 4:6)," *New Testament Studies* 44 (1988): 279–87.

[12.] J. Schneider, "μετασχηματίζω," *TDNT* 7:957–958.

[13.] Wagner, "Not Beyond," 279.

In Phil 3:21 μετασχηματίζω is used in the active voice with the straight-forward and simple sense, *He will **transform*** (μετασχηματίζω) the body of our humiliation. In 2 Cor 11:13, 14, 15 it is used in the middle voice with the sense of changing one's appearance or disguising oneself; *even Satan **disguises*** (μετασχηματίζω) himself as an angel of light.[14] Thiselton correctly notes that μετασχηματίζω possesses a challenge due to the fact that it contains both a sense of probability and openness latent in the Greek.[15] Thiselton overcomes this challenge in a creative manner in that his own translation seeks to hold on to the probability and openness, *I have allusively applied all this*, or alternatively, *I have alluded in language of disguise*.[16] Fiore has shown how μετασχηματίζω may also refer to a rhetorical device used to maintain the anonymity of accused parties and would include the sense of *disguised form* or *covert allusion*.[17] This technique was used by ancient rhetoricians to confront potentates and was characterized by hyperbole, irony, contrast, and figurative language.[18] Thus, this technique of covertly criticizing potentates would lead into Paul's argument in vv. 8–13, where he compares himself to the powerful Corinthians, *Quite apart from us you have become kings*!

Paul does not clarify what exactly the phrase *Do not go beyond what is written* refers to, and Thiselton suggests that this may be one of the most difficult phrases of the whole epistle.[19] Strugnell suggests that the phrase τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται is a scribal gloss accidentally added to the text.[20] W. F. Howard's comment, "Contextual emendation is the last resort of the harassed exegete" is both witty and worth remembering when dealing with this verse.[21] Hanges argues that this phrase refers to Corinthian bylaws that were written by Paul to guide the congregation before he left

---

[14.] Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 105.

[15.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 351.

[16.] Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 73.

[17.] Fiore, "Covert Allusion," 92–94; For a discussion on the four principle views of μετεσχηματιζω, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 349–51.

[18.] Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*, 199; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*; Fiore, "Covert Allusion," 91–93.

[19.] Thiselton gives a list of seven various interpretations of the phrase; (i) a misunderstood scribal gloss, (ii) a reference to the OT in general, (iii) what is written in the epistle, (iv) what Paul has quoted as Scripture already in the epistle, (v) what is written in church regulations or earlier letters, (vi) that it refers to (ii) or (v) as a familiar or accepted maxim, (vii) that part of the "childishness" of the addressees is like that of children unable to read letters properly. Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 352.

[20.] Strugnell, "Conjectural Emendation," 555.

[21.] W. F. Howard, "1 Corinthians 4.6 (Exegesis or Emendation)," *Expository Times* 33 (1922): 139.

Corinth.[22] Barrett puts forward the suggestion that the article τό is a signal that what follows is a quotation.[23] Welborn, also using the definite article, suggests that Paul is making reference to a well-known maxim.[24] Bruce suggests that the phrase refers to the Hebrew Scriptures in general.[25] Hooker suggests that *the things that are written* are a reference to the Scriptural references that Paul has used in 1 Cor 1–3.[26] Wagner adapts Hooker's thesis and suggests that this reference is best understood as a reference to one particular Scripture, that is the one cited in 1:31 and alluded to in 3:31, that is, "Let the one who boasts, boast in the Lord."[27] In light of the discussion since 1:12, the last clause in this verse (*Then you will not take pride in one man over against another*), and the flow of the argument since 4:1, it would seem that Paul is referring to the practice of some of the Corinthians of overstepping their boundaries as clients/stewards. As clients/stewards, their task was to be faithful to the message (*Christ and him crucified*) and their proper place as clients and not patrons. Ross suggests that Paul is presenting himself and Apollos as models who stay in one's proper place,

> In its context the verse clearly means 'What I have said in general about the need for humility is made concrete in the particular case of Apollos and myself. Although we were apostles, we did not pride ourselves on our status, but regard ourselves as servants and underlings of Christ (διάκονοι 3:5; ὑπηρέται 4:1); we simply did our job on the foundations, on the planting and the watering. We were living examples of "keeping within the rules." Don't any of you give yourselves airs one over another, for if it had not been for Apollos and me you would have been nothing.[28]

Paul is once again using himself as a model worth imitating, in that he and Apollos were faithful client/stewards and they did not go beyond their place. Thus, Paul seems to be encouraging the Corinthians to remember that they are clients and not patrons. Yet, the divisions in the congregation is indeed evidence that they have gone beyond their place as clients. Their judging of Paul was yet more evidence that they had gone beyond their place as clients. The divisions and judging are evidence that they were acting more like patrons in search of honor and status, rather than faithful clients of Jesus.

[22.] James C. Hanges, "1 Corinthians 4:6 and the Possibility of Written Bylaws in the Corinthian Church," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117 (1998): 275–98.

[23.] C. K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Black's New Testament; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1968), 106.

[24.] Welborn, *Politics and Rhetoric*, 74, 43–75.

[25.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 167–69.

[26.] Hooker, "Beyond the Things," 130.

[27.] Wagner, "Not Beyond," 280.

[28.] Wagner, "Not Beyond," 217.

In v. 7 Paul asks a series of three questions to further his argument and to put his opponents in their place. In the first question Paul uses another compound of κρίνω as he uses διακρίνω.[29] Thiselton suggests that διακρίνω means *to sift out*, or *to separate between, who separates one from another among you.*[30] While Paul is addressing the whole congregation, his focus is more on those who saw themselves as *clever* (σοφός), *influential* (δυνατός), and *of noble birth* (εὐγενής). It is these who used the congregation as a means of gaining status and power but in their pursuit of status and power they also caused divisions within the congregation. Thus, the answer to Paul's question is that the *clever, influential, and those of noble birth* separated themselves from the rest of the congregation.

With his second and third questions, Paul uses language of *giving* and *receiving*. This language is the language of patronage and clientele and is also an allusion to 1:28–31. The second question is a not so subtle reminder to the *clever, influential, and those of noble birth,* that they are indeed clients rather than patrons. Thus, by using the language of patron-client relationship there is a sense of shaming those who saw themselves as more than clients. Paul is putting them in their place, and it is a place of lower status than what they were used to. There is more than a little shaming here.

In his third question (Paul uses the second question as an affirmation, *you did receive it*), Paul uses a first class conditional sentence. Thus, *since* rather than *if* may have more of the force that Paul uses with this third question (*And since you did indeed*[31] *receive it, why do you boast as though you did not?*) Paul does not illustrate any examples of their boasting here, but it seems it was so prevalent and characteristic of their behavior that Paul needs not to cite any examples of their boasting.[32] However, for them to boast in themselves rather than in their patron is a shameful thing for any client to do. Thus, with a series of three questions, Paul rebukes the self-appointed congregational patrons and puts them back in their proper place as clients. Thus, Paul shames them for their self-elevation and boasting. There is a strong sense of shame in this. They saw themselves as patrons, but Paul reminds them, with the second and third

---

[29.] "διακρίνω" BAGD 231; 1. to differentiate by separating, *separate, arrange*. 2. to conclude that there is a difference, *make a distinction, differentiate*. 3. to evaluate by paying careful attention to, *evaluate, judge.*

[30.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 356.

[31.] εἰ δὲ καὶ is an awkward phrase to translate, but it seems to be used here with a sense of intensity; it is only used four times in the New Testament (Luke 11:18; 1 Cor 4:7; 2 Cor 4:3; 11:6).

[32.] Attacking the rich and powerful without naming them was typical of rhetoricians, see Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth*, 341–448.

questions, that they are indeed clients, and thus they have the same status as the rest of the members in Corinth.[33]

In vv. 6–7, the overall theme may best be described as keeping one's proper place. In v. 6 Paul demonstrates that both he and Apollos have kept their place as servants of Christ and stewards of God's mysteries. In v. 7 Paul demonstrates, through a series of three questions, that the Corinthians should keep their proper place as clients of Jesus.

3.4   Kings and Criminals, 4:8–13

3.4.1   *Realized Eschatology or Peristasis?*

Realized eschatology was typically expressed as the background to Paul's statement in v. 8, *Already you have all you want! Already you have become rich*! A. D. Nock describes a typical view of the Corinthians' realized eschatology as he writes, "Many of the converts, convinced that they were on a new plane of life, felt that they could do anything: they were kings (1 Cor 4:8), they were in the Spirit, they were emancipated. They were altogether superior to the unchanged men around them."[34] As does Barrett when he argues,

> The Corinthians were behaving as if the age to come were already consummated, as if the saints had already taken over the kingdom (Dan 7:18); for them there is no 'not yet' to qualify the 'already' of realized eschatology.[35]

Thiselton continues to argue for an over-realized eschatology in Corinth as he notes,

> It is impossible to fully understand the force of this verse without grasping two factors about the Pauline churches: the problem of 'over-realized eschatology' and the effects of perceived conversion experiences within many Graeco-Roman and especially Graeco-Oriental cults.[36]

While Nock and Barrett address the possibility that the problems in Corinth can be connected with eschatological fulfillment, neither attempt to address this view in detail. A 1978 article entitled "Realized Eschatology at Corinth" by Anthony Thiselton remedied this lacuna.[37]

[33.] There may also be a reference to the problems with the charismatic gifts in 12–14.

[34.] A. D. Nock, *St. Paul* (London: Harper, 1938), 174.

[35.] Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 109.

[36.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 357.

[37.] Thiselton's argument on realized eschatology is dealt with in more detail in the Review of Literature.

D. W. Kuck makes the interesting point that Paul counters his opponents' stance with ethics, not with eschatology. The Corinthians' basic mistake is that they "already see themselves as morally and spiritually perfect, without having to experience the bodily struggles which Paul sees as the sign of life in Christ."[38] Oster suggests that the realized eschatological view is flawed in two ways. First, it is based on a "mirror reading" of Paul's response, and that this mirror reading "has never been applied consistently or accurately." "Accordingly, just because Paul addresses a problem with an eschatological solution does not necessarily mean that the problem with the antagonists was that they were espousing an aberrant eschatology." Second, "one can show how naturally the remarks of Paul fit into the broader issues of chapters 1–4, which have essentially nothing to do with eschatology." Oster suggests that the issues Paul addresses, "'I'm sufficient, I'm wealthy, I rule' are all known to be part and parcel of men-of-wisdom ideology in Greco-Roman and Hellenistic Jewish writings."[39] Oster goes on to cite various references from Greco-Roman sources that correspond with these issues. He concludes,

> The intellectual and cultural values reflected in the above quotations provide a much more obvious background to Paul's rejoinders written to an urban Greco-Roman congregation than to vague allusion to "eschatology."

Hays suggests that Paul is scolding the Corinthians for adopting an inflated self-understanding based on a philosophy alien to the gospel. He also suggests that the Corinthians' errors "were less consciously 'theological' than we often suppose" and that the Corinthians were passively adopting and perpetuating the norms and values of their pagan culture around them.

> It is *Paul* who diagnoses the situation and redescribes its theological categories. It is *Paul* who keeps introducing apocalyptic language into the argument. The eschatological framework is his way of getting critical leverage on the Corinthian boasting, as he tries to encourage them to understand themselves in terms of an apocalyptic narrative that locates present existence in between the cross and the *parousia*.[40]

[38.] D. W. Kuck, *Judgments and Community Conflict: Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5–4:5* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 216–19.

[39.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 112.

[40.] Richard B. Hays, *First Corinthians* (Interpretation; Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 70–71.

The more recent works of W. Schrage,[41] R. Hodgson,[42] Karl Plank,[43] and John Fitzgerald[44] on Paul's *peristasis* catalogues, or *catalogues of affliction* are examples in which the focus has moved away from examining 1 Cor 4:8–13 from a history-of-religions approach. Rather, the focus of the above mentioned scholars may be said to be on literary aspects of the text. Schrage suggests that Paul's *peristasis* catalogue has as its background the afflictions of the righteous in Jewish apocalyptic literature.[45] Fitzgerald sums up his approach to examining Paul's frequent mentioning of his afflictions as "an attempt to use Hellenistic material to address literary rather than history-of-religion issues."[46] He argues that Paul draws on sophistic images in which *peristasis* is an "adverse, unfavourable circumstance."[47] Fitzgerald sees the catalogue in 1 Cor 4:9–13 as arising from Paul's admonitions in 4:6, and 4:14 as a father responding to the arrogance on the part of his children.[48] However, in contrast, Plank views 1 Cor 4:9–13 not as admonition but as an accusation.[49] A second difference between Plank and Fitzgerald is that while Fitzgerald emphasizes the Hellenistic philosophic background of the *peristasis* catalogue, Plank may be said to emphasize Paul's *peristasis* catalogue's connection to his divine message of the cross; "the efficacy of a word, its capacity to have consequences for those who speak and hear it, and may also point to a divine backing."[50] Plank suggests that Paul and the Corinthians have differing definitions of *power* and *weakness* because they also have "different ways of apprehending reality."[51] It is this different way of apprehending reality that is the background to Paul's embarking on a "rhetoric of irony" in vv. 8–13. This situation is one of paradox which reflects the paradox of 1:18–25 and 2:1–5. Paul's rhetoric or irony is based on an "unexpected co-existence, to the point of identity of certain contrasts."[52] Irony states both what it appears to be and what it is not.

[41.] W. Schrage, "Leid, Kreuz und Eschaton. Die Peristasenkataloge als Merkmale Paulinischer Theologia Crucis und Eschatologie," *Evangelische Theologie* 34 (1974): 141–75.

[42.] R. Hodgson, "Paul the Apostle and First Century Tribulation Lists," *Zeitschrift Für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 74 (1983): 59–80.

[43.] Karl A. Plank, *Paul and the Irony of Affliction* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987).

[44.] Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*.

[45.] Schrage, "Die Peristasenkataloge."

[46.] Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 3.

[47.] Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 37.

[48.] Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 117–18.

[49.] Plank, *Irony of Affliction*, 13.

[50.] Plank, *Irony of Affliction*, 18.

[51.] Plank, *Irony of Affliction*, 40.

[52.] Plank, *Irony of Affliction*, 375.

The works of Schrage, Fitzgerald, and Plank are not mutually exclusive and they may be used to better understand Paul's uses of the *peristasis* catalogue in this section. No doubt Paul would have been influenced by both Jewish and the Hellenistic use of the *peristasis* catalogues. However, it will be argued that in 1 Cor 4:8–13 Paul adapts the literary features of the *peristasis* catalogues to suite his own rhetorical strategy as he continues to employ his own textual rhetoric. This would include, as Fitzgerald argues, framing his *peristasis* catalogue between his admonitions in 4:6, and 4:14 as a father admonishing his sons. It also includes, as Plank argues, "a rhetoric or irony."

First Corinthians 4:8–13 will also be examined from the perspective that Paul continues to work from the premise that some of the Corinthians had elevated themselves above their proper place as clients. In fact, he accuses them of elevating themselves to the position of kings. This plays off against his previous admonition for them not to go beyond what is written. Paul contrasts his state of humiliation to their state of exaltation, and the contrast is so great that it has the effect of shaming them. This section is replete with references to shame. Paul presents himself as one who is willing to embrace shame as he faithfully remains in his place and carries out the tasks of his patron.

3.4.2 Examining the text of 4:8–13

The central literary aspect of vv. 8–13 is Paul's use of his *peristasis* catalogue.[53] Paul uses two strong and self-deprecating images to characterize himself and Apollos. In the first image he presents himself as a condemned man about to die with the crowds looking on (v. 9) and in the second image Paul presents himself as the dregs of the earth (v. 13). These images form an *inclusio*, a bracketing construction that constitutes 4:8–13 as a literary unit. Collins provides a general literary overview of the *peristasis* catalogues[54] and he outlines a succinct description of their function, "The lists provide a rehearsal of various external and adverse circumstances that were beyond the control of

---

[53.] David E. Fredrickson, "Paul, Hardships, and Suffering," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003), 172–97.

[54.] "The heart of this epistolary unit revolves around a twelve-item description of Paul's personal circumstances. This list of tribulation, the peristatic catalogue (from *peristasis*, "external circumstances") was a classic topos in the first-century Hellenistic literature. Widely used in the first century, it appears in the writings of such Stoics as Plutarch ("On the Fortune or the Virtue of Alexander," *Moralia* 326 D–E, 327 A–C, etc) and Epictetus, as well as the works of Greek biographers as historians (e.g. Arrian's *History of Alexander and Indicia* 7.10.2) Hardships lists are also found in Jewish apocalypses (e.g. *2 Enoch* 66:6) and the works of Josephus (*Bell.* 2.151.–153), the Mishnah (*m. Pesah.* 10:5, *m. B. Qam.* 1:1, 4, etc.), and Gnostic texts from Nag Hammadi." Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 183.

the one who was subject to them. Their literary function was paraenetic rather than biographical. They were used to demonstrate the virtue of philosophers and moralists and their ability to overcome adversity."[55] Fitzgerald outlines twelve specific characteristics of the *peristasis* catalogues.[56] Paul draws from these characteristics in describing the various hardships he faces.

Paul begins this section in v. 8 with three sarcastic or ironic statements which serve to heighten the contrast between himself and his Corinthian opponents. Paul also continues to work from his usage of *covert allusion* in v. 7. As already noted, this technique was used by ancient rhetoricians to confront potentates and "was characterized by hyperbole, irony, contrast, and figurative language."[57] Paul presents himself as the "wise man" who uses a *peristasis* catalogue to confront the potentates, the satiated kings.

> *Already you have all you want!*
> *Already you have become rich!*
> *Quite apart from us you have become kings!*

Gaston Deluz captures the essence of Paul's sarcasm as he writes,

> *Those Corinthians are lucky. Already* they enjoy favours that the apostles dare only hope for. They no longer 'hunger and thirst after righteousness': they are *filled*; in the theory of the Spirit, they have eaten to satiety . . . . In short, the Messianic kingdom seems to have come to Corinth and these people have been given thrones, while the apostles dance attendance and are placed with the servant.[58]

---

55. Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 183.

56. *"Peristasis* catalogues frequently serve as rhetorical and literary foils for the depiction of various aspects of the wise man's existence and character. As the preceding discussion has indicated, they serve to depict such characteristics as 1) the sage's serenity despite the direst calamities of life, 2) his virtue, especially his courage, 3) his endurance of the greatest and most demanding of hardships, 4) his perseverance in doing noble deeds despite the dangers involved and his refusal, at any cost, to depart from what justice dictates, 5) his contempt for fortune, 6) his victory over adversity, 7) his *askēsis* (self denial) and the role it plays in his victory, 8) his invincibility and invulnerability as a person, 9) his perfect rationality, 10) his demeanor and his response to his adversaries, 11) his consent to the hardships of life and the volitional character of his suffering, 12) his conformity to the will of God and the place of his suffering within the divine plan. In short, the catalogues depict and celebrate the greatness of his invincibility virtue, the power and tranquility of his philosophically informed mind." Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 115.

57. For a discussion on Paul's use of "covert allusion," see Lightfoot, *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*, 199; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 182–86; Fiore, "Covert Allusion," 91–93.

58. Gaston Deluz, *A Companion to 1 Corinthians* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963), 46–47.

Kistemaker argues that the phrase κεκορεσμένοι ἐστέ is a periphrastic construction with the perfect passive participle of κορέννυμι (*I satiate*) and the verb to be is in the present tense second person plural, and this signifies that for a considerable time, the Corinthians had all the things they needed. He also suggests that the aorist form of the verbs πλουτέω (*you have become rich*) and βασιλεύω (*you have become kings*) are ingressive aorists; that is, the Corinthians have become rich, and from their perspective, continue to be rich.[59]

Paul uses ἤδη (*already*) twice to emphasize the irony of the Corinthians' presumptions.[60] Paul uses χωρίς (*apart*) to emphasize the separation or distance of the "ruling" Corinthians from Paul, and even the rest of the Corinthians. Indeed, in Paul's list of shame he more closely identifies himself with the common Corinthians or those of lower status. This may be an indication that Paul is already preparing the Corinthians for the issues he will address in 1 Cor 5–6, especially the call to the weak to cast out the powerful in 1 Cor 5.

G. Highet argues that *king* (βασιλεύω, *to be king*, *to reign*) was a client's word for a rich patron.[61] This prompted Martin to ask, "Were some people at Corinth styling themselves as 'kings' as a claim of patronal position over others in the Corinthian church?"[62] No doubt Paul is still speaking to the some (the *wise, powerful, and noble* of 1:26) who are acting in regal fashion before the full manifestation of the kingdom when all Christians will be elevated and glorified by their super-patron Jesus. This self-elevation to the status of rulers is yet another indication of their shameful disregard for their patron. Paul is accusing them of acting like kings in how they are ruling over the various house churches. Paul seems to stray very little from this theme. It is an echo that reverberates through this whole section. Indeed, it is this acting like kings that has resulted in the discord of the Corinthian community.

Horsley states Paul's sarcastic contrast forcefully, "In 4:8–13 Paul mocks the Corinthians' spiritual attainment with biting sarcasm, an ironic contrast to the sufferings he has undergone as an apostle."[63] Paul ends this statement with a note of sarcasm as he argues that if they really were made kings, then it would signify the arrival of the ἔσχατος, then all Christians, including Paul would be elevated to royal status. Paul uses

---

[59.] Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 138.

[60.] Prior, *The Message of 1 Corinthians*, 65.

[61.] G. Highet, "Libertino Patre Natus," *American Journal of Philology* 94 (1993): 279.

[62.] Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990), 210.

[63.] Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 69.

this sarcasm (*How I wish that you really had become kings so that we might be kings with you!*) to introduce his shame list. Yet, the present reality indicates the very opposite. Paul uses a series of images to show that their glorification has not yet occurred; indeed they are existing in a state of extreme humiliation and shame. The contrast is staggering, and Paul's extreme status of shame serves to shame the Corinthians who are acting like kings. This situation is one of paradox which relates to the paradox of 1:18–25 and 2:1–5. Paul's irony is based on an "unexpected co-existence, to the point of identity of certain contrasts. Irony states both what it appears to be and what it is not."[64]

The sarcasm continues in v. 9. "The sarcastic mocking of the Corinthians' spiritual status is carried further in verse 9, where he compares his owns status as an apostle."[65] By using the phrase δοκῶ γάρ (*it seems to me*), Paul contrasts how the elite Corinthians see themselves as rulers and how Paul sees himself as a condemned criminal. However, Paul subtly indicates that his view of things should be given greater weight for he is, after all, an apostle of Jesus, the super-patron. In contrast to the *ruling* Corinthians who seem to think that their place is at the head of the procession, Paul, and the other apostles, are at the end of the procession displayed as men condemned to death. This is a place of great shame, perhaps the place of greatest shame.[66] The imagery about being at the end of the procession may have as its source the staging of the "Roman triumph, in which a conquering general staged a splendid parade where at the very 'end of the procession' were those captives who have been 'condemned to die in the arena.'"[67] Alternatively, Marshall suggests that this image may refer to a gladiator spectacle in the circus, "it is almost a kind of mocking gladiatorial salute to the would-be kings, 'Hail, Emperor, greetings from men about to die.'"[68] Whether it is a triumph or a gladiator spectacle, Paul describes himself as occupying the place of greatest shame.

While this place at the end of the procession would have been shameful enough, Paul intensifies the shame by expanding the audience. It is not just the people who watch the procession, it is the whole universe. Not only men but angels witness the

---

64. Plank, *Irony of Affliction*, 375.
65. "Despite the plural 'apostles,' Paul is now thinking primarily of himself, and not including Apollos." Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 70.
66. For a detailed description of the shame of the public spectacle, see deSilva, *Despising Shame*, 156–57.
67. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 174.
68. Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth*, 209.

shame of the apostles. Thus, the contrast between Paul and the Corinthian elite is now at its greatest. The Corinthian elite see themselves as sitting in the place of great honor and status, while Paul sees himself in the place of greatest shame. No doubt Paul picked the place of extreme shame as the sharpest possible contrast to the Corinthian elite's place of honor. However, Paul is not content with simply invoking the metaphor of being on display as a condemned man. He adds a measure of reality to his metaphor of shame by cataloguing his shameful experiences. In the next four verses Paul uses the words *fools*, *weak*, *disrepute*, *hungry and thirsty, poorly clothed, beaten, homeless*, *we grow weary from the work of our own hands*, *cursed, persecuted,* and *slandered* to show the reality of his shame. Conzelmann writes,

> The Stoic picture of the philosopher's struggle as a spectacle of the world is taken over by Paul into his world-picture (cosmos and angels) and reshaped in terms of his eschatology; "spectacle" has for him a derogatory sense. He is thinking not of the warrior who is admired by God for his heroism, but of the scene in the Roman theater with those condemned to death.[69]

Yet, Paul adds, it is God who has put his apostles on display and has made them a spectacle.[70] The apostles' acceptance of their place of spectacle and shame displays their faithfulness as apostles, which, in turn, will result in their received honor from their patron at the end of time. In contrast, the Corinthian elites' present self-elevation serves as a harbinger of their ultimate shame at the arrival of their patron. Thus, for the apostles, their shame will be changed to honor, while for the Corinthian elite, their honor will be changed to shame.

In the next verses, vv. 10–12, Paul adopts the following chiastic pattern which features a more prominent contrast between Paul and the Corinthian elite.

> A Three contrasts between Paul and the Corinthians, (10)
>   B Six tribulations (11–12a)
> A' Three contrasting actions (12b–13a)[71]Paul employs this comparison to

discredit the powerful patrons and to confirm his own authority.[72] Fitzgerald, on Paul's use of σύγρισις (*synkrisis*), notes,

---

[69.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 88–89.

[70.] Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 70.

[71.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 184.

[72.] Collins, connecting Paul's use of comparison in v. 10 to his statements in 2:1–5, notes, "In a letter that disavows the use of rhetoric (2:1–5) Paul employs the rhetorical device of *sygkrisis*, compassion, to discredit the powerful and confirm his own authority. The rhetorical force of this first group is heightened by its lack of any verb." Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 188–89.

The twin goal of exemplification and admonition are pursued by Paul chiefly through a *synkrisis* of the Corinthians and the apostles. This *synkrisis*[73] *is most obvious in 4:10, but it runs throughout 4:8–18. In this synkrisis* Paul makes use of various traditions about the *sophos*, some of which have already been discussed in chapter three. In regard to the apostolic *peristaseis*, the emphasis falls on the physical, bodily hardships suffered by the apostles and the lack of approbation accorded them. The apostles are depicted as the contemptible poor.[74]

Paul begins the contrast between the apostles of Christ and the Corinthian elite by using a series of three comparisons:

Fools (μωρός) — wise (φρόνιμος)[75]
Weak (ἀσθενής) — strong (ἰσχυρός)
Honored (ἔνδοξος) — dishonored (ἄτιμος)

Paul's contrast between the apostles and the Corinthian elite is strikingly similar to Philo's contrast between the lovers of virtue and the lovers of pleasure.[76]

With the use of μωρός (*fool*) Paul is no doubt referring back to 1:25 (τὸ μωρὸν τοῦ θεοῦ), 1:27 (τὰ μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου), and 3:18 (μωρὸς γενέσθω).[77] It would seem that Paul is using a measure of sarcasm here. "Paul's use of the catalogue in this situation is clearly fraught with irony, which is in keeping with the ironic depiction of the Corinthians as *sophoi*."[78] Paul's "argument is a classical example of paradoxical irony. Ironic speech is typically characterized by the use of figurative language."[79] For his previous argument he has suggested that he is in fact a fool to the world but wise in Christ. While the Corinthian elite are wise by the world's standards they are fools in Christ.[80] Thus, by reversing his original argument Paul is using sarcasm to ridicule the

---

[73.] *Synkrisis* is Fitzgerald's spelling.

[74.] Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 132–33.

[75.] "The fact that this time he uses not σόφος but φρόνιμος for the antithesis of μωρός is merely a rhetorical variation without inherent meaning." Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 89.

[76.] "The so-called lovers of virtue are almost without exception obscure people, looked down upon, of mean estate, destitute of the necessities of life, not enjoying privileges of subject peoples or even slaves, filthy, sallow, reduced to skeletons, with a hungry look from want of food, the prey of disease, in training for dying. Those, on the other hand, who take care of themselves are men of mark and wealth, holding leading positions, praised on all hands, recipients of honor, portly, healthy, robust, reveling in luxurious and riotous living, knowing nothing of labor, conversant with pleasures which carry the sweets of life to the all-welcoming soul by every channel of sense." (Philo, *Worse* 10.34)

[77.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 262–364.

[78.] Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 148.

[79.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 182.

[80.] Soards notes, "In three parallel statements Paul contrasts the stark experience of the apostles with the glib claims of the Corinthians. His rhetoric is sarcastic, and again he seems to aim at shaming the Corinthians for their presumptuousness. The language reflects the contours of major sections of previous portions of the letter, especially 1:26–31; and in each of the three

Corinthian elite. Witherington clarifies Paul's point as he notes, "In an upside-down world the truly first or wise are treated like the last or foolish."[81]

With the use of two prepositions, διὰ and ἐν, Paul intensifies the sarcasm and the contrast. This would suggest that Paul is saying of himself and the other emissaries, *We are fools for the sake of Christ, we are weak for the sake of Christ, we are dishonored for the sake Christ*. Paul is mocking the Corinthian elite when he says *you are so wise in Christ you are so strong in Christ you are honored in Christ*.[82] Thus, Paul is actually shaming the Corinthian elite by using sarcasm and contrast when he says they are *wise*, *strong*, and *honored* in Christ, but the reality is that they are fools in Christ, weak in Christ, and dishonored in Christ. In contrast, Paul is a fool for Christ because Paul embraces the weakness of the Cross, then the logical result is ἄτιμος (*dishonor* or *disgraced*). However, it seems that Paul embraces his ἄτιμος for the sake of Christ and in so doing, Paul presents his ἄτιμος as honor. This section is characterized by rhetoric flourishes; not only are there *sygkrisis*,[83] but Paul also displays his rhetorical ability as he inverts the last clause from *we . . . you*, to *you . . . we*, so that the content of ἄτιμος can be unpacked in vv. 11–13.[84]

Having, in v. 10, used sarcasm to turn the self honor of the Corinthian elite to shame, and turn his own shame into honor, Paul, in v. 11, now intensifies his ἄτιμος (*dishonor*) by demonstrating six ways he and Apollos are shamed and dishonored:

> *We are hungry* (πεινάω)
> *We are thirsty* (διψάω)
> *We are poorly dressed* (γυμνιτεύω)
> *We are beaten*[85] (κολαφίζω)
> *We are homeless* (ἀστατέω)
> *We work hard,* (κοπιάω) *with our own hands* (ἐργάζομαι) [86]

---

contrasts, Paul's comments both critique and correct the matters they address." Marion L. Soards, *1 Corinthians* (New International Biblical Commentary 7; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999), 95.

[81.] Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 143.

[82.] If we use modern idiom to convey Paul's sarcasm we would write *You are so wise in Christ,* (NOT); *you are so strong in Christ,* (NOT); *you are honored in Christ*, (NOT).

[83.] Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of Literature & Rhetoric*, 110.

[84.] Robertson and Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 86.

[85.] Marks on the body could be marks of honor (battle scars) and the marks of shame (whipping). Jennifer Glancy, A., "Boasting of Beatings (2 Corinthians 11:23–25)," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123 (2004): 99–135.

[86.] This clause seems to fit better with v. 12. Manual labor was seen as shameful to Greeks, Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 363.

Paul describes himself and Apollos as maltreated strangers and the "have nots."[87] Malherbe notes, "Moral philosophers, especially Stoics and Cynics, made extensive use of lists of hardship or unfavourable circumstances in describing themselves or their heroes."[88] The moralist Dio Chrysostom mentions, "'Grappling with hunger and cold, withstanding thirst,' the need to 'endure the lash or give his body to be cut or burned,' and 'hunger, exile, loss of reputation, and the like (*Virt. Or.* 8.9-16).'" Paul and Apollos's hunger and thirst contrasts the Corinthian satiety in v. 10. Their being *poorly dressed*, *beaten, homeless* and *working hard* contrast with the Corinthians being rich in v. 10. Paul intensifies his shame by stating κοπιῶμεν ἐργαζόμενοι (*we work hard with our own hands*). "Labour with one's own hands on lowly tasks gives witness, in the toil thus expended on useless things, to one's own indifference to higher things." (Plutarch, *Per.* 2:1) "The verb κοπιᾶν (*kopian)* implies exhaustive labor."[89] This reference to hard manual labor is also the more pointed in that it appears to be a "clear point of contention between himself and some of the Corinthians."[90] Horsley notes,

> The list of suffering is carefully arranged: a list of five common-place deprivations plus a sixth specific to the Corinthians' criticisms of Paul: a set of three antitheses depicting the apostles' response to abuse; and a concluding characterization of how despicable they appear.[91]

The contrast moves from the metaphors of shame to the specifics of shame, and the time reference, ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας (*to the present hour*), serves as a marker, a rhetorical device that allows Paul to move from the metaphor of shame to the specifics of shame. Yet, by using this time reference, Paul's argument maintains a strong connection and contrast to the Corinthian elite who are *already* acting like kings, and the apostles of Christ, who are *still* being treated shamefully. Paul does not illustrate or provide evidence to support his catalog of shame. Rather, he uses six references which

---

[87.] Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth*, 211.

[88.] Abraham J. Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation, a Greco-Roman Source Book* (Library of Early Christianity 4; Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1986), 141–42.

[89.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 141.

[90.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 115; Hock discusses Paul's tentmaking in connection with the larger cultural discussion on the appropriate means of support for a philosopher. Hock argues that Paul despised his tentmaking trade and viewed work more like a Greco-Roman aristocrat rather than an artisan or a laboring rabbi. "Tentmaking and Apostleship: The Debate at Corinth." Hock, *Social Context*, 50–65. Recently, Still has argued against Hock's view and suggests that "Paul viewed work more as a friend than as a foe." Todd D. Still, "Did Paul Loathe Manual Labor? Revisiting the Work of Ronald F. Hock on the Apostles' Tentmaking and Social Class," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125 (2006): 794.

[91.] Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 71.

serve to move his argument along at a brisk pace and to bring it to a crescendo of shame, *we work hard with our own hands*. It appears that this list of six acts of shame increases their shame level as the list progresses. This, then, would be another indication of Paul's rhetorical prowess. Since the *peristasis* catalogue was a classic topos in the first-century Hellenistic literature then perhaps Paul, in showing his knowledge of existing catalogues of shame and the manner in which he adapts this literary convention to his own rhetorical strategy, is subtly saying that the *unwise convict* is well educated.

Paul, in vv. 12b–13a, ends his *peristasis* catalogue by referring to three contrasting actions, 4:12 . . . *When we are cursed, we bless; when we are persecuted, we endure it; when we are slandered, we answer kindly*. No doubt Paul's reference in v. 12 "to this very hour" would also include these additional three acts of shame (*work, cursed, slandered*). However, Paul now focuses on how they respond to mistreatment.

. . . *When we are cursed* (λοιδορέω), *we bless* (εὐλογέω);
when we are persecuted (διώκω), *we endure it* (ἀνέχομαι);
when we are slandered (δυσφημέω), *we answer kindly* (παρακαλέω).

Are these three final aspects of Paul's shameful treatment connected with the Corinthian elites' treatment of Paul? It is not hard to imagine the Corinthian elites criticizing Paul with insults, harassment, and defamation. If this is a subtle reference to the Corinthian elites' mistreatment of Paul then Paul uses it to further contrast himself and Apollos to the Corinthian elite. Paul's statements in 2:1–4 would indicate that the Corinthian elite insulted Paul and said he had no lofty words, he spoke with fear, weakness, and even his body trembled as he spoke. 1:17–21 may also indicate how they defamed and harassed Paul because he displayed *no eloquent wisdom* in his public speaking. However, since Paul does not state any accusation against the elite directly, it may be that he is using ambiguity. What is clear is the fact that Paul contrasts the treatment he received to his reaction of that treatment. This may again be stated in shame and honor language. Paul was treated shamefully (*cursed, persecuted, slandered)*, but he responded honorably (*bless, endure, answer kindly*). However, by responding with honor to shame, the effect is a subtle type of reverse shaming.

In v. 13b Paul concludes his *peristasis* catalogue. His conclusion interweaves two elements. The first being two metaphors of intense shame and the second being a time reference. The very last phrase in the *peristasis* catalogue is ἕως ἄρτι (*up to this moment*). This time element contrasts the ἤδη (*already*) of verse 8, which is the opening phrase of his *peristasis* catalogue. Thus, with the use of these two time references it can

be seen that the *peristasis* catalogue also forms an *inclusio*. The second element of Paul's peristasis catalogue's conclusion, the two metaphors of shame, also contain a contrast. The contrast is between the Corinthian elite who are already acting as kings (v. 8) and the complete deprivation of Paul and Apollos. Paul now describes himself and Apollos as *the rubbish* (περικάθαρμα) *of the world, the dregs* (περίψημα) *of all things*.[92] Apparently while περίψημα had become more and more a term of polite self-deprecation, common enough in everyday speech,[93] the fact that Paul precedes it with ὡς περικαθάρματα τοῦ κόσμου[94] (*the rubbish of the world*) leaves no misunderstanding that Paul is engaging in more than polite self-deprecation.[95] Thus, περίψημα refers to that which is removed by the process of cleaning such as the dross on a coin or the slag in a furnace.[96] This is strong graphic imagery.[97] Paul is adamant that he still lives in the "now." However, in the "now," there is shame for the humble client/apostle. Fee notes that the apostle ends this line of thought and autobiographic reflection "with the most unflattering of metaphors, indicating the world's reaction to this way of living."[98] To get the force of this contrast the opening and the closing may be seen alongside each other:

> *Already you have all you want!*
> *Already you have become rich!*
> *Quite apart from us you have become kings*!
>
> *We have become like the rubbish of the world,*
> *the dregs of all things,*
> *to this very day*.

Sampley suggests that in these verses Paul opens a window into what is really going on at Corinth. "Their divisiveness is really about power. We have seen their concerns for power in their seeking of status and in their boasting."[99] A central purpose of the *peristasis* lists was that "they were used to demonstrate the virtue of philosophers

---

[92.] The same combination of words occurs in Lam 3:45 *You have made us filth and rubbish among the peoples*, see Anthony Hanson, "1 Corinthians 4:13b and Lamentations 3:45," *Expository Times* 93 (1982): 214–15.

[93.] G. Stählin, "περίψημα," *TDNT* 6:84–93.

[94.] Friedrick Hauck, "περικάθαρμα," *TDNT* 3:430–431.

[95.] Hauck, "περικάθαρμα."

[96.] Stählin, "περίψημα."

[97.] Johnson notes, "The terms translated *scum* and *refuse* were both used in the ancient world to refer to a person, usually a criminal, condemned to death as a sacrifice for the purification and cleansing of a city. . . . The term developed a connotation of abuse, since only worthless persons were so sacrificed." Johnson, *1 Corinthians*, 82.

[98.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 180.

[99.] J. Paul Sampley, *The First Letter to the Corinthians* (The New Interpreter's Bible X; Nashville: Abingdon, 2002), 838–39.

and moralists and their ability to overcome adversity."[100] Paul takes a catalogue of shame and uses it to turn the tables on the Corinthian elite. Paul's *peristasis* catalogue of shame is used by him to demonstrate his and Apollos' virtue and their ability to face adversity and shame as faithful clients of Jesus. The fact that Paul would borrow and adapt the philosophers' use of the *peristasis* catalogue would demonstrate yet again his rhetoric prowess.[101]

When 1 Cor 4:8–13 is read against the peristatic lists, it will be seen that initially Paul appears to be engaging in self-shaming, but the irony is that he is ultimately shaming the Corinthians, and, thus, he presents himself as a faithful client of Jesus, which, paradoxically, is self praise. However, this should be seen as part of Paul's overall rhetorical strategy of putting the Corinthians back in their place as clients of Jesus and Paul's reestablishing of his own place as an apostle of Jesus. Putting the Corinthians in their place was a central part of Paul's argument in vv. 1–5 as he appeals to God's high court. Putting the Corinthians in their place is also a central part of Paul's argument in vv. 6–7 as he admonishes the Corinthians, *Do not go beyond what is written*. Forbes correctly describes Paul's self-shaming as an *inverted encomium*.[102]

In this section, Paul begins with two shameful metaphors *displayed as condemned criminals*, *spectacles for the whole universe*. Paul ends this section with two metaphors we are *the rubbish of the world, the dregs of all things*. However, Paul gives these opening and closing shameful metaphors reality by listing his own shameful experiences. Paul wallows in his shame. Yet, by so engaging in this rhetoric of self-shame, he manages to shame the Corinthian elite for going beyond their positions as

---

[100.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 183.

[101.] Fitzgerald writes, "Paul's argument and admonition thus rest on the paradox that he creates of the exalted Corinthians and the abased apostles. If the apostles of whom the converts boast are still so lowly, how is it possible for the Corinthians, who received their privileges through the apostle's labors (3:5), to be so exalted? For, whereas Epictetus's ideal Cynic shares in the reign of Zeus as his servant (*Diss*. 3.33.950), Paul as God's servant does not even share in his converts' reign (1 Cor 4:1,8). The irony is so profound, and it is designed to prompt the Corinthians to make a radical reassessment of their present status. As 2 Corinthians indicates, however, any hopes that Paul may have entertained about the success of his admonition were soon to be dashed." Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 148.

[102.] "The irony is crucial. Paul is using comparison as a tool of amplification in an inverted encomium of himself and his companions. He is boasting, with such heavy irony, about the hardships and humiliations of his apostolic life. Such humiliations are the last things one would normally want to parade before a status-conscious audience such as the Corinthians. Note also that Paul is not merely boasting of hardships or struggles in a great cause, something a Greco-Roman audience would find perfectly comprehensible. The theme is not the quality of his behavior under hardship, but the hardship and the humiliation itself, as an indicator, Paul argues, of true apostolic status." Forbes, "Comparison, Self-Praise and Irony," 156.

clients and elevating themselves to the place of ruling. This place is reserved only for the patron. Thus, Paul's catalogue of shame reinforces his faithfulness as a faithful apostle, who waits for his patron to bestow upon him honor and status.

3.5   A Letter of Recommendation, 4:14–16

There is a major tone change between this section and the previous one. In fact, the tone here is similar to that found in a well-known Hellenistic letter of admonition.[103] Pseudo-Demetrius describes the letter of admonition as "one which indicates by its name what its character is. For admonition is the instilling of sense in the person who is being admonished, and teaching him what should and should not be done" (*Epistolary Types 7*). In Pseudo-Demetrius' description of the *letter of admonition,* he uses the verb νουθετέω (*admonish*) twice, which is the same verb Paul uses here. In v. 14 Paul clearly states that his purpose is to admonish and not to shame (ἐντρέπω). However, the very fact that Paul makes this statement indicates that shame is a major part of his argument.

Forbes suggests that the Corinthians would have responded to Paul's critique with humiliation and anger.[104] Horsley suggests that perhaps Paul realizes that he has gone too far. This explanation seems out of place for a text that shows much evidence of a high level of literary crafting.[105] However, Thiselton makes the insightful comment that Paul's irony and use of shame in vv. 8–13 is intended to achieve realism, not low self-esteem. Malina and Pilch suggest that vv. 14–16 is Paul's riposte to the Corinthians' challenge.[106] Malina outlines how honor is acquired in this challenge-riposte.

> Challenge and response is a sort of constant social tug of war, a game of social push and shove. . . . Consequently, challenge-response within the context of honor is a sort of interaction in at least three phases: (1) the challenge in terms

---

[103.] See the section, *Letters of Recommendation*, Aune, *Literary*, 166–67.

[104.] "Paul's disclaimer that he is not writing to them as he does to shame the Corinthians, but to warn them, makes clear that humiliation and anger were a likely response to the intensity of his implied critique of Corinthian values." Forbes, "Comparison, Self-Praise and Irony," 156.

[105.] "In 4:12–21, perhaps realizing how sharp his tone has been in the previous passage, Paul softens his rhetoric a bit before resuming a threatening tone in the last sentence of this section. Having, in fact, just shamed the Corinthians, he now insists that his aim was not to shame but to admonish them as his beloved children." Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 72.

[106.] "While Paul says he does not wish to shame the Corinthian clique adherents, he surely does so. We find out eventually why he does so - because they act arrogantly; hence they challenge Paul's honor and the honor of those of others in the group who are not "wise." Every challenge requires a riposte, and this is Paul's. And yet, since this is an ingroup interaction, the goal is not simply to shame the other person but to mend ingroup relations." Bruce J. Malina and John J. Pilch, *Social-Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul* (Mineapolis: Fortress, 2006), 77.

of some action (word, deed, or both) on the part of the challenger; (2) the perception of the message by both the individual to whom it is directed and the public at large; and (3) the reaction of the receiving individual and the evaluation of the reaction on the part of the public.[107]

Paul has used quite a number of rhetorical devices since chapter one. Apparently, he now feels he has made his point and argued with such persuasive force that the majority of the Corinthians would be willing to embrace him as the patron's ἀπόστολος. Now that Paul's rhetoric of shame has accomplished its primary task, Paul can shift his argument and use honor as a motivation. Whether Paul uses shame or admonishing the strategy is the same—to move his audience to a course of action that is less divisive.

Not only does Paul move from shame to honor, but he also moves from ἀπόστολος (*apostle*) to πατήρ (*father*). Michael White defines the *pater familias* in its social and cultural milieu of the Roman world,

> The *pater familias* stood as the ultimate source of power and authority in the household. This notion, called *patria potestas* ("paternal power"), was the father's hereditary rule over the goods, possession, and people belonging to his patrimonial estate. In legal discussion, many of the concepts of public law, administration, and state craft were patterned after this idealized notion of paternal rule over the household. At root stood the conception of the extended *familia* and its social structure as a microcosm of the state.[108]

Typically, admonishing would be done by those who are held in a position of deference and was commonly used in a pedagogic sense.[109] Paul's authority is in his status as ἀπόστολος of Jesus. By moving to *father* Paul seeks to intensify his relationship with the Corinthians, and this, in turn, would also intensify his authority. He would have double authority as both an ἀπόστολος and a πατήρ.

Thiselton notes that the phrase *as my children* used to be read at face value in commentaries up to around 1990.[110] However, in recent years Paul has been accused of using the parent-child imagery for manipulative purposes, for self interest, or at the least in a paternalist way.[111] Elizabeth Castelli puts forth four main concerns relating to paternalism and authoritarianism in connection with Paul's use of parent-child imagery along with Paul's subsequent call for imitation,

---

[107.] Malina, *The New Testament World*, 33.

[108.] L. Michael White, "Paul and *Pater Familias*," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003), 458.

[109.] Johannes Behm, "νουθετέω, νουθεσία," *TDNT* 4:1019–1022.

[110.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 369.

[111.] Shaw, *The Cost of Authority*, 67–69.

1) The paternal metaphor becomes highly authoritarian and political when it is used in conjunction with a call to *mimesis*. "In relation to mimetic language it evokes authority."[112]

2) Paul's lack of specificity in regard to the *mimesis* signals not Paul's gentleness, but rather the reverse. Paul is imposing a uniform social structure upon a diversified community.[113]

3) Paul uses a rhetorical strategy of manipulation in combining his role as both apostle and father. This simultaneous assertion of authority and self-effacement is "a clever rhetorical strategy."[114]

4) Paul's claim for paternity is in fact a bid for power.[115]

Fiorenza suggests that "Paul's authority was used in an oppressive way."[116] Chow notes that, "Paul certainly sought to assert his authority in the Church."[117] However, Chow argues that, "Paul's authority was used to challenge the strong for their lack of care for others."[118] Thus, there appears to be a growing awareness and consensus that Paul's use of the father-child imagery is a bid for power and authority over the Corinthians. However, there is no consensus regarding how Paul would use this power. It would appear that how one views Paul's bid for power may indicate one's underlying view of both Paul and/or power structures. Malina suggests that in an honor and shame culture, *"authority* means the ability to control the behavior of others. Authority is a symbolic reality. It should not be confused with physical force."[119] Thiselton makes a convincing argument that Paul is using his power for the good of the Corinthians.[120]

[112.] Elizabeth A. Castelli, *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 111.

[113.] Castelli, *Imitating Paul*, 109–10.

[114.] Castelli, *Imitating Paul*, 99.

[115.] Castelli, *Imitating Paul*, 35–58.

[116.] Fiorenza, "Rhetorical Situation," 397.

[117.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 187.

[118.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 187.

[119.] Malina, *The New Testament World*, 29.

[120.] "*Power*, we see repeatedly in these verses, has to do with the *effectiveness* of the gospel in life, not, within the world to the cross, with rhetorical manipulation. Paul's choice of low social status as an artisan turns power on its head. Jesus so clearly renounced "glory" that Castelli's view of power would constitute a self-contradictory understanding of the *gospel of Christ crucified*. Both biblical and sociological traditions permit distinctions between *power over* (the possibility of domination) and *power for* (the possibility of resource and transformation)." Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 373.

In v. 14 Paul elevates himself above all their guardians (παιδαγωγός) to special status as a father.[121] This reference to guardians may well be a reference to the Corinthian elite, the house church leaders. White contends that the house church patrons would have been perceived as the pater and mater familias.[122] This would indicate that Paul's strategy of putting the divisive leaders in their place by relegating them from the position of *pater* to the place of the παιδαγωγός. Paul reserves the authority as the *pater* for himself alone.

In 1:1 Paul names himself an ἀπόστολος of Jesus Christ, an ἀπόστολος of their super-patron, and in doing so, he subtly argues that he has more authority than the Corinthian elite. This argument is very similar to Paul's argument in 1:1–9, where Paul argues that he is an ἀπόστολος of Jesus, and they are the clients of Jesus. Now Paul argues the he is their πατήρ (*father*), and they are his beloved children.

Garland succinctly defines the work of the παιδαγωγός,

> They were trustworthy slaves charged by members of the upper class with the duty of supervising the life and morals of their boys. The slave lead the child to the schoolhouse and back home and was assigned the duty of protecting him and keeping him out of trouble. He was caricatured for his severity as a stern taskmaster. In pictures on Greek vases, he frequently has a stick in his hand, and in Greek plays he was often portrayed as harsh and stupid. He was a comic type recognizable by his rod.[123]

While Paul does describe the Corinthians as his beloved children in v. 14, the contrast in v. 15 between the παιδαγωγός and the πατήρ would reinforce this argument from love. However, it may also contain yet another shame/honor contrast, or perhaps the contrast is one of degrees of honor. The πατήρ would hold much greater honor than

---

[121.] For an examination of the social setting and background of παιδαγωγός, see Norman H. Young, "Paidagogos: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor," *Novum Testamentum* 29 (1987): 150–76.

[122.] "As in Greek literature more generally, the Latin term *pater familias* does not occur in Paul's letters. Nonetheless, the social place of the "father," and in some cases the "mother" of the household, are apparent in the social organization of Paul's churches. It was part of Paul's missionary strategy that he organized his congregations around local households. . . . The most direct points of contact with the role of the *pater familias* are the Pauline house church patrons, both men and women. Paul and his coworkers regularly stayed in the homes of house-church patrons while visiting in each city. Consequently hospitality and patronage were important virtues in the social dynamics of congregational life; the dinner gathering for the eucharistic meal or "Lord's supper" would have been hosted by them as well. It also appears that Paul typically baptized only the head of the household, who in turn baptized the rest of the group. This practice would have been in keeping with the prerogatives of a *pater/mater familias* over the rest of the household members." White, "Paul and *Pater Familias*," 466–7.

[123.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 145–46.

the παιδαγωγός.[124] Paul's argument is not only a contrast between the greater (πατήρ) and the lesser (παιδαγωγός), it is also a contrast between the one and the many (μύριοι *innumerable*), the unique and the common.[125]

The means by which Paul became the father to the Corinthians is *in Christ Jesus I became your father through the gospel.* Paul was an ἀπόστολος between Jesus and the Corinthians (1:1), and Paul is an πατήρ in Jesus Christ through the gospel. It is interesting that Paul waits so long to mention the εὐαγγέλιον (*gospel*). N. T. Wright argues that, for Paul, the term εὐαγγέλιον contained both an Isaianic word of comfort and an imperial proclamation.[126]

Since the word εὐαγγέλιον would have had strong imperialistic overtones, it is strange that Paul would use the concept of his being their πατήρ through the εὐαγγέλιον. On the one hand, Paul evokes images of tender care by using the word *beloved children*. Yet, on the other hand, Paul evokes images of imperial power by using the term εὐαγγέλιον. However, the rhetorical effect is again one that elevates Paul over the παιδαγωγός. Paul has greater honor and status than the παιδαγωγός because he is their father and because he has the Lordship of Jesus backing his paternity.[127]

In v. 16 Paul makes an appeal to the Corinthians to imitate him.[128] Fiore, after examining a representative sample of Greco-Roman sources that deal with imitation, notes,

---

124. "The stress is on guardianship rather than instruction, and the world is not one of esteem." Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 115.

125. The adjective μυρίους in the accusative masculine plural does not mean "ten thousands" but rather "innumerable." Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 147; To this Barrett adds, "But this is rhetoric not arithmetic." Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 115.

126. "In the Greco-Roman world of the first century εὐαγγέλιον, (*euangelion*, gospel, or good news) is a conventional technical word referring to a pronouncement of a great victory, or the birth, or succession of an emperor. (The first and third of these could be combined, if someone became emperor by means of a victory.) The coming of a new ruler meant the promise of peace, a new start for the world, not least at the time of Augustus, who became the first Roman Emperor in 31 BC following a long period of civil war." N. T. Wright, *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997), 43.

127. "Since divisiveness in the Corinthian church is caused by the high regard for the apostles as teachers of wisdom, Paul does not use the teacher-pupil relationship in his exhortation, but speaks as a father to his children. As their father he does not shame them or instruct them; rather, he urges and encourages them to imitate him and his example, which is present among them in Timothy who is Paul's beloved child and, as it were, their older brother." Boykin Sanders, "Imitating Paul: 1 Cor 4:6," *Harvard Theological Review* 74 (1981): 363.

128. "The phrase Παρακαλῶ οὖν ὑμᾶς (*I exhort you*) repeats the beginning exhortation in 1:10, and thus bundles 1:10–4:21 into a unit." Sanders, "Imitating Paul: 1 Cor 4:6," 354.

The use of example as a device to persuade or dissuade has been shown above to be constant in Greek and Roman usage. Those engaged in deliberative oratory found it to be a particularly appropriate strategy to move their audiences to action by illustrations with examples. Rhetorical devices found their way into letter-writing as well. It is not surprising to find Paul making use of example in his letters.[129]

Paul's appeal is made on the basis of the father/child relationship which he has reasoned through in vv. 14–15. As previously noted, this paternal appeal to mimesis evokes authority. However, Paul does not state exactly what the Corinthians should imitate.[130]

Thus, the two ways that Paul wishes the Corinthians to imitate him and work toward the building up of the community of believers are, first, to focus on Christ and him crucified. The second way in which the Corinthians are to imitate Paul is that of his relationship with Apollos. They should follow Paul and Apollos's example by working together in a spirit of cooperation rather than a spirit of competitiveness. This, then, would echo Paul's appeal in 1:10, *Now I appeal to you, brothers and sisters, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you be in agreement and that there be no divisions among you, but that you be united in the same mind and the same purpose.* Paul is asking the Corinthians to reject the mindset and practices which have caused division.

There is one other way that Paul is asking his *Corinthian children* to imitate him. This may address the root cause of many of the problems, including the divisions within the Corinthian community of believers. One of the strong motifs that has run through this whole section of the epistle is the rejection of worldly honor and status and the embracing of shame. Paul brings this paradigm to its climax in his *peristasis* list (4:9–13). His life example is that of a faithful client to Jesus his patron. In his faithfulness as a client he has received ever increasing amounts of shame. Thus, Paul is asking his Corinthian children to imitate their father and be faithful clients of Jesus, even if doing so results in receiving shame from the world. He is appealing to them to renounce the seeking of status and honor which lead to the divisions in the congregation.[131]

[129.] Benjamin Fiore, "Paul, Exemplification, and Imitation," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003), 237.

[130.] Sanders notes, "The message of Christ crucified and the conduct of the apostolic ministry are closely interrelated in the First Letter to the Corinthians. The problems of the Corinthian community made this emphasis necessary. The imitation of Paul's ways should bring the Corinthians to an appropriate understanding of the message of the cross and its implications for their life as a community." Sanders, "Imitating Paul: 1 Cor 4:6," 363.

[131.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 146–145.

3.6 Timothy, The Apostle's Apostle, 4:17–21

Collins describes the *parousia* function of Hellenistic letters, "In the Hellenistic world the primary function of the letter was that of *parousia*, presence, specifically making oneself present when, in fact, one was absent."[132] Paul makes a double attempt to reestablish his power in the Corinthian church by reestablishing his presence in Corinth by letter and an emissary, the faithful Timothy. In v. 17 Timothy is presented as the son who imitates Paul, the father, and as such Timothy can help his Corinthian siblings to do the same. By describing Timothy as *my son whom I love,* Paul is showing that there is a close connection between Timothy and the Corinthian Christians, both of whom are loved in a paternal manner by Paul. He also draws a close connection to Timothy's imitation of Paul to Timothy's faithfulness to the Lord. The core difference between Timothy and the Corinthian Christians is their faithfulness to the Lord. *He will remind you of my ways in Christ Jesus*, no doubt implying that the Corinthians appear to have forgotten Paul's ways in Jesus.[133] Thus, once again, Paul reasons that it is the Corinthians' relationship to Jesus, their patron, that shapes their relationship to him; (client and emissary of the patron). Sanders notes,

> Timothy will remind the Corinthians not only by word, but he will represent in his own personal conduct the ways he has learned from Paul (cf. Phil 2:19–22) and thus the pattern of behavior which can overcome the divisiveness in the Church.[134]

Paul ends this verse with a reference to the fact that he is trying to inculcate into the Corinthians the same thing he teaches everywhere in every church. Oster notes that this appeal to similarity is found several times in the first letter to the Corinthians, "We cannot be certain why this particular type of appeal was so needed in the Corinthian correspondence, but it is noteworthy that it shows up with much greater frequency in 1 Corinthians than any other of the Pauline letters.[135] Robertson and Plummer suggest that this is an assurance that Paul will not require more from the Corinthians than that which

---

[132.] Collins also adds, "Paul's reflections on the purpose of his letter in 4:14–16 are immediately followed by a unit that bears the traits of a letter of recommendation. In that unit Paul explicitly writes about his absence and his expected presence in the future. In the meantime he has sent Timothy to exercise a charge on his behalf. Thus, in the epistolary conclusion to the first rhetoric proof (1:10–4:21) Paul dwells on the motif of presence in person, by letter, and through an emissary." Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 196.

[133.] Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 117.

[134.] Sanders, "Imitating Paul: 1 Cor 4:6," 363.

[135.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 118.

identifies any or every community as Christian.[136] This appeal for "ecclesiastical consistency" may well be connected to Paul's argument which he began in 1:10, but Paul is suggesting that his appeal is not limited to the Corinthian congregation. But it also encompasses all congregations. Yet, there may be another reason why Paul would make constant appeals to "ecclesiastical consistency," namely that his opponents in Corinth accused Paul of inconsistency. Thus, Paul sends Timothy to validate the consistency of Paul's life and message, and thus silence his Corinthian opponent's suggestion that Paul is inconsistent.[137]

In v. 18 Paul continues to use his strategy of not naming his detractors. Rather, he simply addresses them as τινες (*some of you*).[138] No doubt the recipients of the epistle would have known to whom Paul is referring. Oster suggests that it is those who would not accept his paternal authority over them as beloved children.[139] Collins suggests that it refers back to 1:20 (*Where is the wise man? Where is the scholar? Where is the philosopher of this age? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world?*). However, it is more plausible this group is in fact one and the same. They are the Corinthian elite of 1:27 who did not believe that Paul was returning to Corinth and using his prolonged absence as an opportunity to take control of the congregation and reject any deference they may have had to Paul's leadership.

Paul's use of φυσιόω (*arrogant*) always has a derogatory sense in his writings.[140] Paul already used this word in 4:6 in connection with the Corinthian elite overstepping their boundaries as clients. In this verse, the Corinthian elite are again accused of overstepping their place. However, this time Paul focuses on why they have done so, they assumed Paul was not returning. Since Paul uses φυσιόω in a derogatory manner in this epistle, this would be another argument of shame. Thiselton suggests that *being blown up with air* was a more familiar metaphor for arrogant self importance in the first century than today. Thus, a more dynamic translation of φυσιόω might be *inflated with arrogance* or *inflated with self importance*.[141] Paul has just presented

---

136. Robertson and Plummer, *First Corinthians*, 91.

137. Bailey suggests that this verse is a key to the theological structure of 1 Corinthians and that Timothy's mission will focus less on looking back to the issues addressed in 1 Cor 1–3. Rather, Timothy is an example of the issues addressed in the rest of the epistle. K. E. Bailey, "The Structure of 1 Corinthians and Paul's Theological Method with Special Reference to 4:17," *Novum Testamentum* 25 (1983): 152–81.

138. On "non-naming" as a rhetoric device, see Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth*, 341–48.

139. Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 118.

140. Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 201.

141. Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 376.

himself as a loving father, but now he describes some of the Corinthians as being arrogant. They are rebellious and arrogant sons who have usurped their father's authority over them. This may be another use of shame. Paul shames his sons for how they are behaving towards their father. The sending of Timothy, the faithful and respectful son, compounds their shame. They are sons who need to be taught again how to honor their father.

In v. 19, Paul throws down the gauntlet to the arrogant Corinthians.[142] Yet, in outlining his travel plans, he still portrays himself as a faithful client and emissary to his patron, his travel plans are contingent on the will of his Lord. With the contrast between *words* and *power* Paul returns to a motif that has been a central focus of his attention since the beginning of his first argument in 1:5: *words* (1:5, 17, 18; 2:1, 4, 13) and *power* (1:18, 24; 2:4, 5). Paul wants to know what influence these men have had on the congregation. The very fact that there has been division within the congregation would suggest that his opponents are full of arrogant speech (λόγος), but they have little power. In chapter two Paul argued that he is empowered by the Holy Spirit, and in chapter three he reasoned that he is a master builder. In contrast, the divisions in the Corinthian congregation would suggest that they are not empowered by the Holy Spirit, nor are they skilled builders.[143]

In v. 20 Paul adds the *kingdom of God* to this contrast between talk and power. This is the first time the phrase *kingdom of God* is used in the first Corinthian epistle.[144] "Paul's choice of terminology here may "be dictated by his desires to present a polemic rejoinder to the Corinthians' talk about already reigning as kings."[145] In v. 8, Paul sarcastically writes, *Quite apart from us you have become kings!* (βασιλεύω) *Indeed, I wish that you had become kings,* (βασιλεύω) *so that we might be kings with you!* (συμβασιλεύω). Thus, Paul may well be evoking a contrast between the kingdom of the Corinthian patrons and the kingdom of God. From Paul's perspective, the kingdom of the Corinthian patrons is characterized by talk, while the kingdom of God is characterized by power.

---

142. Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 119.

143. Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 119.

144. "Although Paul seldom refers to the 'kingdom of God,' his almost offhand use of the phrase suggests that it was well established in his evangelical vocabulary." Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 73.

145. Hays, *First Corinthians*, 75.

Wright has made a convincing argument that Paul uses such expressions not simply as metaphors but as statements of reality based on the gospel.[146] In this reference to the kingdom, Paul places strong emphasis on the Lordship of Jesus Christ, "The exercise of Lordship implies the exercise of a dominion which is closely akin to the idea of a dynamic rule seen in the teaching of Jesus."[147] Thus, with the phrase *kingdom of God* Paul is bringing this rhetorical proof to a close by reminding the Corinthians once more of the Lordship of Jesus. At the beginning of his first rhetorical proof (1:1), Paul presents himself as an ἀπόστολος of Jesus Christ. Thus, Paul is an ἀπόστολος of the one who rules and reigns over the kingdom of God. The congregation in Corinth was described *as those sanctified in Christ Jesus*. It is the power of Jesus who has both made Paul his ἀπόστολος and who has sanctified the Corinthians. It is also the power of Jesus who enriched the Corinthians in every way (1:5 *for in every way you have been enriched in him, in speech and knowledge of every kind)*. In fact, the statement, *For the kingdom of God is not a matter of talk but of power,* is a summary of Paul's whole rhetorical proof since 1:1.

The final statement (v. 21), in Paul's first rhetorical proof fittingly ends with two rhetorical questions:

What would you prefer?[148]
Am I to come to you with a stick, or with love in a spirit of gentleness?

The second of these questions may be viewed as combining both shame and honor. For Paul to come to the Corinthians with a stick would certainly be shameful. Glancy writes "in Roman *habitus*, whipping was the archetypal mark of dishonor."[149] On the other hand, for Paul to come to them as a father with a gentleness would suggest that their relationship had been fully restored, and the sons respect their father and acknowledge his authority. This would bring great honor to both the father and his children. The decision as to whether Paul's visit would be one of shame or honor belongs to the Corinthians.

Once again the themes of shame and honor are interwoven in Paul's argument. First, he uses Timothy as the model of an honorable son who needs to teach his siblings how to behave. Surely his Corinthian siblings would be shamed by such a comparison.

[146.] N. T. Wright, *What Paul Really Said*, 88.

[147.] Donald Guthrie, *New Testament Theology* (Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1981), 429.

[148.] The NIV translates θέλετε as a present indicative active: *what do you prefer*? While the NRS translates θέλετε as a present subjunctive: *What would you prefer*?

[149.] Glancy, "Boastings of Beatings," 107.

Second, Paul scorns them for their arrogance; and again they are shamed. Third, Paul tells them he is coming to face them and to examine their power, or lack thereof. Fourth, Paul gives them an ultimatum, a stick or love, shame or honor?

This section continues to encourage the Corinthians to stay in their proper place. Now their proper place is that of children, who are called to imitate their father. They are called to follow the example of their older brother as he teaches them how to imitate Paul, their father. Paul, in v 19, encourages them to stay in their proper place as he notifies them of his plans to visit Corinth. However, in v. 21, as Paul brings this section to a close, he intensifies his encouragement by asking them if he should come with a rod or with gentleness. No doubt, the stick will be used on those who are not in their proper place, while gentleness will be for those who are in their proper place.

3.7   Conclusion

The central thrust of 1 Cor 4 is Paul's attempt to reestablish his authority over the Corinthians. Paul uses a series of five interwoven arguments to accomplish this goal. Paul uses the social values of honor and shame in these five arguments. In vv. 1–5, *the ultimate tribunal*, Paul appeals to a higher court, the court of the Lord. This appeal to a divine or higher court is often used by minority cultures who are in conflict with the dominant culture for honor. By appealing to this higher court Paul has placed himself outside the jurisdiction of the Corinthians. Since the Lord over this higher court is also the Lord who made Paul a servant and steward, Paul is confident of both his acquittal and his commendation since he has kept his place. However, Paul's conclusion in v. 5 would indicate that the Corinthians are now under the jurisdiction of their Lord Jesus. Thus, the Corinthians will be judged by the Lord if they judge Paul and if they do not stay in their proper place.

In vv. 6–7, *Do not go beyond what is written*, Paul applies the principles he has laid down in vv. 1–5 as he paves the way for his *peristasis* catalogue. *Not going beyond what is written* is a reference to their boasting about men, which Paul has argued in 1:10–3:23 as a foundational cause of the factionalism in the Corinthian congregation. In v. 7 Paul employs the language of the patron-client relationship when he refers to *giving* and *receiving*. Thus, they are indeed clients of Jesus and boasting over men is a strong indication that they do not stay in their place as clients of Jesus. Paul, in 1:1–9, argues that they have been honored by Jesus' patronage, thus to boast in men is to act as if they have not been honored by Jesus, and it is also to behave in a manner that would shame Jesus.

In vv. 8–13, *Kings and Criminals*, Paul employs the well known literary *peristasis* catalogue and compares himself with the Corinthian patrons. He begins, in v. 18, by sarcastically elevating his opponents to the honorable position of kings. This is followed, in v. 19, by Paul's self-deprecating description of the opposite end of the status scale—he is a condemned criminal. Paul then describes himself with decreasing shame which reaches its nadir as he uses the phrase, *We have become like the rubbish of the world, the dregs of all things*. The irony of Paul's *peristasis* catalogue is that Paul's shame results in honor because it catalogues his willingness to endure the most shameful treatment as he stays in his proper place and is a faithful servant, steward, and apostle of Jesus. In contrast, Paul's sarcastic honoring of his opponents, when he describes them as *kings,* shames them. This description suggests that they have dramatically overstepped their proper place. Instead of behaving like clients they are acting like kings. Paul also shames them when he outlines his response to their mistreatment of him, *When reviled, we bless; when persecuted, we endure; when slandered, we speak kindly*.

In vv. 14–16, *A Letter of Recommendation*, Paul now describes his relationship to the Corinthians as one of father and children. Thus far, in this chapter, Paul has emphasized his relationship to Jesus; he is a servant, steward, and apostle of Jesus. Now Paul argues that he is the πατήρ, and while this relationship is through the gospel of Jesus, Paul emphasizes his fatherly relationship with the Corinthians. However, this argument is an argument of power. From this relationship perspective, the behavior of the Corinthians has shamed their father and it has overstepped their place as *faithful* children. While Paul, their father, argues that his *peristasis* catalogue was not intended to shame his children but to admonish them, it does shame them.

In vv. 17–21 *Timothy, the apostle's apostle*, Paul makes a double attempt to reestablish his power in the Corinthian church. First by reestablishing his presence in Corinth by letter, and second by sending his emissary, the faithful Timothy. This double presence, and the potential of Paul's actual physical presence, emboldens Paul to warn of using a rod both to shame and forcefully put the Corinthians in their proper place. Kennedy, commenting on the last stage of rhetoric criticism, writes "At the end of the process of analysis it will be valuable to look back over the entire unit and review its success in meeting the rhetorical exigence and what its implications may be for the speaker or audience."[150]

[150.] Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 38.

One of the implications of Paul's argument of chapter four is the change of tone and argument that is found in the rest of the epistle. This is best seen in the manner in which Paul begins 1 Cor 5 as he addresses the situation of the incestuous man. In v. 1 Paul is much more forceful and direct as he outlines the core problem at the beginning of the section and with a three-fold progression of shame.

> *It is actually reported that there is sexual immorality among you,*
> *and of a kind that is not found even among pagans;*
> *for a man is living with his father's wife.*

This, then, would indicate that Paul writes the rest of the epistle from the perspective that his rhetoric of honor and shame in 1 Cor 4 has worked and he has reestablished his position of authority. He has put the Corinthians in their place, and he proceeds to address the remaining issues from the perspective of an *apostle* of Jesus Christ and the *father* of the Corinthian Christians.

CHAPTER 4

1 CORINTHIANS 5–6

4.1 Introduction

4.1.1 1 Corinthians 5–6 As One Unit

The majority of scholars view 1 Cor 5–6 as one unit, though not all describe 1 Cor 5–6 as a *rhetorical* unit. Witherington outlines 1 Cor 5–6 as Argument 2, and then he describes 5:1–13 as division 1, 6:1–11 as division 2, and 6:12–20 as division 3.[1] Collins argues that the common factor of 1 Cor 5–6 is "the purity of the community."[2] Collins suggests that 1 Cor 5–6 form an ABA' chiastic pattern.[3] Talbert also arranges 1 Cor 5–6 in an ABA' chiastic pattern[4] and he argues that each issue is a moral issue.[5] Thiselton is of a similar opinion in that he views 1 Cor 5–6 as "moral issues which demand a clear-cut verdict." Concerning the three issues addressed in 1 Cor 5–6 Garland notes, "The incidents mentioned in 5:1–6:20 give us a glimpse of some of the behavior that brings moral shame on the community and causes Paul to mourn."[6] Johnson,[7] Soards,[8] Orr and Walter,[9] and Kistemaker[10] also view 1 Cor 5–6 as a unit dealing with moral issues.

[1.] Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 151–62.

[2.] Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 223.

[3.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 225.

[4.] Charles H. Talbert, *Reading Corinthians* (Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2002), 25.

[5.] Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 26, 36–37, 45–47.

[6.] Garland also outlines a number of literary features common to all three issues, Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 150–51.

[7.] Johnson, *1 Corinthians*, 86–87.

[8.] Soards, *1 Corinthians*, 109–10.

[9.] Orr and Walther, *1 Corinthians*, 184.

[10.] Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 155.

Mitchell writes, "In chapters 5 and 6 Paul discusses the relationship between 'the insiders' (οἱ ἔσω) and 'the outsiders' (οἱ ἔξω)."[11]

The common connection in 1 Cor 1–6 for Fee is a *crisis of authority*, and in 1 Cor 5–6 this crisis of authority is reflected in the *three test cases*.[12] Fee also notes that there is a conceptual tie between the case of the incestuous man and the abuse of the law courts in 6:1–11.[13] Horsley takes much the same approach as Fee,

> In chapters 5–6 Paul begins his response to particular Corinthian principles and actions that he views as causes of the crisis of community and authority he had been addressing only in a general, preliminary way in 1:10–4:21. He is still dealing with matters reported to him (5:1; cf. 1:11), not issues raised in the Corinthians' letter to him.[14]

Some scholars see a close connection between the incestuous man in 1 Cor 5 and the sexual immorality in 6:12–20. Paul Minear suggests that what links these two issues together is the way in which Paul argues that the Corinthians' bodies are now members of Christ's body.[15] Gerald Harris argues that a close connection exists between the behavior of the incestuous man and the slogan of 6:12.[16] J. H. Bernard postulates a situation in which the incestuous son, who was co-habiting with his stepmother in 1 Cor 5, was prosecuted by his own father in 1 Cor 6:1–11.[17] Bernard's

---

[11.] Margaret M. Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 112.

[12.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 194.

[13.] "This crisis of authority, then, is what seems to hold chap. 1–6 together. It should be noted, however, that there is also a conceptional tie between 6:1–11 and 5:1–3. Paul concluded the argument in chap. 5 by stating that believers are not to judge those outside the church; rather, they are to judge those inside, meaning of course the incestuous man. That seems to trigger the next item, in which believers had actually gone to outsiders for judgments that Paul is convinced should have been handled within the believing community." Fee, *First Corinthians*, 195.

[14.] Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 77–78.

[15.] It appears that Minear makes this conclusion based on the explicit statement of Paul in 1 Cor 6:12–20, which he then reads back as implicit in 1 Cor 5. However, he fails to discuss 6:1–11. Paul S. Minear, "Christ and the Congregation: 1 Corinthians 5–6," *Review and Expositor* 80 (1983): 341–50.

[16.] "We found, second, what were two conflicting norms. Paul advocated a norm of sexual purity which was in harmony with both Jewish and pagan cultural norms. The Corinthian congregation, or at least that portion which accepted the incest, held to a norm of sexual freedom as one aspect of a wider norm expressed in the slogan: πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν." Gerald Harris, "The Beginnings of Church Discipline: 1 Corinthians 5," *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 21.

[17.] J. H. Bernard, "The Connexion Between the Fifth and Sixth Chapters of 1 Corinthians," *Expositor* 7 (1907): 433–43. Winter is also of the opinion that the father was not deceased. Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 49.

argument has been revived by P. Richardson.[18] Will Deming, working from Richardson's argument, suggests that Paul is not dealing with three separate issues but one related issue. He argues that 1 Cor 5–6 involves a single case of sexual misconduct.[19]

Michael Goulder, arguing from his reworked view of Baur's two mission hypothesis, attempts to reconcile the apparent contradiction between 1 Cor 5–6 and 1 Cor 7. He contends that Paul's opponents appear to be libertines in 1 Cor 5–6, while in 1 Cor 7 they appear to be ascetics. Goulder resolves this apparent conflict by suggesting that Paul's opponents were in fact ascetics.[20] Goulder then goes on to suggest that while there was an occurrence of immorality in Corinth, this was not the norm. He also argues that the *ascetics* respond to the peccadillos of the wealthy members of 1 Cor 5–6 in two possible ways, "One might be: 'it is a passing infatuation; he'll get over it in a month or two if we leave him alone. Hush it up so far as we can.' Or another could be, 'the Torah says, . . . אל תקי, and that means *He shall not marry*: the words do not apply to concubines.'"[21] Goulder concludes that 1 Cor 5–6 reveals Paul's ascetic opponents to be "respecting persons and of inconsistency, procrastination and dishonesty; but not of *gnostisierender Libertinismus* (*Gnostic libertines*)."[22] In 1 Cor 1–4 Paul deals with the problem of factionalism which was caused by patrons in search of status. In 1 Cor 5–6 Paul deals with the three *immoral* problems in the Corinthian congregation; *the incestuous man* in 1 Cor 5, *the law court abuses* in 1 Cor 6:1–11, and the *sexual*

[18.] P. Richardson, "Judgement in Sexual Matters in 1 Corinthians 6:1–11," *Novum Testamentum* 25 (1983): 37–58.

[19.] "I have argued that the crisis to which Paul is responding in 1 Corinthians 5–6 is not a wave of libertinism but a single case of sexual misconduct, which some Corinthians attempted, unsuccessfully, to resolve in the public courts, thereby producing both strife and moral confusion within the community." Will Deming, "The Unity of 1 Corinthians 5–6," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 312.

[20.] "Paul's opponents are people of high principle, *ascetics*, who have given up sex altogether as a practice of the flesh, and who are pressing others to abstain from marital relations, to remain celibate if unmarried and to divorce if not (7:1–11). They are Jewish Christians working on the basis that there is one God (8:4), and risking their salvation of their Gentile brother who have been until recently accustomed to idol worship (8:7); so their sexual asceticism is a deviation from normal Judaism, and may be related to visionary techniques (2:9; 13:12; 2 Cor 12:1–5)." Michael D. Goulder, "Libertines? (1 Cor. 5–6)," *Novum Testamentum* 41 (1999): 347.

[21.] Goulder, "Libertines? (1 Cor. 5–6)," 348.

[22.] Goulder, "Libertines? (1 Cor. 5–6)," 348.

immorality in 1 Cor 6:12–20.[23] However, there may well be a close connection between the patronal factionalism in 1 Cor 1–4 and the three problems addressed by Paul in 1 Cor 5–6.

4.1.2   1 Corinthians 5–6 And Patronal Abuse

It has been argued that the three problems in 1 Cor 5–6 are connected with patronal abuses. For example, in dealing with the issues of the incestuous man of 1 Cor 5 Clarke suggests that the incestuous man was a Corinthian patron.[24] Chow suggests that the litigants of 1 Cor 6:1–11 were patrons in the Corinthian congregation.[25] Bruce Winter suggests that the *Sitz-im-Leben* of 1 Cor 6:12–20 is that of elites (patrons) giving private banquets for their clients and other friends.[26] Vander Broek does not connect the factionalism to the source of the problems in 1 Cor 5–6. Rather, he suggests that one of the underlying causes of the failure of the Corinthians to deal with the incestuous man was the congregational factionalism.[27]

Each of the three problems in 1 Cor 5–6 will be examined from two foci; the cause of the problem and Paul's response to the problem. In examining the cause of each problem, particular attention will be paid to the possibility that the cause of each problem was that of patronal abuse in the Corinthian church. In examining Paul's response to the problem, particular focus will be paid to Paul's uses of the social values of honor and shame.

No doubt, dealing with incest was a matter demanding Paul's attention. However, to take on this issue with such force and focus would suggest that Paul is of the opinion that, by the end of 1 Cor 4, he had reestablished his position as Jesus' apostle, he had reasserted his position as the Corinthians' father in the gospel, and he had regained a sufficient amount of authority to deal with such a difficult issue as incest. Thus, if 1 Cor 1–4 may be described as Paul's reasserting his status as the

---

[23.] Collins classifies 1 Cor 1–4 as Paul's first rhetorical demonstration, and 1 Cor 5–7 as Paul's second rhetorical demonstration. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 203.

[24.] Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 85.

[25.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 127–30. Chow is ambiguous in determining if the case of incest in 1 Cor 5 is the cause of the litigation in 6:1–11.

[26.] Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 88.

[27.] Lyle Vander Broek, "Discipleship and Community: Another Look at 1 Corinthians 5," *Reformed Review* 48 (1994): 9–10.

patron's apostle, then 1 Cor 5–6 may be described as the apostle using his reestablished status to address three serious problems.[28]

4.2 The Incestuous Man, 1 Corinthians 5

4.2.1 Introduction

In probing Paul's use of shame in this section the social status of the man living with his father's wife (ὥστε γυναῖκά τινα τοῦ πατρὸς ἔχειν) needs to be examined. Chow suggests that the incestuous man is one of Paul's opponents in the church and he may be connected to 1 Cor 4:18. These opponents are the cause of the divisions in the Corinthian congregation. Paul's opponents were the powerful people in the church. Chow goes on to postulate the incestuous man was one of the patrons of Corinth and as such he would have been in a position of power in the congregation; if not one of the patrons over a house church.[29] Moffatt suggests that the man was most likely "too important or wealthy" for the church to raise any objection.[30] Michael Goulder is of the same view concerning the man's social status notes, "It is likely that the incestuous man in chapter 5 is in the same category (wealthy or influential): it is easy to exercise discipline when a church member is socially weak, and it is easy to overlook the peccadillos of those who contribute generously to church funds, or open their homes for church meetings."[31]

According to Roman law, it was illegal for a son to marry a step-mother (Gaius, *Inst*. 1.63).[32] However, as a tactic in preserving his deceased father's estate, Clarke suggests, this man married his step-mother. Clarke points out "one of the significant aspects of Roman marriage was the dowry which came with the bride as a gift from her father."[33] Roman law stipulated that upon the dissolution of the marriage the dowry

---

[28.] De Boer speculates that Paul restarts his letter in chapter 5 after hearing from Stephanas, so that 1 Cor 1–4 and 1 Cor 5–16 are essentially two different letters written to address two different sets of circumstances. De Boer M. C., "The Composition of 1 Corinthians," *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 229–45.

[29.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 139.

[30.] James Moffatt, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938), 53.

[31.] Goulder, "Libertines? (1 Cor. 5–6)," 347–8.

[32.] Jane F. Gardner refers to further Roman legal texts, from different periods, relating to incest, Jane F. Gardner, *Women in Roman Law and Society* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991), 126, n. 34.

[33.] Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 80.

would return to the bride's father.[34] However, the woman could make a claim to retain the dowry should she marry again.[35] Clarke concludes his discussion on the possible motives for incest by stating that the underlying motive for the incestuous relationship was financial.[36]

Paul issues two appeals to the Corinthians to deal with the incestuous man, the first is vv. 2–5, the second is vv. 6–8.[37] Both appeals begin with terms that Paul has previously used of the patron-client relationship in Corinth and its resulting factionalism. In 5:2 Paul accuses them of being arrogant (φυσιόω). Paul has already used this term three times in 1 Cor 4. In his first usage of φυσιόω in 4:6 Paul rebukes the Corinthian clients for their patronal factionalism. In 4:18 and 4:19 Paul uses φυσιόω as a warning that he is planning to visit Corinth and address the arrogant men. In light of Paul's discussion in 4:8–13 it would appear that in 4:18–19 Paul is warning the Corinthian patrons of his impending visit. Paul's use of φυσιόω in 5:2 and 4:6 would suggest that in 5:2 Paul is rebuking the clients of the wealthy and incestuous client.

Paul begins the second appeal in 5:6 with a rebuke, *Your boasting is not a good thing*. Here Paul uses the noun καύχημα (*boast*). Paul uses the verb καυχάομαι (*I boast*) five times in 1 Cor 1–4. In 1:29 Paul rebukes the Corinthians for boasting in their patrons and in 1:31 he affirms that if the Corinthians do boast they should boast in the Lord. In 3:21 and in 4:7 Paul links their boasting to their factional slogans of 1:12. Boasting in one's patron was a central factor in how a client honored his patron.[38] Paul's use of καυχάομαι in 1 Cor 4–5 would suggest that by using καύχημα in 5:6 he is rebuking the clients of the wealthy incestuous man. "It would seem that their boasting was more than a general attitude and may have had a specific focus, i.e., the son's social status."[39] A. Y. Collins suggests that the actions of this incestuous man may have been

---

[34.] Richard Saller, "Roman Dowry and the Devolution of Property in the Principate," *Classical Quarterly* 34 (1984): 197.

[35.] J. P. V. D. Balsdon, *Roman Women: Their History and Habits* (Westport: Greenwood, 1962), 201.

[36.] "It is then possible to argue, although it is clear that the text allows no certainty, that the motivation for this incestuous relationship was financial. If this is the case it adds weight to the suggestion that the relationship was between a man and a woman of some social standing." Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 85.

[37.] Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 25.

[38.] Moxnes, "Honor and Shame," 24.

[39.] Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 53.

done with the approval of the other patrons.[40] Clarke correctly argues that the incestuous man's social status and his patronage resulted in his clients ignoring his immorality rather than risk losing his patronage.[41]

Winter offers the insight that while incest was a violation of Roman law, the fact this man was not prosecuted would suggest that he was indeed one of the elite of Corinth. "Corinth like other cities in the empire had two standards in forensic matters, one for the élite and the other for the non-élite."[42] Thus, based on the premise that a central theme of 1 Cor 1–4 is patronal factionalism within the Corinthian congregation, Clarke's and Winter's arguments, and Paul's use of the terms *arrogant* (φυσιόω) in 5:2, and *boasting* (καύχημα) in 5:6, it is plausible to argue that the incestuous man was indeed a wealthy patron in the Corinthian congregation.

Talbert provides an outline of the component parts that will be used in analyzing Paul's argument in chapter 5.

> *A statement of the problem (v. 1)*
>
> *Two appeals for the excommunication of the guilty one, with a similar pattern of arrangement (vv.2–5, 6–8)*
>
> *A twofold clarification of a former letter (vv. 9–13)*
>
> *A final exhortation (v. 13)*[43]

4.2.2 A Statement of the Problem, 5:1

While Paul quickly identifies the problem as one of sexual immorality, (*It is actually reported that there is sexual immorality among you*), his identification is a generic[44]

[40.] "The allusions to the Corinthians' arrogance and boasting in 5. 2, 6 imply that the incestuous alliance was not a deed done secretly out of weakness, but an ideological action done openly with the approval of at least an influential sector of the community." A. Y. Collins, "The Function of 'Excommunication' in Paul," *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 253.

[41.] "If, as argued above, the incestuous man is of high social standing, he would in this instance be to some extent beyond reproach or criticism. His position within the community would have been such that it would have been inexpedient to confront him with the seriousness of his actions. Instead it would have been the case that members within the community had chosen to remain uncritical of the incestuous brother. To lose the favor of a key benefactor, for example, would have been unthinkable in Greco-Roman society, and would invite hostility. It would have been more expedient for such a leading figure to be protected from criticism which lead to his excommunication. There may be, in other words, a situation where clients have chosen to ignore the sinful actions of their benefactor rather than lose the favor of so prominent a person." Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 85–6.

[42.] Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 57.

[43.] Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 25

[44.] The word πορνεία may be described as an *umbrella* word and covers "every kind of

πορνεία[45] (*immorality*).[46] Before Paul gets specific and qualifies what type of πορνεία, he adds a measure of shame (*and of a kind that is not found even among pagans*).[47] Paul uses πορνεία a second time for emphasis, though it is not repeated in the NRSV or the NIV. Paul then goes deeper into the problem as he identifies the specific immoral transgression as that of incest (*for a man is living with his father's wife*). The phrase γυναῖκά τινα τοῦ πατρὸς is used of a step-mother in Lev 18:8, and marriage to one's stepmother was prohibited both by Jewish law (Lev 18:7–8; 20:11; Deut 22:30; 27:20) and by Roman law (Gaius, *Inst.* 1:6:3).[48] Thus, Collins is correct when he notes, "Incest is the most universally recognized sexual taboo."[49]

Paul's rhetorical strategy in dealing with this issue is markedly different from his rhetorical strategy in 1 Cor 1–4. In 1 Cor 1–3 he is cautious as he slowly builds his case and reestablishes his position as Jesus' apostle. In 1 Cor 4 he admonishes the Corinthians as his beloved children (v. 14), and argues that *I became your father through the gospel* (v. 15). Having reestablished his position of authority as apostle of Jesus and father to the Corinthians he can now address the three problems of patronal abuses in the Corinthian church. This, then, would explain the abruptness with which Paul begins this section.[50]

---

unlawful sexual intercourse." "πορνεια" BAGD, 693.

[45.] Thiselton makes the interesting note, "Paul uses the word πορνεία, sexual immorality, or an illicit, sexual relationship, six times, of which five occur in 1 Corinthians 5–7." Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 385.

[46.] Malina offers an interesting view of πορνεία when he writes, *"Porneia* means unlawful sexual conduct, or unlawful conduct in general. What makes a particular line of conduct unlawful is that it is prohibited by the Torah, written and/or oral. Pre-betrothal, pre-marital non-commercial sexual intercourse between man and woman is nowhere considered a moral crime in the Torah." Bruce J. Malina, "Does *Porneia* Mean Fornication?" *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 10–17. Fee contra Malina contents that πορνεία refers to actual occurrences in Corinth. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 278. Joseph Jensen challenges Malina's view and argues that πορνεια means fornication, including sexual abuse. Joseph Jensen, "Does *Porneia* Mean Fornication? A Critique of Bruce Malina," *Novum Testamentum* 20 (1978): 161–84.

[47.] Pascuzzi suggests that the argument of vv. 1–5 is proof by pathos, *Maria Pascuzzi, Ethics, Ecclesiology and Church Discipline: A Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Corinthians 5* (Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 32; Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1997), 104.

[48.] For an overview of the Old Testament and incest, see Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 26–28.

[49.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 209.

[50.] This rhetorical strategy of Paul testifies to the positive relationship Paul still has (or at least thinks he still has) with the community. Pascuzzi, *Church Discipline*, 108–9.

While Paul does not mention the incestuous man by name, the circumstances he describes would leave no doubt among the Corinthians about whom he is referring. Chow and Clarke have both made a strong case that Paul is challenging one of the Corinthian patrons. Paul's challenge against one of the Corinthian patrons is in an area where he would not only have authority as Jesus' apostle, but also the weight of Roman law is behind him. This would again show Paul's rhetorical aptitude in that he carefully picks the matter of incest to begin with as it is an area with which he has double strength. Pascuzzi states, "The reference to the Pagans in 5,1 function as an appeal to the emotions of the Corinthians for the purpose of inducing shame which becomes a motivation for change."[51] The statement of the problem is composed of three phrases, and each phrase contains an element of shame. In fact, there is an elevation of shame as each phrase is presented;

> *It is actually reported that there is sexual immorality* (πορνεία) *among you,*
> *and of a kind* (τοιαύτη πορνεία) *that is not found even among pagans;*
> *for a man is living with his father's wife.*

In the first phrase Paul shames the general community: *there is sexual immorality among you*. In the third phrase Paul indirectly shames the incestuous man. The second phrase is the link between the shamed community and the incestuous man, and it also serves to intensify the shame of both the community and the incestuous man.[52] As Garland aptly writes, "By appealing to a universal norm of decency, Paul intends to evoke shame in the Corinthians to puncture their inflated pride and make them more amenable to change."[53] Paul is the apostle speaking to his patron's clients, and Paul uses shame to rebuke his patron's clients. In fact, Paul is willing to do in his opening sentence, what the Corinthians were unwilling or perhaps unable to do, that is shame the incestuous man.[54]

[51.] Pascuzzi, *Church Discipline*, 104.

[52.] "Part of the apostle's strategy is to shame the readers by stating (with obvious exaggeration) that such a sin is found nowhere among the pagans." Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 122. In contrast, Garland does not think it is an exaggeration for rhetorical effect, Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 155.

[53.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 157.

[54.] Pascuzzi, commenting on Paul's use of shame, notes, "Though a negative stimulus, the evocation of shame is a positive rhetorical strategy. Through it Paul gains access to the community's emotional lever which must be pushed in order to dispel its arrogance and open it up towards change. That Paul begins with a rhetorical tactic that aims at establishing a willing and cooperative spirit within the community betrays his rhetoric skill. But more importantly, it betrays his concerns for the community which he brings forward step by step in what is ultimately a process of conversion and recommitment to the values and behavior consonant with

4.2.3   The First Appeal, 5:2–5

Paul's refusal to address the incestuous man directly or to mention his name would be a clear indication that Paul has already cast the man out, and this is a strong element of shame.[55] Paul is already treating the incestuous man in the manner in which he will appeal to the Corinthians to imitate. Not only does Paul treat the incestuous man with shame, but in v. 2 he also addresses the community with shame. As Paul turns to the congregation's arrogant (φυσιόω) response[56] to the incestuous situation he again employs shame in rebuking them.[57] In fact, Paul's rhetorical strategy in shaming the Corinthians also follows three steps of growing intensity. First, he shames them for being proud (φυσιόω).[58] Second, he shames them for not being filled with grief (πενθέω). Third, he shames them for not removing (αἴρω) the immoral man. This removing of the incestuous man would shame him. Thus, Paul shames the community for not shaming the man.

As Paul's shaming of the Corinthians is examined one question needs to be considered. What were the Corinthians proud of ? Clarke suggests that the Corinthians were not boasting over the incestuous relationship, but rather they were boasting about the social status of the incestuous man.[59] It is interesting that Lenski, writing many years before the current social history and social-scientific approaches, notes,

> Were the members at Corinth so taken up with their factional wrangling that their eyes were closed to this kind of moral turpitude? Did this man occupy such a prominent place in the congregation that the members did not venture to challenge his crime. We may assume that the former was the case.[60]

---

the reality of its new mode of being in Christ. Such a process cannot be effected through force but through skillful persuasion." Pascuzzi, *Church Discipline*, 106.

[55.] In fact, Paul never mentions the incestuous man's name. On a similar note, Paul never mentions any of his opponent's names in the first epistle. "Paul leaves unnamed the man guilty of this outrage, identifying him only as a 'certain one.' Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 157.

[56.] καὶ ὑμεῖς πεφυσιωμένοί *and you became arrogant*. Paul uses three cognates of φυσιόω in chapter 4, (4:6, 18, 19). In all three uses there is an element of rebuke, but in vv. 18 & 19 Paul issues a strong warning to the arrogant people.

[57.] "Paul's ambivalent stance towards the Mosaic Law may have contributed to the congregation's attitude." Harris, "Church Discipline," 11.

[58.] Based on Paul's usage of φυσιόω in 1 Cor 4, especially in vv. 18 & 19, *arrogant* would be a better translation.

[59.] Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 85–86.

[60.] L. C. H. Linski, *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians* (Columbus: Augsburg, 1937), 207–8.

Lenski reminds us that the factionalism may have indeed played a major part in the congregation's failure to deal with the incestuous sin. However, it would seem that both the cause of the incest and the failure of the congregation to deal with it may be closely connected to the high social status of the incestuous man. Thus, if the incestuous man was indeed a wealthy patron of high social standing this would explain the clients' silence on his incest and their failure to remove him.[61] Clarke has shown how the societal rules of patron-client relationships prohibited a client from rebuking or shaming a patron.[62]

For the Corinthian members to put the incestuous man out of their fellowship would be a total reversal of the patron-client relationship. The patron may remove a client, but a client would never remove a patron. Thiselton,[63] Chow,[64] and Garnsey,[65] have demonstrated how the Roman law courts served the interest of the powerful, and thus, with this man being a leading patron in Corinth, there was little chance of his being prosecuted by his peers, and there was no chance of his clients broaching this matter.

Paul employs a reversal of honor and shame in v. 2 as he "insists that they should have mourned in shame rather than be swollen up with pride."[66] He accuses them of being arrogant (φυσιόω) but then states that the correct response to the situation

---

[61] "The client in this relationship remains under the power (*potestas*) and with the familia of the patron for life (as in the case of manumitted slaves). He or she owes the patron a variety of services (*obsequium*) and is obligated to enhance the prestige, reputation, and honor of his or her patron in public and private life. For example, the client favors the patron with daily early-morning salutations, supports his political campaigns, pays his fines, furnishes his ransom, supplies him information, does not testify against him in the courts, and gives constant public attestation and memorials of the patron's benefactions, generosity, and virtue." Elliott, "Patronage and Clientage," 149.

[62] "The dynamic of patronage was such that it was incumbent on the clients of a patron to show due gratitude. Enmity was expected to be incurred by any lack of suitable gratitude to the patron – a relationship which would have been seriously deleterious to the man of lower social status. Even for a social equal it will often have been too costly to initiate enmity with someone. On these grounds there may be a reason for the apparent reluctance to bring litigation against the incestuous man in 1 Corinthians 5. . . . Besides the matters of expediency and *gratia*, socially inferior people also faced legal obstacles against bringing those from the social elite to court. There was legal protection against those of the lower classes bringing *infamia* on a social superior. This was done by forbidding any person to enter into litigation with their superior." Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 86.

[63] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 419.

[64] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 127–30.

[65] Peter Garnsey, *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1970), 217–18.

[66] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 163.

should have been mourning (πενθέω). Thus, from Paul's perspective, their honor is their shame. This reversal of honor and shame is a core theme of 1:26–31 and has as its base their new relationship with Jesus their super-patron. Paul does not make this connection directly in v. 2. Rather, he assumes the connection; he will, however, make the connection more directly in the following verses.

In vv. 3–5 Paul presents two motivations to the Corinthian clients to shame their incestuous patron. Since the patron-client rules prohibited the clients from casting out the patron and shaming him in doing so, Paul has the heavy burden of presenting a powerful argument to the Corinthians which would enable them to reverse such an ingrained societal norm. Paul's argument does not abandon the societal rules of the patron-client relationship. Instead, Paul reorganizes the patron-client structure of the Corinthian congregation. Paul does this in two interconnected stages. First, by reminding the Corinthians of his special status as Jesus' apostle in v. 3. Second, by reminding them that Jesus is their super-patron in v. 4.

In v. 3 Paul employs an argument that both reaffirms his status as Jesus' apostle to the Corinthians, and his argument also extends his authority in that role. Murphy-O'Connor, suggests that vv. 3–5 should be translated with Paul calling upon the Lord Jesus as an affirmation of Paul's judging the incestuous man and his appeals to the Corinthians to hand the man over to Satan.

> In consequence, the passage should be translated thus: "As for me, absent in body but present in spirit, I as one who is present have already judged the one who has done this thing in the name of the Lord Jesus. When you are assembled, I being with you in spirit, and empowered by our Lord Jesus, such a person should be handed over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh in order that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord.[67]

Paul reaffirms his power in that he has already judged (κρίνω) the incestuous person, and Paul extends his power in that he judged from a distance. Ancient epistolary theorists considered a letter to be a mode of personal presence. Specifically Demetrius held that the letter should offer a reflection of the author's very soul (*Eloc.* 227). Paul develops this epistolary absent-present (ἀπὼν παρὼν) theme as he uses an expanded formula, *absent in the body but present in the spirit* motif, (ἀπὼν τῷ σώματι παρὼν δὲ τῷ πνεύματι).[68] Paul does not enter into the reasoning behind his judgment at this stage

---

[67.] Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "1 Corinthians, 5:3–5," *Review Bibliques* 84 (1977): 245 For a discussion and evaluation of various translations of vv. 3–5, see Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 158–60, and Fee, *First Corinthians*, 206–7.

[68.] For a discussion on the recent views pertaining to Paul's use of the absent-present, body-spirit motif and epistolary theory, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 290–92.

of his argument, rather he simply lays down the principles of the matter in v. 1. Indeed, to get into the specifics of the situation and use logic may only weaken his apostolic power. As Jesus' apostle he uses the authority that comes with that position to act in the best interests of his patron. In this case the use of the apostle's power is exercised in shaming his patron's client who has engaged in an openly incestuous relationship. Paul is setting the example for the Corinthians as he shames the man who has shamed Jesus their super-patron.

In vv. 4–5, Paul's second stage of reorganizing the Corinthian patron-client structure, he moves beyond his role as Jesus' apostle, and he now directly involves Jesus, their patron. In v. 4 Paul describes their assembly (συνάγω) as being in *the name of the Lord*.[69] This would seem to be closely connected with the patronal factionalism addressed by Paul in 1:10–3:23. As already discussed, it seems plausible that the Corinthians whom Paul shames in v. 2 are the clients of the incestuous man. However, more than being clients of the incestuous man, it would also be quite plausible that they assemble in the home of the incestuous man. This then would make it all the more difficult for them to address the incest and remove him. Thus, Paul completely restructures their concept of their assembly when he writes, *When you are assembled in the name of our Lord Jesus*.[70] They do not assemble in the name of the unnamed incestuous man, rather when they assemble they assemble in the name of the Lord Jesus, the super-patron who has blessed them with all gifts (1:1–9).

Paul follows up this redefinition of their assembly by again reminding them that he is with them in spirit. This second reference to his being with them differs from the first one. In the first reference in v. 3 Paul emphasizes his presence and his judging the incestuous man; in this second reference in v. 4 he is present with them when they assemble in the name of Jesus. Thus, when they assemble they assemble in the name of their Lord and super-patron Jesus, and Paul the apostle of Jesus is with them. Murphy-O'Connor makes the interesting suggestion that Paul, "stresses his involvement, because this gave him the right to speak without destroying their responsibility."[71]

[69.] For a discussion on seven possible options on Paul's meaning of the phrase *in the name of the Lord*, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 393–94.

[70.] The wording of the NIV is preferred here to the wording of the NRSV. Barrents notes that the verb συνάγειν became a technical term for the meeting of the Christian assembly. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 124.

[71.] Murphy-O'Connor, "1 Corinthians, 5:3–5," 244.

Paul ends v. 4 by again mentioning Jesus, but now he mentions that the power (δύναμις) of Jesus is with them when they assemble in his name. Δύναμις has played a central part in Paul's arguments thus far in 1 Corinthians. In 1:18; 25, 2:4, and 2:5 Paul defines the message of the cross as the power (δύναμις) of God. In 4:19 and 4:20 Paul indirectly addresses his arrogant opponents and suggests a conflict and contest of power (δύναμις). Thus far in 1 Corinthians, Paul has been consistent in evoking δύναμις as God's power and the means of undermining the Corinthian patrons and addressing their patronal abuses in the congregation, both the factional abuses and now the immoral abuses.

In v. 4 Paul uses three interrelated themes to enable those whom he addressed in v. 2 to remove the incestuous man. First, Paul redefines the nature of their assembly, *you are assembled in the name of our Lord Jesus*. Second, Paul reminds them he is with them, *I am with you in spirit*. Third, when they assemble they have the power of Jesus, *the power of our Lord Jesus is present*. In v. 5 Paul now calls on the Corinthians to take action against the incestuous man. Verse 5 is composed of a few controversial clauses that go beyond the scope of this discussion.[72] However, the very first word παραδίδωμι *(hand over)* is worth noting. Paul uses the infinitive aorist active, but Collins suggests that it should be understood as an imperative infinitive. Collins translates the infinitive παραδοῦναι as *hand over that person*.[73] Thiselton argues that παραδίδωμι should be translated as an active finite verb and he links it back to the finite verb in v. 3. Thiselton translates παραδίδωμι as *we are to consign*.[74] While the debate may continue as to the grammatical usage of παραδίδωμι,[75] both Collins' and Thiselton's translations reflect a strong community judgment of Paul, the apostle, and the Corinthians against the incestuous man. By using παραδίδωμι Paul continues to pass judgment on the immoral man, and now he is calling the Corinthians to pass judgment on him.

As Paul wraps up his first call to judgment in v. 5, he once again makes a reference to Jesus as patron as he refers to the *Day of the Lord*. This is the third reference to the

---

[72.] For a diccussion of the various textual and translation problem relating to vv. 4–5, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 392–400.

[73.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 212. Both the *New International Version* (hand this man over to Satan) and the *New Revised Standard Version* (*you are to hand this man over*) appear to translate παραδοῦναι as an "imperative infinitive." However, the *New American Standard Version* appears to translate παραδοῦναι as an indicative (*I have decided to deliver*).

[74.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 395.

[75.] Ἐκκαθάρατε in v. 7 is an imperative, since Paul uses the Passover analogy in 6–8.

Day of the Lord thus far in 1 Corinthians.[76] While various scholars draw various meanings from Paul's references to the *Day of the Lord*,[77] one thing they all appear to have in common is the concept of the visitation of a powerful patron to his clients. This visitation would include the patron's evaluation of their clients' behavior. Thus, in this verse, the Corinthians are called to act on behalf of the incestuous man's best interests and to keep in mind the impending vision of Jesus, their super-patron. The motive in casting out the incestuous brother is to bring him to the realization of his shameful behavior so that he may change, and thus be saved from a much more severe shaming and casting out by Jesus.

In vv. 4–5 Paul makes three references to Jesus as Lord, and these references are strategically placed in his first appeal. Paul makes reference to Jesus as Lord in the beginning, the middle, and in the end of his call to the Corinthians to deal with the incestuous man. These are, (1) The assembly of the Lord, (2) The power of the Lord, and (3) The presence of the Lord. Central to Paul's argument is Jesus the super-patron over all the Corinthians. Jesus is the patron under whose name they assemble. Jesus is the patron who empowers them. Jesus is the patron who will visit them. Thus, he is the patron that they must honor. Jesus has elevated them to a new status of equality in the new community of faith; however, they must act in a manner that is appropriate to their new found place of honored clients. They must put out of their presence the incestuous man in preparation for the visitation of the Lord.

Paul's enigmatic phrase in v. 5, *hand the man over to Satan*, along with the spirit body comparison has received much scholarly attention. James South labels the traditional interpretations of this verse the "curse/death interpretation."[78] Orr and Walther,[79] C. T. Craig,[80] and Conzelmann argue σάρξ refers to the man's physical body. Conzelmann notes, "the destruction of the flesh can hardly mean anything else but

---

[76.] *His work will be shown for what it is, because the Day will bring it to light. It will be revealed with fire, and the fire will test the quality of each man's work.*1 Cor 3:13
Therefore judge nothing before the appointed time; wait till the Lord comes. He will bring to light what is hidden in darkness and will expose the motives of men's hearts. At that time each will receive his praise from God. 1 Cor 4:5

[77.] Garland suggests that "the day of the Lord is shorthand for the revealing of Christ and the final judgment on the last day. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 176.

[78.] James South, "A Critique of the 'Curse/death' Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 5.1–8," *New Testament Studies* 29 (1993): 540.

[79.] Orr and Walther, *1 Corinthians*, 188–89.

[80.] C. T. Craig, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians* (Interpreters Bible 10; New York: Abingdon, 1953), 62.

death. Here it is not a case of mere exclusion from the church, but a dynamistic ceremony."[81] Deissman,[82] Conzelmann,[83] Schneider,[84] and Goran Forkman[85] argue that the phrase "hand over to Satan" matches an ancient magical curse formula. Collins identifies παραδιδωμι (*hand over*) as a technical term in the magical papyri and suggests that Paul borrowed this technical curse language.[86]

George Joy suggests that "what is to be destroyed is not the body, but the tendency which binds the offender to sin."[87] Barth Campbell suggests that Paul is referring to the congregation not the incestuous man when he refers to the spirit and body in v. 5.[88] Thornton argues that Satan is God's agent of "remedial punishment."[89] In contrast, Thiselton suggests that σάρξ in v. 5 may be interpreted as *self-satisfaction*, and that Satan may be viewed in the role of accuser rather than the agent of sickness and death.[90] South,[91] Collins,[92] and Fee[93] suggest that Paul's instruction to the Corinthians to hand the incestuous man back over to Satan is an instruction to banish

---

[81.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 97.

[82.] Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East*, 302–3.

[83.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 97.

[84.] Schneider, TDNT 5:169.

[85.] Goran Forkman, *The Limits of Religious Community: Expulsion from the Religious Community Within the Qumran Sect, with Rabbinic Community, and Within Primitive Christianity*, in *Limits of Religious Community* (trans. P. Sjolander; New Testament Series 5; Lund: Coniectanea biblica, 1972), 143, 146–47.

[86.] A. Y. Collins, "Excommunication," 255–56.

[87.] George Joy, "Is the Body Really to be Destroyed?" *The Bible Translator* 39 (1988): 436.

[88.] "Rather than making reference to the destruction of the incestuous adulterer's flesh, Paul identifies the sinful element within the church as that which is to be destroyed. Similarly the spirit to be saved is not that of the offender but the corporate life of the church lived in union through the Holy Spirit." Barth Campbell, "Flesh and Spirit in 1 Cor 5:5: An Exercise in Rhetorical Criticism of the NT," *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 36 (1993): 341.

[89.] Timothy Thornton, "Satan - God's Agent for Punishing," *Expository Times* 83 (1972): 152.

[90.] Anthony C. Thiselton, "The Meaning of σάρξ in 1 Corinthians 5.5: A Fresh Approach in Light of Logical and Semantic Factors," *Scottish Journal of Theology* 26 (1973): 227–28.

[91.] For an overview and critique of the *curse/death interpretations* v. 5 see, South, "Curse/death".

[92.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 209.

[93.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 213.

the incestuous man from the Christian community. Victor Pfitzner,[94] Harris,[95] Joy,[96] and Oster[97] argue that in this first appeal of vv. 2–5 Paul's prime concern is that of the incestuous man's restoration.

While cursing/death or expulsion may be debated from the social values of honor and shame the end result is the same. The Corinthians are called to act in a manner which would completely reverse the typical patron-client structure in Corinth. By *handing the man over*, the Corinthians would be acting like a patron who shames a client who has engaged in behavior that brought shame to his patron. Thus, with the handing over, Paul is calling for both a reversal of shame and status of the incestuous man.

4.2.4   The Second Appeal, 5:6–8

In both appeals Paul addresses the behavior of the community at large, and in both appeals Paul calls on the community to expel the immoral brother. In the first appeal Paul is concerned about the man's salvation.[98] In the second appeal of vv. 6–8, Campbell,[99] Rosner,[100] Johnson[101] and Oster[102] argue Paul is concerned about the community's purity.[103] Thus, to emphasize this aspect Paul's appeal draws on a metaphor from the Jewish festival of Passover.[104] Collins makes the interesting suggestion that Paul's move from the maxim on yeast in v. 6 of the reference to the Passover in v. 7 may indicate that the feast of Passover was at hand.[105] Rosner

---

[94.] Victor C. Pfitzner, "Purified Community - Purified Sinner: Expulsion from the Community According to Matthew 18:15–18 and 1 Corinthians 5:1–5," *Australian Bible Review* 30 (1982): 48.

[95.] Harris, "Church Discipline," 21.

[96.] Joy, "Is the Body Really to be Destroyed?" 436.

[97.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 125.

[98.] Pascuzzi suggests that the argument of vv. 6–8 is proof by logos, Pascuzzi, *Church Discipline*, 123.

[99.] Campbell, "Flesh and Spirit," 341.

[100.] Brian S. Rosner, "Temple and Holiness in 1 Cor 5," *Tyndale Bulletin* 42 (1991): 145; Brian S. Rosner, "οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἐπενθήσαντε: Corporate Responsibility in 1 Corinthians 5," *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 470–73.

[101.] Johnson, *1 Corinthians*, 91.

[102.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 126.

[103.] Harris, "Church Discipline," 5.

[104.] For a discussion on purity and excommunication from a pre-exilic Jewish perspective, see William Hornbury, "Extirpation and Excommunication," *Vetus Testamentum* 35 (1985): 31–38.

[105.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 213–14.

convincingly argues that Paul's ethics were shaped by the Hebrew Scriptures and that 1 Cor 5 is based on three Old Testament motifs,

> We are now in a position to identify the theological presupposition which underlines and facilitates Paul's appropriation of Scriptural teaching in 1 Corinthians 5. Paul's uses of the three motifs associated with excommunication in the Scriptures indicates that he understands the church to be a sanctified (holiness motif), covenant (covenant motif) community (corporate responsibility motif). This 1 Corinthians 5 description of the church uniquely combines the image of church as a temple found in 1 Corinthians 3:16–17 and as a body developed in 1 Corinthians 10:17; 11:29; 12:12–27.[106]

Rosner's work does indeed support his conclusion, "The finding of the present study support the conclusion that the Jewish Scriptures are a crucial and formative source for Paul's ethics.[107]

However, while Paul does write from a strong Jewish ethical perspective, Paul does not fully develop the Passover theme. Rather, he simply outlines a maxim, *a little yeast leavens the whole batch of dough*, and then he develops this maxim in light of the Passover. In fact, Paul only gives two verses to the Passover theme.[108] In v. 7 Paul presents Jesus as the Passover Lamb, and in both v. 7 and v. 8 Paul evokes the period of preparation for the Passover where leaven/yeast was removed from the home. Mitton notes, "leaven symbolises something that has a vigorous inward vitality of its own which gives it the power to affect with its own quality whatever it touches."[109]

In v. 6 Paul switches from their *arrogance* in v. 2 to their *boasting*. This boasting has been a central feature of 1 Cor 1–3. It was foundational to their factionalism as mentioned by Paul in 1:12. Their boasting was reversed by Paul in 1:26–31 when he argues that the majority was not from the elite class, but God through Christ changed their status and, now, when they boast, they should boast in the name of the Lord. In 3:1–4 Paul addresses them as babes (νήπιος) because of their boasting. In 3:21–23, Paul closes his argument on factionalism by instructing the Corinthians in v. 21, *So let no one boast about human leaders*. Thus, as Paul begins v. 6 with a rebuke of

---

[106] Brian S. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5–7* (Biblical Studies Library; Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994), 90–91.

[107] Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics*, 176.

[108] For general information on Paul's usage of the Passover theme, see J. K. Howard, "'Christ Our Passover': A Study of the Passover-Exodus Theme in 1 Corinthians," *Evangelical Quarterly* 41 (1969): 97–108; Roger Le Deaut, "The Paschal Mystery and Morality," *Doctrine and Life* 18 (1968): 262–69; Leslie M. Mitton, "New Wine in Old Wine Skins: IV, Leaven," *Expository Times* 84 (1973).

[109] Mitton, "New Wine," 340.

their boasting it echoes the patronal factionalism of 1 Cor 1–3, and it echoes the arrogance of v. 2. From Paul's perspective, then, just as the boasting in human leaders was a core part of the factionalism, their boasting in the human leaders has impeded them from dealing with the immorality in the congregation.

Paul begins his second call to action in the same manner in which he began his first, by shaming the Corinthians for their boasting, *your boasting is not a good thing*. Paul follows the rebuke with a maxim about how yeast works to affect the whole batch of dough.[110] While Paul develops the yeast-dough analogy in the following verses, the fact that he rebukes them for their boasting is a reference to the leaven and yeast-dough analogy.

Thus, with an ironic twist, Paul argues in this second appeal, that the incestuous man's clients, who are boasting in their patron's social status, have failed to confront him and thus their boasting is contaminating them. Paul does not rebuke the Corinthians for their immorality, rather he rebukes them for their arrogance, their lack of mourning, their failing to put out the incestuous man in v. 2, and their boasting in v. 6. Paul not only tells the Corinthians that their boasting is not good, he explains with the leaven maxim why it is not good. In so doing Paul takes their boasting and describes it as a contaminant. The irony is that the very thing they are boasting in is in fact contaminating them.[111] Thus, in v. 6, Paul reverses their boasting and turns it to shame.

A second and parallel manner in which Paul shames the Corinthians is by introducing his maxim of yeast and dough with the phrase οὐκ οἴδατε (*don't you know*). A maxim by its nature is well known. However, their boasting is a strong indication that they failed to apply this clear maxim to their Christian walk. The tone of this verse is similar to that of 3:1–4. Here Paul assumes the role of the older brother who rebukes his younger siblings for their childish behavior. In that passage, their childish behavior is connected with their boasting over men. Now in 5:6, Paul rebukes the Corinthians for failing to follow a course of action that Paul presents as clear as the maxim, a little yeast leavens the whole batch of dough.

In v. 7 Paul moves from his introductory comments and his reversal of their boasting/honor to a call for action. First, Paul moves from the maxim in v. 6 and

---

[111.] Mitton, on the symbolism of leaven, notes, "In the Old Testament leaven is something which has to be destroyed because it has become tainted in itself and so a source of contamination to any dough with which it is mixed. Hence in the New Testament it becomes a symbol for moral evil which from a small beginning spreads insidiously in a community until the whole life of the community is adversely affected by it." Mitton, "New Wine," 340.

commands the Corinthians *to clean out* (ἐκκαθαίρω) the old batch so they can be a new batch. While Paul has not directly referred to the Passover, a central aspect of the feast is evoked, specifically the removal or purging of the leaven.[112] Undoubtedly, the old yeast that is to be purged is the incestuous man. The implication, which is carried on from v. 6, is that they had become tainted by the man's immoral action. The evidence of their being tainted is their display of arrogance and boasting. The result of purging the old yeast is that the Corinthians would become a new batch without yeast.

It is interesting that in v. 2 Paul uses a subjunctive as he informs them that they should have *put him out* (αἴρω). In v. 5 Paul uses an infinitive as he closes the first appeal and instructs them *to hand him over* (παραδίδωμι) to Satan. Now, in v. 7, Paul uses an imperative as he commands them *to purge* (ἐκκαθαίρω) him. There is an increase in the tone of the language as Paul moves from subjunctive to infinitive to imperative. There is a strong connection between the verb αἴρω used by Paul in v. 2 and the double compound verb ἐκκαθαίρω used in v. 7.

Paul follows his imperative with two motivations to follow the command. The first finds Paul using an interesting interplay of words as he follows the imperative clause of v. 7 with a result clause ἵνα ἦτε νέον φύραμα, καθώς ἐστε ἄζυμοι (*so that you may be a new batch, as you really are unleavened*). In this clause Paul uses a subjunctive (ἦτε) and an indicative (ἐστε), which would be translated, *so that you would be what you are, unleavened.* With this interplay between the imperative clause and the result clause, Paul moves from shame, *clean out the old yeast*, to potential honor *you might be a new batch*, to actual honor, *just as you are unleavened*. Thus the shaming of the incestuous man results in the honoring of the Corinthians in that they have returned to their pure status.[113]

In his second motivation, Paul evokes a new description of Jesus, that of a Passover lamb, who has been sacrificed. This description of Jesus as the Passover lamb

---

[112.] Mitton notes, "The practice at the feast of the Unleavened Bread was for every particle of leaven to be ruthlessly destroyed, and an entirely new start to be made with a baking of new, unleavened dough. This practice is used in the New Testament to symbolize the complete newness of the Christian life as it turns resolutely away from evil of every kind and commits itself to the way of purity and love. Mitton, "New Wine," 340.

[113.] Wenthe, on the unleavened state of the Corinthians, writes, "The fact that the lamb has been slain transports Paul's readers into a new state of affairs, into a new identity; they are now celebrants in the festival; therefore they should conduct themselves with an eye to their status." Dean O. Wenthe, "An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 5:7b," *The Spring Fielder* 38 (1974): 138.

is tied to the preceding phrase, *you are unleavened*. Mitton, on Jesus as the Passover Lamb, comments,

> The association in the one Jewish celebration of the clean newness of the unleavened bread and the slaughter of the Passover lamb with the shedding and proper application of its blood, provides an opportunity of bringing together in the unity of the Christian experiences all that has been achieved by the death of Christ (the Lamb of God) along with the new quality of life awakened in the heart of the new believer.[114]

The contrast, then, between the incestuous man and Jesus is striking. While the actions of the incestuous man have contaminated the community, the sacrifice of Jesus is the means by which the community was created and now can be cleansed. While this description of Jesus as the cleansing Passover lamb is new to first Corinthians it is drawn from the description of Jesus that Paul outlined in 1:1–9, especially when he describes the Corinthians as those who have been sanctified in Christ Jesus. Thus, Paul is again contrasting the power of Jesus, the super-patron, over and against the weakness of the incestuous man. This contrast between the corrupting yeast and the cleansing lamb is used to reinforce Paul's call to action in vv. 2–5. The call to *purge the old yeast* is similar to the call in v. 5 to *hand this man over to Satan*. Both are calls to cast the incestuous man out of the community. Wenthe suggests that Paul's use of the "old leaven-lump" emphasizes the urgency of dealing with and removing the incestuous man.[115]

In v. 8, as Paul brings his second appeal to a conclusion, he uses the hortatory subjunctive *let us celebrate* (ἑορτάζω *I celebrate*) as his final motivation. However, this is tied back to v. 7 and the description of Jesus as the Passover Lamb. If Collins is correct in suggesting that the reason Paul draws upon the Passover theme is due to the fact that the Passover is approaching[116] then this would tie together the image of casting out of actual yeast in preparation for the Passover with the casting out of the incestuous man.

Paul's exhortation continues the metaphor of preparing for the Passover, but now he develops the metaphor. While in v. 7 Paul uses the somewhat vague leaven-unleavened contrast, now Paul clarifies his argument by employing a vice-virtue contrast. Paul offers two virtues, *sincerity* (εἰλικρίνεια) and *truth* (ἀλήθεια), in place of

---

[114.] Mitton, "New Wine," 340.
[115.] Wenthe, "An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 5:7b," 138.
[116.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 213–14.

the existing vices, *malice* (κακία) and *evil* (πονηρία).[117] "These particular virtues and vices are classic examples of paraenetic catalogues, but with the exception of immorality (*porneia*) they rarely appear in Paul."[118]

Paul's use of malice and wickedness is somewhat ambiguous. He does not clarify if these twin vices are characteristics of the incestuous man, the proud Corinthians, or both. If the maxim from v. 6 is applied to v. 8 then it would suggest that Paul is subtly describing the incestuous man as the leaven of malice and evil and his presence in the community threatens to contaminate the whole community with malice and evil. However, Paul is not ambiguous about the result of purging the incestuous man. The community would be purified of the malice and wickedness and characterized by sincerity and truth.

The central motif of the second appeal is that of the Passover. The central argument in vv. 6–8 that Paul uses for purging the incestuous man is the purity of the community of faith. Paul makes reference to this three times; once in each verse. In v. 5 Paul uses the maxim of leaven, in v. 6 Paul issues an imperative, and in v. 8 Paul employs an exhortation. Thus, it is necessary to shame the incestuous man so that the community might regain its purity that Jesus, their super-patron and Passover lamb, provided for them.

While vv. 2–5 and vv. 6–8 have the same purpose, that is to cast out the incestuous man, Paul uses two different descriptions of Jesus and two underlying reasons to motivate the Corinthians to follow his instructions. In vv. 2–5 Paul describes Jesus as a powerful patron whose name the Corinthians assemble in, and when they assemble Jesus' powerful presence is also there. Jesus is the powerful patron who will visit his clients. In vv. 6–8 Paul describes Jesus as the Passover lamb, the cleansing sacrifice. The first appeal to cast the incestuous man out is so that he would come to his senses, change his behavior, and, thus, not suffer on the day of the patron's visit. The second appeal to cast the incestuous man out is to purify the community from his corrupting influence.

[117.] For a discussion on Paul's use of the catalogues of virtues and vices, see Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 100–101; Peter S. Zaas, "Catalogues and Context: 1 Corinthians 5 and 6," *New Testament Studies* 24 (1988): 622–29; B. J. Oropeza, "Situational Immorality: Paul's 'Vice Lists' at Corinth," *Expository Times* 110 (1998): 9–10. Rosner suggests that these virtues and vices come not from Greco-Roman paraenetic catalogue lists but that they reflect the ethics of the Old Testament, especially Deuteronomy, Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics*, 61–93.

[118.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 215.

The fact that Paul uses these two parallel appeals may well indicate the degree of social change Paul is calling for. This would demonstrate how difficult it would have been for the clients of a wealthy and powerful patron to take action against his immorality. Paul's call to action is a total reversal of the social norms. The powerful patrons were the ones who cast out their clients. While revolution may be a strong term to use, it may well come close to accurately describing the level of social change Paul is calling the Corinthians to undertake.

4.2.5   A Twofold Clarification of A Former Letter, 5:9–13

While Paul, with the two appeals of vv. 2–8, has provided powerful arguments to the Corinthians to put out the incestuous man, he realizes there would be strong resistance to this instruction. In vv. 9–13, Paul addresses this potential resistance in two ways.[119] First, Paul makes reference to his previous letter.[120] Thiselton suggests this reference to his previous letter as a way of reinforcing his appeals in vv. 2–8 by reminding them that "they had already received prior warnings about the elements of holiness and purity for those who wished to be part of the Christian congregation."[121]

Second, it may be that v. 10 indicates Paul's anticipation of resistance, or it may be actual resistance voiced by the Corinthians. Thus, in good sophistic style Paul addresses the resistance to his instruction. One argument Paul's opponents would have used against Paul's call to judge the incestuous man would be that if the church begins to judge sexually immoral people (πόρνος), then the church would begin a course of action with no possible end. This may be described as negation by exaggeration.[122] Thiselton describes the resistance as he notes, "On the other hand, some may maliciously have applied a *reductio ad absurdum* of which Paul now shows himself fully aware."[123]

Whether Paul has received a message from those of Chloe's household, or he encountered similar types of negating exaggeration before, or he has picked up this stylist touch from a sophist, Paul seeks to neutralize those who would try to negate his argument by their use of hyperbole. Paul neutralizes his opponents by setting clear

---

[119.] Pascuzzi suggests that the argument of vv. 9–13 is proof by pathos, *Pascuzzi, Church Discipline*, 136.

[120.] On Paul's *previous* letter, see Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 184–85, 191–92.

[121.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 408.

[122.] Negation by exaggeration is similar to *reductio ad absurdum*.

[123.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 409.

limits of judging and association and by engaging in his own *reductio ad absurdum* as he states *in that case you would have to leave this world*. Paul addresses the negation by exaggeration by making reference to three new vicious persons: *the greedy*, *the swindlers*, and *the idolaters*. No doubt Oster is correct when he observes, "These three terms 'greedy,' 'swindlers,' and 'idolaters' all fit the culture of a Roman colony with a dynamic economy based upon propitiously located ports."[124] However, these vices may reflect more than just a generic connection with the city of Corinth and its booming economy. Paul addresses three issues in 1 Cor 5–6, the incestuous man in 1 Cor 5, the law court abuses in 1 Cor 6:1–11, and sexual immorality in 1 Cor 6:12–20. The four vicious persons Paul mentions in v. 10, (*the immoral, the greedy, the swindlers, and the idolaters*) can be connected to these three issues. No doubt *the immoral* are connected to the incestuous man of 1 Cor 5. *The greedy* (πλεονέκτης) and *the swindlers* (ἅρπαξ) are connected to the law courts of 6:1–11 as Paul uses these terms again in 6:10. *Idolaters* (εἰδωλολάτρης) may be connected with the sexual immorality of 6:12–20, especially when read in light of Paul's use of prostitutes in 6:15 and temple language in 6:19.[125] Paul's use of *greedy* may well be a term that connects both the incestuous man and the abuse occurring in the law courts in that the root cause of the incest and the law courts' abuse is greed. Thus, v. 10 is Paul's argument of limitation to his opponents' argument of negation by exaggeration. He limits his opponents' attempts to discount his instructions to shame the incestuous man. He also puts *the swindlers*, *the idolaters*, and *the greedy* on notice that he is aware of their activities, and he prepares his audience for his instructions that are forthcoming.

After clarifying that his instructions do not apply to those of the world and, in so doing, Paul negates any attempt to undermine his instructions on that basis of exaggeration. In v. 11, Paul further expands this clarification by stating that his instructions only apply to *anyone who calls himself a brother*. Thus, Paul's instructions are limited to the family of faith and by using the term brother (ἀδελφός), Paul is once again reinforcing the concept that the church is not structured along the typical patron-client relationship conventions, rather it is structured more like a family. Similarly, by using the family reference the incestuous man's status and power are drastically undermined, while the familial responsibility of his siblings—the rest of the

---

[124.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 128.

[125.] However, moving outside the close context of 1 Cor 5–6, the idolaters on the vice list are more explicitly anticipated by the idolatry/idol issues addressed by Paul in 1 Cor 8–10.

congregation—is enhanced.[126] Thus, the imperatival call to cast him out, or in this case, the imperative to *not associate* (συναναμίγνυμι), is made all the more possible. Paul, in v. 11, expands his list of four vices from v. 7 to six by adding *slanderer* (λοίδορος) and *drunkard* (μέθυσος). Just as the four vices of v. 7 are related to the abuses of the powerful in Corinth and are covered in 1 Cor 5–6, Paul uses both slanderer and drunkard again in 6:10.[127] Thus, it would appear that not only is Paul being very specific about who should not be associated with, but he continues to lay the groundwork for dealing with the abuses occurring in the law-courts.[128]

Paul begins with an instruction *"not to associate* (συναναμίγνυμι in vv. 9, 11) with the *so called brother*, and he ends with an instruction *not even to eat* (συνεσθίω) with such a person."[129] There is some discussion on whether Paul's instruction to *not even eat with such a one* is a reference to sharing of the Lord's Table or to eating together in houses in regular social relationships. Both Thiselton[130] and Collins[131] agree that the force of Paul's statements would include regular relationships and the Lord's Supper. Oster views Paul's instructions not to associate with and not to eat with such a person as reflecting Jewish forms of censure and would have included Christian censure, "Paul's commandment about the denial of the table fellowship would have included both the Lord's Supper as well as other social and communal meals among the Corinthian believers."[132] Kistemaker notes that "to not offer food to a relative, an acquaintance, a friend, or a guest could be interpreted as a declaration of war."[133] Thus, while in vv. 9–10 Paul does indeed limit who to judge, the so called brother, he goes on to expand the level of judgment, *do not associate, do not even eat with such a person*.

While Paul's instructions *not to associate with* and *do not even eat with such a person* are often understood in a purity setting, they may have a close connection with

---

[126.] Paul makes similar familial references in 1:1, 10, 11, 26; 2:1; 3:1; 4:6. Paul also presents himself as the father of the Corinthian community in 4:14–17.

[127.] Garland connects these six vices by suggesting that they are related to sexual sins and all listed in Deuteronomy. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 189.

[128.] There is the interesting possibility that Paul is also laying the groundwork for dealing with the Corinthian abuses which occurred at the Lord's Supper as μεθύω is also used in 11:20. The Passover Lamb mentioned in 1 Cor 5:7 may also be part of Paul laying the groundwork for his discussion of the abuses of the Lord's Supper.

[129.] Paul uses three infinitives but with imperatival force.

[130.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 415.

[131.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 220.

[132.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 129.

[133.] Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 170.

the patron-client relationship. Moxnes, in describing the patronage of a city, reminds us that patrons often provided food.[134] Garnsey and Saller, on the relationship of a patron to his clients note that invitations to dinner were a vital part of the relationship.[135] Neyrey offers an insightful view of Jesus as patron and his providing of food as a means of sustaining his community.[136] Winter suggests that since invitations to dinner were indications of endorsement and sustaining *societas*, it would have been a breach of social etiquette to comment on the incest.[137] Winter goes on to consider the implications of Paul's comments in v. 11 from a patron-client relationship perspective,

> We do not know enough to determine whether this person had clients and if any from the Christian community had stood in that relationship with him. If they did, it would have been impossible to censure the son without breaking the relationship and creating one of lasting enmity with the former patron. In any case, the action Paul required would have created an enmity relationship with the Christian community.[138]

[134.] "Benefaction to a city was frequently expressed through the erection of public buildings such as temples, basilicas, and aqueducts. It could also take the form of the instigation and payment for public festivals and sacrifices, or public distribution of food." Halvor Moxnes, "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (ed. Jerome H. Neyrey; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 249.

[135.] "Nevertheless, some quid pro quo was still possible and provided the bases for patronal exchange. Clients could contribute to their patron's social status by forming crowds at his door for the morning salutatio (Tacitus, *Ann.* 3.55) or by accompanying him on his rounds of public business during the day and applauding his speeches in court. In return, they could expect handouts of food or sportulae (small sums of money, customary about six sesterces in Martial's day) and sometimes an invitation to dinner." Peter Garnsey and Richard Saller, "Patronal Power Relations," in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society* (ed. Richard A. Horsley; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1977), 99.

[136.] "Jesus, the founder of a faction, starts and sustains the group he gathers around himself precisely by meals or distribution of food. Since patron-client relations are a form of reciprocity, if the patron distributes food, then one might ask what he gets in return? What is expected of those who receive? Patron-client relations, then, are an indispensable scenario for understanding the full meaning of the social relations in Luke-Acts, especially those that deal with food and meals." Jerome H. Neyrey, "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table Fellowship," in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation* (ed. Jerome H. Neyrey; Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991), 374.

[137.] "From Paul's comments it would seem that the Corinthian Christians had continued to conduct social relationships with the incestuous man, including eating with him. The development and maintenance of a network of social relations was at the heart of Roman society. Invitations to dinner were an indication of the endorsement of a person. They were also a means of continuing friendships which was part of the Corinthian way of sustaining *societas*. By "keeping company" with this person and dining with him, the Christians indicated their continuing desire to court his friendship. It would, then, have been a deliberate breach of Roman social etiquette to comment on his incestuous relationship." Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 56.

[138.] Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 56–57.

In contrast to Winter's view, it does indeed seem plausible that the incestuous man had clients in the Christian community. Winter is correct in affirming that there was indeed a strong possibility that lasting enmity would have been created if his clients had followed Paul's instructions in 1 Cor 5.[139] This helps explain why Paul goes to the lengths he does in attempting to persuade the Corinthians to follow his instructions to put out the incestuous man. This would not only remove him, it would also be a strong demonstration that he is no longer their patron, but rather Jesus is their patron.

In v. 12, as Paul begins to wrap up his discussion on the incestuous man, he asks two deliberative questions. This first question sets up the second one. The first question is focused on Paul and his relationship to the outsiders, while the second question is focused on the insiders and their relationship to one another, or more precisely, their relationship to the incestuous man. The first question expects a negative answer, while the second question expects a positive answer. These two questions take the essence of what Paul has stated in vv. 9–11 and reduces them to a simple no and yes answer. With the first question, *For what have I to do with judging those outside?*, the answer that his audience is expected to respond with is, *nothing*, or, *it is none of your business!* This first question is connected with Paul's argument in vv. 9–10 where he addresses the negation by exaggeration argument of those who are resisting his instructions concerning the incestuous man. With this question Paul succinctly affirms that the Christian moral code is not applicable to outsiders. In contrast, the second question, *Is it not those who are inside that you are to judge?*, Paul expects an affirmative answer, *yes, we are to judge those inside*. Again, this is based on the preceding verse where Paul has made it clear that the family must not associate or even eat with an immoral brother, and the fact that Paul's use οὐχὶ indicates that he expects an affirmative answer.

4.2.6 A Final Exhortation, 5:13

In v. 13 Paul makes two affirmations which are based on the two deliberative questions of v. 12. In fact, they function as parallel answers to the two questions of v. 12.

[139.] Concerning the incestuous man of 1 Cor 5 being identified as the repentant man of 2 Cor 2:5–11, Garland notes, "The majority of ancient commentators identified the offender as the man guilty of living with his father's wife (1 Cor 5:1–5). . . . The majority of modern commentators emphatically reject identifying the offender with the man guilty of incest in 1 Corinthians 5." David E. Garland, *2 Corinthians* (New American Commentary 29; Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 118 -19.

> *For what have I to do with judging those outside?*
> *God will judge those outside.*
>
> *Is it not those who are inside that you are to judge?*
> *"Drive out the wicked person from among you."*

Sampley makes an interesting observation as he notes, "Chapter one closes with Paul's axiomatic recitation of a deutoronomic refrain,[140] (Deut 19:19; 21:21; 22:24; 24:7).[141] Concerning this Zaas notes,

> This passage functions rhetorically in two other ways, rather, within its epistolary context: Paul is both providing a rhetorical framework for his case against *porneia* in chap. 5 and invoking the original ethos defined by the quotation, an ethos that closely resembles the epistolary situations of this part of I Corinthians.[142]

Paul's ultimate imperative (*Expel the wicked man from among you*) is not only based on the previous deliberative question, it is also based on everything he has argued since v. 1. In the immediate context Paul has shown that while God will judge those outside the body it is the Corinthians' responsibility to judge those inside the body. Paul ends this issue with a forceful imperative, ἐξαίρω (*remove, cast out*). Thiselton notes that "the double use of εκ (or εξ) requires a strong word such as **banish**."[143] Paul begins this discussion by describing the πορνεία (*sexual immorality*) within the congregation and making reference to the fact that they should have cast out (αίρω) the man. Paul ends the discussion by commanding that the τὸν πονηρὸν (*the immoral one*) be banished. For a powerful patron this would be the ultimate shame. For not only is he banished, but he is banished by those who used to be his own clients.

4.2.7   First Corinthians 5 Conclusion

Paul has been relentless in dealing with the incestuous man and the community that failed to deal with his sin. In v. 1 he identifies the shameful behavior, and for the rest of the section he is unceasing in arguing, motivating, and commanding the Corinthians to shame the incestuous man. In v. 2 he tells the Corinthians that they should have removed the incestuous man, in v. 3 he says that he has already judged the man, and in v. 5 he says that they should hand him over to Satan. In v. 6 he refers to the man as

---

[140.] Sampley, *First Corinthians*, 846.

[141.] Rosner suggests that there is similarity between the course of action called for by Paul and that adopted by Ezra 7–10. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics*, 80–81.

[142.] Peter S. Zaas, "'Cast Out the Evil Man from Your Midst' (1 Cor 5:13b)," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984): 259.

[143.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 417.

yeast, in verse 7 he commands them to purge the old yeast, and in v. 8 he alludes to him as being malicious and wicked. In vv. 9 and 11 he tells the Corinthians not to associate with the immoral man, and in v. 11 he tells them not to even eat with such a one. Paul's final instruction is to banish the immoral man.

Paul's instruction to cast out and/or banish the immoral man, who was most probably a wealthy patron, is a shocking reversal of the patron-client relationship. To motivate the Corinthians to banish the incestuous man Paul first shames the very act of incest, v. 1. He then shames the Corinthians for their pride and their lack of grief, v. 2. Paul informs the Corinthians that he has already judged the incestuous man, v. 3. In v. 4 Paul reminds them that their assembly is in the name of Jesus, he (Paul) is present, and the power of Jesus is present. In v. 5 Paul alludes to the visit of Jesus, their super-patron, and the shaming of the man is intended to save him. In v. 6 Paul shames the Corinthians for their boasting, which is evidence of the incestuous man's influence on the whole community. In v. 7 Paul reminds them of Jesus' powerful sacrifice. In v. 8 he encourages them to celebrate the festival as bread without yeast. Thus, it is has been demonstrated that one of the main motivations Paul uses in 1 Cor 5 is shame. He shames the congregation into shaming the incestuous man because he is bringing shame on Jesus, the super-patron. In a world of patron-client relationships where the coin was honor and shame, Paul's call to action is indeed a case where the punishment fits the crime.

4.3   On Going To The Law Courts, 1 Corinthians 6:1–11

4.3.1   The Legal Background

The situation addressed by Paul in 1 Cor 6:1–11 is that of a civil case rather than a criminal case.[144] The description κριτηρίων ἐλαχίστων is a *trivial case*, *totally insignificant*,[145] or an *ordinary matter*.[146] Garnsey suggests that the terms in 1 Cor 6:7 and 6:8 of *being wronged* and *cheated* seem to indicate the type of offense which would have come under the umbrella of civil jurisdiction—which would have dealt with claims of possession, breach of contract, damage, fraud, and injury.[147] Theissen writes,

---

[144] Bruce W. Winter, "Civil Litigation in Secular Corinth and the Church: The Forensic Background to 1 Corinthians 6:1–8," *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 559–72.

[145] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 234.

[146] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 203 204.

[147] Garnsey, *Social Status*, 181.

"In 1 Corinthians 6:1–11 we hear about litigation among the Corinthian Christians. The object of such suits are βιωτικός, probably affairs of property or income."[148] Thus, the type of legal case that forms the background to 6:1–11 is that of a civil case involving property.

Concerning the structure of Corinth's civil courts Collins notes,

> Relatively little is known about the actual administration of civil justice in Corinth at the time Paul was writing to the Corinthians. Without the evidence to prove otherwise one may presume that justice was administered in Corinth in much the same mode as it was in the other cities of the Roman Empire.[149]

While the jury-system was commonly employed in the criminal jurisdiction of the Republican period, this is unlikely to have been the process used in the civil case alluded to in 1 Cor 6:1.[150] It was customary for the governor himself to hear the more important cases, "The provincial governor must himself act and judge or appoint a panel or jurors (for capital cases) but with the rest of such affairs it is my wish that Greek Jurors be appointed."[151] Ordinary civil cases were heard by two *duoviri*, two citizens appointed to the magistrature, while *Aediles* heard cases pertaining to business and the agora.[152] Thus, it may be assumed that it is one of these officials along with the appointed judge, who are referred to in 1 Cor 6:1 and 6:6 as ἄδικος (*unrighteous*) and ἄπιστος (*unbeliever*).

Various views concerning the precise nature of the litigation have been offered. Bernard suggests that the incestuous man of 1 Cor 5 was prosecuted by his own father.[153] Chow argues that Bernard's thesis is unlikely due to the fact that βιωτικός "is best understood as referring to a case concerning financial or mercantile matters rather than one concerning sexual infidelity and adultery."[154] Fiorenza suggests the case has an indirect connection to financial matters but she also suggests that if 1 Cor 6:1–11 is read in the light of 6:20–7:40 the legal situation might be related to institutional marriage and may be closely connected to "questions of dowry, divorce settlement, or

---

[148.] Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 97.

[149.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 226.

[150.] J. A. Crook, *Law and Life of Rome 90 B.C.–A.D. 212* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1967), 85.

[151.] Victor Ehrenberg and A. H. M. Jones, *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1976), 66–88. Cf. J. Wiseman, "Corinth and Rome 1: 228 BC–AD 267," *ANRW* 2.7.1 (1979): 498.

[152.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 226.

[153.] Bernard, "The Connexion Between the Fifth and Sixth Chapters of 1 Corinthians."

[154.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 125.

inheritance."[155] Reidar Aasgaard, working from the premise that Paul's use of ἀδελφός in this section refers to actual brothers, suggests that "the lawsuit was likely over a family matter related to property, most probably inheritance."[156] Clarke argues that the issue was less about finance matters and more about status, "it has been suggested that it was men of relatively high social standing who were entering into vexatious litigation, and that this may well have been undertaken in order to protect reputation and status."[157] Winters connects the court case with the factionalism and power struggle among the elite of the congregation, "It is clear that the strife and jealousy aroused over teachers (1 Cor. 1:11ff.) had spilt over into the arena of civil courts."[158] However, while the above views are plausible, there is a common theme in all of them, namely that Paul's rebuke of the Corinthians was because they were using secular courts to address issues that could have been settled in the church. Paul's use of language in vv. 1–11, and particularly his use of the phrase in v. 8 ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε καὶ ἀποστερεῖτε (*you yourselves wrong and defraud*), indicates that while the issue did indeed involve financial matters, there was more to the situation. It will be argued that central to Paul's argument is not that the Corinthians were using the law courts to address legitimate financial disputes, but rather they were using the courts to perpetrate fraud.

4.3.2   The Corinthian Courts and Patronage

The fact that Paul is addressing civil cases rather than criminal cases once again brings Paul into conflict with *the wise*, *the powerful*, and *the well-born* in the congregation. Thiselton sets the stage for this area of discussion when he points out that the local civil magistrates' courts allowed too much room for patronage and the vested interests of the powerful. The poor did not have any expectation of having an equal standing before the law.[159] Mitchell outlines three reasons as to why the offenders are people of higher

---

[155.] Elisabeth Schüssler Fiorenza, "1 Corinthians," in *Harper's Biblical Commentary* (ed. James Luther Mays; New York: Harper & Row, 1988), 1175.

[156.] Reidar Aasgaard, *'My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!': Christian Siblingship in Paul* (JSNTSup 265; London: T&T Clark, 2004), 235.

[157.] Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 71.

[158.] Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 73–75.

[159.] "For whereas the criminal courts of the Roman government to some reasonable extent could be respected as sources of relative justice, the local civil magistrate's courts allowed too much room for patronage and vested interest in the stance of local judges or the appointment of juries to reflect anything like even a near degree of integrity in comparison with major criminal courts. The "wealthy," "influential," and "clever" could manipulate social networks outside the church to their advantage and thereby, in effect, take advantage of the poor

status,

> These three internal reasons point to the offenders in chap. 6 as people of higher status: the contrast of high and low status shared by 1.26–30 and 6.1–11, the ironic use of the term σοφός, and the reference to their shame. Evidence from outside the text supports this conclusion.[160]

Mitchell goes on to suggest, "the higher status people were taking the lower status people to court, where the latter were at a disadvantage."[161] The elder Seneca, an older contemporary of Paul, tells the story of a rich man taunting a poor man, "Why don't you accuse me, why don't you take me to court?" To this the poor man replied, "Am I, a poor man, to accuse a rich man?" (*Controversiae* 10.1.2) Cicero notes that the three main problems in civil litigation were *gratia*, *potentia*, and *pecunia* (i.e. *favor, power, and money*) (*Caecin.* 73). J. M. Kelly contends that such corruption was especially serious in the civil courts of the Empire.[162] Apparently it was the patrons in Corinth who were taking the poor members of the congregation to court.[163]

Thus, in 1 Cor 6:1–11, Paul continues to deal with an issue that is directly connected to the patron-client relationships of Corinth which has made its way into the congregation. First Corinthians 6:1–11 will be examined with special focus being paid to Paul's rhetoric of shame as he addresses the abuses in the law courts. Paul's argument in 6:1–11 is structured into two parallel units. Talbert provides a working outline of the structure of 6:1–11 that will be slightly modified and followed;

> *Statement of the problem*, (vv. 1, 7a)
>
> *An argument from tradition, in two parts* (vv. 2–4, 7b–10)

---

or "weak" within the congregation." Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 419.

[160.] Alan Mitchell, "Rich and Poor in the Courts of Corinth: Litigiousness and Status in 1 Cor 6:1–11," *New Testament Studies* 39 (1983): 574–75.

[161.] Mitchell, "Rich and Poor," 576.

[162.] "It may be no more than an accident; but among the Roman lay or legal texts on judicial bribery; it is remarkable that in the Republican sources corruption in criminal trials is most frequently mentioned, which in the tests from the first two or three centuries of the Empire most complaints about judicial corruption related clearly to civil litigation." J. M. Kelly, *Roman Litigation* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1966), 37.

[163.] Clarke notes, "In Graeco-Roman time it was widely assumed that there was no equal standing before the law. Exercising legal privilege was a normal fact of the Roman judicial system. Respect for status was all pervasive in Imperial society, and it did not seem remarkable that legal privilege should be directly linked with the honor in which an individual was held. There were accepted ways, therefore by which litigants could enhance their own changes of success in the courts. Three aspects of that privilege will be discussed in order to demonstrate that only those of senior status would have undertaken public litigation: the importance of status; ways of obstructing the legal process; and the use of *vituperatio*." Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 63.

An argument from experience, in two parts (vv. 5–6, 11)[164]

4.3.3   First Statement of the Problem, 6:1

In a similar manner to that of 5:1 Paul begins by directly addressing the issue. Fee notes of 6:1–2, "Although the question of v. 1 was directed towards the plaintiff (Man B), the rest of the paragraph is addressed to the whole community for its own failure in allowing this to happen in the first place."[165] Just as in 5:1, now in 6:1, Paul never mentions any names of either the plaintiff or the defendant. He never mentions any specific legal issue, only the case of one pertaining to a generic issue, a πρᾶγμα. Paul does speak with a measure of authority, and he does begin with shame. He comes out swinging, as it were, when he begins this section with *dare you*.[166] Thiselton writes, "The very first word, τολμᾷ, identifies another anomaly which causes Paul to experience a further sense of outrage and disappointment, introduced here by means of a rhetorical question. The question carries the force of an exclamatory expression of censure: *How dare you*"![167] While not quite as strong as Paul's shame of 5:1, he employs three stages of shame in 6:1 as he introduces the problem:

> *Dare any of you,*
>
> *Having a grievance*
>
> *Take it before the unjust for judgment / Instead of before the saints.*

The first stage of shame is seen in the manner with which Paul begins this section, specifically by using τολμάω, and by putting the verb first in the sentence. The second stage of shame is seen in the manner with which Paul describes the issue they are going to court over, he minimizes it as he describes it as a πρᾶγμα (*a simple deed*). In the third stage of shame Paul draws a sharp contrast between the outsiders, to whom they are taking the πρᾶγμα, and the insiders.[168] The outsiders are *the unrighteous* (ἄδικος) while the insiders are *the holy ones* (ἅγιος). Addressing the Corinthians as both their father

---

164. Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 35.

165. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 232.

166. "The opening salvo of Question 1 reveals both the nature of the problem and the depth of Paul's feelings about it. He is simply horrified by what he has heard. This is indicated by the very way the question is asked (especially the presence of the verb first, which is difficult to put into good English): "Dare anyone, having a case against another, take it for judgment before the ungodly and not before the saints?" The gall of such a man!" Fee, *First Corinthians*, 231.

167. Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 423.

168. For a discussion of community and boundaries, see Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, 86–110.

(4:15) and the apostle of Jesus, he is shocked that they would dare to do such a thing. There is a strong sense that they have overstepped their boundaries, and now their father/apostle is rebuking them for their inappropriate conduct.

The source of Paul's incredulity in this matter is intensified as he identifies who the Corinthians have selected as judges, (ἄδικος), for judgment. Winter has made a compelling argument by referencing the epigraphic and papyrological evidence of the injustices perpetrated by judges and juries, and this validates Paul's criticism that the judges were unjust.[169] In fact, the evidence suggests that everybody knew that the civil law courts were corrupt. As previously noted, Cicero writes that the three main problems in civil litigation were *gratia*, *potentia*, and *pecunia* (i.e. *favor*, *power*, and *money*). Rosner argues that Paul's statements reflect the prevalent thought among Jews in Paul's time and that this thought was shaped by Exodus 18 and Deuteronomy (and related passages),[170]

> In any place where you find heathen law courts, even though their law is the same as Israelite law, you must not resort to them since it says, "these are the judgments which you shall bring them," that is to say, 'before them' and not before the heathen.[171]

By contrasting ἄδικος with ἅγιος Paul shames the wealthy who were using the law courts, not as a means of addressing legitimate legal issues, but as a means of taking advantage of the less powerful. There may be a subtle shaming in this verse. The elites who gained high status and honor through unjust means, were in fact unjust.

4.3.4   Argument from Tradition, Part I, 6:2–4

In v. 2 Paul asks the Corinthians two questions. *Do you not know that the saints will judge the world?* And *if the world is to be judged by you, are you incompetent to try trivial cases*? Barrett describes Paul's use of two questions as a simple *a majori ad minus* argument (*the major to the lesser*).[172] Concerning the first question, Rosner suggests that Paul's reference to the saints judging the world is based on thoughts "expressed in Daniel 7:22, developed by post-Biblical Jewish writings."[173] Conzelmann suggest that "Paul is referring back to one of the primitive Christian catechisms."[174] Fee suggests that "the first eschatological presupposition (Q2[1]) picks up a common motif

---

169. Winter, "Civil Litigation," 562–64.
170. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics*, 103.
171. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics*, 96.
172. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 136.
173. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics*, 111.
174. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 104.

from Jewish apocalyptic eschatology."[175] Kistemaker is confident that Paul was well acquainted with the intertestamental literature which speaks of the saints judging and ruling the nations and peoples of the world (*Wis* 3:8).[176]

However, we can be less confident concerning what the Corinthians knew of such views. Perhaps we may speculate that Crispus, as the synagogue ruler (Acts 18:8) and a member of the congregation in Corinth (1 Cor. 1:14), may have known of this teaching. Thiselton goes further and argues that the Corinthians did in fact hold the view that they would judge the world. In fact, Thiselton reconstructs the Corinthians' view of judging the world,

> Some of the Corinthians might still hold a more naïve, individualist, self-congratulatory view of their role at the last judgment. If so, Paul's argument would retain its full force logically if served as a strictly *ad hominem* argument, with the sense: "You think you are worthy (ἄξιοι) to judge the Roman Gentiles on the last day, do you? So why are you not competent or worthy (ἀνάξιοι) to arbitrate concerning some **very little**, every day matter.[177]

Both of the questions expect a yes answer, and both are used to advance Paul's argument that the saints are competent to judge trivial cases. Six times in this chapter Paul uses the phrase οὐκ οἴδατε (*do you not know?*)[178] and in each occurrence Paul is referring to moral issues and the end of time. With these two questions Paul uses an enthymeme which argues from the greater (*judgment of the world*) to the lesser (*judgment of trivial cases*).[179]

In v. 3 Paul now expands his argument of v. 2. Once again he uses an enthymeme but now the contrast is even greater than that in v. 2. Concerning Paul's question in v. 3, *Do you not know that we are to judge angels*,[180] Rosner notes, "the

---

[175.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 232.

[176.] Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 179.

[177.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 427.

[178.] 1 Cor 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19. Paul uses this expression in 3:16; 5:6; 9:13, 24.

[179.] Anderson provides a succinct definition of the enthymeme, "The ἐνθύμνμα is thus a deductive process of reasoning, a version of the three step syllogism (major premise, minor premise, conclusion). Παράδειγμα and ἐνθύμημα are the two kings of logical proofs (available to the orator. The rhetorical ἐνθύμημα, however, is not συλλογισμός in the technical sense. An orator never spells out a formal syllogism, but the elements should be present or at least clearly implied." He also notes, "The standard definition of an ἐνθύμημα in rhetorical theory remained what it had already been before Aristotle, namely, a short argument or consideration based on contraries." R. Dean Jr. Anderson, *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms* [Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2000], 45, 47. However, Aune argues that Anderson's definition is an "exaggeration." Aune goes on to argue against defining the enthymeme as a simple "truncated syllogism." Aune, *Westminster Dictionary of Literature & Rhetoric*, 150–7.

[180.] For a discussion on various interpretations of this question, see Thiselton, *First*

question of a source for the notion of judging angels is less clear since no extant antecedent text contains the thought." Rosner goes on to suggest that this question is "simply an extension from verse 2, 'the world' including not only mankind on earth but heavenly beings."[181] While the precise background of the saying may be hard to establish, Paul cites both enthymemes in order to establish the premise that the saints are well qualified to judge trivial matters, or *things of this life*.

In v. 2, Paul introduces the first part of the first enthymeme with the third person plural κρινοῦσιν. Then he introduces the second part of his first enthymeme with a second person plural (ἐστε). In v. 3 Paul introduces the first part of his second enthymeme with a first person plural (κρινοῦμεν). This movement from *they*, to *you*, to *we* moves Paul from outside the argument and makes himself an integral part of it. Paul inserts himself into the argument and by so doing he again heightens his challenge to his opponents, and he endears himself to those who are being taken to court and swindled by the well-connected. This serves as a preemptive strike against those who might argue that the saints—especially those of the lower status groups—are not qualified to act as judges in civil legal cases between members. While there is no direct reference to shame, there are quite strong allusions of shame in Paul's opening statements. By contrasting the unjust with the saints in v. 1 and by using a reference to that judgment of the world by the saints in v. 2 Paul reveals the core problem and he has taken away any defense. Thus, Paul's argument may be paraphrased, *How dare you take the matter before the unjust, when the saints are more than competent to judge these matters*.

In v. 4 we read Paul's first instruction on the issue of addressing legal issues between the members in Corinth; and it is radical. There is a direct verbal link between v. 3 and v. 4. The work βιωτικός, rendered *ordinary matters* by the NRSV, is the very first word in v. 4.[182] As previously noted those who were appointed to positions of judging were *the powerful*, *the wise*, and *the well-born* of Corinth. Now Paul reverses this system and suggests that the *despised* (ἐξουθενέω) saint is more qualified to judge than the unjust. This contrast between the unjust and the saint is intensified by Paul as he uses the participle form of the verb ἐξουθενέω to describe the saints whom the Corinthians should appoint as judges. This is the same word that Paul used in 1:28. In

Corinthians, 430–31.

181. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics*, 111–12.

182. Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 133.

1:28 ἐξουθενέω is used as a direct contrast to the σοφοὶ κατὰ σάρκα, δυνατοί, εὐγενεῖς (*wise according to the flesh, powerful, well-born*) of 1:26. In fact, ἐξουθενέω is most probably used by Paul in 1:28 as a direct contrast to εὐγενής in 1:26.[183] It is not hard to imagine that Paul continues this contrast in this section dealing with the law courts. In 1:28 Paul argued that God chooses the lowly things of the world and the despised things of the world. Now, in 6:4 Paul appears to be working from this theme but he expands God's choosing to include the Corinthians as judges. In 6:2 Paul argues that God chose the despised to judge the world. In v. 3 Paul argues that God chose the despised to judge angels. Now, in v. 4, Paul is calling the Corinthians to continue this process and to appoint *the despised* as judges.

The second part of v. 4 (οὓς ἐξουθενημένους ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, τούτους καθίζετε) has given rise to three various interpretations. First, the NRSV, REB, NJB, and the NASB translate it as an interrogative, *you appoint as judges those who have no standing in the church*? (NASB) This view is supported by Barrett,[184] Fee,[185] and Collins.[186] Second, the NIV, AV, and the KJV translate it as an imperatival, *appoint as judges even men of little account in the church!* (NIV) This is supported by Kistemaker,[187] Clarke,[188] Garland,[189] and Derrett.[190] Third, Moffatt[191] and the NJB translated it as an indicative exclamatory, *you bring them before those who are of no account in the Church!* (NJB).[192] However, it would appear that F. F. Bruce is correct when he suggests that the issue is too finely balanced to invite a conclusion.[193]

By using ἐξουθενέω (*despised*) Paul is again using the rhetoric of shame. While it may be suggested that it is a sarcastic use of shame, it is shame none the less. In fact,

---

[183] In Cor 1:27 Paul uses μωρός and contrasts it to σοφος of 1:26, and Paul uses ἀσθενής and contrasts it to δυνατος of 1:26. In 1:28, Paul uses ἀγενής (*base, inferior*) and ἐξουθενέω (*contemptible, despised*), and while he does not use the word in 1:28, it is strongly implied.

[184] Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 137.

[185] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 236.

[186] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 232.

[187] Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 181–82.

[188] Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 71.

[189] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 194.

[190] J. Duncan M. Derrett, "Judgement and 1 Corinthians 6," *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 29.

[191] Moffatt, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, 63.

[192] For a more detailed discussion on this issue, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 432–33; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 204–7.

[193] Bruce, *1 and 2 Corinthians*, 60.

the opening statement of v. 5, πρὸς ἐντροπὴν ὑμῖν λέγω (*I say this to shame you*), may well be better understood as a transitional phrase that concludes Paul's opening statements of vv. 1–4 and begins his next stage of his argument pertaining to the abuses in the law courts. In fact, just as v. 4 is a sarcastic use of shame, v. 5 also appears to be a sarcastic use of shame. By the combination of ἐξουθενέω in v. 4 and ἐντροπή in v. 5 Paul severely rebukes the Corinthians for their abusive practices in the law courts, and shame is the very foundation of his rebuke.

4.3.5   An Argument from Experience, Part I, 6:5–6

With vv. 5–6 Paul moves to an argument from experience, with the familial motif being a central theme.[194] The NRV mistranslates the genitive of ἀδελφός as *believers* instead of *brothers,* and this mistranslation is unfortunate as Paul uses ἀδελφός to introduce a new element to his rhetoric. Paul uses ἀδελφός in v. 5, he uses ἀδελφός twice in v. 6, and ἀδελφός in v. 8. Paul's shaming now takes on a new level as he rewrites the relationships in the Corinthian congregation along familial lines. While Paul has previously used ἀδελφός at strategic points in his argument[195] what is new in chapter 6 is the intensity of Paul's familial references. Paul's use of shame and the familial relationship is intended to completely shatter the patron-client relationship, which has no small connection to the abuses occurring in the law courts. While it may be typical for patrons to use the law courts to take advantage of the weak and unprotected, this is not the type of behavior that should occur within families. In fact, Aasgaard writes, "Statistically such lawsuits appear to have formed the majority, even though it was regarded very shameful when family conflicts were brought into public, or even to the courts."[196]

As in v. 1, Paul in v. 5 again addresses the issue with a sense of incredulity and shame. In fact, Paul bluntly states that his intent is to shame (ἐντροπή) them, and then

---

[194.] As previously noted, Paul's use of familial language does not mean equality. Clarke, "Equality or Mutuality," 163–64.
[195.] 1 Cor 1:1, 10, 11, 26; 2:1; 3:1; 4:6, and 5:1. It is interesting to note that in all but the first occurrences of the familial references in chapters 1–4 the context is that of Paul's relationship to the Corinthian as his brothers. While in the familial references in chapters 5–6, the context is that of the relationships within the Corinthian congregation.
[196.] Aasgaard, *Brothers and Sisters*, 235.

he asks a question that shames them. Oster,[197] Barrett,[198] and Johnson[199] suggest that the reference to shame points back to vv. 2–4. Thiselton suggests that Paul's shame refers back to vv. 1–4, and he outlines three specific ways Paul does so,

> (i) ranking grasping attitude above the welfare of the church; (ii) resorting to a potentially corrupt use of patronage to serve the interests of the self at the expense of the community; and (iii) thereby deepening damaging splits within the community.[200]

However, Winter suggests that the reference to shame may refer to both vv. 2–4 and the following question of v. 5.[201] This incredulity is paired to sarcasm by Paul's use of σοφός. Paul has made reference to σοφός ten times thus far in this epistle.[202] In the ten previous occurrences all are negative and are part of Paul's conflict with the patrons in Corinth. The patrons claim to be wise but now Paul uses this claim against them. To restate Paul's argument we might suggest, *If you are so wise, which you have claimed to be, how is it that now, when you need a wise man, you can't find one.* Thus, Paul's question in v. 5 is an ironic taunt.[203]

In v. 5 Paul shames the Corinthians, and that with a strong edge of sarcasm, for their lack of wisdom and inability to judge a dispute between brothers. Now, in v. 6,[204] Paul again intensifies his shaming of the Corinthians in two steps. First, by applying the result of not having any wise among them, namely that now a brother is going to court against another brother. Second, Paul uses a question to restate his sense of incredulity at their behavior and to expand the familial theme he introduced in v. 5.[205] Paul

---

[197.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 133.

[198.] Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 137–38.

[199.] Johnson, *1 Corinthians*, 95.

[200.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 434.

[201.] "The sentence following is a rhetorical question concerning one 'wise' person who could arbitrate, as he has noted that there were such in the congregation (3:18ff.). If the reference was to the previous verse, as it would seem (6:4), then Paul was shaming them for allowing the secular and unjust judges of Corinth to arbitrate on a case that was, in effect, a legal pretext by one Christian to humiliate another in a power struggle." Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 73.

[202.] 1 Cor. 1:19, 20, 25, 26, 27; 3:10, 18x2, 19, 20; 6:5.

[203.] Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 208.

[204.] While the NIV translates v. 6 as an exclamation, both the NAU (*but brother goes to law with brother, and that before unbelievers?*) and the NRV (*but a believer goes to court against a believer-- and before unbelievers at that?*) translates v. 6 as a question. The NRV also translates the double use of ἀδελφος in v. 6 as *believer*. This would indicate that the NRV translators take Paul's uses of ἀπίστων at the end of the verse to be used in contrast to the faith of the Christians.

[205.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 234.

continues to intensify his shaming of the Corinthians by describing the judges as ἄπιστος. With the use of ἄπιστος Paul may well be using ambiguity. Paul may be using ἄπιστος as a contrast to the family of faith, *a believing brother takes another believing brother to court, and this in front of unbelievers*. Or, Paul may be using ἄπιστος as a synonym of ἄδικος in v. 1, *brother goes to law against another-- and this in front of untrustworthy judges*. Or Paul may be using ἀπίστων both ways, *a believing brother takes another believing brother to court, and this in front of untrustworthy judges*. The overall effect of Paul's use of ἄπιστος and its undoubted connection to ἄδικος of v. 1 is that of a strong sense of shaming. Concerning Paul's use of questions in vv. 1–6 Sampley makes the insightful observation,

> Paul's rapid-fire questions have the ring of a courtroom. Form follows function. The questions have the effect of placing the auditors, with their fascination with courts, on the witness stand; Paul adopts the stance of one who with leading questions exposes what he takes to be the shameful conduct of the Corinthian believers.[206]

4.3.6 Second Statement of the Problem, 6:7a

In v. 7, Paul introduces the second statement of the problem and he does so with a stinging rebuke.[207] Paul, no doubt, is shaming the Corinthians, yet the shame and the rebuke are not quite as strong as the one of the first statement of the problem in v. 1. As Paul restates the core problem surrounding the law courts, he does so in a manner that is quite startling when compared to his argument in vv. 1–6. Paul now moves away from asking quick interrelated questions on judging. Instead, Paul lays down a radical new principle which involves a major reversal of shame and honor principles.[208] Stephen Chester suggests that Paul is concerned about members shaming one another.[209] Clarke suggests that status, honor, and shame were central to litigation, "It has been suggested that it was men of relatively high social standing who were entering into vexatious

---

[206] Sampley, *First Corinthians*, 854.

[207] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 208.

[208] Kloppenborg, commenting on association rules from Ptolomic and Roman Egypt, states "The context of these rules suggests that the prohibition of members using the courts, . . . has to do with, . . the concern to contain the rivalry and competition for honor and status that was typical of life in the circum Mediterranean world. . . . Taking a fellow member to court belonged on a spectrum of agonistic behavior that also included challenge to the integrity of another's household, attempts to assume his place at a banquet, and physical insults." J. S. Kloppenborg, "Egalitarianism in the Myth and Rhetoric of Pauline Churches," in *Reimaging Christian Origins* (ed. E. A. Castelli and H. Taussig; Valley Forge: Trinity, 1996), 257–58.

[209] Stephen J. Chester, *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 254.

litigation, and that may well have been undertaken in order to protect reputation and status."[210] Thus, to lose (ἥττημα *defeat*)[211] a legal case would result in a loss of honor, and inversely, to win a case would have resulted in gaining a measure of honor.

Paul moves his argument from the verdict that would be announced at the end of the law court to the very beginning of the process. While the litigious Christians were looking towards the end of a case as a means of gaining honor and shaming their enemies, Paul argues that the very process of beginning a case results in a loss of honor. Paul structures his argument to focus not on the gaining of honor but on the loss of honor, that is shame. He does so by using ἥττημα, a word used of legal defeat and the shame resulting from that defeat. ἥττημα is now used of Christians beginning a civil legal dispute against a brother. Thus, the very process of using the law courts, which those in power used as a means of gaining honor and status, has now become a source of shame.

Having laid down this radical principle and introducing a plea that is based on a reversal of honor and shame. Paul intensifies it by using two questions.

Why not rather be wronged? (ἀδικέω)
Why not rather be defrauded? (ἀποστερέω)

Both of these questions are stated in the passive voice. To be wronged or cheated would normally have been considered a matter of great shame for a powerful patron. The rules and standards of society would strongly encourage him to address his being wronged and defrauded by taking the offender to the courts. One of the principle ways he would have reclaimed his honor would have been through a favorable ruling in the court. Yet, now Paul is suggesting that they should allow themselves to be wronged and defrauded; he is asking that they allow themselves to be shamed. However, allowing them to be shamed in this manner would prevent an even greater shame, that is, the taking of a brother to court before the ἄπιστος and the ἄδικος judges.

Horsley notes, "that the wise person would rather be wronged than do wrong had been a standard point in ancient philosophy since Plato's portrayal of Socrates in the *Apology*."[212] Conzelmann argues that these questions can be compared with the generic Greek slogan, "better to suffer wrong than to do wrong."[213] Collins suggests

---

[210.] Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 71.
[211.] Christian Wolff, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther* (Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996), 116, n. 127; cf. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 240, n. 8.
[212.] Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 86.
[213.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 106.

they indicate a Pauline adaptation of a Stoic and/or a Cynic discourse in which a lesser wrong is to be preferred over a greater wrong.[214] In contrast, Fee suggests these questions are "a direct reflection of the teaching and example of Jesus."[216] Rosner suggests Paul's approach here is influenced both by Jesus and early Judaism, Jesus' teaching "stands solidly in a tradition of non-retaliatory ethics of early Judaism."[217] No doubt Paul's argument is based on the teaching and example of Jesus, but the wording of Paul's two questions (ἀδικέω and ἀποστερέω) serve to set up a major twist in Paul's argument in the next verse. This is especially true of ἀδικέω, "the word ἄδικος which was applied in v. 1 to outsiders, is now turned against the Christians."[218]

4.3.7 *An Argument from Tradition, Part II, 6:7b–10*

There are two views concerning Paul's accusing statement in v. 8, *But you yourselves wrong and defraud*. The first view suggests that Paul's statements indicate that the very act of going to court against one's brother is a moral failure. Kistemaker,[219] Barrett,[220] Soards,[221] Richard Hays,[222] Leon Morris,[223] David Prior,[224] Derrett,[225] Robert Taylor,[226] Witherington,[227] and Chester[228] view v. 8 in this manner. Conzelmann notes,

> The expression is aggressive. ἀδικεῖτε καὶ ἀποστερεῖτε, "you do wrong and rob," does not mean that they have become criminals in the legal sense. The conditions in question are already fulfilled, in the light of the standard indicated in v 7, by the very act of going to law.[229]

The second view suggests that Paul's statements indicate "that not only are the believers seeking redress from wrong in the courts rather than letting themselves be

---

[214.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 235.
[215.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 228.
[216.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 241.
[217.] Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics*, 116.
[218.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 105.
[219.] Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 186.
[220.] Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 139–40.
[221.] Soards, *1 Corinthians*, 123–24.
[222.] Hays, *First Corinthians*, 95–96.
[223.] Leon Morris, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians* (Revised; Tyndale New Testament Commentaries; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 96.
[224.] Prior, *The Message of 1 Corinthians*, 112.
[225.] Derrett, "Judgement and 1 Corinthians 6," 31.
[226.] Robert D. Taylor, "Towards a Biblical Theology of Litigation: A Law Professor Looks at 1 Cor. 6:1–11," *Ex Auditu* 2 (1986): 105–15.
[227.] Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 166.
[228.] Chester, *Conversion at Corinth*, 255.
[229.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 106.

wronged and cheated, but they were inflicting wrong and cheating on one another."[230] Fee,[231] Jean Héring,[232] Collins,[233] Garland,[234] Thiselton,[235] Mitchell,[236] Orr and Walters,[237] and Oster[238] view v. 8 in this manner. Based on the premise that 6:1–11 pertains to patronal abuses in the Corinthian congregation, Paul's continued use of the ἀδικέω/ἄδικος language through this section and the vices pertaining to property which are included in the vice list of vv. 9–10, it would appear that the powerful of the congregation were indeed inflicting wrong and defrauding the weaker members of the congregation.

In v. 8a (*But you yourselves wrong and defraud*), Paul drops a bombshell for the expression is indeed aggressive. As Oster notes, "the two passive ideas of 'be wronged' and 'be cheated' in 6:7 are now turned into active accusations in 6:8."[239] At the very end of his familial argument, he shares devastating information with the Corinthians. He reveals to them that he knows that the real abuse in Corinth is they were using the courts, not to address a legitimate grievance, but rather as a means to wrong (ἀδικέω) and defraud (ἀποστερέω).[240]

The interplay between v. 7 and v. 8 is that of arguing from the lesser to the greater. In v. 7 Paul has appealed to the Corinthians not to go to courts but, rather, to allow themselves to be wronged and defrauded as a way of preventing great shame. However, Paul's revelation in v. 8b exposes the greatest shame. For if it is a shameful thing for a Christian to take another Christian to court and have the matter adjudicated by ἄπιστος (*unbelieving*) and ἄδικος (*unjust*) judges, how much greater is the shame when a Christian takes another Christian to court and has the matter settled by ἄπιστος and ἄδικος judges and uses these same judges to wrong and defraud his Christian bother? This is not a situation where the judges do not know what is going on; they are

---

230. Johnson, *1 Corinthians*, 96.
231. Fee, *First Corinthians*, 241–42.
232. Jean Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians* (London: Epworth, 1962), 41.
233. Collins, *First Corinthians*, 235.
234. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 210.
235. Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 437–38.
236. Mitchell, "Rich and Poor," 579.
237. Orr and Walther, *1 Corinthians*, 197.
238. Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 135.
239. Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 135.
240. Johnson, *1 Corinthians*, 96.

an integral part of the fraudulent process. That is why Paul calls them ἄπιστος and ἄδικος.

First Corinthians 6:6 and 6:8 end in a very similar manner:

καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ ἀπίστων (*and before unbelievers at that?*)
καὶ τοῦτο ἀδελφούς (*and brothers at that?*)

By using this structure, Paul punctuates his argument with a deep sense of incredulity. Paul turns the knife of shame by ending his argument with the phrase καὶ τοῦτο ἀδελφούς. If we were to restate Paul's rhetoric of shame, it might read, *Shame on you that you would use the courts as a means to wrong and defraud people, and that before ἄπιστος and ἄδικος. Double shame on you that you would do this to your own brother.* Thus, it is no wonder that Paul begins this section with a sense of incredulity. But even with his incredulity, Paul slowly, patiently, and masterfully constructs a powerful argument that is built on shame. This section has both direct and indirect references to shame, but at the end of v. 8 Paul reaches what may be described as his *crescendo of shame* as he accuses the powerful of failing to act like the wise ones they claim to be.[241]

In vv. 9–10 Paul continues the ἀδικέω/ἄδικος motif but now he expands it as he adds a vice list.[242] Ernest Evans[243] and Collins[244] suggest that Paul's rhetorical question, ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε,[245] implies that the Corinthians know what Paul is talking about; presumably because Paul has already instructed them on this matter. Thus, by using this formula Paul is removing any possible defense based on ignorance, and it may contain an element of shame. Paul highlights the consequences of continuing in their wicked (ἄδικος) behavior, *they will not inherit the kingdom of God*. In v. 8 Paul accuses them of *cheating* their brothers, and he uses ἀδικέω. Now, he plainly states that the ἄδικος will not inherit. But in using ἀδικέω in v. 8 there can be no doubt whom Paul is referring to in v. 9. However, this connection between v. 8 and v. 9 is often missed in English translations. Oster notes, "It is unfortunate that virtually no English translation

---

[241.] "Thus, Paul's rhetorical move in verses 7–8 implicitly accuses the Corinthians one more time of failing to act like true *sophoi*; once again we see him turning their own philosophical categories against them, beating them at their own game." Hays, *First Corinthians*, 96.

[242.] For a description of the uses of virtue and vice lists and a representative sample, see Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 138–41.

[243.] Ernest Evans, *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1930), 87.

[244.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 235.

[245.] On Paul's use of the phrase, *do you not know*, see Hurd, *The Origins of 1 Corinthians*, 85–86.

maintains the verbal linkage between 6:8 and 6:9 that is so evident in the Greek text."[246] No doubt, to be disinherited is to be shamed, and it may be a subtle continuation of the familial motif began in v. 6, and which features so strongly in vv. 6–8. Paul has rebuked the patrons for mistreating their brothers in the courts. Now Paul outlines the consequences of mistreating family members, namely that they will be cast out of the family and lose their inheritance.[247]

Not only does the inheritance metaphor play off the family motif of vv. 1–8, it may play off the words Paul has used to describe the civil case, κριτηρίων ἐλαχίστων (*trivial case*) in v. 2, and βιωτικός (*ordinary*) in v. 3. Various scholars have suggested that the case involved some aspect of financial or mercantile matter.[248]

Working from the premise that the phrase ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε implies that the Corinthians knew what Paul is talking about, presumably because Paul has already instructed them on this matter, it may well be that these ten vices are not new to the Corinthians. However, what is striking about these ten vices is that the last five may be very closely connected to the abuses in the law courts. The terms κλέπτης (*thief*) and πλεονέκτης (*greedy*) would certainly be easy to see as part of the motive behind using the law courts to *wrong* and *defraud* others. The word μέθυσος (*drunkard*) is often used in connection with other vices, but closely connected to λοίδορος, (*slanderer*).[249] Again, it is easy to imagine slander being part of the abuses occurring in the Corinthian law courts. Paul's final vice is ἅρπαξ (*swindler*), and this is exactly what is wrong with the Corinthian law courts. They were used by the powerful (who are *thieves*, *greedy*, *drunkards*, and *slanderers*) who swindle the poor and weak.

This aspect of Paul's use of the vice list has apparently suffered a lacuna in scholarship, perhaps this may be due to an overemphasis on the terms dealing with

---

[246.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 136.

[247.] Kistemaker is one of the few who point out the connection between disinheritance and taking a brother to court, yet this connection is made in passing and is not developed. Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 188.

[248.] Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 125; Fiorenza, "1 Corinthians," 1175; Clarke, *Leadership in Corinth*, 71. Hays writes, "While they jostle each other for economic status and advantage, the Corinthians wrong and defraud, acting just like unrighteous outsiders who will ultimately incur the much greater loss of not "inheriting" God's kingdom. . . . Here, it (the inheritance metaphor) makes a subtle point about the particular problem of lawsuits in the Corinthian church: By grasping for material advantage now, the Corinthians are jeopardizing their far greater reward in the coming age." Hays, *First Corinthians*, 96.

[249.] "μέθυσος" BAGD 626; "drunkard with those addicted to other vices, but closely connected with λοίδορος, 1 Cor 5:11; 6:10."

homosexuality, namely μαλακός (*male prostitutes*) and ἀρσενοκοίτης (*sodomites*). This overemphasis is seen in both commentaries and in journals.[250] While Oster does a commendable job in his short commentary, he briefly mentions the vices (κλέπτης, πλεονέκτης, μέθυσος, λοίδορος, ἅρπαξ) connected to the defrauding. Instead he spends a relatively long time on μαλακός and ἀρσενοκοιτής.[251] Thiselton, in a detailed excursus in his commentary, continues to show a tremendous grasp of the scope of scholarship pertaining to 1 Corinthians, however, this excursus, titled *Vice Lists, Catechesis, and the Homosexual Debate (6:9–10)*, spends ten pages examining in great detail μαλακός and ἀρσενοκοίτης and yet he fails to discuss κλέπτης, πλεονέκτης, μέθυσος, λοίδορος, ἅρπαξ.[252]

In vv. 1–8, Paul waits until the very end of this argument to accuse them of ἀλλὰ ὑμεῖς ἀδικεῖτε καὶ ἀποστερεῖτε (*you yourselves wrong and defraud*), and by so doing, he makes a dramatic closing. In vv. 9–10 as Paul expands their ἀδικεῖτε καὶ ἀποστερει he follows a similar rhetorical strategy to the one he used in vv. 1–8. He begins v. 9 by using ἄδικος which not only connects vv. 1–8 to vv. 9–10, but it also sustains the tension created in v. 8. Paul brings his argument of vv. 9–10 to a dramatic close by accusing the Corinthians of being ἅρπαξ (*swindlers*).

Verses 9–10 contain both an explanation of the consequences of ἀδικέω (*unjust*) and ἀποστερέω (*defraud*) (*these will not inherit the kingdom of God*) and a full description of the ἀδικέω and ἀποστερέω. Thus, while Paul reaches a crescendo of shame in v. 8 by revealing that the powerful patrons are in fact unjust defrauders, now, in vv. 9–10 Paul holds the note of shame for an extended period of time as he develops his ten-vice list and climaxes with swindlers. Paul warns them twice that they will lose

---

[250.] The following focus on homosexuality, K. E. Bailey, "Paul's Theological Foundations for Human Sexuality: 1 Cor. 6:9–20 in the Light of Rhetorical Criticism," *Near Eastern School of Theology Theological Review* 3 (1980): 27–41; R. C. Devor, "Homosexuality and St. Paul," *Pastoral Psychology* 23 (1972): 50–58; David E. Malick, "The Condemnation of Homosexuality in 1 Corinthians 6:9," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (1993): 479–92; W. L. Peterson, "Can ἀρσενοκοῖται be Translated by 'Homosexuals'? (1 Cor 6:9, 1 Tim 1:10)," *Vigiliae Christianae* 40 (1986): 187–91; Richardson, "Judgement"; P. M. Ukleja, "Homosexuality in the NT," *Bibliotheca Sacra* 140 (1983): 350–58; David F. Wright, "Homosexuality: The Relevance of the Bible," *Evangelical Quarterly* 61 (1989): 291–300; David F. Wright, "Homosexuals or Prostitutes? The Meaning of ἀρσενοκοῖται (1 Cor 6:9, 1 Tim 1:10)," *Vigiliae Christianae* 38 (1984): 125–53; David F. Wright, "Translating ἀρσενοκοῖται (1 Cor 6:9; 1 Tim 1:10)," *Vigiliae Christianae* 41 (1987): 396–98; Peter S. Zaas, "Was Homosexuality Condoned in the Corinthian Church?" *SBL Seminar Papers* 19 (1980): 205–12.

[251.] Oster spends close to three full pages on μαλακοὶ and ἀρσενοκοῖται. Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 136–39.

[252.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 438–53.

their inheritance; he rebukes them for being lead astray, and then he uses a list of ten vices, five of which can be directly tied to their defrauding of their brothers.

4.3.8   Conclusion: An Argument From Experience, Part II, 6:11

In vv. 1–10 Paul has severely shamed the patrons for their abuse of their brothers in the law courts. Now, in v. 11, Paul moves in a different direction. The language in v. 11 takes on a tone of honor; the honor Jesus has bestowed on the Corinthians. Yet, Paul keeps an element of shame in this argument when he begins by saying *And that is what some of you were.*[253] This is a reference to the list of ten vices in vv. 9–10. However, this shame is used to contrast their former way of life and the power of their new patron, Jesus. This shame reminder is used to offer them hope and a challenge. Jesus changed your shame to honor before, it is time to embrace Jesus' honor.[254]

To emphasize the change of life and the power of Jesus their super-patron, Paul uses the aorist middle verb ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε (*but you were washed*) and two aorist passive verbs ἀλλὰ ἡγιάσθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε,(*you were sanctified, you were justified*). The use of the compound verb ἀπολούω (*washed off*) stresses the removal of dirt.[255] Oster, "the true sensationalism of 6:11 is found in the threefold use of the strong adversative word 'but' (ἀλλά *alla*) to introduce each of the three aorist verbs."[256] Paul's use of ἀπολούω in the middle voice may indicate "that while this washing was not their own act, it did not take place without an act of their own."[257] Their *washing*, *sanctification*, and *justification* are three ways in which they have been honored, and this honoring is tied to the name of Jesus, their Lord, and the Spirit of God.

Their shame (καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε *and such were some of you*) has been washed away by the name of Jesus and the Spirit of God. However, Paul's rhetorical purpose is that they should renounce the ways of shame, and especially the swindling law courts. So he moves beyond the washing away of shame and moves to their sanctification. This

---

[253.] "Paul continues to poke holes in the Corinthians' pride by reminding them that before their conversion some of them were guilty of these very sins that would exclude them from the kingdom of God." Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 215.

[254.] "The phrase (*in the name of the Lord*) serves a fundamental community definition function; it asks the believers gathered in Christ's name to be reflective about their identity, founded in their baptism, and how they ought to live in order more fully to honor Christ's Lordship." Sampley, *First Corinthians*, 856.

[255.] Paul Beasley-Murray, "ἀπολούω," *NIDNTT* 1:150–53.

[256.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 140.

[257.] Thomas C. Edwards, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians* (2nd ed.; London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1885), 144.

washing and sanctification has a strong shame-honor contrast. Their shame has been washed away and they have been honored by being made saints, selected for a new holy life. In v. 1, at the beginning of this argument, Paul rebuked the patrons for bringing their legal cases before the unjust and not before the saints. Now he begins to tie the end of his argument with the beginning. The saints are uniquely qualified to settle these legal matters because they will judge the world according to v. 2 and they will judge the angels according to v. 3. However, it is Jesus who has made them saints. Thus, to bring legal matters before the ἄδικος instead of the ἄγιος is to shame Jesus, the one who removed their shame. Conversely, to bring legal matters before the saints is to honor Jesus.

Not only were they washed and sanctified in the name of Jesus, the super-patron, they were *justified*. They have received a three-stage honoring in Jesus, and the last and greatest honor was being justified. What they have received in Jesus is now used by Paul as the greatest contrast with their shameful (ἄδικος/ἀδικέω) behavior.

4.4   "All Things Are Permissible," 1 Corinthians 6:12–20

4.4.1   Introduction

Rosner is surely correct when he states, "1 Cor. 6:12–20 is widely acknowledged to be one of the most difficult passages in the Pauline corpus."[258] B. N. Fisk notes that "scholars continue to puzzle over the meaning and rhetoric function of 1 Corinthians 6.12–20."[259] In attempting to reconstruct the *Sitz-im-Leben* of 1 Cor 6:12–20, scholars have arrived at somewhat of a consensus that a core issue in this section is that of πορνεία. Malina and Pilch suggest that this section returns to the theme of incest as discussed in chapter 5.[260] Barrett contends that Paul is returning to the theme of "sexual license" which he introduced in chapter 5.[261] Collins writes, "The issue of sexual misconduct is the rhetorical *stasis* of the passage."[262]

[258.] Brian S. Rosner, "Temple Prostitution in 1 Corinthians 6:12–20," *Novum Testamentum* 40 (1998): 336.

[259.] B. N. Fisk, "πορνεύειν As Body Violation: The Unique Nature of Sexual sin in 1 Corinthians 6:18," *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 540.

[260.] Malina and Pilch, *The Letters of Paul*, 83–85.

[261.] Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 144.

[262.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 239.

While πορνεία is a central theme of this section, the precise nature of the
πορνεία needs to be examined. In the Greek culture of that day, prostitution and
fornication were considered permissible activities.[263] Horace tells of when the venerable
Roman leader Cato was supposed to have congratulated a young man he saw departing
from a brothel. "When your sexual passions are strong," he told the young man, "it is
better to have sex with a prostitute than another man's wife." (*Sat.* 1.2.28–36.).
Athenaeus, a writer in the second century C.E., quoting from a speech of Demosthenes,
writes,

> We have mistresses for pleasure, concubines for daily concubinage, but wives
> we have in order to produce children legitimately and to have a trustworthy
> guardian of our domestic property. (*Deipn.* 13.573b)

Broadly speaking, there are three main views suggested as to the specific nature
of the πορνεία which was occurring in Corinth. The first and most popular view is
described by Fee as he argues that some of the Corinthians were going to brothels.[264] In
fact, Fee, in his commentary, titles this section "On going to the prostitutes."[265] Timothy
Radcliffe,[266] Garland,[267] Conzelmann,[268] Oster,[269] Witherington,[270] Horsley,[271] Orr and
Walter,[272] Hays,[273] Kistemaker,[274] Sampley,[275] and Prior[276] hold the view that the
Corinthians were visiting prostitutes.

The second view is presented by Soards who agrees that prostitution is at the
core of the problem. However, he argues the possibility that it may have been connected
with cultic prostitution; "it may also be pertinent that at times sacred prostitution was

---

[263.] Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 197.

[264.] "Apparently some men within the Christian community are going to the prostitutes
and are arguing for the right to do so. Being people of the Spirit, they imply, has moved them to
a higher place, the realm of the spirit, where they are unaffected by behavior that has merely to
do with the body." Fee, *First Corinthians*, 250–51.

[265.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 249–66.

[266.] Timothy Radcliffe, "'Glorify God in Your Bodies': 1 Corinthians 6, 12–20 as a
Sexual Ethic," *New Blackfriars* 67 (1986): 310.

[267.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 219.

[268.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 108–12.

[269.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 142.

[270.] Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 164.

[271.] Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 89–94.

[272.] Orr and Walther, *1 Corinthians*, 203.

[273.] Hays, *First Corinthians*, 107.

[274.] Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 197.

[275.] Sampley, *First Corinthians*, 860–63.

[276.] Prior, *The Message of 1 Corinthians*, 101.

practiced as part of pagan worship, especially in fertility cults, although nonreligious prostitution was often common place in the ancient world."[277] This view is held by Rosner[278] and J. I. Miller.[279] Typically, the basis for this connection is the philological evidence that the Greek verb κορινθιάζεσθαι (*to be a Corinthian*) means to *fornicate* or to be *sexually immoral*.[280] Also connected with this view is Strabo's description of a thousand sacred prostitutes at the Corinthian temple of Aphrodite, (Strabo, *Geogr.* 8.6.20c). However, the temple described by Strabo was destroyed in the second century B.C.E. and the small Roman temple to Aphrodite on the Acrocorinth in Roman Corinth would have been too small for temple prostitution.[281]

The third view is that of Winter. He agrees that the background to 6:12–20 is closely connected to prostitution. However, he argues that the context is that of the elitist banquets and not brothels or temples.[282] Thus, while there appears to be widespread consensus among scholars that one of the central issues of 1 Cor 6:12-20 is that of Christian liaisons with prostitutes, there is disagreement over whether these liaisons were occurring in brothels, temples, or private homes. A textual rhetorical analysis of the text will attempt to identify the location where these immoral liaisons were occurring and point out why the location is important in reconstructing the *Sitz-im-Leben* and how the location is tied to Paul's argument.

Closely connected to reconstructing the *Sitz-im-Leben* of this section is the background of the slogans. Paul's citing of the Corinthians' maxim/slogan *All things are lawful for me* was once commonly cited as evidence of gnosticism, libertinism, and realized eschatology in the Corinthian congregation; these views have waned in recent

---

[277.] Soards, *1 Corinthians*, 129.

[278.] Rosner, "Temple Prostitution"; Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics*, 145.

[279.] J. I. Miller, "A Fresh Look at 1 Corinthians 6.16 f," *New Testament Studies* 27 (1980): 125–27.

[280.] The Greek author Aristophanes (c. 450–385 B.C.E.) created this verbal connection, Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 55.

[281.] Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 55–56.

[282.] "The elite who gave private banquets to which they invited clients as well as other guests provided not only for their physical hunger but also for their sexual appetites. It needs to be noted that 1 Corinthians 6:12–20 does not state that Christians actually went to brothels. They were having sexual intercourse with prostitutes in the context of the dinner. Winter ties the three slogans together and suggests they are connected to the *toga virilis and banquets.* He argues that the slogan *Everything is permissible for me* is a slogan used by those in power." (Every March 17 in the *Liberalis*, a ceremony during which adolescent boys symbolically became men by casting off their juvenile clothes, the clothes were replaced with the *toga virilis, the robes of men.*) Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 89.

years.[283] More recently, Paul's use of the maxim slogan is seen as evidence of Stoic-Cynic influence in Corinth.[284] Numerous others have drawn the connection between Paul's use of the Corinthians' maxim and Stoic-Cynic tendencies.[285]

4.4.2   Paul's Rhetoric in 6:12–20

There are three noticeable literary aspects of Paul's argument in 6:12–20. The first aspect is Paul's use of diatribe.[286] The second aspect is Paul's use of maxims/slogans. The third aspect is Paul's use of rhetorical questions. In fact, Paul's use of maxims/slogans and rhetorical questions provide both the structure and the movement in the diatribe.[287] Hays, on Paul's use of diatribe, notes,

> The argument is a little difficult to follow, because Paul here adopts the *diatribe* style, in which he constructs an imaginary dialogue between himself and his Corinthian hearers. To understand the line of argument we must reconstruct the different voices in this imaginary conversation.[288]

Hays' suggestion that *we must reconstruct the different voices* is good advice, but not as easy to accomplish as would initially appear. One difficulty in reconstructing the different voices is determining when Paul is citing a Corinthian slogan. There is widespread consensus that Paul does indeed cite two of the Corinthians' slogans. These slogans are *Everything is permissible for me* (v. 12 x2) and *Food for the stomach and the stomach for food* (v. 13). Brian Dodd is certainly in the minority when he rejects this consensus and goes as far as to suggest that there are no Corinthian slogans in v. 12. Rather, "6:12 may be understood as a typical use of Paul's paradigmatic 'I', congruent with his rhetorical strategy through 1 Corinthians."[289] Garland provides

---

[283.] On realized eschatology, see Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology," 515; on libertinism, see Héring, *First Corinthians*, 45; on gnosticism, see Rudolf Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament* (vol. 1; trans. Kendrick Grobel; Scribner, 1955), 341; Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 144.

[284.] "In light of the evidence we have already seen of Stoic-Cynic tendencies in the thinking of the Corinthian *sophoi*, we should understand that this slogan declares a philosophically-informed autonomy: The enlightened wise person is free do to anything he or she chooses." Hays, *First Corinthians*, 101.

[285.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 239; Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 90; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 108–10; Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 227–28.

[286.] Malina and Pilch, *The Letters of Paul*, 84.

[287.] For a description of the diatribe and example of its usage, see Malherbe, *Moral Exhortation*, 129–38.

[288.] Hays, *First Corinthians*, 101.

[289.] Brian J. Dodd, "Paul's Paradigmatic 'I' and 1 Corinthians 6.12," *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 59 (1995): 58.

convincing reasons for accepting the prevailing view that Paul does indeed cite a Corinthian slogan in v. 12.[290]

However, there is disagreement among scholars if Paul cites a third Corinthian slogan in v. 18 when he says *Every sin that a man commits is outside the body*.[291] Murphy-O'Connor provides a detailed overview of the discussion pertaining to whether v. 18 is a Corinthian slogan. He makes a convincing argument, primarily from the language used in vv. 13–14 and repeated in v. 18, that it is indeed a Corinthian slogan.[292] There appears to be growing support for viewing the phrase *Every sin that a man commits is outside the body* as a Corinthian slogan.[293]

Thus, taking v. 18 as a Corinthian slogan, there are three slogans in vv. 12–20, and one slogan is used twice. These slogans give structure to Paul's diatribe in vv. 12–20. Paul quotes the Corinthian slogan and then responds with his refutation or counter-slogan:

> *"Everything is permissible for me,"*
> Corinthian slogan (12a)
> *but not everything is beneficial.*
> Paul's counter-slogan (12b)
>
> *"Everything is permissible for me,"*
> Corinthian slogan(12c)
> *but I will not be mastered by anything.*
> Paul's counter-slogan (12d)

---

290. "(1) Paul repeats it four times in the letter, twice here and twice in 10:23. (2) Paul's counter statements introduced with ἀλλά (*alla*) indicates that he introduced it with the intent of rebutting it. (3) As a slogan in vogue in Corinth, it could express in a nutshell their moral and theological positions. Carried to an extreme, this maxim would appear to legalize every behavior and every object and could explain the problems besetting the congregation, from the case of incest to the incidents of eating idol food." Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 225–26.

291. Those who argue that it is not a Corinthian slogan include, Brendan Byrne, "Sinning Against One's Own Body: Paul's Understanding of the Sexual Relationship of 1 Corinthians 6:18," *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 45 (1983): 608–16; Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 201; Soards, *1 Corinthians*, 132. Others see no qualitative difference between viewing this as a Corinthian slogan or as part of Paul's argument, i.e. Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 150–51.

292. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, "Corinthian Slogans in 1 Cor 6:16–20," *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 391–96.

293. Those who contend that the term *all sins a man commits are outside his body* as a Corinthian slogan include, Sampley, *First Corinthians*, 863–64; Johnson, *1 Corinthians*, 103; Hays, *First Corinthians*, 105–7; Fisk, "Body Violation"; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 248; C. F. D. Moule, *An Idiom Book of the New Testament* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959), 196; Stanley K. Stowers, "'A Debate' Over Freedom: 1 Cor 6:12–20," in *Christian Teaching* (ed. Everett Ferguson; Abilene: Abilene University Press, 1981), 67; Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 50; R. Omanson, "Acknowledging Paul's Quotations," *Bible Today* 43 (1992): 201–13; Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 92; Radcliffe, "Glorify God," 307.

"Food for the stomach and the stomach for food, God will destroy them both."
> Corinthian slogan (13a)

The body is not meant for sexual immorality but for the Lord.
> Paul's counter-slogan (13b)

"All sins a man commits are outside his body,"
> Corinthian slogan (18a)

but he who sins sexually sins against his own body.
> Paul's counter-slogan (18b)

Interconnected with Paul's use of slogans are Paul's use of maxims.[294] According to both Rollin Ramsaran and Sampley both the Corinthians' slogans and Paul's counter slogans are maxims. Paul's use of slogan/counter-slogan, or what Sampley describes as a Corinthian maxim followed by a Pauline qualifier, creates *figured speech*.[295] Paul's diatribe is characterized by four rhetorical questions. Three of these questions begin with the formula οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι (*do you not know*), vv. 15, 16, 19. While this formula has been previously used by Paul, it is interesting that he uses it as often as he does in chapter six as he increases his rhetoric of shame.[296] Paul's fourth rhetorical question in 15b, *Shall I then take the members of Christ and unite them with a prostitute?*, is answered by Paul's emphatic μὴ γένοιτο (*Never!*).

Again Talbert's outline will be followed in analyzing Paul's argument in 6:12–20;

> *First part (6:12–18)*
>> *Corinthian Assertions (6:12–14)*
>> *Pauline Arguments (6:15–17)*
>> *A Concluding Exhortation (6:18a)*

[294.] "Greeks called proverb-like pity, and epigrammatic sayings *gnōmai*; Romans called them *sententiae*. The content of these gnomic sentences is drawn largely from recurrent, observable, and taken-for-granted experiences common to the world of the intended hearers. I use the English term "maxims" to refer to the *gnōmai* and *sententiae* as found in the rhetorical handbooks of Paul's time. Most translations of the rhetorical handbooks use "maxim" to designate *gnōmē* and *sententia*. In addition, the standard dictionary definition of "maxim" best exemplifies the identifying boundaries of *gnōmē* and *sententia* as portrayed in these handbooks." Rollin A. Ramsaran, *Liberating Words: Paul's Use of Rhetorical Maxims in 1 Corinthians 1–10* (Valley Forge: Trinity, 1996), 2.

[295.] "Verses 12–20 are a dense, closely ordered passage that expects some work from its auditors. Rhetorically it is what's called "figured speech," a type of rhetoric in which rhetorical figures or tropes carry the message like pearls arranged on a string. In order to understand it, we must identify the figures and show how they work. In Paul's time figured speech was much valued and was considered powerful because it invited the hearers or readers to assess the relationship between the different figures and make self-application of what was heard or read." Sampley, *First Corinthians*, 861.

[296.] 3:16; 5:6; 6:2, 3, 9, 15, 16, 19; 9:13, 24.

Second Part (6:18b–20)
>*Corinthian Assertions (6:18b, c)*
>*Pauline Arguments (6:19–20a)*
>*A Concluding Exhortation (6:20b)*[297]

4.4.3   Corinthian Assertions, 6:12–14

The first thing we notice in v. 12 is that the maxim/slogan πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν (*"All things are lawful for me,"*) is stated twice but with two counter-slogans or qualifiers from Paul.[298] This πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν slogan is used twice in 10:23. Collins suggests that Paul's fourfold quoting of this slogan indicates that it has a formulaic nature and the use of ἔξεστιν has a legal ring to it.[299] Conzelmann suggests that the Corinthian slogan was derived from Paul's doctrine of freedom.[300] However, there is the suggestion that the slogan may have come from Greek moralists or incipient Gnostics.[301] In a discourse on freedom, Epictetus argued, "He is free who lives as he wills, who is subject neither to compulsion, nor hindrance, nor force, whose choices are unhampered, whose desires attain their ends, whose aversions do not fall into what they would avoid." (*Discourses* 4.1.1) Dio Chrysostom described the wise person as one "to whom all things are permissible" (*Discourses* 3.10). Collins goes on to suggest that this extreme individual who claims to be above the law and has unrestricted freedom was typical of kings such as Caligula and Nero.[302] Ramsaran suggests that the use of this maxim, in v. 12, can be connected with the Corinthian leaders and their moral opinion.[303] Winter argues that this slogan was used by the elite in Corinth.[304]

[297.] Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 446–52.

[298.] Winter suggests that the list of aphoristic sayings were popular across the Hellenistic world and were placed so that everyone could see them. They constituted evidence of the *Vulgarethink* (*common thought*). However, these lists did not contain the slogan πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν. "No pithy saying such as "do whatever you wish" (ποίει ὅσα βουλονται) which is the imperatival equivalent of 1 Corinthians 6:12; 10:23 can be found in the public lists." Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 82.

[299.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 243.

[300.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 243.

[301.] Kistemaker, *1 Corinthians*, 193.

[302.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 243.

[303.] Ramsaran, *Liberating Words*, 30.

[304.] "It was the prerogative of those who posses power, whether they were privileged citizens or rulers, to live by that maxim with relative impunity. It was not a saying for the ordinary members of a city nor was it one that the elite promoted for the non-elite." Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 82.

It is plausible to suggest the slogan πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν is a slogan of the *wise* (σοφός) *influential* (δυνατός) and *wellborn* (εὐγενής) of 1:26. It is a slogan of the Corinthian patrons. This, then, would tie the three issues that Paul addresses in 1 Cor 5–6 around the central theme of patronal abuses in the Corinthian congregation. In 1 Cor 5 Paul addresses the issue of patronal incest. In 6:1–11 Paul addresses patronal use of corrupt courts to wrong and defraud. Now, in 6:12–22, Paul is addressing the patronal slogans and their resulting immorality. In fact, the slogan, *All things are lawful for me*, may be seen as an underlying cause of the incest in chapter 5 and using the corrupt courts in 6:1–11.

In dealing with this third area of conflict, with the powerful patrons in Corinth, Paul does not begin by attacking their behavior, as he did in 5:1 and 6:1, rather, Paul confronts the slogans upon which their behavior is predicated.[305] Thus, in the three major problems with the powerful elites in 1 Cor 5–6, Paul utilizes three distinct rhetorical strategies. In the case of the incestuous man in 1 Cor 5, Paul begins by directly addressing the issues (5:1, *It is actually reported that there is sexual immorality among you, and of a kind that does not occur even among pagans: A man has his father's wife*.) In the case of the law courts in 6:1–11, Paul begins by suggesting that the problem is their going to the law courts (6:1, *If any of you has a dispute with another, dare he take it before the ungodly for judgment instead of before the saints?*). However, Paul waits until the middle of this argument to reveal that the core problem is using the law courts to swindle fellow Christians, (6:8, *Instead, you yourselves cheat and do wrong, and you do this to your brothers*.) This section begins not with the immorality but with the mindset which lead to their immorality.

The πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν slogan is repeated twice but with two counter arguments. They revolve around the themes of profit and self-mastery:

> *"Everything is permissible for me"*
>   *but not everything is beneficial*. (Profit)
> *"Everything is permissible for me"*
>   *but I will not be mastered by anything*. (Self-Mastery)

Horsley notes there is a word play between the verbs ἔξεστιν and ἐξουσιάζω (*authorize/empower*) that is difficult to translate in English. Horsley suggests an English translation that retains the word play, "I am empowered for everything, but I will not be overpowered by anything."[306] Thiselton notes the difficulty in conveying the "flavor of

---

305. Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 222.
306. Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 90.

the pun" in English and suggests the translation, "'Liberties to do anything'; but I will not let anything take liberties with me."[307] Mitchell argues that 1 Corinthians is primarily a work of deliberative rhetoric illustrating that the foundation of Paul's argument is related to what is best or profitable for the Corinthians.[308] Paul's first response to the πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν slogan is somewhat impersonal and contrasts the words ἔξεστιν (*lawful*) and συμφέρω (*profitable*). Thus, Paul's first response to the πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν slogan is a succinct example of deliberative rhetoric.

Paul's second response is very personal; he uses a personal pronoun and he may well be comparing the πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν slogan of the Corinthian elite to a slogan of his own. This is based on Paul's use of ἐγὼ and his statement 1 Cor 9:27, *No, I beat my body and make it my slave so that after I have preached to others, I myself will not be disqualified for the prize.* If Paul is indeed using a personal slogan when he says οὐκ ἐγὼ ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπό τινος, then Paul is doing more than just challenging the Corinthian elites' slogan; he is presenting himself as a strong moral comparison to the Corinthian elite.[309]

If Winter is correct in his argument that those who use the πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν slogan are the Corinthian elite and that their slogan is one of both power and pride, then it would appear that Paul's second response and specifically his use of ἐξουσιάζω introduces elements of weakness and shame.[310] Thus, once again Paul engages in a rhetoric of reversal, ἐξουσιάζω reverses power to weakness and pride to shame. This is a master stroke of argumentation. The foundation of the Corinthian elites' behavior which lead to their debauchery in food, and their immorality was based on their πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν slogan. Before dealing with the behavior which resulted from this slogan, Paul demonstrates how fallacious their foundational slogan was. First, their slogan is

---

307. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 93.

308. Mitchell, *Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 25–38.

309. Stowers on self-mastery notes, "In a society and economy nearly the opposite of our capitalistic consumer culture that produces new goods and services, all of the land and goods available through the ancient technology were already distributed. Thus the social order was based on maintaining inherited social status and property and passing it on to heirs. The morals of the ancient Mediterranean revolved around an ethic of restraint that could be expressed: 'Do not desire more than is your due by your station of birth.' The central ancient moral precepts were like the ancient Israelite "thou shall not covet" and the Greek "in nothing too much." Stanley K. Stowers, "Paul and Self-Mastery," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World* (ed. J. Paul Sampley; Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003), 524–50.

310. This counter-slogan of Paul is highly reminiscent of his style of argument in 1:11–4, where Paul reverses the Corinthians' arguments.

not advantageous. Second, their slogan has resulted in their becoming enslaved, weak, and shamed. Indeed, the fact that they have become enslaved, weak, and shamed is proof that their slogan is not advantageous. Paul does not specify to whom or what they are enslaved, and thus his response may be deliberative in that he calls his audience to ponder over to whom or to what those who use the πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν slogan would be enslaved. In this case, it may well be that Paul is suggesting the elites have become enslaved to their slogan of freedom, or they have become enslaved to food and sexual immorality, as these are the other two Corinthian slogans Paul deals with in this section.

It is intriguing to contemplate the possible setting surrounding the oral delivery of 1 Cor 6:12–20 to the church in Corinth. It is not hard to imagine Paul instructing the one entrusted with this letter to pause after his second counter slogan to allow his audience to deliberate on his counter slogan and then proceed to the next Corinthian slogan, τὰ βρώματα τῇ κοιλίᾳ καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασιν (*"Food is meant for the stomach and the stomach for food"*). Thus, Paul's own slogan, *I will not be enslaved to anything* becomes both a bridge between the first two Corinthian slogans and a comparison between Paul and the Corinthian elite.

> *"Everything is permissible for me"*
> > *but I will not be mastered by anything.*
> *"Food for the stomach and the stomach for food"*

In this one short verse, there are clear signs of Paul's rhetorical skills. First, there is the quoting of the Corinthian slogans followed by Paul's counter-slogans. Second, by using one of his own slogans, Paul makes a comparison between himself and the immoral elite. Third, by using ἐξουσιάζω Paul reverses the elites' power and pride to weakness and shame. Fourth, the deliberative element of Paul's second counter-slogan would serve as a way to expand his counter-arguments. Fifth, the brevity of Paul's counter-slogans does not demise their potential; it may in fact enhance them.

Having severely weakened the elites' foundational slogan (πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν), Paul, in v. 13, now proceeds to undermine the second and third elite slogans. Both the NIV and the NRSV place the quotation marks at the end of "*Food for the stomach and the stomach for food.*" Sampley argues that the maxim, *but God will destroy them both*, is the Pauline qualifier.[311] Thiselton, Murphy-O'Connor, Collins, and Barrett argue that the quotations should include *but God will destroy them both*.[312] Collins goes on to

---

[311.] Sampley, *First Corinthians*, 862.
[312.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 462–3; Murphy-O'Connor, "Corinthian Slogans"; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 239; Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 146.

suggest that this slogan may have represented an "Epicurean idea of corporal human existence or a kind of anthropology that considers the body as being independent to the spirit."[313] Garland notes, that κοιλία (*stomach*) could be used as a euphemism for sexual organs; perhaps it made it easy to draw an analogy between eating food and having sex.[314] Rosner reconstructs this Corinthian slogan,

> Just as food is meant for the stomach and the stomach for food, so also the body is meant for sexual activity and sexual activity for the body. Furthermore, since God will one day destroy both the stomach and the body, is not what we do with our bodies now of no moral consequence?[315]

Winter makes a compelling argument that the elites, once they had celebrated their *toga virilis*, would have attended banquets where they had sexual intercourse with prostitutes.[316] The strength of Winter's argument is twofold. First, it attempts to hold onto the theme that Paul began in chapter one, that of patronal abuse in the Corinthian congregation. Second, it explains the progression of Paul's argument in v. 13; food—stomach—body—sexual immorality.

Working backwards from Paul's response, *The body is not meant for sexual immorality, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body,* it would appear that the second Corinthian slogan, *Food for the stomach and the stomach for food—and God will destroy them both,* was expanded by the Corinthians to include a parallel slogan which may be described as *the body is for sexual immorality, sexual immorality is for the body, and God will destroy them both.* John Polhill puts it more bluntly, "The corollary to their statement was the genitals were made for sex."[317] Winter argues that the Corinthians who used this slogan do so in an attempt "to rationalize their privilege on the grounds of first-century Platonic anthropology, philosophical hedonism, and social conventions."[318]

[313.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 245.

[314.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 230.

[315.] Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics*, 129.

[316.] "The elites who gave private banquets to which they invited clients as well as other guests provided not only for their physical hunger but also for their sexual appetites. It needs to be noted that 1 Corinthians 6:12–20 does not state that the Christians actually went to brothels. They were having sexual intercourse with prostitutes in the context of the dinner." Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 88.

[317.] John B. Polhill, *Paul and His Letters* (Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999), 240.

[318.] "The Corinthian Christians who argued that everything was permitted for them rationalized the exercising of their privilege on the grounds of first-century Platonic anthropology, philosophical hedonism, and social conventions. An outline of the former argument is preserved when the body is said to have been ordained for pleasure and the immortal soul was unaffected by any such conduct. In fact, the enjoyment of life was what

Paul does not respond to this second Corinthian slogan in the same manner as he responded to the first Corinthian slogan. While there is an initial counter-slogan, Paul develops an extended counter-argument which goes from v. 14 to v. 20. Paul's counter-slogan, *The body is not meant for sexual immorality but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body*, centers around the patron/Lord motif.[319] Paul is reminding the Corinthians that they are not free agents but clients, and as clients they should not use their bodies for self-gratification but to serve their patron. This reminder may contain a subtle element of shame, especially if the first Corinthian slogan, πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν, was being used as a statement of power and prestige among the Corinthian elite. However, the second part of Paul's response moves from the clients' shameful use of their bodies to the patron's honoring of his clients and their bodies.

No doubt v. 14 is to be understood as an explanation of the statement in v. 13, *the Lord is for the body*. Yet, Paul's argument is forceful in that he makes two points concerning the resurrection. The first point is the Corinthian slogan in v. 13 (*"Food for the stomach and the stomach for food-- but God will destroy them both"*) and its parallel slogan (*"the body is for sexual immorality, sexual immorality is for the body, and God will destroy them both"*). Thus, while the Corinthians are correct in saying that God will destroy food and the stomach, they are incorrect in reasoning that God will destroy the body. In fact, the very opposite is true, God will not destroy the body, he will raise the body. Thus, Paul's argument that God will raise the body demonstrates that the body is not intended for πορνεία.

The second point Paul makes is the connection between the resurrection of Jesus and the resurrection of the Corinthians.[320] In 1 Cor 15 Paul devotes a large section to the doctrine of the resurrection. Two questions dominate Paul's discussion on the resurrection. The first is found in v. 12 *But if it is preached that Christ has been raised from the dead, how can some of you say that there is no resurrection of the dead?* The

---

'Nature' intended, bearing in mind that 'Nature' and 'God' could be used synonymously. Gluttony could be justified because 'food is for the belly, and the belly is for food,' and by implication 'sex (fornication) is for the body, and the body is for sex (fornication)' (ἡ πορνεία τῷ σώματι καὶ τὸ σῶμα τῇ πορνείᾳ). This self-centered aphorism they espoused is brought out by the emphatic place of the personal pronoun "for me" in the sentence πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν." Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 88–89.

[319.] This double reference to κύριος may also refer back to the slogan in v. 12 in that clients cannot make the assertion πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν. Also the κύριος reference creates an interplay with ἐξουσιασθήσομαι ὑπό τινος in that the Corinthians already have a master.

[320.] For a discussion on the themes of the cross and resurrection in 1 Corinthians from a rhetorical criticism/social-scientific criticism blend, see Ackerman, *Lo, I Tell You a Mystery*.

second is found in v. 35 *But someone may ask, "How are the dead raised? With what kind of body will they come?"* Paul answers the question posed in v. 12 by using a series of enthymemes to demonstrate the connection between Jesus' resurrection and the resurrection of Jesus' disciples.[321]

It appears that while the Corinthians were not directly denying the physical resurrection of Jesus, they were denying their own physical resurrection. Paul argues that to deny the resurrection of humanity is to deny the resurrection of Jesus, since he was in fact human. Paul answers the second question in vv. 35–57 with a series of arguments that center on the power of God. Thus, Paul's references in 6:14 to the power of God and the connection between Jesus' resurrection and the Corinthians' resurrection may be viewed as a précis of 1 Cor 15. However, at this point Paul does not allow the mechanics of the resurrection to sidetrack his argument that God is for the body and Christians should live lives free of πορνεία.[322]

For Paul, the doctrine of the resurrection is tied to both shame and honor. In 1 Corinthians 15:43, Paul argues, σπείρεται ἐν ἀτιμίᾳ, ἐγείρεται ἐν δόξῃ (*it is sown in shame, it is raised in honor*.) Thus, the promise that the Corinthians will be raised by the power of God is a promise of having a great honor bestowed on them. Peterson, in his translation/paraphrase, seeks to hold onto this resurrection honor motif,

> You know the old saying, "First you eat to live, and then you live to eat"? Well, it may be true that the body is only a temporary thing, but that's no excuse for stuffing your body with food, or indulging it with sex. Since the Master honors you with a body, honor him with your body! God honored the Master's body by raising it from the grave. He'll treat yours with the same resurrection power. Until that time, remember that your bodies are created with the same dignity as the Master's body. You wouldn't take the Master's body off to a whorehouse, would you? I should hope not. (*The Message* 1 Cor 6:13–15)

This move to honor is a new development in 1 Cor 1–6. Overall, the arguments in 1–6 have focused predominantly on shame, but as Paul brings the first section of this book

---

[321.] Anders Eriksson, *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians* (Coniectanea Biblica NTS 29; Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998), 255.

[322.] Byrne writes, "My conclusion, then, concerning 1 Cor. 6, 12–20, would be that this passage shows very clearly not only the contrasting eschatologies of the Corinthians and Paul respectively, but also the divergent value systems emerging, in Paul's view, from those eschatologies. In one case, an eschatology of destruction leads to or can lead to casualness and indifference about bodily morality and the social commitment that bodily existence entails. In the other, an eschatology of the resurrection of the body, with the resurrection of the Lord as both model and pledge, leads to the possibility that bodily activity here and now can and should glorify God." Brendan Byrne, "Eschatologies of Resurrection and Destruction: The Ethical Significance of Paul's Dispute with the Corinthians," *Downside Review* 104 (1986): 292.

to a close, there is a movement towards honor. There are still elements of shame, but these are mild and may function to draw a greater contrast between the shameful behavior of the Corinthians and the great honor Jesus desires to bestow on his faithful clients.

4.4.4   Pauline Arguments, 6:15–17

Now, in v. 15, Paul asks the first of three questions that begin with ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε (*do you not know*), the others occur in v. 16 and v. 19. Each of these three questions is used by Paul to establish a premise which he will use to develop his argument on how the body is not intended for πορνεία. Hurd has demonstrated that the phrase ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε is a reference to teaching that the Corinthians did in fact know. Thus, for Paul to use this phrase three times in quick succession would be, at the least, a mild rebuke.[323]

With the use of the first ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε question Paul maintains a close link with the argument begun in v. 12. By the use of σῶμα there is a direct link with v. 13 and Paul's premise, *The **body** is not meant for sexual immorality, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body*. By making reference to their being *members of Christ*, Paul draws a parallel to his premise in v. 14, *By his power God raised the Lord from the dead, and he will raise us also*. Not only will the Corinthians be raised like Jesus in the future, but they are presently connected with Jesus. This connection is not in some abstract metaphysical way; rather this connection is somatic. Sampley observes,

> Many translators rightly render it "present your selves" because for Paul sōma is a technical term that refers to one's whole self. Modern people tend to think of having a body; Paul thinks of people being "bodies." Sōma for Paul, stands for the whole self.[324]

Dale Martin suggests that Paul deliberately reverses the Greek religious and philosophical assumptions that *spirit* took precedent over *body* in importance for the human self.[325] Thus, Paul uses his first ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε question to re-establish the premise that the Corinthians are somatically connected to Jesus. However, in Paul's follow up question (*Shall I then take the members of Christ and unite them with a prostitute?*) he moves beyond Jesus having a somatic connection to the Corinthians to the Corinthians being the very embodiment of Christ. The theme of πορνεία (*sexual immorality*) is still under discussion, but by using πόρνη (*prostitute*) Paul moves from what might be

---

323. Hurd, *The Origins of 1 Corinthians*, 85.
324. Sampley, *First Corinthians*, 862.
325. Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 174–78.

described as generic sexual immorality, to the specific sexual immorality of having sexual intercourse with a πόρνη.[326]

The manner in which Paul follows this second question with the strong μὴ γένοιτο (*Never*!) would suggest that Paul did not intend the Corinthians to deliberate his question for too long.[327] Malherbe has shown that the Greek formula μὴ γένοιτο was a common convention of diatribe argumentation and could either end the argument or provide a transition.[328] Thus, it becomes clear that the first two Corinthian slogans ('*Everything is permissible for me*' and '*Food for the stomach and the stomach for food, but God will destroy them both*') are closely connected to some of the Corinthian elite having sexual intercourse with prostitutes during a banquet. It is this union with prostitutes that would suggest that the first two slogans were expanded by the Corinthians to include a parallel slogan which may be described as *the body is for sexual immorality, sexual immorality is for the body, and God will destroy them both*

This second use of the ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε question, in v. 16, sets up another premise which Paul uses to undermine the Corinthians' sexual immorality. Paul does this by arguing that when a person has intercourse with a prostitute, it is more than just *casual sex*.[329] Rather, there is a bond that goes beyond just sexual intercourse, the two become σάρκα μίαν (*one flesh*).[330] To reinforce his argument, Paul quotes a passage from Gen 2:24. Collins suggests that this is an argument from authority.[331] Rosner argues that Paul may be alluding to the idea that the Christian is united with Christ in a nuptial

---

[326.] Malina and Pilch, continuing to work from the premise that in 6:11–20 Paul returns to the issue of incest as addressed in chapter 5, suggest that *the prostitute* is a reference to the stepmother of chapter 5:1. However, to argue this point on the basis that "Paul does not speak of 'a' prostitute but 'the' prostitute" is not the strongest of arguments. Malina and Pilch, *The Letters of Paul*, 84.

[327.] Soards notes, "The form of this question and answer would register immediately with the Corinthians as a diatribe, setting up an assumed false position and then knocking it down. The tone is strong and colloquial and the readers would recognize Paul's intention to expose the shamefully absurd character of their behavior." Soards, *1 Corinthians*, 131.

[328.] Abraham J. Malherbe, "μὴ γένοιτο In the Diatribe and Paul," *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 231–40.

[329.] For a succinct overview of prostitution in the Old Testament, the New Testament, and in the Greco-Roman world, see Talbert, *Reading Corinthians*, 47–49.

[330.] For a discussion of the σάρκα μία language in Eph 5:21–33, see Richard Batey, "The μία σάρξ Union of Christ and the Church," *New Testament Studies* 13 (1996): 270–81; T. A. Burkhill, "Two Into One: The Notion of Carnal Union in Mark 10:8; 1 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 5:13," *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 62 (1971): 115–20.

[331.] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 247.

relationship.[332] However, J. Duncan Derrett goes too far when he contends that κολλάω is a *sticking* which results in marriage and thus, "those possessed by the spirit of Christ, so sure a guide for behavior, find whoredom repulsive and even marriage distracting."[333]

Paul has used the idea of the Corinthians becoming one with Christ in body as a motive to abstain from sexual immorality. Now, in v. 17, Paul argues for being one with Christ in spirit as a motive to abstain from sexual immorality. "Paul uses the same word for *unites* (κολλώμενος) with the Lord as he uses for *unites* with the prostitute in 6:16."[334] Thus, Paul constructs v. 17 as a contrast with v. 16a.[335] Between the two unitings is Paul's quote from Genesis 2:24, *The two shall be one flesh*.[336] This structure would suggest that Paul is presenting an either/or option before the Corinthians. You may be joined to a prostitute, or you can be joined to the Lord, but you cannot be joined to both, for that would be adultery.

Thus, with his two ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε questions, Paul develops an interwoven argument wherein the whole being, body and spirit, is joined with Jesus. Sampley suggests that Paul employs a word play, πορνεία/πόρνη, and the powerful metaphor of marriage as a prohibition against a liaison with a prostitute, "So Paul likens the relationship of believers to Christ as a proper marriage and the turning to a prostitute (*pornē*; *porneia*) as harlotry (cf. Jeremiah 23; Hosea 2; cf. 2 Cor 11:2)."[337] Again, this would suggest that the Corinthians had viewed sexual intercourse with an Epicurean mindset, it was just another appetite. At the elite banquets all appetites, food and sex, could be satiated on the premises that *all things are permissible for me* and *food is for the body*, and *the body for sex*.

---

[332] Rosner, *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics*, 134–36.

[333] J. Duncan M. Derrett, "Right and Wrong Sticking (1 Cor 6,18)?" *Estudios Biblicos* 55 (1997): 89–106.

[334] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 147.

[335] Collins, *First Corinthians*, 248.

[336] Miller claims that the verb κολλάω without the prefix πρός means *adhesion* and *loyalty,* not sexual intercourse, and it was chosen to remove any sexual connotation from the clinging. Miller, "A Fresh Look". Porter suggests that κολλάω has an economic nuance here and implies *obligating oneself, selling oneself.* Stanley E. Porter, "How Should κολλώμενος in 1 Cor 6:16–17 be Translated," *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 67 (1991): 105–6. For a discussion on the Classical and New Testament usage of καλλάω, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 464–69.

[337] Sampley, *First Corinthians*, 862–63; cf. J. Paul Sampley, *Walking Between the Times, Paul's Moral Reasoning* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1991), 104–5.

4.4.5   Concluding Exhortation, 6:18a

Paul's argument in vv. 15–17 leads to his initial imperatival conclusion in v. 18a, *Flee from sexual immorality.*[338] This is the conclusion that the Corinthians should draw from Paul's argument. However, to avoid any potential for manipulating or misunderstanding the intended conclusion, Paul plainly states the conclusion of his argument. "With *shun fornication!* in 6:18 Paul finally exclaims what he has been driving towards."[339] His argument has been building from his first citing of the Corinthian slogan πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν in v. 12. It would appear that Paul's ultimate response to the Corinthian slogan πάντα μοι ἔξεστιν is the imperative φεύγετε τὴν πορνείαν. Thus, Paul's didactic argument in vv. 12–18b may by outlined in the following manner.

> *'All things are permissible'.* Corinthians
> > *But not all things are beneficial.* Paul
>
> *'All things are permissible.'* Corinthians
> > *But I will not be enslaved by anything.* Paul
>
> *'All things are permissible.'* Corinthians
> > *Flee sexual immorality.* Paul

4.4.6   Corinthian Assertions, 6:18b, c

In v. 18b Paul quotes another Corinthian slogan, *"all sins a man commits are outside his body."*[340] Thiselton notes that this phrase may be viewed as a Corinthian slogan rather than a comparative generalization.[341] Viewing *"all sins a man commits are outside his body"* as a Corinthian slogan would tie the second slogan in v. 13a to Paul's subsequent argument in vv. 13b-18a. In v. 13a Paul cites the second Corinthian slogan "*Food for the stomach and the stomach for food, but God will destroy them both.*" Working backwards from Paul's response, *The body is not meant for sexual immorality, but for the Lord, and the Lord for the body,* it would appear that the second Corinthian slogan was expanded by the Corinthians to include a parallel mindset which may be described as *the body is for sexual immorality, sexual immorality is for the body, and God will destroy them both.* While this mindset is unstated in the text, it is certainly implied as Paul's argument in v. 13b to v. 18a and does not argue against food but against sexual immorality. Thus, viewing *all sins a man commits are outside his body*

[338.] It would appear that this imperative would better fit here than in the next verse.

[339.] Richard A. Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 92.

[340.] See comments on section, *Paul's rhetoric in 6:12–20*, above.

[341.] Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 470.

as a third Corinthian slogan, would closely connect this third slogan to the second, the parallel but unstated Corinthian mindset, and the first Corinthian slogan.[342]

Paul responds to this third Corinthian slogan in the same manner as he responded to the first two; he responds with a succinct counter-slogan, *but he who sins sexually sins against his own body*. Conzelmann suggests that Paul was being unduly influenced by Prov 6:25–33, "he is plainly taking his cue from a Jewish saying which describes fornication as the direst of sins."[343] Paul's counter-slogan dismisses the Corinthian idea that having sexual intercourse with a prostitute is not a sin because it only involves the body. In fact, Paul's succinct counter-slogan carries the weight of what Paul has just demonstrated in vv. 13b–18a. In v. 13, Paul demonstrated that the Lord is for the body; in v. 14, the body will be resurrected; in v. 15a, the Corinthians' bodies are members of Christ; in vv. 15b and 16, to have intercourse with a prostitute is to be united with her and thus uniting Christ with a prostitute. This would suggest that the slogan counter-slogan of v. 18b is the culmination of Paul's argument thus far. This is Paul's first use of ἁμάρτημα (*sin*) in 1 Corinthians. Malina and Pilch connect Paul's use of sin with dishonor.[344]

Paul's counter-slogan in v. 18b may be described as a culmination of shame. Working from the fallacious premise that *all things were permissible for me* the Corinthian elite attended banquets where they engaged in sexual intercourse with prostitutes. They saw nothing morally wrong with their actions for they held to the faulty premise that *all sins a man commits are outside his body*. However, when Paul counters the third Corinthian slogan with the slogan, *but he who sins sexually sins against his own body*, he accuses the Corinthians of engaging in activities that resulted in self-shaming. This counter-slogan of shame may be connected with Paul's counter-slogans in v. 12, *not everything is beneficial* and *but I will not be mastered by anything*.

[342.] Collins writes of this third Corinthian slogan, "In its expression of one aspect of the Corinthians' erroneous anthropology v. 18b is akin to the slogans of vv. 12 and 13. Considering the body to be merely physical and without ultimate value, the Corinthians held that the domain of sin lies beyond the merely physical. What is merely physical, including irregular sexual intercourse, is not sinful, they reasoned." Collins, *First Corinthians*, 248.

[343.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 112.

[344.] "Paul once more commands the Corinthians to distance themselves from the previously mentioned *porneia* (forbidden marital arrangements). "Sin" means some action that dishonors another. All dishonoring activities have others as their object. Through "sin" one seeks to dishonor another. Paul notes that this *porneia* dishonors the perpetrator himself." Malina and Pilch, *The Letters of Paul*, 84.

Thus, when Paul's counter-slogans of v. 12 are connected with the counter-slogan of v. 18, the intensity of the shame is increased. First, their fornication (πορνεία) with prostitutes (πόρνη), which resulted in self-shaming, is not beneficial. Second, their fornication with prostitutes, which resulted in self-shaming, is to become enslaved to fornication (πορνεία). Paul's counter-slogan in v. 13, *and God will destroy both one (stomach) and the other (body)*, is closely connected to his counter-slogan in v. 18, especially in light of the fact that both are slogans connected to πορνεία. Thus, connecting both of these counter slogans, their fornication (πορνεία) with prostitutes (πόρνη) has resulted in self-shaming and may result in destruction. At the least, Paul's counter-slogan in v. 18 certainly ties with the premise that he uses in v. 13, *the body is meant not for fornication but for the Lord*.

As previously noted, one of the aspects of Paul's argument of shame has been that he constantly refuses to name his opponents or those guilty of sin.[345] In 1 Cor 5, Paul refuses to name the incestuous man, in fact, typically, he refers to him with pronouns. In 6:1–12, Paul does not mention by name those who are using the corrupt courts, rather, he refers to them as the ἄδικος in 6:11. In vv. 12–20, Paul continues his practice of not naming those who are guilty of πορνεία. However, Paul does adapt his argument somewhat in that he does use two substantival participles to refer to them, and these substantive participles are less than complimentary. In vv. 16 and 17, Paul uses the present middle substantive participle ὁ κολλώμενος (*the one who unites himself*).[346] In classical literature and in papyri outside the NT κολλάω frequently means to *join, to glue, to bind indissolutely*. In Christian literature the word is used of sexual intimacy. It is quite difficult to translate the participle ὁ κολλώμενος into English and keep the substantival force. While *the prostitute uniter* may get the dynamic sense across, it is quite awkward, to say the least. Thus, most translations translate ὁ κολλώμενος as an adverbial participle, *whoever is united to a prostitute* (NRSV).

In v. 18, Paul uses a present active substantive participle ὁ πορνεύων. The NRSV accurately communicated the dynamic sense of ὁ πορνεύων which it translates as *the fornicator*. It is certainly stronger and more contextually focused than the vague and rather insipid translation of the NIV, *he who sins sexually*. In fact, ὁ πορνεύων is

---

[345.] On non-naming as shame, see Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth*, 341–48.
[346.] Edwards, *First Corinthians*, 148.

used both of a prostitute and of one who visits a prostitute.[347] Thus, while not naming is indeed a way of shaming, Paul's use of these two substantive participles function so as to rename the offender with names of increasing shame. First, Paul shames him in v.16 by naming him *the prostitute uniter*. Paul increases the shame in v. 18 by naming him *the fornicator*.

4.4.7   Pauline Arguments, 6:19–20a

In v. 19, once again, Paul uses the phrase ἢ οὐκ οἴδατε. This is the third occurrence of this phrase in this section. This phrase introduces material that Paul previously taught the Corinthians.[348] Thus, Paul continues to shame the Corinthians. Not only did they engage in self-shaming acts of sexual immorality, they did so in spite of being taught otherwise. This reference to the body being a temple of the Holy Spirit is part of Paul's development of his premise in v. 18 that sexual sin violates a person in a unique way. Paul's argument may be phrased as, *not only does sexual immorality violate you, it also violates the Holy Spirit who is in you*.[349] This argument is similar to his argument in vv. 15–17 where sexual morality is to be avoided because of the body-member connection the Corinthians share with Jesus. Sexual immorality shames the body which is both a member of Christ and a temple of the Holy Spirit. Fee suggests that "they thought the presence of the Spirit meant a negation of the body, Paul argues the exact opposite: the presence of the Spirit in their present bodily existence is God's affirmation of the body."[350]

In this section Paul has a Trinitarian appeal concerning the use of the body. The first is found in vv. 13–14, and it refers to God who will raise the body. The second is found in vv. 15–17, where Paul refers to how the Corinthians' bodies are now members of Jesus. Now, in v. 19, Paul brings the Holy Spirit into the argument as he reasons for sexual morality on the basis that the body is a temple of the Holy Spirit, whom they have received from God. Thus, Paul's argument against πορνεία contains an interweaving of the honor-shame motif with his Trinitarian appeal. In v. 13, Paul

---

[347.] Louw and Nida πορνεύω; ἐκπορνεύω; πορνεία, "to engage in sexual immorality of any kind, often with the implication of prostitution - to engage in illicit sex, to commit fornication, sexual immorality, fornication, prostitution." "πορνεύω" BAGD 854; "to engage in sexual immorality, *engage in illicit sex, to fornicate, to whore,* in Greek literature frequently in reference to prostitution."

[348.] Hurd, *The Origins of 1 Corinthians*, 85.

[349.] Fisk, "Body Violation," 557.

[350.] Fee, *First Corinthians*, 264.

evokes honor as he outlines how God is for the body and will honor the body in the resurrection. In vv. 15–17, Paul evokes both shame and honor. First, in vv. 15–16, he describes the shameful practice of being united with a prostitute. Second, in v. 17, he describes the honor of being united with the Lord. In v. 19, Paul evokes the shame motif as he reminds the Corinthians that the body is a temple of the Holy Spirit.

The last phrase of v. 19, *You are not your own,* would appear to be connected to the first phrase of v. 20*, you were bought with a price.* Oster notes that γὰρ shows the conceptual connection between v. 19 and v. 20.[351] *You are not your own* is most likely another response, or at least an echo, to the Corinthian slogan of v. 12, *"all things are permissible for me."*[352] Paul reasons inversely that all things are not permissible for you because *you are not your own, you were bought with a price*. With this argument Paul demonstrates that the "Lord has full property rights over them."[353] Thus, if the original *"all things are permissible for me"* may be described as a means of self-honoring among the elite, then Paul, by stating *you are not your own,* is again using shame to rebuke the Corinthians.

By using the phrase *you were bought with a price*, Paul evokes a common image of a slave being transferred from one owner to another. This is not a case of manumission but of transfer of ownership.[354] Orr and Walter make the interesting suggestion that "the 'price' may be an antithesis of the amount paid for the favor of a prostitute."[355] Malina and Pilch suggest that the phrase, *you were bought at a price*, is an idiom meaning "the price was paid in full."[356] Of this metaphor Conzelmann wisely points out, "The metaphor is not developed. The point is merely that you belong to a new master. Beyond this the metaphor should not be pressed."[357]

Paul's use of an image of slavery in reference to the elite of Corinth may demonstrate a strong allusion to shame. However, Paul's use of the word τιμή adds an interesting twist to the shame-honor argument. While τιμή may be translated as *price*, it

---

[351.] Oster, *1 Corinthians*, 149.

[352.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 113.

[353.] Garland, *1 Corinthians*, 239.

[354.] Deissmann argues that Paul's use of τιμή indicates a formula of emancipation from the realm of sacred law, where a slave was sold to a god and then set free. *Deissmann, Light From the Ancient East*, 320–30. However, Bartchy notes that the most common verb used in those contexts was πρίασθαι, not ἀγοράζειν. S. Scott Bartchy, *First Century Slavery and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7* (Wipf & Stock, 2002), 121–25.

[355.] Orr and Walther, *1 Corinthians*, 200.

[356.] Malina and Pilch, *The Letters of Paul*, 84–85.

[357.] Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 113.

may also be translated as *honor*. Paul, no doubt, intends this double meaning of τιμή to function as a word play in this phrase itself and to create another word play with δοξάζω in the final phrase of v. 20. Thus, the phrase, ἠγοράσθητε γὰρ τιμῆς, may be translated as *you were purchased for a price* / *you were purchased for honor*. With this being the case, Paul begins with an allusion to shame but then moves to honor. In using this slave terminology, Paul again echoes his second counter-slogan of v. 12, *I will not be dominated by anything*. This, then, would suggest that the twin phrases, *You were bought at a price* and *You are not your own,* form an *inclusio* to the Corinthian slogans of v. 12 and Paul's second counter-slogan of v. 12.

4.4.8   A Concluding Exhortation, 6:20b

The honor motif began by Paul in v. 20a, *you were bought with a price*, is continued in v. 20b as Paul brings his argument to a conclusion by stating, *therefore honor God with your body*. Central to the development of the honor motif is Paul's use of the imperative of δοξάζω (*praise, honor*). Moxnes, on the semantic field pertaining to honor, writes,

> Greek words for honor, esteem, recognition (τιμή, *timē*; τιμάω, *timaō*), are commonly used of humans (John 4:44; Rom 2:7, 10; 9:21; 12:10; 13:7; 1 Pet 1:7; 2:7, 17; 1 Cor 12:2–24). They can also be used in praise of God, most commonly together with other terms like δόξα, *doxa* (1 Tim 1:17; Rev 4:9). Glory (δόξα, *doxa*, δοξάζω, *doxazō*) is most used of God and Jesus (John 5:44; 7:18; 8:50; Rev 4:10–11; 5:12–13; Rom 9:23; 1 Cor 2:8). It is especially used in doxologies (Rom 11:36; 16:27). But these terms are also used of human beings in the ordinary sense of honor, fame, and repute (John 5:44; 7:18; 8:50; 1 Thess 2:6).[358]

"'Glorify' means to show honor by one's outward conduct."[359] Thus, it is indeed interesting that Paul makes this close τιμή—δοξάζω interplay in v. 20. The implication being, *you were purchased for honor, therefore honor God with your body*. Thiselton notes,

> Price indicates the costliness of redemption: Christ shed his blood submitting himself to the humiliation and contempt of the death by crucifixion (1:23–25). . . . The phrase corroborates Christ's entitlements to be the "rightful Lord" of those whom he has redeemed to belong and to serve. The public, everyday life of the redeemed Christian is to show forth the glory of God.[360]

In this section there are two imperatives, φεύγετε in v. 18 and δοξάσατε in v. 20. The first imperative, φεύγετε, is used as a conclusion to the first two slogans and in the

---

358. Moxnes, "Honor and Shame," 23.
359. Malina and Pilch, *The Letters of Paul*, 85.
360. Thiselton, *1 Corinthians*, 98.

section vv. 12–17; it functions as a transition for the third slogan in v. 18. The second imperative, δοξάσατε, brings Paul's argument against the fourth Corinthian slogan to a close and it ends the section on a positive note, one of honor. These two imperatives are interconnected with each other. The manner in which the Corinthians are to obey the second imperative, *honor God with your bodies*, is the same manner in which they obey the first imperative, *flee sexual immorality*. The first imperative is that of escaping shame, while the second imperative is that of embracing honor.

4.4.9   1 Corinthians 6:12–20 Conclusion

It would appear that Winter's argument is correct and that the elitist banquets, which some of the Corinthian Christians either attended or hosted, included sexual intercourse with prostitutes. They reasoned or rationalized this behavior by citing their three slogans;

> *All things are permissible for me.*
> *Food for the stomach and the stomach for food - but God will destroy them both.*
> *All sins a man commits are outside his body.*

Winter's argument is convincing and preferred due to the strong connection it makes with the theme of patronal abuses in 1 Cor 5–6. This reconstruction does offer a plausible *Sitz-im-Leben* in which the honor and shame motif may be better understood. However, this honor and shame motif would work if the situation was that of the Corinthians visiting brothels or participating in cultic prostitution. Thus, while the elitist banquet reconstruction is indeed plausible and it gives detailed nuance to the honor-shame motif, it should not be pressed.

The first two Corinthian slogans were self-centered and lead to a wrong view of both sexual immorality and the body. The first two slogans lead to the third slogan which resulted in sexual immorality. This dishonored their patron and it also dishonored the clients. Yet, in spite of this shameful activity, Paul is clear that their patron has honored them by honoring their bodies. The resurrection of their bodies, their being members of Christ, their bodies being temples of the Holy Spirit, and finally their being purchased at a price/purchased for honor are the ways in which their patron has honored their bodies. In return for honoring their bodies, Jesus, their super-patron, asks that they would now use their bodies to honor him. Specifically, they would honor their patron by fleeing sexual immorality.

While this section is ultimately about sexual purity, it is interesting how Paul reasons towards this goal. He engages diatribe as a dominant feature. He uses a series of

slogan/counter-slogan arguments. He employs three, *do you not know*, questions. He uses a rhetorical question, to which he answers with μὴ γένοιτο. There are two imperatives. But woven through all these elements of style and structure is the shame-honor motif. Simply put, sexual immorality (πορνεία) shames Jesus their patron and it shames the client. Conversely, sexual purity honors their patron, and it honors the client.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

At the very beginning of his first epistle to the Corinthians Paul begins by laying a foundation that will remain central to his argument throughout 1 Cor 1–6. In vv. 1–9 Paul forcefully identifies Jesus as the patron of the Corinthian congregation. In fact, Jesus is the super-patron due to the gifts and protection that he bestows on the Corinthians. Paul also describes the Corinthians as the clients of Jesus. Also found in vv. 1–9 is Paul's description of his relationship to both Jesus and the Corinthians. Paul's authority over the Corinthians has been challenged, most probably by the Corinthian elite. Paul's response to this challenge, is first, to emphasize the nature of Jesus' patronage to the Corinthians. Second, Paul emphasizes his status as an apostle of Jesus. In vv. 10–17 Paul begins to address the problem of the Corinthians' competitive slogans which are tied to the patronal competitive factionalism within the congregation.

After introducing the problem of status driven patronal factionalism within the Corinthian congregation Paul uses a series of three *inclusi* to shame the Corinthians for engaging in this competitive factionalism. In the first *inclusio*, 1:18–25, Paul compares the message of the cross with eloquent wisdom and he shames eloquent wisdom and honors the message of the cross. Thus, Paul argues, with God backing him up, that human wisdom, which is intrinsically part of the patronal factionalism, is deeply flawed. In the second *inclusio*, 1:16–32, Paul outlines how the congregation is in fact a new community with new standards of honor and shame. God, in his choosing and through the shameful message of the cross, has honored and changed the status of the lowly of Corinthian society. However, in this *inclusio* Paul also shames the elite, the house church leaders, the *wise*, the *powerful*, the *noble born* of Corinthian society. The result of this honoring of the shamed and shaming of the honored is, *so that no one*

might boast in the presence of God. However, Paul quickly argues that the Corinthians can in fact boast, but now their boasting must be in Jesus, their super-patron. He is their source of life and he is wisdom from God. Paul concludes this *inclusio* by replacing the Corinthians' three claims of status (the *wise*, *powerful*, the *noble born)* with three Christian status claims (*righteousness*, *sanctification*, and *redemption*). In the third inclusio, 2:1–5, Paul turns to his speech and proclamation and addresses the criticism of his critics, namely that he did not use *lofty words of wisdom*; he was an unpolished rhetor. Paul's response to this criticism is to embrace its shame, and then to reverse it. In the first two *inclusi* Paul argues that the message of the cross is shameful. But now Paul argues that his presentation of the message of the cross is shameful. However, Paul ends this third *inclusio* by arguing that this double shame was done *so that your faith might rest not on human wisdom but on the power of God*. Paul closes this third *inclusio* in the same manner that he closed the *narratio* in 1:17, by referring to the cross of Christ as the power of God. Thus, in this final *inclusio*, Paul again presents himself as the faithful apostle of Jesus who is willing to preach a shameful message in a shameful way so that he might honor Jesus and receive honor from Jesus.

In the three *inclusi* there is also a strong sense of Paul's attempting to erect a barrier between the insiders and the outsiders. The insiders and the outsiders have competing views of honor and shame. This is best seen in the two views of the cross. The outsiders see the cross as foolishness and Paul's preaching of the cross unsophisticated. In contrast, the insiders view the cross as the wisdom and power of God, and Paul's preaching as a demonstration of the Spirit's power. Thus, the patronal factionalism of 1:12 indicates that the Corinthians were in fact behaving like outsiders rather than insiders.

The central thrust of 1 Cor 4 is Paul's attempt to reestablish his authority over the Corinthians. Paul uses a series of five interwoven arguments to accomplish this goal. Paul uses the social values of honor and shame in these five arguments. In vv. 1–5, *the ultimate tribunal*, Paul appeals to a higher court, the court of the Lord. By appealing to this higher court Paul has placed himself outside the jurisdiction of the Corinthians. However, Paul's conclusion in v. 5 would indicate that the Corinthians are now under the jurisdiction of their Lord Jesus. Thus, the Corinthians will be judged by the Lord if they judge Paul and if they do not stay in their proper place.

In vv. 6–7, *Do not go beyond what is written*, Paul applies the principles he has laid down in vv. 1–5 as he paves the way for his *peristasis* catalogue. In v. 7 Paul employs the language of the patron-client relationship when he refers to *giving* and

receiving. Thus, they are indeed clients of Jesus and boasting over men is a strong indication that they do not stay in their place as clients of Jesus. Paul, in 1:1–9, argues that they have been honored by Jesus' patronage, thus to boast in men is to act as if they have not been honored by Jesus, and it is also to behave in a manner that would shame Jesus.

In vv. 8–13, *Kings and Criminals*, Paul employs the well known literary *peristasis* catalogue and compares himself with the Corinthian patrons. The irony of Paul's *peristasis* catalogue is that Paul's shame results in honor because it catalogues his willingness to endure the most shameful treatment as he stays in his proper place and is a faithful servant, steward, and apostle of Jesus. In contrast, Paul's sarcastic honoring of his opponents, when he describes them as *kings,* shames them. This description suggests that they have dramatically overstepped their proper place. Instead of behaving like clients they are acting like kings. Paul also shames them when he outlines his response to their mistreatment of him, *When reviled, we bless; when persecuted, we endure; when slandered, we speak kindly*.

In vv. 14–16, *A Letter of Recommendation*, Paul now describes his relationship to the Corinthians as one of father and children. From this relationship perspective, the behavior of the Corinthians has shamed their father and it has overstepped their place as *faithful* children. While Paul, their father, argues that his *peristasis* catalogue was not intended to shame his children but to admonish them, it does shame them.

In vv. 17–21 *Timothy, the apostle's apostle*, Paul makes a double attempt to reestablish his power in the Corinthian Church, First by reestablishing his presence in Corinth by letter, and second by sending his emissary, the faithful Timothy. This double presence, and the potential of Paul's actual physical presence, emboldens Paul to warn of using a rod both to shame and forcefully put the Corinthians in their proper place.

One of the implications of Paul's argument of chapter four is the change of tone and argument that is found in the rest of the epistle. This is best seen in the manner in which Paul begins 1 Cor 5 as he addresses the situation of the incestuous man. In v. 1 Paul is much more forceful and direct as he outlines the core problem at the beginning of the section and with a three-fold progression of shame. This, then, would indicate that Paul writes the rest of the epistle from the perspective that his rhetoric of honor and shame in 1 Cor 4 has worked and he has reestablished his position of authority. He has put the Corinthians in their place, and he proceeds to address the remaining issues from the perspective of an *apostle* of Jesus Christ and the *father* of the Corinthian Christians.

First Corinthians 5–6 outlines Paul addressing three *immoral* problems connected with patronal abuses; *the incestuous man* in 1 Cor 5, *the law court abuses* in 1 Cor 6:1–11, and the *sexual immorality* in 1 Cor 6:12–20. The central issue addressed in 1 Cor 5 is that of an incestuous wealthy patron. Paul's instruction to cast out and/or banish the immoral man is a stark reversal of the existing patron-client relationship within the congregation. To motivate the Corinthians to banish the incestuous man Paul shames the congregation into shaming the incestuous man because he is bringing shame on Jesus, the super-patron. In a world of patron-client relationships where the coin was honor and shame, Paul's call to action is indeed a case where the punishment fits the crime.

In 1 Cor 6:1–10 Paul addresses the abusive or unjust use of the civil law courts, which was another avenue being used by the powerful patrons to garner honor and shame the less powerful. Paul severely shames the patrons for the abuse of their brothers in the law courts. However, in v. 11, Paul moves in a different direction. The language in v. 11 takes on a note of honor; the honor Jesus has bestowed on the Corinthians. Not only were they washed and sanctified in the name of Jesus, the super-patron, they were justified. They have received a three-stage honoring in Jesus, and the last and greatest honor was being justified. What they have received in Jesus is now used by Paul as the greatest contrast with their shameful (ἄδικος/ἀδικέω) behavior.

In 1 Cor 6:12–20 Paul addresses the sexual immorality of the wealthy patrons who were engaging in sexual union with prostitutes. Paul begins by first addressing two Corinthian slogans. Paul argues that these two slogans were self-centered and lead to a wrong view of both sexual immorality and the body. The first two slogans lead to the third slogan which resulted in sexual immorality. This dishonored their patron and it also dishonored the clients. Yet, in spite of this shameful activity, Paul is clear that their patron has honored them by honoring their bodies. The resurrection of their bodies, their being members of Christ, their bodies being temples of the Holy Spirit, and finally their being purchased at a price/purchased for honor are the ways in which their patron has honored their bodies. In return for honoring their bodies, Jesus, their super-patron, asks that they would now use their bodies to honor him. Specifically, they would honor their patron by fleeing sexual immorality.

The textual rhetorical analysis of 1 Cor 1–6 has demonstrated that a central feature of these chapters is Paul's rhetoric of honor and shame. Since the patron-client relationship was also one of honor and shame, this would reinforce the contention that one of the core problems in the Corinthian congregation was elite members of society

who viewed the Christian community as another venue to dominate and use in their constant competition for status.

The manner in which Paul crafts his response to the patronal abuses would also indicate that he, whether he was formally trained in rhetoric or not, had a high degree of rhetorical prowess. Three examples may be cited to demonstrate evidence of Paul's rhetorical skills. First, the manner in which Paul begins 1 Cor 1:1–9 as he sets the stage for his argument in chapters 1–6. Paul defines Jesus as the super-patron of the Corinthian congregation, himself as the apostle and father of the congregation, and all the members of the congregation as clients of Jesus. Second, Paul's use of shame in dealing with the factionalism and the patronal abuses. This leads to the third example, which is Paul's constant reversal of honor and shame. This is clearly seen in 1 Cor 5 as Paul shames the congregation for being arrogant and not mourning the incest of the man who is living with his father's wife.

This textual rhetorical analysis with an emphasis on the rhetoric of honor and shame may also be used to examine the rest of 1 Corinthians. Paul employs honor and shame language in addressing the head covering issues in 1 Cor 11:2–16, the problems surrounding the Lord's supper in 1 Cor 11:17–34, and the spiritual gifts in chapter 12. It would also appear that Paul uses language of honor and shame when addressing the issue of the resurrection, particularly when he argues in 15:43; *It is sown in dishonor, it is raised in glory*. It would also appear that the issue of Corinthian patronage may have been connected with the issue of eating food offered to idols as addressed by Paul in chapter 8.

However, it should be noted that 1 Cor 1–6 is a rich and complex section. While examining it through rhetorical criticism and focusing on the patron-client relationship and honor and shame values have provided new insights into the text, care must be taken not to read 1 Corinthians in a myopic fashion. Textual rhetorical analysis with an emphasis on Paul's rhetoric of honor and shame is only one of many valid methods to read the text. This caveat would also apply to the rest of 1 Corinthians. As noted, it would appear Paul's rhetoric of honor and shame is employed in the rest of the epistle. However, a detailed textual rhetorical analysis would have to be done on each rhetorical unit of the epistle to determine how dominant Paul's rhetoric of honor and shame is in the unit. Thus, this caveat comes with two applications. First, while a rhetoric of honor and shame is a dominant theme in 1 Cor 1–6, this does not imply that the rest of the epistle follows in the same vein. Second, while Paul may employ language of honor and shame or allude to honor and shame in other rhetoric units, this should not be taken that honor and shame is the dominant theme of the unit.

Kennedy suggests that the last step in rhetorical criticism is to determine "its success in meeting the rhetorical exigence and what its implications may be for the speaker or audience."[1] From a literary perspective it can be argued that Paul's argument does work. The overall literary structure of chapters 1–6 is well formulated. In 1:1–9 Paul defines Jesus, himself, and the Corinthians in a way that enables him to employ his rhetoric for the next six chapters. In 1:10–3:23 Paul moves through a very well crafted series of arguments that shame the Corinthians for their divisive slogans of 1:12. In 1 Cor 4 he meticulously and carefully weaves an argument that puts the patrons in their proper place as he reestablished himself to the position of authority as the father. In 1 Cor 5–6 Paul's tone changes as he assumes the role of a father rebuking his children. This change of tone is markedly different from the tone of 1 Cor 1–3 but it is keeping in line with Paul's argument in chapter 4. First Corinthians 5–6 also demonstrate careful organization and crafting.

Rhetoric is about persuasion. Thus, in seeking to determine the success of Paul's rhetoric, the question really becomes less about literary structure and more about pragmatics. This leads to a question that is difficult to answer, namely, does Paul's rhetoric work? This question is difficult to answer because, hypothetically, a person can craft a message that follows the guidelines of classic rhetoric theory and yet still fall to persuade his intended audience. Perhaps a second question may be asked, does Paul persuade the Corinthians to change their behavior? The key to answering that question may be found in 2 Corinthians. One might argue that the very fact that Paul has to write to the Corinthians again would suggest that he failed to persuade them in first Corinthians. Paul's own statements of 2 Cor 12:20-21 could well be cited as evidence of his failure. Conversely, it could also be argued that Paul's rhetoric succeeds since problems related to patronal abuses are not addressed in 2 Corinthians. Nor does Paul employ honor and shame with the same level of intensity in 2 Corinthians as he does in 1 Corinthians. Yet, the manner in which Paul defends his ministry in 2 Cor 10 appears to be quite similar to the language of 1 Cor 1–3. Paul's *peristasis* catalogue of 2 Cor 11:16–33 and the *peristasis* catalogue of 6:3–11 are reminiscent of his *peristasis* list of 1 Cor 4:8–13. Thus, selective sections of 2 Corinthians may be cited as evidence for and against Paul's rhetoric success in 1 Cor 1–6.

Perhaps, in attempting to determine the success of Paul's rhetoric of honor and shame in 1 Cor 1–6 , an initial and tentative answer would be that Paul's rhetoric

---

1. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation*, 38.

appears to be partially successful. However, this also opens another area of fruitful study, that of a textual rhetorical analysis of 2 Corinthians with a view of determining the success of Paul's rhetoric of honor and shame in 1 Cor 1–6.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aasgaard, Reidar. *'My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!': Christian Siblingship in Paul*. JSNTSup 265. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Ackerman, David A. *Lo, I Tell You a Mystery: Cross, Resurrection, and Paraenesis in the Rhetoric of 1 Corinthians*. Princeton Theological Monograph Series 54. Eugene: Wipf & Stock, 2006.

Adams, Edward, and David G. Horrell. *Christianity at Corinth, the Quest for the Pauline Church*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2004.

Agosto, Efrain. "Patronage and Commendation, Imperial and Anti-Imperial." Pp. 103–23 in *Paul and the Roman Imperial Order*. Edited by Richard A. Horsley. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2004.

Anderson, R. Dean Jr. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. Rev. ed. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 1999.

------. *Glossary of Greek Rhetorical Terms*. Leuven, Belgium: Peeters, 2000.

Archer, R. L. "The Epistolary Form in the New Testament." *Expository Times* 68 (1951): 296–98.

Arichea, Daniel. "Translating 'Grace' (Charis) in the New Testament." *The Bible Translator* 29 (1978): 210–206.

Artz, Peter. "The 'Epistolary Introduction Thanksgiving' in the Papyri and in Paul." *Novum Testamentum* 36 (1994): 27–46.

Aune, David E. *The New Testament in Its Literary Environment*. Library of Early Christianity 8. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1987.

------. *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament & Early Christian Literature & Rhetoric*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2003.

Bailey, K. E. "Paul's Theological Foundations for Human Sexuality: 1 Cor. 6:9–20 in the Light of Rhetorical Criticism." *Near Eastern School of Theology Theological Review* 3 (1980): 27–41.

------. "The Structure of 1 Corinthians and Paul's Theological Method with Special Reference to 4:17." *Novum Testamentum* 25 (1983): 152–81.

Baird, William. "'One Against the Other': Intra-Church Conflict in 1 Corinthians." Pp. 116–36 in *The Conversation Continues: Studies in Paul & John*. Edited by Robert T. Fortna and Beverly R. Gaventa. Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.

Balsdon, J. P. V. D. *Roman Women: Their History and Habits*. Westport: Greenwood, 1962.

Barclay, John M. G. "Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 47 (1992): 57–72.

Barrett, C. K. "Christianity at Corinth." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 46 (1964): 269–97.

------. "Christianity at Corinth." Pp. 269–97 in *New Testament Essays*. London: SPCK, 1972.

------. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. London: A&C Black, 1968.

------. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Black's New Testament. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1968.

Bartchy, S. Scott. *First Century Slavery and the Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 7*. Wipf & Stock, 2002.

Barton, John. "History and Rhetoric in the Prophets." Pp. 51–61 in *The Bible as Rhetoric*. Edited by Martin Warner. London: Routledge, 1990.

Barton, Stephen C. "Social-Scientific Criticism." Pp. 277–89 in *Handbook to Exegesis of the New Testament*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. Leiden: Brill, 1997.

Bassler, Jouette M. "1 Corinthians 4:1–5." *Interpretation* 4 (1990): 179–83.

Batey, Richard. "The μία σάρξ Union of Christ and the Church." *New Testament Studies* 13 (1996): 270–81.

Baur, F. C. "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des paulinischen und petrinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom." *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 4 (1831): 61–206.

------. *Paul, The Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings; a Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*. ET of 2nd ed. London: Williams & Norgate, 1873.

Beasley-Murray, Paul. "ἀπολούω." *NIDNTT* 1:150–53.

------. "Romans 1:3f: An Early Confession of Faith in the Lordship of Jesus." *Tyndale Bulletin* 31 (1980): 147–54.

Behm, Johannes. "νουθετέω, νουθεσία." *TDNT* 4:1019–1022.

Belleville, Linda L. "Continuity or Discontinuity: A Fresh Look at 1 Corinthians in the Light of First-Century Epistolary Forms and Conventions." *Evangelical Quarterly* 59 (1987): 15–37.

Bernard, J. H. "The Connexion Between the Fifth and Sixth Chapters of 1 Corinthians." *Expositor* 7 (1907): 433–43.

Betz, H. D. *Galatians; A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia*. Hermenia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979.

Bitzer, Lloyd. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1–14.

Blomberg, Craig. *1 Corinthians*. NIV Application Bible. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1994.

Botha, Pieter J. J. "Letter Writing and Oral Communication in Antiquity: Suggested Implications for the Interpretation of Paul's Letters to the Galatians." *Scriptura* 42 (1992): 17–34.

Bowersock, G. W. "Eurycles of Sparta." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 51, Parts 1 and 2 (1961): 112–18.

Bowie, E. L. "The Importance of the Sophists." *Yale Classical Studies* 27 (1982): 29–59.

Bruce, F. F. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. London: Oliphants, 1971.

Bultmann, Rudolf. *Theology of the New Testament*. Vol. 1. Translated by Kendrick Grobel. Scribner, 1955.

Burkhill, T. A. "Two Into One: The Notion of Carnal Union in Mark 10:8; 1 Cor. 6:16; Eph. 5:13." *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 62 (1971): 115–20.

Byrne, Brendan. "Eschatologies of Resurrection and Destruction: The Ethical Significance of Paul's Dispute with the Corinthians." *Downside Review* 104 (1986): 608–16.

------. "Sinning Against One's Own Body: Paul's Understanding of the Sexual Relationship of 1 Corinthians 6:18." *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 45 (1983): 608–16.

Calvin, John. *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*. Translated by J. W. Fraser. Calvin's New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1960.

Campbell, Barth. "Flesh and Spirit in 1 Cor 5:5: An Exercise in Rhetorical Criticism of the NT." *Journal of the Evangelical Theological Society* 36 (1993): 331–42.

Carlson, Richard P. "The Role of Baptism in Paul's Thought." *Interpretation* 47 (1993): 225–66.

Carson, D. A. *Exegetical Fallacies*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1996.

Carter, Timothy L. "'Big Men' in Corinth." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 66 (1997): 45–71.

Castelli, Elizabeth A. *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.

------. "Interpretations of Power in 1 Corinthians." *Semeia* 51 (1991): 197–222.

Ceresko, Anthony R. "A Rhetorical Analysis of 'David's Boast' (1 Samuel 17:34–37): Some Reflections on Method." *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 47 (1985): 58–74.

Chester, Stephen J. *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church*. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

Chow, John K. *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth*. JSNTSup. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992.

Clarke, Andrew D. "Equality or Mutuality? Paul's Use of 'Brother' Language." Pp. 151–64 in *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by P. J. Williams, Andrew Clark, Peter Head, and David Instone-Brewer. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

------. *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6*. Leiden: Brill, 1993.

Classen, Carl Joachim. *Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament*. Boston: Brill, 2002.

Clifford, Richard. *Fair Spoken and Persuading: An Interpretation of Second Isaiah*. New York: Paulist, 1984.

Clines, David J. A. "Deconstructing the Book of Job." Pp. 65–80 in *The Bible as Rhetoric: Studies in Biblical Persuasion and Credibility*. Edited by Martin Warner. London: Routledge, 1990.

Cole, Thomas. "Who Was Corax?" *Illinois Classical Studies* 16 (1991): 65–84.

Collins, A. Y. "The Function of 'Excommunication' in Paul." *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 251–63.

Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1999.

Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1999.

Colson, F. N. "μετεσχημάτισα In 1 Corinthians 4:6." *Journal of Theological Studies* 17 (1916): 380–83.

Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians*. Translated by James W. Leitch. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.

Craffert, Pieter F. "Relationships Between Social-Scientific, Literary, and Rhetorical Interpretation of the Texts." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 26 (1996): 45–55.

Craig, C. T. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Interpreters Bible 10. New York: Abingdon, 1953.

Cranfield, C. E. B. *Romans 9–16*. International Critical Commentary. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Craven, Toni. *Artistry and Faith in the Book of Judith*. SBLDS 70. Chicago: Scholars Press, 1983.

Crook, J. A. *Law and Life of Rome 90 B.C.–A.D. 212*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1967.

Dahl, Nils A. *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 1977.

Davis, James A. *Wisdom and Spirit: An Investigation of 1 Cor. 1:18–3:20 Against the Background of Jewish Sapiential Traditions in the Greco-Roman Period*. Lanham: University of America Press, 1984.

De Boer M. C. "The Composition of 1 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 229–45.

Le Deaut, Roger. "The Paschal Mystery and Morality." *Doctrine and Life* 18 (1968): 262–69.

Deissmann, Adolf. *Light From the Ancient East*. Rev. ed. Translated by Lionel Strachen. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2004.

------. *A Study in Social and Religious History*. 2nd ed. Translated by W. Wilson. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1926.

Deluz, Gaston. *A Companion to 1 Corinthians*. London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963.

Deming, Will. "The Unity of 1 Corinthians 5–6." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 115 (1996): 289–312.

Derrett, J. Duncan M. "Judgement and 1 Corinthians 6." *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 22–36.

------. "Right and Wrong Sticking (1 Cor 6,18)?" *Estudios Biblicos* 55 (1997): 89–106.

deSilva, David A. *Despising Shame: Honor Discourse and Community Maintenance in the Epistle to the Hebrews*. SBLDS 140. Atlanta: Scholars, 1995.

------. *Honor, Patronage, Kinship & Purity; Unlocking New Testament Culture*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2000.

------. *The Hope of Glory: Honor Discourses and New Testament Interpretation*. Collegeville: Liturgical, 1999.

------. *An Introduction to the New Testament: Contexts, Methods & Ministry Formation*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.

------. "'Let the One Who Claims Honor Establish That Claim in the Lord': Honor Discourse in the Corinthian Correspondence." *Biblical Theological Bulletin* 28 (1998): 61–74.

------. "Patronage." *Dictionary of New Testament Background*, 766–71.

------. *Perseverance in Gratitude: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on the Epistle "to the Hebrews"*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Devor, R. C. "Homosexuality and St. Paul." *Pastoral Psychology* 23 (1972): 50–58.

Dodd, Brian J. "Paul's Paradigmatic 'I' and 1 Corinthians 6.12." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 59 (1995): 39–58.

Dominik, William J., ed. *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Doty, W. G. "The Classification of Epistolary Literature." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 31 (1969): 183–99.

Doughty, Darrell. "The Priority of χάρις." *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972–73): 163–80.

Douglas, Mary. *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology*. 3rd. London: Routledge, 2003.

Edwards, Thomas C. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. 2nd ed. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1885.

Ehrenberg, Victor, and A. H. M. Jones. *Documents Illustrating the Reigns of Augustus and Tiberius*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1976.

Elliott, John H. "Patronage and Clientage.". In *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard L. Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.

------. *What is Social-Scientific Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993.

Ellis, E. Earle. "Christ Crucified." Pp. 69–75 in *Reconciliation and Hope. New Testament Essays in Atonement and Eschatology*. Edited by R. Banks. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1974.

Eriksson, Anders. "Enthymemes in Pauline Argumentation: Reading Between the Lines in 1 Corinthians." Pp. 243–59 in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts*. Edited by Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Übelacker. Emory Studies in Early Christianity. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2002.

------. *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians*. Coniectanea Biblica NTS 29. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1998.

Evans, Ernest. *The Epistles of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1930.

Fee, Gordon G. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1987.

Ferguson, Everett. *Backgrounds of Early Christianity*. 3rd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Fiore, Benjamin. "'Covert Allusion' in 1 Corinthians 1–4." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 47 (1985): 85–102.

------. "Paul, Exemplification, and Imitation." Pp. 228–57 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003.

Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler. "1 Corinthians." Pp. 1168–89 in *Harper's Biblical Commentary*. Edited by James Luther Mays. New York: Harper & Row, 1988.

------. "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 386–403.

Fisk, B. N. "πορνεύειν As Body Violation: The Unique Nature of Sexual sin in 1 Corinthians 6:18." *New Testament Studies* 42 (1996): 540–58.

Fitch, W. O. "Paul, Apollos, Cephas, Christ." *Theology* 74 (1971): 18–24.

Fitzgerald, John T. *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence*. SBLDS 89. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

------. "Paul, the Ancient Epistolary Theorists, and 2 Corinthians 10–13: The Purpose and Literary Genre of a Pauline Letter." Pp. 190–200 in *Greek, Romans and Christians*. Edited by David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Forbes, Christopher. "Comparison, Self-Praise and Irony: Paul's Boasting and Conventions in Hellenistic Rhetoric." *New Testament Studies* 32 (1986): 1–30.

Forkman, Goran. *The Limits of Religious Community: Expulsion from the Religious Community Within the Qumran Sect, with Rabbinic Community, and Within Primitive Christianity*. In *Limits of Religious Community*. Translated by P. Sjolander. New Testament Series 5. Lund: Coniectanea biblica, 1972.

Fowl, Stephen E. *Philippians*. The Two Horizons New Testament Commentary. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2005.

Fredrickson, David E. "Paul, Hardships, and Suffering." Pp. 172–97 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003.

Freeman, Charles. *Egypt, Greece and Rome: Civilizations of the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

Gardner, Jane F. *Women in Roman Law and Society*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1991.

Garland, David E. *1 Corinthians*. Baker Exegetical Commentary. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2003.

------. *2 Corinthians*. New American Commentary 29. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999.

Garnsey, Peter. *Social Status and Legal Privilege in the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1970.

Garnsey, Peter, and Richard Saller. "Patronal Power Relations." Pp. 96–103 in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society*. Edited by Richard A. Horsley. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1977.

Gitay, Yehoshua. *Prophecy and Persuasion: A Study of Isaiah 40–48*. Bonn: Linguistica Biblica, 1981.

Glancy, Jennifer, A. "Boasting of Beatings (2 Corinthians 11:23–25)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 123 (2004): 99–135.

Goulder, Michael D. "Σοφία in 1 Corinthians." *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 516–34.

------. "Libertines? (1 Cor. 5–6)." *Novum Testamentum* 41 (1999): 334–48.

------. *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2001.

------. *St. Paul and St. Peter: A Tale of Two Missions*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1994.

Gowler, D. B. "Hospitality and Characterization in Luke11:37–54: A Socio-Narratological Approach." *Semeia* 64 (1993): 213–51.

Grant, F. C. "Rhetoric and Oratory." *Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible* 4:75–78.

Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Theology*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1981.

Hall, David R. "A Disguise for the Wise: μετεσχημάτισμος In 1 Corinthians 4.6." *New Testament Studies* 40 (1994): 143–49.

------. *The Unity of the Corinthian Correspondence*. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

Hammerton-Kelly, Robert G. *Sacred Violence: Paul's Hermeneutic of the Cross*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992.

Hanges, James C. "1 Corinthians 4:6 and the Possibility of Written Bylaws in the Corinthian Church." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 117 (1998): 275–98.

Hanson, Anthony. "1 Corinthians 4:13b and Lamentations 3:45." *Expository Times* 93 (1982): 214–15.

Harris, Gerald. "The Beginnings of Church Discipline: 1 Corinthians 5." *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 1–21.

Hauck, Friedrick. "περικάθαρμα." *TDNT* 3:430–431.

Hays, Richard B. *First Corinthians*. Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.

Hengel, Martin. *Crucifixion: In the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*. Translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.

------. *The Pre-Christian Paul*. Translated by Rowland Deines. Philadelphia: Trinity, 1991.

Héring, Jean. *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*. London: Epworth, 1962.

Highet, G. "Libertino Patre Natus." *American Journal of Philology* 94 (1993): 268–81.

Hock, Ronald F. *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship.* Philadelphia: Fortress, 1980.

Hodgson, R. "Paul the Apostle and First Century Tribulation Lists." *Zeitschrift Für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 74 (1983): 59–80.

Hooker, Morna D. "'Beyond the Things Which Are Written': An Examination of 1 Cor. 4:6." *New Testament Studies* 10 (1963): 127–32.

Hornbury, William. "Extirpation and Excommunication." *Vetus Testamentum* 35 (1985): 31–38.

Horrell, David G. *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement.* Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Horsley, Richard A., ed. *Paul and Politics: Ekklesia, Israel, Imperium, Interpretation.* Harrisburg: Trinity, 2000.

------. "1 Corinthians: A Case Study of Paul's Assembly as an Alternative Society." Pp. 242–52 in *Paul and Empire: Religion and Power in Roman Imperial Society.* Edited by Richard A. Horsley. Harrisburg: Trinity, 1997.

------. *1 Corinthians.* Abingdon NT Commentaries. Nashville: Abingdon, 1998.

------. "Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8.1–6." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1981): 32–52.

------. "Patronage, Priesthood and Powers: Introduction." Pp. 88–95 in *Paul and Empire.* Edited by Richard A. Horsley. Harrisburg: Trinity, 1997.

------. "Wisdom of Word and Words of Wisdom in Corinth." *Catholic Bible Quarterly* 39 (1977): 224.

Howard, J. K. "'Christ Our Passover': A Study of the Passover-Exodus Theme in 1 Corinthians." *Evangelical Quarterly* 41 (1969): 97–108.

Howard, W. F. "1 Corinthians 4.6 (Exegesis or Emendation)." *Expository Times* 33 (1922): 137–41.

Humphries, Raymond. "Paul's Rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 1–4." Ph.D dissertation. Graduate Theological Union, 1979.

Hurd, John Coolidge. *The Origins of 1 Corinthians.* Macon: Mercer University Press, 1983.

Hurst, L. D. "Apollos, Hebrews, and Corinth: Bishop Montefiore's Theory Examined." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 38 (1985): 505–13.

Jeffers, James S. *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament Era: Exploring the Background of Early Christianity.* Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1999.

Jensen, Joseph. "Does *Porneia* Mean Fornication? A Critique of Bruce Malina." *Novum Testamentum* 20 (1978): 161–84.

Jewett, Robert. "Paul, Shame, and Honor." Pp. 551–74 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003.

------. *Romans*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2007.

John, S. E. "Tarsus and the Apostle Paul." *Lexington Theological Quarterly* 15.4 (1980): 105–13.

Johnson, Alan F. *1 Corinthians*. InterVarsity NT Commentary 7. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity, 2004.

Joy, George. "Is the Body Really to be Destroyed?" *The Bible Translator* 39 (1988): 429–36.

Judge, E. A. *The Social Pattern of Christian Groups in the First Century: Some Prolegomena to the Study of New Testament Ideas of Social Obligation*. London: Tyndale, 1960.

Judge, Edwin A. "Cultural Conformity and Innovation in Paul: Some Clues from Contemporary Documents." *Tyndale Bulletin* 35 (1984): 3–24.

Käsemann, Ernst. *Commentary on Romans*. Translated by G. W. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980.

Keck, Leander E. "God the Other Who Acts Otherwise: An Exegetical Essay on 1 Cor 1:26–31." *Word & World* 16 (1996): 437–43.

Kelly, J. M. *Roman Litigation*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1966.

Kennedy, George A. *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1999.

------. *Comparative Rhetoric*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998.

------. *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*. North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press, 1984.

Kent, John H. *Corinth 8.3 The Inscriptions 1926–1950*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1966.

Kirby, John T. "Ciceronian Rhetoric: Theory and Practice." Pp. 13–31 in *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. Edited by William J. Dominik. London: Routledge, 1997.

Kistemaker, Simon J. *1 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1993.

Kloppenborg, J. S. "Egalitarianism in the Myth and Rhetoric of Pauline Churches." Pp. 247–63 in *Reimaging Christian Origins*. Edited by E. A. Castelli and H. Taussig. Valley Forge: Trinity, 1996.

Kuck, D. W. *Judgments and Community Conflict: Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5–4:5*. Leiden: Brill, 1992.

Kümmel, Werner. *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of Its Problems*. Translated by S. M. Gilmour and H. C. Kee. Nashville: Abingdon, 1972.

Lampe, Peter. "Paul, Patrons, and Clients." Pp. 488–523 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003.

------. "Theological Wisdom and the 'Word About the Cross': The Rhetorical Scheme in 1 Corinthians 1–4." *Interpretation* 39 (1990): 117–31.

Lanci, John R. *A New Temple in Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*. New York: Peter Lang, 1997.

Lawson-Tancred, Hugh. "Introduction.". In *The Art of Rhetoric*. London: Penguin, 1991.

Legault, A. "'Beyond the Things That Are Written' (1 Cor. 4:6)." *New Testament Studies* 18 (1971): 227–31.

Lieu, Judith M. "'Grace to You and Peace': The Apostolic Greeting." *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library* 68 (1985): 162–78.

Lightfoot, J. B. *Notes on the Epistles of St. Paul*. London: Macmillan, 1895.

Lim, Timothy H. "Not in Persuasive Words of Wisdom, but in the Demonstration of the Spirit and Power." *Novum Testamentum* 29 (1987): 137–49.

Linski, L. C. H. *The Interpretation of St. Paul's First and Second Epistle to the Corinthians*. Columbus: Augsburg, 1937.

Litfin, A. Duane. *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation: An Investigation of 1 Cor. 1–4 in the Life of Greco-Roman Rhetoric*. SNTS. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Word Biblical Commentary 41. Thomas Nelson, 1990.

Lundbom, Jack R. *Jeremiah: A Study in Ancient Hebrew Rhetoric*. SBLDS 18. Missoula: Scholars Press, 1975.

MacDonald, D. R. *There is no Male and Female: The Fate of a Dominican Saying in Paul and Gnosticism*. HDR 20. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

MacDonald, Margaret. "Women Holy in Body and Spirit: The Social Setting of 1 Corinthians 7." *New Testament Studies* 36 (1990): 161–81.

Mack, Burton L. *Rhetoric and the New Testament*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

MacMullen, Ramsay. "Women in Public in the Roman Empire." *Historia* 29 (1980): 208–18.

Malherbe, Abraham J. "μὴ γένοιτο In the Diatribe and Paul." *Harvard Theological Review* 73 (1980): 231–40.

------. *Moral Exhortation, a Greco-Roman Source Book*. Library of Early Christianity 4. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1986.

------. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. Baton Rouge: Louisiana State University Press, 1977.

Malick, David E. "The Condemnation of Homosexuality in 1 Corinthians 6:9." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 150 (1993): 479–92.

Malina, Bruce J. "Does *Porneia* Mean Fornication?" *Novum Testamentum* 14 (1972): 10–17.

------. *The New Testament World: Insights from Cultural Anthropology*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.

------. "Rhetorical Criticism and Social-Scientific Criticism: Why Won't Romanticism Leave Us Alone?" Pp. 72–101 in *Rhetoric, Scripture and Theology: Essays from the 1994 Pretoria Conference*. S. E. Porter and T. H. Olbricht. Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1996.

Malina, Bruce J., and Jerome H. Neyrey. "Honor and Shame in Luke-Acts: Pivotal Values of the Mediterranean World.". In *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.

Malina, Bruce J., and John J. Pilch. *Social-Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul*. Mineapolis: Fortress, 2006.

Marshall, Peter. *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians*. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1987.

Martin, Dale B. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.

------. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.

Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of The Apostle Paul*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Meggitt, Justin J. *Paul, Poverty and Survival*. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000.

------. "The Social Status of Erastus (Rom. 16:23)." *Novum Testamentum* 38 (1996): 218–23.

Miller, J. I. "A Fresh Look at 1 Corinthians 6.16 f." *New Testament Studies* 27 (1980): 125–27.

Minear, Paul S. "Christ and the Congregation: 1 Corinthians 5–6." *Review and Expositor* 80 (1983): 341–50.

Mitchell, Alan. "Rich and Poor in the Courts of Corinth: Litigiousness and Status in 1 Cor 6:1–11." *New Testament Studies* 39 (1983): 562–86.

Mitchell, Margaret M. "Concerning Περὶ δέ in 1 Cor." *Novum Testamentum* 31 (1989): 229–56.

------. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1991.

------. "Rhetorical Shorthand in Pauline Argumentation: The Function of 'The Gospel' in the Corinthian Correspondence." Pp. 63–88 in *Gospel in Paul: Studies in Corinthians, Galatians and Romans*. Edited by Ann Jervis and Richardson. JSNTSup 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic, 1994.

Mitton, Leslie M. "New Wine in Old Wine Skins: IV, Leaven." *Expository Times* 84 (1973).

Moffatt, James. *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1938.

Morgan, Teresa. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Morris, Leon. *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. Revised. Tyndale New Testament Commentaries. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

Moule, C. F. D. *An Idiom Book of the New Testament*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1959.

Moulton, James H., and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament: Illustrated from the Papyri and Other Non-Literary Sources*. Reprint. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1997.

Moxnes, Halvor. "Honor and Shame." Pp. 19–40 in *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Edited by Richard L. Rohrbaugh. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.

------. "Patron-Client Relations and the New Community in Luke-Acts." Pp. 241–68 in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.

Muilenburg, James. "Form Criticism and Beyond." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 88 (1969): 1–18.

Mullins, Terence Y. "Greeting as a New Testament Form." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 87 (1968): 418–26.

Munck, Johannes. *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. Translated by Frank Clarke. London: SCM, 1959.

Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "1 Corinthians, 5:3–5." *Review Bibliques* 84 (1977): 239–45.

------. "Corinthian Slogans in 1 Cor 6:16–20." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 40 (1978): 391–96.

------. *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*. 3rd ed. Good News Studies, 6. Collegeville: Liturgical, 2002.

Nanos, Mark. "Paul's *Reversal* of Jews Calling Gentiles 'Dogs' (Philippians 3:2): 1600 Years of an Ideological Tales Wagging an Exegetical Dog." *Biblical Interpretation* (Forthcoming).

Neill, Stephen, and N. T. Wright. *The Interpretation of the New Testament, 1861–1986*. 2d ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1988.

The New Oxford American Dictionary. New York: Oxford University Press, 2005.

Neyrey, Jerome H. "Ceremonies in Luke-Acts: The Case of Meals and Table Fellowship." Pp. 361–87 in *The Social World of Luke-Acts: Models for Interpretation*. Edited by Jerome H. Neyrey. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1991.

------. *Paul in Other Words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1990.

Nobbs, Alanna. "'Beloved Brothers' in the New Testament and Early Christian World." Pp. 143–64 in *The New Testament in Its First Century Setting*. Edited by P. J. Williams, Andrew Clark, Peter Head, and David Instone-Brewer. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2004.

Nock, A. D. *St. Paul*. London: Harper, 1938.

Nolland, John. "Grace as Power." *Novum Testamentum* 28 (1986): 26–31.

Norden, Eduard. *Die antike Kunstprosa vom IV Jahrhundert vor Christus bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1898.

O'Day, Gail. "Jeremiah 9:22–23 and 1 Corinthians 1:26–31 A Study in Intertextuality." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 109 (1990): 259—267.

Oke, Clark C. "Paul's Method not a Demonstration but an Exhibition of the Spirit." *The Expository Times* 67 (1955): 85–86.

Olbricht, Thomas H. "An Aristotelian Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Thessalonians." Pp. 216–136 in *Greeks, Romans, and Christians*. Edited by David L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Olyan, Saul M. "Honor, Shame, and Covenant Relations in Ancient Israel and Its Environment." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 116 (1996): 201–18.

Omanson, R. "Acknowledging Paul's Quotations." *Bible Today* 43 (1992): 201–13.

Oropeza, B. J. "Echoes of Isaiah in the Rhetoric of Paul: New Exodus, Wisdom, and the Humility of the Cross in Utopian-Apocalyptic Expectations." Pp. 87–112 in *The Intertexture of Apocalyptic Discourse*. Edited by Duane F. Waston. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2002.

------. "Situational Immorality: Paul's 'Vice Lists' at Corinth." *Expository Times* 110 (1998): 9–10.

Orr, William F., and James A. Walther. *1 Corinthians*. The Anchor Bible 32. New York: Doubleday, 1976.

Oster, Richard E. *1 Corinthians*. The College Press NIV Commentary. Joplin: College Press, 1995.

Parkin, Vincent. "Some Comments on the Pauline Prescripts." *Irish Biblical Studies* 8 (1986): 92–99.

Pascuzzi, Maria. *Ethics, Ecclesiology and Church Discipline: A Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Corinthians 5*. Tesi Gregoriana Serie Teologia 32. Rome: Pontifical Gregorian University Press, 1997.

Patrick, Dale, and Allen Scult. *Rhetoric and Biblical Interpretation*. JSOTSup 82. Sheffield: Almond, 1990.

Pearson, Birger. *The Pneumatikos-Psychikos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and Its Relation to Gnosticism*. SBLDS 12. Atlanta: Scholars, 1973.

Perelman, Chaïm, and Lucy Olbrechts-Tyteca. *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*. Translated by John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1969.

Peterson, Brian K. *Eloquence and the Proclamation of the Gospel in Corinth*. SBLDS 163. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1998.

Peterson, W. L. "Can ἀρσενοκοῖται be Translated by 'Homosexuals'? (1 Cor 6:9, 1 Tim 1:10)." *Vigiliae Christianae* 40 (1986): 187–91.

Pfitzner, Victor C. "Purified Community - Purified Sinner: Expulsion from the Community According to Matthew 18:15–18 and 1 Corinthians 5:1–5." *Australian Bible Review* 30 (1982): 34–55.

Pickett, Raymond. *The Cross in Corinth: The Social Significance of the Death of Jesus*. JSNTSup 143. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.

Pilch, John J., and Bruce J. Malina, eds. *Handbook of Biblical Social Values*. Updated ed. Peabody: Hendrickson, 2000.

Plank, Karl A. *Paul and the Irony of Affliction*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.

Pogoloff, Stephen M. *Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians*. SBLDS 134. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.

Pohill, John B. "The Wisdom of God and Factionalism: 1 Corinthians 1–4." *Review and Expositor* 80 (1983): 325–50.

Polhill, John B. *Paul and His Letters*. Nashville: Broadman & Holman, 1999.

Porter, Stanley E. "How Should κολλώμενος in 1 Cor 6:16–17 be Translated." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 67 (1991): 105–6.

------. "Paul in Acts and Letters." *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*, 679–92.

------. "Paul of Tarsus and His Letters." Pp. 533–85 in *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period 330 B.C.– A.D. 400*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter, 2001.

Powell, M. A. *What is Narrative Criticism?* Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Prior, David. *The Message of 1 Corinthians*. The Bible Speaks Today. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 1985.

Radcliffe, Timothy. "'Glorify God in Your Bodies': 1 Corinthians 6, 12–20 as a Sexual Ethic." *New Blackfriars* 67 (1986): 306–14.

Ramsaran, Rollin A. *Liberating Words: Paul's Use of Rhetorical Maxims in 1 Corinthians 1–10*. Valley Forge: Trinity, 1996.

Richards, Randolph E. *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition and Collection*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity, 2004.

Richardson, P. "Judgement in Sexual Matters in 1 Corinthians 6:1–11." *Novum Testamentum* 25 (1983): 37–58.

Robbins, Vernon K. *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide of Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*. Harrisburg: Trinity, 1996.

Robertson, Archibald, and Alfred Plummer. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1914.

Rohrbaugh, Richard L. *The Social Sciences and New Testament Interpretation*. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1996.

------. "Social Scientific and Literary Criticism: What is at Stake?" *Hervormde Teologiese Studies* 49 (1993): 221–133.

Rosner, Brian S. "οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἐπενθήσαντε: Corporate Responsibility in 1 Corinthians 5." *New Testament Studies* 38 (1992): 470–73.

------. *Paul, Scripture, and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5–7*. Biblical Studies Library. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1994.

------. "Temple and Holiness in 1 Cor 5." *Tyndale Bulletin* 42 (1991): 137–45.

------. "Temple Prostitution in 1 Corinthians 6:12–20." *Novum Testamentum* 40 (1998): 336–51.

Ross, J. M. "Not Above What is Written: A Note on 1 Cor 4:6." *Expository Times* 82 (1971): 215–17.

Saller, Richard. *Personal Patronage Under the Early Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.

------. "Roman Dowry and the Devolution of Property in the Principate." *Classical Quarterly* 34 (1984): 195–204.

Sampley, J. Paul. *The First Letter to the Corinthians*. The New Interpreter's Bible X. Nashville: Abingdon, 2002.

------. *Walking Between the Times, Paul's Moral Reasoning*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1991.

Sanders, Boykin. "Imitating Paul: 1 Cor 4:6." *Harvard Theological Review* 74 (1981): 353–63.

Sandmel, Samuel. "Parallelomania." *Journal of Biblical Studies* 81 (1962): 2–13.

Schmidt, J. E. C. *Bibliothek für Kritik und Exegese*, 1797–1803.

Schmithals, Walter. *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians*. Translated by John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.

Schneider, J. "μετασχηματίζω." *TDNT* 7:957–958.

Schrage, W. "Leid, Kreuz und Eschaton. Die Peristasenkataloge als Merkmale Paulinischer Theologia Crucis und Eschatologie." *Evangelische Theologie* 34 (1974): 141–75.

Schreiner, Thomas R. *Romans*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.

Shaw, Graham. *The Cost of Authority: Manipulation and Freedom in the New Testament*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Smit, Joop F. M. "'What is Apollos? What is Paul?' In Search for the Coherence of First Corinthians 1:10–4:21." *Novum Testamentum* 44 (2002): 231–51.

Soards, Marion L. *1 Corinthians*. New International Biblical Commentary 7. Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999.

South, James. "A Critique of the 'Curse/death' Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 5.1–8." *New Testament Studies* 29 (1993): 539–61.

Stamps, Dennis L. "The Christological Premise in Pauline Theological Rhetoric: 1 Corinthians 1:4–2:5 as an Example." Pp. 441–57 in *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Dennis L. Stamps. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 2002.

------. "Rethinking the Rhetorical Situation: The Entextualisation of the Situation in New Testament Epistles." Pp. 193–209 in *Rhetoric and the New Testament: Essays from the 1992 Heidelberg Conference*. Edited by S. E. Porter and Olbricht T. H. Sheffield: Sheffield Press, 1993.

------. "Rhetorical Criticism of the New Testament: Ancient and Modern Evaluation of Argumentation." Pp. 129–69 in *Approaches to New Testament Study*. Edited by Stanley E. and David Tombs Porter. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1995.

Stanley, Christopher D. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*. London: T&T Clark, 2004.

Stählin, G. "περίψημα." *TDNT* 6:84–93.

Still, Todd D. "Did Paul Loathe Manual Labor? Revisiting the Work of Ronald F. Hock on the Apostles' Tentmaking and Social Class." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 125 (2006): 781–95.

Stirewalt, M. Luther Jr. *Paul, the Letter Writer*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.

Stowers, Stanley K. "'A Debate' Over Freedom: 1 Cor 6:12–20." Pp. 59–71 in *Christian Teaching*. Edited by Everett Ferguson. Abilene: Abilene University Press, 1981.

------. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. Library of Early Christianity 5. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1988.

------. "Paul and Self-Mastery." Pp. 524–50 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003.

------. "Social Status, Public Speaking and Private Teaching: The Circumstances of Paul's Preaching Activity." *Novum Testamentum* 26 (1984): 59–82.

Strugnell, John. "A Plea for Conjectural Emendation in the New Testament, with a Coda on 1 Cor 4:6." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 36 (1974): 543–58.

Strüder, Christof W. "Preferences not Parties: The Background of 1 Cor 1,12." *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* (2003), 431–55.

Swearingen, C. Jan. "The Tongues of Men: Understanding Greek Rhetorical Sources for Paul's Letters to the Romans and 1 Corinthians." Pp. 232–42 in *The Tongues of Men*. In *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts*. Edited by Anders Eriksson, Thomas O. Olbricht, and Walter Übelacker. Emory Studies in Early Christianity. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2002.

Talbert, Charles H. *Reading Corinthians*. Macon: Smyth & Helwys, 2002.

Taylor, Robert D. "Towards a Biblical Theology of Litigation: A Law Professor Looks at 1 Cor. 6:1–11." *Ex Auditu* 2 (1986): 105–15.

Theissen, Gerd. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Translated by John H. Schütz. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1982.

Thiselton, Anthony C. *1 Corinthians: A Shorter Exegetical & Pastoral Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

------. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.

------. "The Meaning of σάρξ in 1 Corinthians 5.5: A Fresh Approach in Light of Logical and Semantic Factors." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 26 (1973): 204–28.

------. "Realized Eschatology at Corinth." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1978): 510–26.

Thornton, Timothy. "Satan - God's Agent for Punishing." *Expository Times* 83 (1972): 151–52.

Thrall, Margaret E. *The Initial Attraction of Paul's Mission in Corinth and of the Church He Founded There*. In *Paul, Luke and the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by Alf Christophersen, Carsten Claussen, Jörg Frey, and Bruce Longenecker. JSNTSup 217. T&T Clark, 2002.

Trible, Phyllis. *Rhetorical Criticism: Context, Method, and the Book of Jonah*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1994.

Ukleja, P. M. "Homosexuality in the NT." *Bibliotheca Sacra* 140 (1983): 350–58.

van Unnik, Willem C. *Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth*. London: Epworth, 1962.

Vander Broek, Lyle. "Discipleship and Community: Another Look at 1 Corinthians 5." *Reformed Review* 48 (1994): 5–13.

Vorster, J. N. "The Context of the Letter to the Romans: A Critique on the Present State of Research." *Neotestamentica* 28 (1994): 127–45.

Wagner, J. Ross. "'Not Beyond the Things Which Are Written': A Call to Boast Only in the Lord (1 Cor 4:6)." *New Testament Studies* 44 (1988): 279–87.

Wannamaker, Charles. "Christ as Divine Agent in Paul." *Scottish Journal of Theology* 39 (1986): 517–28.

Wardy, Robert. *The Birth of Rhetoric: Gorgias, Plato and Their Successors*. Issues in Ancient Philosophy. London: Routledge, 1998.

Watson, Duane F. *Invention, Arrangement and Style: Rhetorical Criticism of Jude and 2 Peter*. SBLDS 104. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.

------. "Paul and Boasting." Pp. 77–100 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003.

------. "Paul's Boasting in 2 Corinthians 10–13 as Defense of His Honor: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis." Pp. 260–75 in *Rhetorical Argumentation in Biblical Texts*. Edited by Anders Eriksson, Thomas H. Olbricht, and Walter Übelacker. Emory Studies in Early Christianity. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2002.

Welborn, Laurence L. "Discord in Corinth: First Corinthians 1–4 and Ancient Politics." Pp. 1–42 in *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistles*. Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press, 1997.

------. *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistles*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1997.

Wenthe, Dean O. "An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 5:7b." *The Spring Fielder* 38 (1974): 134–40.

White, L. Michael. "Paul and *Pater Familias*." Pp. 457–87 in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg: Trinity, 2003.

Wilckens, Ulrich. *Weisheit und Torheit*. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr, 1959.

Wilson, R. McL. "How Gnostic were the Corinthians?" *New Testament Studies* 19 (1972): 65–74.

Winter, Bruce W. *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influences of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.

------. "Civil Litigation in Secular Corinth and the Church: The Forensic Background to 1 Corinthians 6:1–8." *New Testament Studies* 37 (1991): 559–72.

------. *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement*. 2d ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002.

------. *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens*. First-Century Christians in the Graeco-Roman World. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.

Wire, Antoinette Clark. *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction Through Paul's Rhetoric*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1990.

Wiseman, J. "Corinth and Rome 1: 228 BC–AD 267." *ANRW* 2.7.1 (1979): 438–538.

Witherington, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Carlisle: Paternoster, 1995.

Wolff, Christian. *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996.

Wright, David F. "Homosexuality: The Relevance of the Bible." *Evangelical Quarterly* 61 (1989): 291–300.

------. "Homosexuals or Prostitutes? The Meaning of ἀρσενοκοῖται (1 Cor 6:9, 1 Tim 1:10)." *Vigiliae Christianae* 38 (1984): 125–53.

------. "Translating ἀρσενοκοῖται (1 Cor 6:9; 1 Tim 1:10)." *Vigiliae Christianae* 41 (1987): 396–98.

Wright, N. T. *What Saint Paul Really Said: Was Paul of Tarsus the Real Founder of Christianity*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1997.

Wüllner, Wilhelm. "Haggadic Homily Genre in 1 Cor. 1–3." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 89 (1970): 199–203.

------. "Hermeneutics and Rhetorics: From 'Truth and Method' to 'Truth and Power'." *Scriptura* 3 (1989): 1–54.

Yamuchi, Edwin M. "Gnosis, Gnosticism." Pp. 350–54 in *Dictionary of Paul and His Letters*.

Young, Norman H. "Paidagogos: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor." *Novum Testamentum* 29 (1987): 150–76.

Zaas, Peter S. "'Cast Out the Evil Man from Your Midst' (1 Cor 5:13b)." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 103 (1984): 259–61.

------. "Catalogues and Context: 1 Corinthians 5 and 6." *New Testament Studies* 24 (1988): 622–29.

------. "Was Homosexuality Condoned in the Corinthian Church?" *SBL Seminar Papers* 19 (1980): 205–12.