

"AS I SAID TO YOU BEFORE":

PAUL'S WITNESS TO FORMATIVE EARLY CHRISTIAN INSTRUCTION

DPHIL THESIS AND ABSTRACTS

BENJAMIN A. EDSALL

THE QUEEN'S COLLEGE

UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD



## Acknowledgements

All who have undertaken to write a dissertation know well the communal nature of the endeavor. Such is no less the case here.

This project would have been impossible but for the guidance of my supervisor, Prof. Markus Bockmuehl, who simultaneously gave me the freedom to pursue the present topic in my own way and kept the project from growing too far out of proportion. Those who know him and his work will undoubtedly see much of his influence here; it has only been beneficial and my gratitude and debt to him are deep.

Many others at the University of Oxford and elsewhere contributed to the completion of this project and deserve my thanks. Dr. David Lincicum stepped in for Prof. Bockmuehl as my interim supervisor at the Master's level and I remain grateful for his help then and his friendship now. Profs. John Muddiman and Christopher Rowland provided feedback at crucial stages and Prof. Christopher Tuckett helpfully served at my Confirmation of Status and as my internal examiner for my *viva*, working with me on the more complex administrative tangles of completion. Prof. N. T. Wright served as my external examiner and was as charitable and helpful as the *viva* setting allows. To my friends who have graciously engaged me about my research when they all had much better things to be doing – Bobby Ryu, Casey Strine, Justin Hardin, Nick Ellis, Alex Kirk, Jenn Strawbridge, Jeremy Kidwell, Chris Hays, T. M. Law and many others – I am grateful. Bobby, Justin, and Alex along with Derek Brown gave feedback on early drafts of my dissertation. I am also thankful for the opportunity I had to road-test some of this material (largely from chapters 1–3) on the Oxford New Testament Graduate Seminar, the Oxbridge NT Seminar and at the International Society of Biblical Literature meeting in London (2011).

I am exceedingly grateful to the Clarendon Fund and the Long Studentship at Queen's College (Oxford) for funding this research. Their support enabled me to focus on my work and still maintain a healthy family life. While I know that kind of "outcome" is not quantifiable for a financial report, that does not make it any less valuable. Quite literally, I could not have done this without their help.

My family has been a constant encouragement to me throughout this project and long before. My children, Nora and Eli, remind me that reading them *The Gruffalo* (one more time!) is more important than that fifteen minutes of research. To my wife, Deanna, there are no words that I could write to express my love and thanks. She has borne with the hardships of graduate life with patience and grace.

Ben Edsall



## Abstract

"As I Said to You Before": Paul's Witness to Formative Early Christian Instruction; Benjamin A. Edsall; The Queen's College; DPhil Thesis; Trinity Term, 2013.

This study addresses the question of formative early Christian preaching and teaching. Unlike previous approaches, I eschew synthesis across a broad range and focus instead on the earliest extant Christian source: the letters of Paul.

My method draws on ancient communication practices, primarily represented in ancient rhetoric, wherein communicators rely on knowledge they presume their interlocutors to possess. Passages are analyzed according to the type of appeal to Paul's initial teaching: (1) *explicit reminders of previous teaching*, (2) *direct appeals to knowledge* not explicitly linked to previous teaching, and (3) *indirect appeals to knowledge* about practices, beliefs, conventions, etc.

The reconstruction focuses on 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians and Romans. 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians represent neophyte and well-established Pauline communities, respectively, while Romans is of interest because it represents non-Pauline believers.

I proceed with a comparative analysis of 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. Chapter 4 lays out the rhetorical situation for these letters while chapters 5-7 investigate the three types of appeal respectively, each closing with a comparison of similar material in each letter. Chapter 8 summarizes and concludes this discussion, providing the basis for my subsequent analysis of Romans.

Finally, I compare the picture from the Thessalonian and Corinthian communities with Paul's letter to the Romans (chapter 9). Topics he expects his Roman audience to know indicate points of expected congruence between Paul's own teaching and that of others. By contrast, topics that receive significant expansion in Romans suggest perceived potential for conflict.

In this dissertation I identify consistent elements of early Christian instruction, ranging from Christology to apocalyptic cosmology, while also noting possible conflict. My approach places the reconstruction of early Christian teaching on firmer methodological footing than previous attempts have done and offers a rhetorically sensitive account of the teaching and how it was used.



## Long Abstract

What did the earliest Christian teachers impart to their audiences? Although interest in this topic has a pedigree reaching back to antiquity, in the last thirty years academic interest has waned due to a number of factors. Foremost among these is the sustained criticism of previous formgeschichtliche reconstructions of the early Christian kerygma or catechesis (e.g. by Alfred Seeberg, Martin Dibelius and Charles H. Dodd) by scholars such as Ulrich Wilckens, Erhardt Güttgemanns, and James Dunn. Furthermore, newer narrative and rhetorical criticisms have provided more adequate tools for reading the New Testament texts than the piecemeal approach of form and redaction criticism. In this project, I turn the "new tool" of rhetorical criticism, generally construed, to an analysis of the old question.

In order to avoid the problems of facile synthesis and anachronism that plagued earlier studies of the kerygma and catechesis of the early Church, I root my inquiry in the very earliest extant Christian source: the letters of the apostle Paul. I argue that, by careful attention to his rhetorical appeals to knowledge in these letters, one can reconstruct concepts, beliefs and practices that he expects his audience to know and, further, one can link these to formative Christian instruction.

The introductory chapter lays out the problem of early Christian preaching and teaching, dispensing with the terms "*kerygma*" and "*catechesis*" as analytically less than useful and surveying previous scholarly reconstructions. In so doing I identify methodological weaknesses that need to be addressed, focusing the question more narrowly on Paul's witness to early Christian teaching to avoid the principal pitfall of a prematurely synthetic approach.

In Part I (chapters 2-3), I expound my method and situate it within ancient communication practices and the realities of letter writing. My approach builds on the fact that ancient communicators, like their contemporary counterparts, intentionally relied on knowledge that they expected their audience to possess. This structure of communication is explicitly treated within Greco-Roman rhetorical theory, though in practice it is found in a wide range of authors including Hellenistic Jewish writers such as Josephus and Philo. However, the historical realities involved in letter-writing raise issues for applying this communicative model to Paul's letters. In particular, the presence of co-writers, secretaries, and letter-carriers could affect Paul's knowledge of his audience and the structure of communication in his letters. Chapter 3 is devoted to these issues. I conclude that epistolary rhetorical features do reveal the sender's presumption of knowledge among his recipients, despite potential interference from co-senders, secretaries, and letter-carriers.

In light of this methodological discussion, I identify three ways by which Paul refers to such formative teaching, whether his own or that of other Christian teachers. They are as follows: (1) *explicit reminders to previous teaching*, (2) *direct appeals to knowledge* not explicitly linked to previous teaching, and (3) *indirect appeals to knowledge* about practices, beliefs, conventions, etc. In particular, I apply these criteria to 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians (with some discussion of 2 Corinthians) before turning to Romans.

The value of the Thessalonian, Corinthian and Roman communities for this project is two-fold. First, 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians represent significantly

different rhetorical situations in letters written to Pauline communities at different stages of development. 1 Thessalonians was written to a community of relative neophytes from whom Paul had been prematurely separated (1 Thess 2:17) and there is very little time between the end of Paul's mission there and his composition of the letter. 1 Corinthians, on the other hand, was written to a well-established community among whom Paul had lived and worked for over a year; the letter was written after more time had passed and after other teachers such as Apollos had been in Corinth. These points, along with greatly differing rhetorical situations, inform the ways in which Paul refers to his initial teaching. His references illuminate, and are illuminated by, his rhetorical stance in each letter, providing numerous points of contact as well as various differences.

The second value of these three letters for this study is that while 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians were written to communities that Paul had personally established, Romans was not. What we see in the latter, among other things, is Paul attempting to present "his" gospel (Rom 2:16) in terms that are acceptable to communities he had never visited. In doing this, Paul presumes that certain things are non-controversial (such as the person of Abraham or impending eschatological judgment) while others receive extended defense (such as his understanding of the law and his construal of salvation history). Both presumptions are valuable: the first suggests points of contact with his Roman readers and the second suggests potential points of conflict. In this way, Romans shows Paul positioning himself within the wider early Christian movement.

The two-fold value just described translates directly into the structure of the remaining chapters. Part II focuses on Paul's witness to his formative instruction in Thessalonica and Corinth. Chapter 4 provides a comparative overview of the different rhetorical contexts faced by Paul in each letter as a framework for the investigation. Chapters 5-7 deal respectively with the three types of appeal to Paul's teaching in Thessalonica and Corinth. Each chapter is divided into three major sections, addressing Thessalonian and Corinthian material respectively before offering a comparative analysis of the materials culled from each letter. Chapter 8 concludes Part II with a comprehensive summary of the formative instruction identified in Thessalonica and Corinth and a thematic comparison. I find that, in the face of striking differences (e.g. the lack of Christological participation language in 1 Thessalonians or the toned down eschatological imagery of 1 Corinthians), there is significant overlap in topics that are appealed to as originating from the context of Paul's formative Christian instruction (including God, Christology, the Holy Spirit, ethical exhortations, apocalyptic eschatology, communal praxis and self-understanding). Further, several of the topics identified as original teaching in Paul's Gentile churches and part of Paul's presumed agreement with the Roman churches are notably analogous to foundational Jewish discourse in relation to Gentiles.

With that outline in place, I turn to Romans in Part III (chapter 9). There I deploy the findings of the previous chapters, though with a different approach. Rather than looking respectively at three types of appeal to knowledge, the comparison now proceeds from the synthesis of Paul's own formative instruction that emerged from my earlier analysis in chapter 8. The purpose of each section is to assess whether and how much Paul presumed that the formative instruction he imparted in Thessalonica and Corinth was also present among the Romans. In the course of discussing each topic, points of continuity and discontinuity are evident by the way in which Paul assumes certain elements to be unproblematic for the Roman readers while others receive considerable expansion and defense. The former point to expected commonalities between Pauline teaching and the communities in Rome, while the latter suggest issues that Paul knew (or feared) not to be universally accepted among other early Christian communities.

In Romans we see Paul engaged in commending his gospel to an unfamiliar audience, relying on points he nevertheless expects the Romans to know in order to defend those topics that may be controversial. Matters of presumed agreement between Paul and his Roman audience include God, Jesus, the Spirit, the coming judgment (with elements of an apocalyptic cosmology), the moral transformation of believers, and the church as God's people. Chapter 9, then, returns the trajectory of the investigation back to the initial question posed in chapter 1: What is the content of formative early Christian preaching and teaching?

My dissertation contributes to New Testament scholarship in several ways. Primarily, it provides a more complete picture of Paul's formative instruction than has previously been given, and on a more secure methodological footing. For instance, incorporating the recent insights of conversion studies enables one to appreciate the complex shift of consciousness (or one's symbolic universe) involved in conversion. Of course, this picture of Paul's teaching is still not comprehensive, due to the *ad hoc* nature of Paul's letters; but it is marked by greater nuance and methodological precision than has been the case in previous study. Linked with this, I present a picture of wider early Christian teaching and Paul's relationship to it, to the extent that these are present in his letter to the Romans. I support the position that there was no fixed, universal teaching of the early Christian movement in the middle of the first century. On the other hand, I challenge those who claim that the only unifying element of the early Christian movement was a commitment to Jesus as the risen Lord; Paul, I argue, thinks there are many more elements to be held in common.

More narrowly, my thesis contributes to the interpretation of 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians individually by emphasizing the way in which Paul restates, reinforces, and reinterprets material from his initial instruction according to the needs of each congregation. Finally, by isolating recurrent features of Paul's formative teaching, this study contributes to the quest for Paul's theology insofar as the major themes of his initial instruction may be said to represent key elements of his theology. (Notably, however, Romans provides a counter-balance to 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians in that it brings to the fore certain elements of Pauline theology that are not necessitated by previous pastoral concerns.) The results of my study reinforce portrayals of Paul that emphasize his indebtedness to second temple Judaism (though without marginalizing important differences), which contributed to the formation of his communities.

In short, my thesis illuminates Paul's formative instruction – what he taught while establishing his communities and how he built on this initial instruction in his letters – and how he assumed certain elements of his own teaching to have been received as part of a shared formative heritage among non-Pauline communities in Rome.



## Table of Contents

Acknowledgements	iii
Abstract	v
Long Abstract	vii
Table of Contents	xi
Abbreviations	xv
Chapter 1 Introduction	1
1.1. Early Christian Teaching	1
1.2. Definitions: Dispensing with Kerygma and Catechesis	3
1.3. Previous Scholarship: An Overview	5
1.3.1. The early Christian kerygma and catechism	6
1.3.2. Dismantling the kerygma and catechism	9
1.3.3. Early Christian teaching after form criticism	14
1.4. The Plan of this Study	15
<i>Excursus 1: A note on recent studies of Paul's teaching</i>	17
Part I: Method: Finding Paul's Teaching	21
Chapter 2 Finding Paul's Teaching through Rhetoric	23
2.1. Introduction	23
2.2. Rhetoric, Presuppositions and Paul's Teaching	25
2.2.1. General considerations	25
2.2.2. Rhetorical common ground in Greco-Roman rhetoric	28
2.2.3. Audience presumptions in Philo, Josephus and 4QMMT	31
2.2.4. Rhetorical criteria and Paul's teaching	36
<i>Excursus 2: Conversion and sociology: two recent contributions</i>	39
2.3. Plan of Study	42
Chapter 3 Finding Paul's Teaching in Letters	45
3.1. Co-Senders and Secretaries	46
3.2. Letter-carriers	53
3.3. Summary of Part I	58
Part II: Formative Instruction in Churches Paul Established: Thessalonica and Corinth	59

Chapter 4 The Rhetorical Situations of Paul's Letters to Thessalonica and Corinth	61
4.1. The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Thessalonians	61
4.1.1. Paul in Thessalonica	61
4.1.2. Paul's letter to the Thessalonians	65
4.2. The Rhetorical Situation of the Corinthian Correspondence	66
4.2.1. Paul in Corinth	67
4.2.2. Paul's letters to the Corinthians	71
4.3. Rhetorical Situations and Procedure	73
4.3.1. Comparison of rhetorical situations	73
4.3.2. Moving forward	75
Chapter 5 Paul's Explicit Reminders about his Message	77
5.1. Paul's Teaching in Thessalonica	77
5.1.1. The character and content of Paul's preaching	77
5.1.2. Paul's ethical instruction: sexual immorality and greed	82
<i>Excursus 3: εἰδολωλατρία, πορνεία and πλεονεξία</i>	84
5.1.3. Paul's social instructions: love and the quiet life	86
5.1.4. Summary of explicit reminders in 1 Thessalonians	90
5.2. Paul's Teaching in Corinth	91
5.2.1. The character and content of Paul's preaching: the word of the cross	91
5.2.2. The Corinthians' conversion: belief, baptism and receiving the Spirit	96
5.2.3. Paul's "ways," traditions and the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον	102
5.2.4. Summary of explicit reminders in 1 Corinthians	109
5.3. Paul's Explicit Reminders in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians	110
5.3.1. Moving forward	113
Chapter 6 Paul's Direct Appeals to Knowledge	115
6.1. Appeals to the Thessalonians' Knowledge	115
6.1.1. On resurrection and timing (4:13–18)	116
6.1.2. The coming day of judgment (5:1–11)	118
6.1.3. Summary of direct appeals to knowledge in 1 Thessalonians	120
6.2. Appeals to the Corinthians' Knowledge	121
6.2.1. "You know that when you were Gentiles..."	122
6.2.2. "Now concerning...": Paul's response to familiar topics	123
6.2.3. "I do not want you to be ignorant...": Paul and Corinthian ignorance	135
6.2.4. "Do you not know...": Rhetorical flourish or sarcastic reminder?	137
6.2.5. Summary of direct appeals to knowledge in 1 Corinthians	147
6.3. Paul's Direct Appeals to Knowledge and his Initial Teaching	149
Chapter 7 Paul's Presupposed Audience: Implicit Appeals to Paul's Teaching	153
7.1. Identifying Implicit Appeals: Some Guidelines	153

7.2. Implicit Appeals to Knowledge in 1 Thessalonians	154
7.2.1. Paul as a "weighty" apostle	154
7.2.2. God our father	155
7.2.3. Jesus, his titles, his death and his teachings	156
7.2.4. The gift and gifts of the Holy Spirit	161
7.2.5. Apocalyptic eschatology and cosmology	162
7.2.6. Community structure and praxis	165
7.2.7. The Thessalonian community's self-understanding	169
<i>Excursus 4: Election, holiness, ἐκκλησία and ἀδελφός</i>	170
7.2.8. Implicit appeals and the framework of explicit reminders	174
7.3. Implicit Appeals to Knowledge in 1 Corinthians	175
7.3.1. Paul the apostle	175
7.3.2. Jesus, his titles and his teachings	176
7.3.3. Eschatological errata	179
7.3.4. Satan, angels and demons	185
7.3.5. "It is written...": Paul's use of scripture in Corinth	187
7.3.6. Praxis and structure in the Corinthian church	195
7.3.7. The Corinthian community's self-understanding	203
7.3.8. Implicit appeals and the framework of explicit reminders	207
7.4. Comparative Analysis of Paul's Presupposed Audience	208
Chapter 8 Summary and Conclusions on Paul's Formative Instruction	213
8.1. Outline and Character of Paul's Formative Instruction	213
8.2. Paul, his Converts and Cultural Dissonance	217
8.3. Moving Forward	219
 Part III: Formative Instruction in Churches Paul did not Establish: Romans	221
 Chapter 9 Paul's Teaching and the Roman τύπος: A Comparison	223
9.1. Methodological Notes	223
9.2. The Rhetorical Dynamic of Romans	224
9.2.1. Paul's purpose in writing	224
9.2.2. Paul's audience in Romans	225
9.2.3. The τύπος διδαχῆς in Rome: common categories of belief	227
9.2.4. Paul's gospel and the Roman τύπος	231
9.3. Paul's Formative Instruction and the τύπος in Rome	232
9.3.1. One God, the father and judge	232
9.3.2. Jesus Christ our Lord, son of God, raised from the dead	235
9.3.3. Holy Spirit, dwelling in Christians, given by God	244
9.3.4. Apocalyptic and eschatology	247
9.3.5. Conversion: belief, baptism and moral transformation	250
9.3.6. Knowledge of scripture	257
9.3.7. Community praxis: worship and other	262
9.3.8. Community self-understanding	267

9.4. Summary and Conclusions	271
9.4.1. Summary	271
9.4.2. Conclusions	275
Chapter 10 Conclusions and Implications	277
10.1. Summary	277
10.2. Open Questions and Limitations	279
10.3. Conclusion: Paul and Early Christian Formative Instruction	281
Bibliography	285

## Abbreviations

Where possible, the abbreviations conform to Patrick H. Alexander, John F. Kutsko, James D. Ernest, Shirley Decker-Lucke, and David L. Petersen, ed. *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Peabody: Hendrickson, 1999). Citations of papyri follow John F. Oats, *et al.*, ed. N.D. *Checklist of Editions of Greek, Latin, Demotic and Coptic Papyri, Ostraca and Tablets* (Web Edition: [library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/texts/clist.html](http://library.duke.edu/rubenstein/scriptorium/papyrus/texts/clist.html)). See the latter for bibliographic information pertaining to the publications of papyri. Additions and alterations are as follows.

BTH	Bibliothèque de théologie historique
<i>CBR</i>	<i>Currents in Biblical Research</i>
CSIC	Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas
<i>Diaet.</i>	<i>De diaeta in morbis acutis</i> in É. Littré, ed. 1840. <i>Oeuvres complètes d'Hippocrate</i> . Vol. 2. Paris: Baillière.
EKK	Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar
HE	Hermes: Einzelschriften
<i>IJudO</i>	Noy, David, Hanswulf Bloedhorn, and Alexander Panayotov, ed. 2004. <i>Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis</i> . 3 vols. TSAJ 99, 101, 102. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
<i>JGRChrJ</i>	<i>Journal for Greco-Roman Christianity and Judaism</i>
<i>ModChm</i>	<i>Modern Churchman</i>
MThSt	Marburger theologische Studien
PhilAnt	Philosophie der Antike
RVV	Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten
SESJ	Suomen Eksegeettisen Seuran Julkaisuja
SJSJ	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
SMBen	Série monographique de Benedictina
SNTW	Studies of the New Testament and its World
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
TBN	Themes in Biblical Narrative
VAWJ	Veröffentlichungen der Akademie für die Wissenschaft des Judentums



# Chapter 1

## Introduction

### 1.1 Early Christian Teaching

In the study of the development of the early Christian movement, one feature that has often been proposed as a unifying foundation is the *kerygma* or catechesis of the early church. On this view, explored in more detail below, the differences between (at least some of) the texts that make up the New Testament are merely variations on the stable musical theme of early Christian teaching. Of course, for some, this theme is quite minimal, being restricted to the worship of Jesus of Nazareth as Christ the Lord for example. For others, the theme of early Christian instruction is merely in the ear of the listener, a later harmonization of initial discord.

Although the terminology of "the *kerygma*" is particularly indebted to early 20th century biblical scholarship, appeals to unifying *and unwritten* formative Christian instruction are hardly new. In his famous work *Against Heresies*, Irenaeus of Lyons criticizes his opponents for, among other things, taking scripture out of context to create their own theological systems.

If anyone takes these [Homeric] verses and restores them to their original setting, he will make the system disappear. And thus whoever keeps the rule of truth [τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας], which he received through baptism, unchanged within himself knows these names, phrases and parables from the scriptures but he does not recognize their blasphemous system. If he recognizes the stones [of the mosaic] he will not take the fox for the royal image. (*Haer.* 1.1.9; trans. Grant 1997, 70)

This passage, involving Irenaeus' earlier analogy to the mosaic of the king (*Haer.* 1.1.8), notably places emphasis on the "rule of truth" (ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας) as the key for

interpreting scripture.<sup>1</sup> Irenaeus goes on to claim that this "rule of truth" includes belief in the one creator God, the father, the incarnate son Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit who inspired the prophets to speak about Jesus' birth, death, resurrection and ascension, and the coming eschatological judgment by Christ (*Haer.* 1.1.10). Perhaps unsurprisingly, the same concerns present here are reflected in the later creeds and texts such as the *Apostolic Constitutions* (6.3.11).

One particularly interesting feature here is that Irenaeus is consciously appealing not to a general theological structure but to a specific tradition, baptismal instruction (ὄν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος εἴληφεν, *Haer.* 1.1.9) that was handed on by the apostles and stands apart from scripture itself (cf. 1.1.8; 3.2.2). A similar concern to rely on the teaching of the apostles is found in the *Didache* which is entitled διδαχὴ τῶν [δώδεκα] ἀποστόλων.<sup>2</sup> Other examples, many with less historical proximity, could be adduced *ad nauseam*. But even in antiquity these claims for harmonious continuity were contested. Indeed, the very fact of their constant assertion suggests disagreement on this matter. Celsus famously claimed that there were as many theological positions as there were Christians (who were, in his opinion, ignorant masses anyway),<sup>3</sup> and many scholars today would agree with him. Perhaps even more telling are the debates between Paul and his opponents, particularly reflected in Galatians and 2 Corinthians, who evidently self-identified as followers of Jesus and yet are indicted by Paul as preaching "another gospel."

Who then is right, Irenaeus or Celsus? Is there a *kerygma*, catechesis, baptismal instruction, or some other type of teaching that unified the early Christian movement? If so, how might one find this without presupposing it *a priori*? I will in due course attempt

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Tertullian *Apol.* 47.10 "regulam veritatis, quae veniat a Christo transmissa per comites ipsius."

<sup>2</sup> See the textual discussion of the title in Niederwimmer 1989, 81.

<sup>3</sup> Preserved in Origen *Cels.* 3.10, 12, 55.

to answer these questions refracted, metaphorically, through a Pauline prism. But before doing so, our object of inquiry requires clarifying with a few definitions and a brief history of scholarship.

## 1.2 Definitions: Dispensing with *Kerygma* and Catechesis

As I mentioned above, the use of the term *kerygma* in New Testament scholarship is particularly indebted to the use of the term in the early 20th century and properly refers to the preaching that undergirds early Christianity. For some this meant a core set of propositions that could be traced across a wide range of texts. Rudolf Bultmann and some of his students, however, rejected such a distillation arguing that the *kerygma* is nothing more than "the proclamation of the decisive act of God in Christ" (Bultmann 1953, 13). However, Bultmann's *kerygma* was intentionally a theological abstraction – in his terms, it was demythologized – and he still went into great detail tracing the development of the actual content of early Christian teaching in his *Theology of the New Testament* (Bultmann 1952). Use of the term is somewhat plastic, referring specifically to preaching (i.e., *Missionspredigt*) as well as to a demythologized "core" of the New Testament. Given that I am interested in more than either of these alternatives provides, I will eschew the use of it in what follows. It should be noted here, however, that in spite of these points of discontinuity, this study stands in the "tradition," one might say, of these predecessors insofar as I am interested in the relationship of preaching (and other teaching) to the unity or the early church (or lack thereof).

The term "catechesis" has a much longer history as a technical term than *kerygma* and accordingly carries a good deal of baggage. According to Lampe's *Patristic Lexicon*, the Greek verb *κατηχέω* became a technical term for pre-baptismal Christian instruction

only from the 4th century CE.<sup>4</sup> It is worth noting that the passage from Irenaeus cited above referred specifically to baptismal instruction and yet did not use the term "catechesis," which would be strange if it had been a commonly used technical term in his time. Nevertheless, prior to the 4th century and as early as the 1st century CE the verb *κατηγέω* was used in reference to instruction more generally.<sup>5</sup> The nominal form of the verb *κατήγησις* has a similar development, becoming a technical term around the time of Clement of Alexandria (c. 150–215 CE; cf. his *Paedagogus*) but used earlier than that as a general term for instruction or passing on information.<sup>6</sup> With respect to the early Christian movement, no doubt any instruction which we might call "catechesis" overlapped in content with what we might call the *kerygma*. Therefore, while the initial preaching (of a missionary for instance) may be distinguishable from later instruction in their historical order, isolating the content of one from the other is notoriously difficult and will not be attempted here.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, because the term catechesis has been used as a technical term quite specifically for pre-baptismal instruction for over a millennium, it simply carries overtones that I do not want to evoke in my analysis.

Therefore, due to the plasticity of the term *kerygma*, the baggage of the term catechesis, and the extreme difficulty of distinguishing between initial preaching and subsequent instruction, these terms inhibit a clear picture of what I am after – namely, an account of the *content* of formative instruction within early Christianity. This instruction comprises the preaching and teaching that lies behind, and is presupposed by, the various texts of the New Testament. This is not to assume from the start that there is *one* unified

---

<sup>4</sup> Particularly at the 2nd Ecumenical Constantinopolitan Council in 381 CE; cf. Lampe *s.v.* *κατηγέω* who cites Athanasius *Ep. fest.*

<sup>5</sup> E.g. 1 Cor 14:19; Gal 6:6; Rom 2:8; Luke 1:4; Acts 18:25; 21:21, 24; Josephus *Vita* 65.

<sup>6</sup> Chrysippus uses the term (negatively) for general instruction (*Frag. moral.* 229a); Dionysius of Halicarnassus for rhetorical instruction (*Dem.* 50); Soranus for (alleged) medical instruction (*Gyn.* 1.3.4). and Philo (*Legat.* 198) uses it in reference to a report.

<sup>7</sup> See below for a brief account of previous scholarship on this matter.

"formative instruction" within early Christianity; it is simply to say that the author of any given New Testament text presumed of his (or her) audience *some kind* of knowledge about Jesus and nascent Christianity, whether the knowledge was imparted in a missionary sermon in the *agora*, communal worship meetings or some other teaching context. The matter of unity, disunity or some middle ground will be addressed in due course, but that is a matter for the conclusion, not the introduction.

With these definitions out of the way, it is important to survey previous scholarly investigations of the content of early Christian formative instruction.

### 1.3 Previous Scholarship: An Overview

The history of scholarship on the teaching of the early church is diffuse and not always easily categorized. However, the general outline provides instructive background.<sup>8</sup> Since the authors surveyed here use the terms *kerygma* or catechesis frequently, to avoid these terms would result in misrepresentation and, in any case, would be impractical. Therefore, in spite of my desire to avoid these terms in my own analysis, I am compelled to use them temporarily here.

While, as noted above, interest in identifying the teaching of the early church stretches back in various forms to the post-apostolic period, the works of Alfred Seeberg (1863–1915) provided new impetus to the question. Between 1903 and 1908, Seeberg produced four monographs in pursuit of what he saw as *the* early Christian catechism.<sup>9</sup> His approach was appropriated and developed, though not without criticism, for the greater part of seventy years but by the late 1970s the tide of scholarly opinion had

---

<sup>8</sup> An extended version this section has been published as Edsall 2012. It should be noted that this account only fits a particular stream of NT scholarship, since among others more influenced by the conflict-based reconstructions of J. J. Semler, W. M. L. de Wette, and F. C. Baur the unity of the early church had long been denied. For an overview of these scholars and their impact, see Kümmel 1973, 62–73, 120–184.

<sup>9</sup> Seeberg 1903; Seeberg 1905; Seeberg 1906; Seeberg 1908, translations of his works are my own.

eroded the foundation on which he built his theories. Although Seeberg preceded the introduction of *Formgeschichte* as a formal method,<sup>10</sup> from the beginning the quest for early Christian teaching had a distinctively form-critical flavor (so Kümmel 1973, 450 n. 404). Seeberg's work was followed by Martin Dibelius, C. H. Dodd and E. G. Selwyn, among others, all of whom took a similar path in examining the *kerygma* or catechesis in question.

### 1.3.1 The early Christian *kerygma* and catechism

#### 1.3.1.1 Alfred Seeberg

Seeberg's catechism comprised ethical teaching (*die Sittenlehre*) and faith-formula (*die Glaubensformel*). The former were, he argued, equivalent to "the ways" (1 Cor 4:16) and the "pattern of teaching" (Rom 6:17) that Paul mentions and were made up of virtue and vice lists (Seeberg 1903, 1–8).<sup>11</sup> The *Glaubensformel* fulfilled a dual function of providing the content for missionary preaching<sup>12</sup> as well as acting as a baptismal confession (168, 213); it is the theological core of the New Testament and early Christianity that was present in preaching and teaching. Seeberg began his reconstruction of the *Glaubensformel* with 1 Cor 15:3–5, arguing that the death, resurrection and ascension of Jesus was the center of early Christian theology (45). He then filled out the content of the *Glaubensformel* with a further exploration of Paul's letters, 1 Peter, the Pastoral Epistles, Luke and Hebrews, identifying major themes such as the confession of the one creator God who raised Jesus from the dead, Christ being from the seed of David, and his imminent return for judgment (58–151).<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>10</sup> Especially in Dibelius 1919 (2nd ed. 1933, ET 1934) who likely drew his terminology from the pioneering study of Norden 1913.

<sup>11</sup> Translations of the New Testament are my own, occasionally modified from the NRSV.

<sup>12</sup> Later Seeberg directly identified the two: "Der Inhalt des Evangeliums [which is the message preached by Paul, 31–32] ist der Inhalt der Glaubensformel"; Seeberg 1905, 34.

<sup>13</sup> This is similar to the account of missionary preaching in other scholars around that time, cf. the apparently independent views of Harnack 1904, 111; Deissmann 1926 [1911], 244; Weiss 1959, 1:220–257

Seeberg's approach was basically statistical. For both aspects of his catechesis he proceeded by identifying recurring terms and themes within the New Testament (and some other early Christian texts) and those with the greatest spread were accorded the highest likelihood of being part of *der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*.<sup>14</sup> There are a number of problems with this method, which will be discussed below, but with the advent of form criticism as a method, similar investigations were carried out many times in the subsequent decades. Nevertheless, for reasons of space and because this ground has been covered more fully elsewhere by myself and others,<sup>15</sup> I will only briefly discuss a few key scholars before turning to criticism and the aftermath.

#### 1.3.1.2 Martin Dibelius and C. H. Dodd

In the work of Martin Dibelius and C. H. Dodd, the quest for the preaching and teaching of the early church became intimately connected with *Formgeschichte* and with a particular view of the speech material in Acts. Both authors adopted a similar division to Seeberg's *Sittenlehre* and *Glaubensformel* with Dibelius distinguishing between the *kerygma* and paraenetic material (though he also included scriptural proof separately, cf. Dibelius 1934, 17) and Dodd between the *kerygma* and *didache* (moral teaching) of the early church (Dodd 1936, 56). Further, both authors isolated the contents of the *kerygma* by comparing references in Paul's letters to Acts and then extending the survey through the rest of the New Testament (Dibelius 1934, 9–36; Dodd 1936, 13–14).

Dodd in particular emphasized the *kerygma*, arguing that it "included the facts of the death and resurrection of Christ in an eschatological setting" while also arguing that Paul himself drew on an older *kerygma* common to himself and other Christian

---

and Meyer 1923, 349–363.

<sup>14</sup> For his treatment of virtue and vice lists, which is representative of his approach, see Seeberg 1903, 9–31.

<sup>15</sup> See Edsall 2012 and the critics discussed below.

missionaries which included proof from prophecy, Jesus' davidic lineage, and his exaltation by God (Dodd 1936, 13–14). Dibelius, on the other hand, drew heavily on Seeberg's approach to the paraenetic material, arguing that Paul's statement in Rom 6:17, the hortatory section in Rom 12–13, and similar materials in James, 1 Peter, 1 Clement, *Didache* and *Shepherd of Hermas*, indicate that Paul "assumes that his readers have received similar teaching" and thus the hortatory sections of Paul's letters "belong to tradition" (Dibelius 1934, 239–240).

### 1.3.1.3 E. G. Selwyn

In the second appendix to his 1946 commentary on 1 Peter, E. G. Selwyn took up the catechetical torch.<sup>16</sup> Explicitly working within a form-critical framework, Selwyn identified two stages of development within what he argued was *the* early Christian baptismal catechism. Beginning with a comparison between the Thessalonian letters, 1 Peter, and the Apostolic decree (Acts 15:19–21), he argued that the first stage of catechetical material included baptism, the abstention from idolatry, murder and sexual immorality and the dualistic imagery of light and dark (Selwyn 1958, 369–372), while the central virtue was love (374). Selwyn identifies the second stage of the catechism with an earlier proposal by Philip Carrington (1940). His analysis of this stage is grounded in parallels identified between Romans, Colossians, Ephesians, 1 Peter, and James. This catechism begins with baptism as the entry point into new life which necessitates certain renunciations, patterns of faith and worship (somewhat analogous to Seeberg's *Glaubensformel*) and social duties (Selwyn 1958, 389–423).

### 1.3.1.4 Common Presuppositions

It is important to note that, various disagreements and nuances aside, the above

---

<sup>16</sup> He was, in particular, drawing on Carrington 1940, though he notes his indebtedness to Martin Dibelius as well. Citations for Selwyn are from the 1958 second edition.

authors (and the majority of scholars in the first half of the 20th century) agree on four major points: (1) the existence of the *kerygma* or *catechesis* (variously defined), (2) the ability of scholars to identify it especially through the use of *Formgeschichte* (at least in general outline), (3) the utility of Acts for reconstructing early Christian preaching and (4) the essential unity of the early church necessary to support such theses. It is, however, precisely these four presuppositions that have become increasingly seen as problematic.<sup>17</sup>

### 1.3.2 Dismantling the *kerygma* and catechism

#### 1.3.2.1 Ulrich Wilckens and Acts

While confidence about these various reconstructions varied from scholar to scholar, it was not until the final three points of agreement listed above came under fire that the quest for the *kerygma* and catechesis began to waver. In 1963 Ulrich Wilckens published *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte* in which he contested the then popular view of Dibelius (among others) that the speeches in the early part of Acts could be explored for content of the earliest *kerygma*.<sup>18</sup> Wilckens argued on the contrary that the speeches were inextricably linked to their literary contexts and accordingly could not be treated as foreign remnants of an older stratum of tradition (Wilckens 1974, 71).<sup>19</sup> He then examined the connections made by Dibelius between 1 Cor 15:3–8, 1 Thess 1:9–10 and the early speeches in Acts concluding that there are, at best, minor agreements and that Paul's letters display quite a different emphasis (Wilckens 1974, 77–86). Arguing instead that Luke worked backwards from later missionary preaching to construct speeches he thought fitting for the speakers, Wilckens' arguments effectively undermined the basis for Seeberg's, Dibelius' and Dodd's reconstructions. Even Graham Stanton, who disputed

---

<sup>17</sup> I have omitted here the overlapping history of scholarship on virtue and vice lists; for this see Edsall 2012, 417–420, 430–431.

<sup>18</sup> Citations for this work are from the 1974 second edition.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. already Baur 1875, 61.

many of Wilckens' conclusions, offered his own criticisms of form-critical assumptions concerning the *Sitz im Leben* of texts and was less optimistic about establishing the theological outlook of the church at any given time or the details of its missionary preaching (Stanton 1974, 6, 115).

Furthermore, the fact that Luke appears to be dependent on Paul (Wilckens 1974, 89) touches on another issue in the works of Seeberg *et al.*, namely that they do not sufficiently account for the possibility of direct lines of influence between the parallels they cite. Seeberg and Selwyn especially present their evidence as though it were spread evenly across the NT texts, but upon closer examination one can easily see that the majority of the evidence is Pauline.<sup>20</sup> What then is the evidence that these "catechetical" themes were present in other areas of the early Christian movement? In fact, this critique is even more pronounced for Selwyn's arguments since he attributes many of the similarities between 1 Peter and 1 Thessalonians to the fact that Peter and Paul list Silvanus as co-author (or possibly as *amanuensis*; διὰ Σιλουανοῦ, 1 Pet 5:12), placing 1 Peter even closer to the Pauline orbit.

### 1.3.2.2 Erhardt Gütgemanns and form criticism

With Erhardt Gütgemanns' publication of his *Offene Fragen zur Formgeschichte des Evangeliums* (1967, 2nd ed. 1971, ET 1979), another of the supports for reconstructions like those of Seeberg *et al.* collapsed. Although he was concerned principally with form criticism of the Gospels, many of his observations undermined the entire project of form criticism. In a move that anticipates what came to be known in Anglophone scholarship as the literary turn, Gütgemanns noted that the "anti-individualist" approach of the form-critic is not able to take the author of the text into account (Gütgemanns 1979, 103). This strikes at the heart of Dibelius' argument that the

---

<sup>20</sup> So Crouch 1972, 15–16 on Seeberg.

hortatory material in Paul's letters was general and unconnected to the given situation, a position that was followed by many scholars.<sup>21</sup> Further, he noted that "hypothetical reconstruction of the pre-history" of these forms is necessarily dependent on the ways in which the authors use them (Güttgemanns 1979, 104). That is, we are at the mercy of the final form of the text for our ability to isolate pre-textual traditions. Drawing also on Wilckens' arguments, Güttgemanns denied the value of Acts for reconstructing early Christian teaching and he concluded that

'ur-historical' territory seems to be a pretty shaky terrain, because of the often considerable differences in the traditio-historical results in each case, and it is necessary to persuade oneself of its safety, since the evolutionary implications of the method [of form criticism] produce only false hopes and scientific phantoms. (311).

He levels similar critiques against Dodd noting also that Paul's statements in 1 Cor 11:23–25 and 15:3–7 "concern not the reconstructed Markan 'outline' but the passion narrative" (316), thus severing the connection between the early Pauline evidence and the gospels and calling form-critical synthesis across these texts into question. Turning finally to Seeberg, Güttgemanns rejects what he sees as a confused mixture of *Form-* and *Religionsgeschichte* but the center of his criticism is Seeberg's concept of "an ancient, all encompassing credo" (319). Without Acts to provide crucial material and the form-critical framework to support syntheses across the various New Testament texts, this was no longer convincing to him.

### 1.3.2.3 *Disunity and James Dunn*

Also crucial to Güttgemann's criticisms was his correct assessment that the arguments of Seeberg *et al.* were based on a presupposition of the unity of the early church, a unity that Güttgemanns thought was no longer tenable (317). In this he was not alone. A steady stream of scholars had long denied the unity of the early church that a

---

<sup>21</sup> But see the criticism in Furnish 1968, 68–69.

widespread *kerygma* or catechesis requires. Of immediate relevance to our project are the criticisms of Ernst Käsemann. Reacting to the heritage of his teacher, Rudolf Bultmann, Käsemann argued "[t]here is no uniform and steady development of the whole church" but rather "many currents" and "a great variety of traditions."<sup>22</sup> Any unity there is in the New Testament witness "is provided by an early catholicizing and more or less orthodox Church's interest in normative doctrine."<sup>23</sup>

In this context of the decline of form criticism and apparent fragmentation of early Christianity, James D. G. Dunn produced his incisive *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (1977, 2nd ed. 1990, 3rd ed. 2006). In a sweeping statement that bears quoting in full, Dunn dismisses the work of Dodd and Seeberg:

The second [pitfall of study of primitive confessional formulae] is the danger of looking for a single unified creed – the danger of making a patchwork quilt of bits and pieces from here and there in the NT and hailing it as a seamless robe. This was the weakness of Dodd's reconstruction of the primitive kerygma. And A. Seeberg fell into the same trap in his pioneering study in our present area of concern. The temptation here is to pick out confessional forms from diverse strands of the primitive tradition and to group them together into a single formula, disregarding questions about their original life-settings. In such a case 'the Church's primitive confession of faith' is nothing more than an uneven amalgam of disparate elements bonded together by twentieth-century methodology. (Dunn 1977, 34)<sup>24</sup>

He takes up a similar critique of the theories of Selwyn where he subsumes him under the tendency towards "pan-liturgism" (Dunn 1977, 141–148).

Dunn's criticism here is certainly justified, Selwyn providing a perfect instantiation of the problem in such a widespread synthetic approach. Selwyn lays out the various parallels in a set of charts (Selwyn 1958, 369–372, 389–423), which, while impressive at first glance, are in fact misleading. In an effort to present the parallels in the

---

<sup>22</sup> For his own account of his break with Bultmann's idealism, see Käsemann 1988, 328–331.

<sup>23</sup> Käsemann 1973, 242, cf. Käsemann 1988, 332.

<sup>24</sup> See also Cullmann 1943, 6.

most easily accessible way, he is forced to use one text as the base of the pattern (usually from 1 Peter) and rearrange the other texts in the chart to match. This leads to the impression that the catechetical material adduced by Selwyn occurs in the same order when very often material from disparate parts of a text are juxtaposed, even with the order reversed, to show the "form" more clearly. This is putting the cart before the horse. Furthermore, as noted above, the assumption of the representative quality of Pauline letters and the possibility of influence of one text (or author) on another renders judgments about the spread of common themes difficult. The facile synthesis attempted by Selwyn, and Seeberg before him, begs questions of textual relationships, influence, dating, and many others – too many questions to be convincing.

What is particularly interesting about Dunn's treatment is the small amount of space he gives to refuting these various theories. Apparently, by 1977, he felt that the variety of the New Testament witnesses was established clearly enough to become his operating assumption. Indeed, in the end he identifies a single, and rather vague, unifying element in early Christianity: "the unity between the historical Jesus and the exalted Christ, that is to say, the conviction that the wandering charismatic preacher from Nazareth had ministered, died and been raised from the dead to bring God and man finally together, the recognition that the divine power through which they now worshipped and were encountered and accepted by God was one and the same person..." (Dunn 1977, 369).<sup>25</sup> Thus, a unified *kerygma* or catechetical framework that underlies the New Testament texts is designated as a scholarly fiction.

---

<sup>25</sup> This conclusion regarding the unifying significance of Christ was anticipated by Käsemann 1963.

### 1.3.3 Early Christian teaching after form criticism

In the wake of criticisms such as those leveled by Dunn, the quest for the preaching and/or teaching of the early church had a very different, more restrained, quality. For instance, in 1980 James McDonald proposed a structural analysis of early Christian teaching, dividing up different *modes* of communication into Propheteia, Paraclesis and Homily, Paranesis and Catechesis, and Paradosis. Of these four categories, Paradosis "is a fundamental form of Christian communication. It is 'of first importance' (1 Cor. 15:1). It differs from our first three structures – *propheteia*, *paraclesis*, and *paraenesis* – in that it provides them with basic data...its centre, its substance, is inviolate" (McDonald 1980, 124). This sounds very much like the relation between the *Glaubensformel* and *Missionspredigt* already argued by Seeberg (1903, 154). Furthermore, in determining the content of this tradition, McDonald is forced to rely on previous form-critical analyses, thus opening him up to the critiques leveled against his predecessors.

Eugene Lemcio responded to Dunn's analysis with two articles (restated in Lemcio 1991) in which he identified "six constant items" within the *kerygmatic* core of the New Testament message: "(1) God who (2) sent (Gospels) or raised (3) Jesus. (4) A response (receiving, repentance, faith) (5) towards God (6) brings benefits (variously described)" (Lemcio 1988, 6; cf. Lemcio 1990, 7–8). It should be noted that the *kerygmatic* frame resulting from his work is vague and minimal. At almost every point these statements admit a variety of interpretations (the benefits are "variously described"). Further, this analysis says nothing of the early teaching on morality, community formation, ethics, or any other non-core topic. In the end, his analysis seems more suggestive than conclusive.

In recent years scholarly approaches to early Christian teaching have varied,

ranging from those who largely ignore questions regarding the *content* of such teaching, an approach that dominates the field, to those who adopt the presuppositions and methods of those already criticized.<sup>26</sup> Neither of these options is sufficient: the first ignores an important aspect of the development and internal relations of the nascent Christian movement and the second fails to escape the pitfalls of previous form-critical approaches.

If one is to attend to the question of the content of early Christian teaching and preaching, as I contend one should, certain lessons from previous attempts must be taken to heart. Form criticism and its attendant synthetic approach across a number of texts are too problematic a basis for reconstructing anything other than a general pastiche of recurrent early Christian themes. A new approach must treat texts as whole cloth, attending to their rhetoric and supplying a nuanced view of their referential value. Further, mining the speeches in Acts for the earliest Christian preaching is problematic in light of their literary function and context. And, finally, one must not start with the determinative presupposition of a unified early church.

## 1.4 The Plan of this Study

In light of these observations, a number of courses could fruitfully be charted. One could proceed by assembling the wide range of material extant from early Christianity and present patterns that emerge without attempting to link these main contours to any historical period with accuracy. However, as the above survey of research shows, these contextually disconnected patterns are too often in the eye of the beholder. Instead, this study will pursue evidence that *can* be tied to an early historical period with a procedure duly chastened in light of previous attempts.

---

<sup>26</sup> See Edsall 2012, 432–433 for a discussion of Reinbold 2000 (a prosopographical approach, denying unified catechetical material), Ellis 1999 (a traditional form-critical approach, affirming unified early Christian teaching), and Schnabel 2004 (a mixed approach, denying a fixed early Christian missionary sermon).

As noted, the reconstructions provided by scholars in the first half of the 20th century went beyond the available evidence. The fact is that *Paul* is our best and earliest contemporary witness to the nascent Christian movement, in spite of the fact that his testimony poses its own problems (in particular regarding the extent to which "Pauline" Christianity can be considered representative or the use of his highly rhetorical letters for the purposes of historical reconstruction).<sup>27</sup> Introducing parallels from other periods of church history begs the questions of influence and anachronism.

Therefore, our point of departure here will be to ask what is *Paul's witness* to his initial teaching in his churches. This is not to insist at the start on a total uniformity in Paul's teaching at every locale, but merely to take seriously, at least on a provisional basis, Paul's own claim that there were certain things which he taught ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ (1 Cor 4:17; cf. 14:33).

Importantly, Paul also provides evidence, indirect though it is, regarding the relationship between what he called "my gospel" (Rom 2:16) and the teaching provided by other early Christian teachers (cf. Rom 6:17). Thus, while the analysis focuses on Paul's teaching and Paul's letters, the trajectory of the project will point beyond Paul to wider early Christian instruction. The move, then, is from establishing the outlines of Paul's teaching in churches he himself founded to a comparison of that teaching with the presumed prior instruction in his letter to the Roman Christian communities which were founded by others. In this process, points of convergence and divergence between the two suggest places where Paul considers his own teaching to line up with or differ from that

---

<sup>27</sup> But cf. the pertinent comments of Ginzburg 1999, 24–25: "Sources are neither open windows, as the positivists believe, nor fences obstructing vision, as the skeptics hold: if anything, we could compare them to distorting mirrors. The analysis of the specific distortion of every specific source already implies a constructive element. But construction...is not incompatible with proof...Knowledge (even historical knowledge) is possible" (25).

of others.<sup>28</sup>

This examination of Paul's witness to early Christian formative instruction takes place in three parts. In Part I, I lay out the method for this study. Part II takes up the bulk of the space with an investigation of Paul's formative instruction evident in two of his letters, 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. I close the main argument in Part III by comparing Paul's teaching with the framework of formative instruction presumed in his letter to the Romans, which was written to communities founded by teachers other than Paul. To begin, I now turn to answer the question, "How does one find Paul's teaching?"

*Excursus 1: A note on recent studies of Paul's teaching*

My approach to early Christian formative instruction has a number of things in common with certain features characterizing a good deal of scholarly literature specifically on Paul's missionary work. These studies are similar in many respects to those discussed above, with older scholarship pursuing a form-critical reconstruction<sup>29</sup> and more recent scholarship employing different methods. For the most part, studies in the 21st century have focused on Paul's work in particular locations – Börschel 2001 on Thessalonica and Chester 2003 on Corinth. These works are addressed throughout my argument, including Excursus 2. Two very recent works on Paul's establishment of communities and their character, worth singling out briefly here, are James C. Hanges' *Paul, Founder of Churches* (Hanges 2012) and Claire Smith's *Pauline Communities as 'Scholastic Communities'* (Smith 2012). Hanges argues carefully that Paul's establishment of communities should be seen in relation to Greco-Roman cult "founders" and "cult transfers" in which a founder figure set up a cultic association (which he argues are the

---

<sup>28</sup> See the justification for use of these letters in §2.2.4.

<sup>29</sup> E.g. Bussmann 1971 with bibliography of earlier attempts, and as recently as Pak 1991, cf. Edsall 2012, 428 for criticism.

closest analogy to Pauline communities), and provided the association charter as well as teaching on cultic matters, social behavior and, importantly, providing a foundational narrative within which the association was to place themselves (Hanges 2012, 47–139). He does not claim that this analogy exhausts the explanation of Paul's work, but that it explains certain elements of it in terms that were native to Paul's original context and audience (Hanges 2012, 462, *passim*). As will become clear, the role of a cult "founder" identified by Hanges does indeed have significant parallels to Paul's work, though it needs to be mentioned that the evidence base for Hanges' analogy is relatively narrow and he is occasionally forced to extrapolate generalities from single examples, as in the case of his comparison of Pauline teaching on sexual ethics and other cult founders (408).

Smith's work is of a different character, focusing on the character of Pauline communities. Smith classifies them as "learning communities," adapting Edwin Judge's phrase "scholastic communities" (Smith 2012, 388–391). According to Smith, this means that Paul deliberately set up his communities (though she focuses on 1 Corinthians and the Pastorals) in such a way that continual teaching and learning was an ongoing process. While this is an interesting argument, it is not without its limitations. In the first place, her approach of examining "teaching vocabulary" in Paul's letters does not differentiate between Paul's initial teaching, Paul's teaching in his letter, other teaching activity within the community or even divine instruction. These are not all "teaching" in the same sense and it leads to somewhat vague conclusions about the significance of who was teaching whom, about what, how, where, and why (note esp. the charts in her appendices, 396–493). Therefore, while Smith argues *that* learning (of various stripes) was of central importance for Paul's communities, she does not devote much space to *what* they were learning, which is of course the purpose of this study. Furthermore, her use of the Pastorals as comparative material with 1 Corinthians is problematic since many scholars

view these as later, non-Pauline compositions written in a situation with a reified tradition and community structure. If that is the case, then the importance of teaching and learning in that setting is not necessarily representative of Paul's practice and a lack of sustained interaction with other non-disputed Pauline letters weakens her case. Finally, the fact *that* the Corinthians were continually instructing each other, even at Paul's instigation, does not mean that *what* they taught was valid in Paul's eyes. Indeed, that does not seem to have been the case, as his extensive corrections in 1 and 2 Corinthians suggest.



# Part I: Method:

## Finding Paul's Teaching

In Part I, I lay out the methodological foundation for the project as a whole. Drawing on insights from Greco-Roman rhetoric, I argue in chapter 2 that ancient communicators intentionally relied on what they expected their audience already to know. Beyond ancient rhetorical handbooks, this structure of communication is present also in numerous actual works, including those by Jewish authors such as Philo, Josephus and 4QMMT. I identify three types of potential appeals to Paul's teaching that will structure the exegetical portion of the project: (1) explicit reminders of Paul's teaching, (2) direct appeals to knowledge (or ignorance) and (3) implicit appeals to knowledge.

I close this section in chapter 3 with a discussion of two features that could be seen to disrupt this communicative structure, co-senders and letter-carriers. I conclude that the contribution of co-senders to Paul's letters is ultimately unquantifiable and does not undermine Paul's reliance on what his readers already know, though their presence does inject a certain amount of ambiguity. Furthermore, contrary to the assertions of some scholars, I conclude that letter-carriers were not normally expected to read or interpret a letter to its recipients and so it is highly improbable that Paul would intentionally include them in the structure of communication, assuming that they would explain difficult elements in his letters.



# Chapter 2

## Finding Paul's Teaching through Rhetoric

### 2.1 Introduction

How then does one identify the contours of Paul's teaching from the material in his letters without returning to earlier form-critical approaches? In 1990, Joseph Plevnik argued for the possibility of using "Pauline presuppositions" as a means of identifying Paul's initial teaching at Thessalonica. He argued that if one took account of "what Paul takes for granted that the community knows [*sic*] concerning the gospel, [and] Christian living in light of the gospel" one could uncover Paul's initial teaching (Plevnik 1990, 50).<sup>1</sup> Prior to the work of Plevnik, Traugott Holtz formulated a similar argument in relation to Paul's ethical instructions in 1 Corinthians (Holtz 1995). Holtz noted that in several cases, the actual grounds for Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians remain implicit, suggesting that he relied on a common understanding of the unstated material for the force of his argument.<sup>2</sup> More recently Anders Eriksson, in his work *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof* (1998), has attempted to give these insights further clarity and support by means of ancient rhetoric.<sup>3</sup>

Eriksson argues that Paul's use of traditional material in 1 Corinthians, that is, material that Paul received from others and passed on to the Corinthian community – identified in 8:6, 11b; 10:16; 11:23–26; 12:3, 13; 15:3–5; and 16:22 – is best explained by analogy to the process of *inventio*, that part of ancient speech-making wherein one

---

<sup>1</sup> On this point, cf. already von Dobschütz 1909, 81.

<sup>2</sup> The famous reconstruction of the stages of interaction between the Corinthians and Paul in Hurd 1965 is addressed at relevant places throughout Part II.

<sup>3</sup> Though neither Holtz's nor Plevnik's article appear in his bibliography.

formulates arguments.<sup>4</sup> In Eriksson's words, "The traditions to be studied here constitute the *common ground* between Paul and the Corinthians" (Eriksson 1998, 33, emphasis added). While this is an important insight and will be discussed further below, Eriksson's treatment of these "traditions" is not without difficulties. For instance, he notes that the traditions are extrinsic proofs in that they are not worked out by Paul but rather provide the "facts of the case."<sup>5</sup> In antiquity, these extrinsic proofs, such as laws and witness testimony, were appealed to for their authority in order to support one's case.<sup>6</sup> However, in several passages the "traditions" identified by Eriksson are not appealed to *as such* but merely as an accepted practice or theological truth.<sup>7</sup> This begs the question as to whether Paul would have placed more emphasis on "traditional" material than on "non-traditional" material (if the distinction between the two were clear) or whether together it formed the singular authoritative unity of his gospel. In any case, the distinction between the two is much more difficult to delineate than indicated by Eriksson.

Further, going beyond what Eriksson tried to do, even if such a distinction could in fact be drawn confidently, then "traditions" may well provide a lopsided picture of Paul's initial teaching. Nevertheless, Eriksson's use of the category of *inventio* and his identification of assumed common ground between Paul and the Corinthians is helpful. This common ground is an important feature in the quest for Paul's initial teaching but before we elucidate concrete criteria for identifying it, some methodological groundwork is required.

---

<sup>4</sup> Eriksson's criteria for identifying traditions are deeply indebted to the form-critical processes and are thus in theory open to the same critiques. However, Eriksson himself notes that form-critical criteria cannot be used as they were through the 1960s (Eriksson 1998, 81–86). Nevertheless, some problems remain in his treatment of the material as "traditional." See below.

<sup>5</sup> Eriksson 1998, 33. The language of *extrinsic* and *intrinsic* proofs comes from Cicero *Top.* 21.73. Aristotle referred to *atechnic* and *entechnic* proofs (*Rhet.* 1.2.2 1355b).

<sup>6</sup> See Kennedy 1980, 120–122 for a discussion of authority in Greco-Roman and Judeo-Christian rhetoric.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. 1 Cor 8:11; cf. Debanné 2006, 219.

## 2.2 Rhetoric, Presuppositions and Paul's Teaching

### 2.2.1 General considerations

As has been noted by many communication theorists, successful communication, at its most basic, must proceed from what the recipient already knows.<sup>8</sup> In the words of the historian Carlo Ginzburg, "The most elementary communication presupposes a shared, obvious, and thus unstated knowledge."<sup>9</sup> Chaim Perelman, progenitor and proponent of the "new rhetoric," expands on this insight:

The objects of agreement on which the orator can build his argument are various. On the one hand, there are facts, truths and presumptions; on the other, values, hierarchies, and *loci* of the preferable.... Presumptions are opinions which need not be proved, although adherence to them can be either reinforced, if necessary, or suppressed by proving the opposite.<sup>10</sup>

This material can include well known maxims or stories, current events, various stereotypes, etc. with the only requirement being that this material is known to the recipient of the communication. As any teacher can attest, failing to assess correctly what students already know results in unsuccessful communication: either boring those who consider the lesson too simple or losing those who lack the requisite base knowledge.

Of course, as noted, this is communication *at its most basic*; actual communication is much more complicated. Communication is not always successful and can involve deception, manipulation and coercion. For instance, a speaker may affect Perelman's "objects of agreement," which they do not in fact share, for manipulative purposes. Further, one may attempt to impose new "objects of agreement" through authority or force. In this way, the exigencies and contexts of individual acts of

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Barker and Gaut 2002, 228–229; Burgoon, Hunsaker and Dawson 1994, 10–11; Satlow 1998, 136. For this view with regard to writing history, cf. Landau 2006, 41.

<sup>9</sup> Ginzburg 1999, 22, cf. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 1958, 20.

<sup>10</sup> Perelman 1979, 15, cf. Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca 1958, 93–94.

communication will alter the way in which a communicator uses these "common" conceptions.

Although elucidation of this complex interplay could be approached from the position of either ancient or contemporary communication theory, given that the focus of this work is on Paul's teaching in the first century CE it seems that ancient discussions of communication are more appropriate and run less risk of gross anachronism. Even within antiquity, reliance on "common" conceptions appears in a variety of contexts, as do explicit discussions of this same phenomenon. For the former, one can mention the obvious use of "common" conceptions recorded in Matthew 5:21–48, the six so-called "antitheses" of the sermon on the mount: "You have heard it said...but I say to you..." (5:21–22, 27–28, 31–32, 33–34, 38–39, 43–44).<sup>11</sup> This formulation "addresses the readers or the listeners in terms of their present situation" (Betz 1995, 215), drawing explicitly on material that Matthew's Jesus considered to be familiar to the audience.<sup>12</sup>

Explicit discussions of audience understanding also appear in educational and paraenetic contexts from various cultural traditions. Many ancient writers recognized the necessity of tailoring their lessons to the knowledge and ability of their students. "For, just as plants are nourished by moderate applications of water, but are drowned by many in succession, *in the same fashion the mind is made to grow by properly adapted tasks* [τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ψυχὴ τοῖς μὲν συμμέτροις αὐξεται πόνοις], but is submerged by those which are excessive" ([Plutarch] *Lib ed.* 9b-c).<sup>13</sup> The adaptability displayed by Greco-Roman philosophers, who often considered their educational task in terms of *ψυχαγωγία*

---

<sup>11</sup> If not in precise content, it is probable that these antithetical statements do indeed originate with Jesus; Luz 2001–2007, 230–231; Wiefel 1998, 105.

<sup>12</sup> Note also the oracles against the nations in Amos 1:3–2:5, which rely on crucial theological and ethical assumptions; see Barton 1980, 4–5, *passim*. (I am indebted to Dr. Casey Strine for this reference.)

<sup>13</sup> Unless otherwise stated, translations of classical texts, Phio and Josephus are drawn from the Loeb editions. Cf. also the importance of prior knowledge for paraenesis from Isocrates to Seneca in Malherbe 1992, 280–287.

(leading the soul in moral and philosophical development),<sup>14</sup> is paralleled by (possibly later) Jewish tradition in *m. Pesach*. 10.4: "And here the son asks his father (and if the son does not have understanding [דעת] his father instructs him), 'Why is this night [the Passover] different from other nights?...!' According to the understanding of the son his father instructs him [לפי דעתו שלבן אביו מלמדו]."<sup>15</sup> Indeed, basic education in reading and writing seems to have followed the same general pattern of cumulative learning in Greco-Roman and Jewish schools, namely first learning the letters (orally and visually), followed by syllables, words, phrases and then, finally, texts.<sup>16</sup> One cannot learn the latter materials without knowing the former. In non-scholastic contexts, writers as diverse as Seneca and the author(s) of 4QMMT explicitly relied on the recipients' previous knowledge as the foundation for further instruction.<sup>17</sup> However, for better or worse, the only sustained discussion of the mechanics of effective communication in antiquity is found in the ancient rhetorical handbooks and related literature (cf. Kennedy 1980, 7).<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> The parallel between Paul's works and Greco-Roman philosophical *psychagogy* has been drawn numerous times; cf. Malherbe 1987, esp. 61–94; Malherbe 1992, 301–304; Glad 1995. Glad emphasizes well the need for a teacher to adapt their lessons to the particular student (69–98).

<sup>15</sup> Translation modified from Danby 1933; See also the comments of R. Eleazar and R. Akiba in *b. Erub*. 54b. Further, Perelman 1979, 12, 15 notes that the Talmud represents a type of legal reasoning that "makes abundant use of presumptions, for which it has worked out refined definitions and elaborate rules for their use."

<sup>16</sup> For Greco-Roman educational practices, see, e.g. Plutarch *Lib. ed.*, Quintilian *Inst.* 1.1.24–32 and *passim*; Bonner 1977, 167; Marrou 1965, 229–264. For Jewish education, cf. Barclay 1959, 40–47; Safrai 1987; Riesner 1981, esp. 182–198.

<sup>17</sup> On 4QMMT, see below. For Seneca, see his discussion of advice (*admonitio/adhortatio*) in *Ep.* 94.25–29, cf. Malherbe 1992, 280–28. See also the discussion of Epicurus' instructional letters in Doering 2012, 389.

<sup>18</sup> In turning to Greco-Roman rhetoric I am not suggesting that Paul had read or was familiar with rhetorical handbooks such as those that Cicero and Quintilian used. That may have been the case (cf. e.g. Betz 1975; Long 2004; McCant 2004; Mitchell 2010, 18–30), but the differences between Paul's letters and the rhetoric prescribed in the handbooks should not be ignored. Note the cautions in Classen 1991; Anderson Jr. 1996, 249–257; Vos 2002, 27–28.

### 2.2.2 Rhetorical common ground in Greco-Roman rhetoric<sup>19</sup>

Let us return to Eriksson's insight regarding the *inventio* mentioned above. According to Cicero, "The *inventio* is the devising of true or apparently true arguments which render a case probable" (*De inv.* 1.9, my translation).<sup>20</sup> That is, the *inventio* "discovers" grounds for the arguments that occur in the various parts of a speech given that what is probable is that which "usually comes to pass, or which is *part of the ordinary beliefs of mankind, or which contains in itself some resemblances to these qualities*, whether such resemblance is true or false" (*De inv.* 1.46, my emphasis). Probability is a key theme throughout Cicero's *De inventione* and it also features in the anonymous contemporary handbook *Rhetorica ad Herennium*.<sup>21</sup> An important feature of both these works is that they are dependent on earlier materials, possibly including a shared teacher, and are (independently) "products of the Greek rhetorical tradition" (Corbeill 2002, 29) that had flourished since the time of the pre-Socratics. What is particularly interesting for our purposes is the concern displayed by Cicero and the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (and later, Quintilian *Inst.* 4.1.31) to address the knowledge, assumptions and disposition of the audience at hand, in most cases the presiding judge. Arguments in favor of one's position should rest on premises familiar to and accepted by the listeners (e.g. *De inv.* 1.53; *De or.* 2.185–186).<sup>22</sup> In this, as in other areas of rhetorical theory, Cicero was following earlier writers, even if indirectly.

---

<sup>19</sup> After I had formulated my approach, Collin Bullard graciously pointed me to a similar use of Greco-Roman rhetoric in Maxwell 2010, who focuses on the importance of audience knowledge in literary contexts.

<sup>20</sup> The same definition is given verbatim in *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.1.2.3, on which see below.

<sup>21</sup> On the relation between these two texts, see Corbeill 2002; Kennedy 1972, 103–148; Schanz and Hosius 1966, 457–459.

<sup>22</sup> This attention to the audience is also worked out in terms of capturing their good will by flattery and emotional and social appeal. See Cicero *De inv.* 1.22–23; *Rhet. ad Her.* 1.7–8; Quint. *Inst.* 4.1.5; cf. Nesbit 1992.

The concern for probability in persuasion appears already as a negative foil in

Plato's *Phaedrus*. Socrates says

For in the courts, they say, nobody cares for truth about these matters [the just and the good], but for that which is convincing [ἀλλὰ τοῦ πιθανοῦ]; and that is probability [τὸ εἰκόζ], so that he who is to be an artist in speech must fix his attention on probability. (*Phaedrus* 272d-e; cf. 237a-b)

Socrates, of course, rejects this view in favor of placing philosophy and virtue at the root of any account of rhetoric (cf. 260a-c) since "rhetoric is a certain art of ψυχαγωγία through words" (261a, my translation; cf. 271c-d). However, as is evident in his own dialectical style, the necessity of building an argument on a shared foundation is basic to the Socratic method.<sup>23</sup> Plato's most famous student, however, would produce a much more extensive work on rhetoric in which probability and audience assumptions play a more positive role.

Aristotle's *Rhetorica* opens with the statement, "Rhetoric is an ἀντίστροφος to dialectic," thus identifying it as an art common to all people and linking it with his wider theories of knowledge (1354a). Aristotle then goes on to define rhetoric as "an ability [δύναμις], in each case, to see the available means of persuasion [τὸ ἐνδεχόμενον πιθανόν]" (1355b). Indeed, since "the persuasive is persuasive to someone" (1356b),

one must not argue from all possible opinions [ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν δοκούντων], but only from those that define the speech [ἐκ τῶν ὀρισμένων λεκτέων], such as the judge's opinions or those of whom they approve. And this argument, therefore, in this way appears to be clear to all or to most. And again, conclusions should not be drawn from necessary premises alone, but also from those which are generally accepted. (1395b-1396a, my translation)<sup>24</sup>

In his *Topica*, which provides a number of "topics" (or types of arguments) for use in dialectical argument, this discussion of opinions and persuasion is couched in terms of

---

<sup>23</sup> E.g. 720c and *passim*. Alexandre Jr. 1998, 35–38 notes that regardless of his disclaimers, Plato "does prove himself to be in practice a consummate master of rhetorical art"; cf. Kennedy 1980, 46–56; Litfin 1994, 55.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. the statement in Isocrates *Hel. enc.* 5, 59.

ἔνδοξα which are opinions "that seem [true] to all or to most or to the wise – and with respect to them, either to all [of them] or to most or to the majority of the well known and respected ones" (*Top.* 100b, my translation).<sup>25</sup> It is on these opinions that one bases arguments such as maxims and enthymemes, which Aristotle claims to be the most important argument in rhetoric and equates with the syllogism.<sup>26</sup> Indeed, according to Aristotle, if any premise of the enthymeme is known to the audience it need not be stated, since the audience could supply the missing step (*Rhet.* 1357a).<sup>27</sup> While there is much debate over the significance of key terms in Aristotle's account, such as ἐνθύμημα and συλλογισμός, it is significant that both terms appear earlier in his *Analytica*. One example will suffice:

*"All teaching or learning that involves the use of reason proceeds from pre-existent knowledge.... Similarly too with logical arguments, whether syllogistic or inductive [οἱ τε διὰ συλλογισμῶν καὶ οἱ δι' ἐπαγωγῆς], both effect instruction by means of facts already recognized, the former making assumptions as though granted by an intelligent audience, and the latter proving the universal from the self-evident nature of the particular. The means by which rhetorical arguments carry conviction are just the same; for they use either examples, which are a kind of induction [παραδειγμάτων, ὁ ἐστὶν ἐπαγωγή], or enthymemes, which are a kind of syllogism [ἐνθυμημάτων, ὅπερ ἐστὶ συλλογισμός]." (An. post. 71a, my emphasis)*

From this passage it is evident that Aristotle's conception of effective rhetoric is a function of his larger theory of knowledge.<sup>28</sup> That is, he does not consider himself to be inventing a new mode of argumentation, rather he is identifying the ways in which people are naturally persuaded and developing *topoi* to build on that (so Engberg-Pedersen 1996, 139). This is an important point because it indicates that a concern for the presuppositions

---

<sup>25</sup> See also the discussion in Olmstead 2006, 14–15.

<sup>26</sup> Burnyeat 1996, 16–17. See also Hellholm 1994; Debanné 2006, 10–11.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Ginzburg 1999, 40–42; Alexandre Jr. 1998, 43.

<sup>28</sup> So Kennedy 1963, 96. This remains the case even if the precise philosophical meaning of "enthymeme" and "syllogism" has been "relaxed" for a more popular audience as argued by Burnyeat 1994. Notably, ἔνδοξα also play a role in Aristotle's ethical reasoning whereby the philosopher begins by collecting these opinions and uses them to derive an ethical truth, see Most 1994.

of one's audience need not be solely linked with Greek and Roman rhetoric but can be seen as stemming from a universal desire to make oneself understood and persuasive.<sup>29</sup> Furthermore, the similar appeal to probability and audience assumptions in Cicero and the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* can be accounted for in this way despite Aristotle's apparent lack of direct influence on them.<sup>30</sup> Even more importantly, appeal to general modes of speech, even if not entirely universal, can account for a similar concern in Paul's letters to build on what his readers already know and believe.

The value of these ancient theorists for this study, then, is not in their prescriptions for formal rhetorical composition nor in their analysis of different rhetorical genres (epideictic, demonstrative, judicial, etc.), both of which have an ambiguous connection with the letter genre.<sup>31</sup> *It is rather in their recognition of the structure of effective communication, the need to start from what is already known.* In short, ancient authors "were intensely conscious of their audiences."<sup>32</sup> As Paul himself claims to the Corinthians, "we do not write to you anything except what you can read and understand" (2 Cor 1:13).

### 2.2.3 Audience presumptions in Philo, Josephus and 4QMMT

Paul, as a Jew from the Diaspora town of Tarsus, encountered Greco-Roman ideas within the larger context of Judaism's long engagement with "Hellenism." For well over a century various authors have examined the interaction of "Judaism" and "Hellenism"

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Kennedy 1980, 6–7; Thurén 2000, 27–28. Oliver 1971 has also noted the centrality of audience presuppositions in Asian rhetoric (7, 24, 27, 222, *passim*).

<sup>30</sup> On the reception and influence of Aristotle's *Rhetorica*, see Kennedy 1996. It is the case, however, that Cicero explicitly draws on Aristotle throughout his *De inventio* and appropriates the Aristotelian tripartite typology of speeches – judicial, deliberative and epideictic.

<sup>31</sup> For a critical evaluation of the relation between ancient rhetorical and epistolographical theory, see Anderson Jr. 1996, 93–109. For a more positive account, see Bauer 2011, 101–105.

<sup>32</sup> Woodman and Powell 1992, 204 (from the epilogue). Note the varied contributions in that volume, all of which explore the concern which Latin writers display to communicate effectively with their readers.

noting points of convergence and divergence.<sup>33</sup> Out of all this discussion, what is increasingly clear is the fact that the boundary between the two is not. Recent discussion has correctly noted that direct dependence in one direction or another is not necessary, or even likely at times, since Greco-Roman and eastern cultures share a long and complex relationship with each other.<sup>34</sup> In this light, it is instructive to examine briefly the rhetorical use of presumed "common" conceptions in the writings of three other Jewish authors with varying relationships with Hellenistic culture and education: Philo, Josephus and the author(s) of 4QMMT. It should be noted that the type of literature produced by these writers differs from one another and from Paul in scope and audience. Where Josephus and Philo rely on very general *ἔνδοξα* for relatively wide readership, and 4QMMT is directed at a specific, though unspecified, group of ambiguous size and scope, Paul has a specific community in mind when writing his letters.

Philo, the Alexandrian Jew *par excellence*, likely received a full rhetorical education.<sup>35</sup> In his *De congressu*, he argues that education, which includes *inter alia* the study of rhetoric (11), is the necessary prerequisite to virtue (9–10). He later indicates his familiarity with the Aristotelian connection between rhetoric and dialectic (18; cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1354a). It comes as little surprise, then, that in his treatise *Legatio ad Gaium* Philo makes use of the types of *ἔνδοξα* advocated by the above theorists: commonly known stories and figures (80: to an Egyptian, Proteus, mentioned by Homer; 237: to Medusa), common sayings (22, 61), maxims (210: "all men are guardians of their own customs"),

---

<sup>33</sup> The studies of Lieberman 1962 and Hengel 1974 are classic examples. However, see Momigliano's early critique of Hengel's work (Momigliano 1977 [1970]).

<sup>34</sup> While previous generations of scholars preferred to see a unilateral influence from "Hellenism" to "Judaism" in matters of education and interpretation (e.g. Daube 1949), more recent scholarship has recognized that such "influences" are due more likely to a common *Zeitgeist* than to direct dependence. See esp. Alexander 1998; cf. Lieberman 1962, 62; Hengel 1974, 87, 108, 149; Cozijnsen 1998, 87–88.

<sup>35</sup> See Alexandre Jr. 1998, 84–91; Vos 2002, 21. For Philo's appropriation of *ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία*, see Mendelson 1982; Alexandre 1967.

direct appeals to the presumed knowledge of the audience (277: "there is no need to instruct you"), etc.<sup>36</sup>

Josephus, a Jewish author with a more ambiguous relationship with Greco-Roman education (perhaps analogous to Paul's own), also displays remarkable rhetorical awareness.<sup>37</sup> A number of recent works have drawn attention to the way in which Josephus mimics Greco-Roman historiography (such as that of Thucydides) as well as rhetorical tropes of irony and ethnic stereotyping.<sup>38</sup> Like Philo before him, he too makes use of ostensibly commonly known information (e.g. *C. Ap.* 1.28–29): commonly known and respected people (e.g. Pythagorus, 1.162), maxims (2.38–41) and Roman prejudice regarding Greeks and Egyptians (1.224–225; 2.29, 56–60; *passim*).<sup>39</sup> However, both Josephus and Philo present critiques of the rhetorical tradition that they (to varying extents) inhabit. Philo lampoons Gaius as one who was "clever at producing plausible arguments [δειναὶ...εἰκοτολογῆσαι]" (*Legat.* 57, my translation) while being morally bankrupt.<sup>40</sup> Similarly, Josephus condemns the "sophistical narrations [διηγήματα σοφιστικῶς]" of previous historians on the Jewish revolt (*B.J.* 1.1 my translation; cf. *C. Ap.* 1.24–25; *Vita* 40). These criticisms seem to place Josephus and Philo in the same camp as Plato: practitioners of rhetoric who were critical of amoral rhetorical efforts.

In turning to 4QMMT (4Q394-399), one enters a different world to that of Philo

---

<sup>36</sup> Bruce Winter 1997, 102 thinks that "the preserved *captatio benevolentiae* [in the *Legatio*] stands as a monument to Philo's rhetorical skills." On the rhetoric of Philo, see esp. Alexandre Jr. 1998; cf. Michel 1967; Hay 1979; Mack 1984.

<sup>37</sup> Older scholarship tended to have a dim view of Josephus, but over the last half of the 20th century scholars have increasingly noted his subtlety and ability as an author. For an account of this shift, see Landau 2006, 206–218 and Mason 1998, 65–66.

<sup>38</sup> See particularly the work of Steve Mason (e.g. Mason 2003) and John Barclay (e.g. Barclay 2005); cf. Landau 2006, 18–20, 39–68; van Henten 2005.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Barclay 2007a, 362–365. On Roman ambivalence towards Greek ideas, see Wisse 2002. See also Barclay 2007b for examples of Josephus' intentional use of well-known religious tropes in his defense of Jewish iconoclasm.

<sup>40</sup> On Philo's critique of sophistical rhetoric, see esp. Winter 1997, 83–91, cf. Alexandre 1967, 113–14.

and Josephus. Here, there is no defense of the Torah or Jewish practices in a Diaspora context. Rather, 4QMMT is Palestinian in origin and, if it is indeed a letter, destination. Although the "in-group" and "out-group" language of this text has generated much debate, there is no doubt that all parties were Jewish, perhaps even priestly, in theology and practice (so Yadin 2003). Some scholars, including the editors of the *editio princeps*, argue that 4QMMT is a polemical or eirenic letter in which the in-group "we" addresses the out-group "you" (both singular and plural).<sup>41</sup> Others have denied the any extramural intent in the text as well as its epistolary character, rightly noting that the prepended calendrical section (Qimron and Strugnell's section A) and the presence of six different manuscripts indicates a lively intramural life of 4QMMT.<sup>42</sup> Of course, those observations do not rule out an epistolary origin regardless of its later use within the community. It may be that the reception of 4QMMT at Qumran is similar to the reception of Paul's letters in the early church. Thus, in that case, the letters were copied and studied irrespective of their originally *ad hoc* nature (cf. now Doering 2012, 211).

As is expected in texts from Qumran, the affinities between 4QMMT and the rhetorical handbooks are few and there is no evidence that the author was aware of them.<sup>43</sup> However, there is a series of clear appeals to the implicit reader's *ἔνδοξα* in terms strikingly reminiscent of Paul's letters. In the second major section (Qimron and Strugnell section B) a series of halakhic decisions are introduced by the phrase "(now) concerning..." (B 8, 37-39, 49, 52, *passim*) which suggests that the author was dealing with topics familiar to the recipients (cf. §6.2.2). Further, the writer explicitly appeals to

---

<sup>41</sup> Qimron and Strugnell 1994, 114-121, changing their earlier view that the letter was a polemic directed at the "you" party. See a full listing in Reinhartz 2009.

<sup>42</sup> So, most forcefully, Fraade 2000; Fraade 2003; cf. Høgenhaven 2003, 187-189; Reinhartz 2009, 96-105; Yadin 2003, 148.

<sup>43</sup> Notably, however, Bockmuehl 2009 has recently suggested a connection between Alexandrian Jewish scholarship and the origin of commentary at Qumran.

presumed knowledge, even agreement, with statements such as "As you know it is so" (B 37, cf. 69) and extols their "cleverness and knowledge of the Law" (C 27-28). The author adduces examples of well-known ancestors such as David (C 25) and uses scripture as (in Ciceronian terms) an extrinsic proof (B 76; C 6). Indeed, even apparently binary language of "you" and "we" may well indicate not two groups but one such that "you" is simply a particular group within (or co-extensive with) "we" (Fraade 2000, 512-513). If this is the case, it would suggest that the letter is more pedagogical than polemic, implying a greater degree of continuity between the presumptions of the author and the ἐνδοξα of the readers, whoever they may have been. From this text too, then, the communicator's need and conscious attempt to begin from what is already known is apparent.

Of course, ancient rhetoric is notoriously slippery and ancient practitioners were (and are) often accused of developing the discipline without any moral compass. The objection may be raised, then, that these authors – or, specifically for our purposes, Paul – could be equally Machiavellian in their application of rhetorical techniques.<sup>44</sup> Christopher Stanley has forcefully put forward this very argument in relation to Paul's use of quotations, which he argues were used as rhetorical crowbars to impress his largely ignorant audiences (Stanley 2004).<sup>45</sup> However, what is important to note is that the very authors accused of being amoral, and who indeed advocate the tactful use of *vanitas* (untruth) in argumentation (Quint. *Inst.* 4.1.33), are precisely the same authors who emphasize the importance of knowing one's audience and their presuppositions. *The ability of an orator to woo, challenge, delight, captivate, deceive and otherwise shrewdly*

---

<sup>44</sup> Mason 2005a, 245 comes close to suggesting this for Josephus; cf. Mader 2000, 2. Recently Bauer 2011, 105–109 has emphasized the fact that even the self-referential "I" in Paul's letters is "Teil der rhetorischen Ausbildung" (109) involved in developing one's ἥθος.

<sup>45</sup> Significantly, even this would not have been possible were there not already a shared respect for ancient writings. Castelli 1991 similarly casts doubt on the referential value of Paul's rhetoric, though even she notes the fact that Paul uses apparently common conceptions in his rhetorical power-plays (122–123, cf. Thurén 2000, 25).

*manipulate their audience is rooted in their correct assessment of the listeners' ἔνδοξα* (cf. Mason 2005b, 78). To identify these materials is the common task of communicators.

## 2.2.4 Rhetorical criteria and Paul's teaching

Looking for these ἔνδοξα, then, is a way to discover what material it is that Paul expects his audiences to know.<sup>46</sup> These audience presuppositions are effectively *rhetorical* common ground insofar as they provide the basis for subsequent arguments while not necessitating that Paul himself agrees with the presuppositions of his readers in every instance. Furthermore, this presumed material constructs a "reader" who may not in fact match up with the actual historical reader. While it might be argued that such language of rhetorical common ground is simply another way toward what contemporary literary critics call the "ideal/implied audience," in the case of Paul's letters there is a subtle, but important difference. These are not literary works, written for an unspecified audience in no particular location but rather they are *ad hoc* letters sent to a specific audience Paul knew (at least indirectly as in the case of Romans and perhaps Colossians) in a particular location. Thus, the reconstructed audience presuppositions do not belong simply to the "ideal" reader but, to alter the phrase, to Paul's *intended* reader.

Since our concern is specifically to uncover what can be known about Paul's initial teaching (rather than, say, general social mores of the early Principate), there are three types of appeal to presumed knowledge which demand our attention. The first comprises (1) *explicit reminders about Paul's teaching* seen in places such as 1 Thess 4:1, Gal 5:21, or 1 Cor 2:1–4. The second type of appeal comprises (2) *direct appeals to*

---

<sup>46</sup> In a recent work, Debanné 2006 has explored Paul's use of enthymemes in detail, noting that the important premises on which they are founded reflect, *inter alia*, "the pre-agreement between Paul and [a] particular group of addressees" (264, *passim*). However, he makes no real attempt at a reconstruction of Paul's teaching, nor does he tie his study to the larger issue of early Christian teaching. Further, his focus on enthymemic argumentation leads at times to a rather narrow view of Paul's logic as well as, perhaps, giving an overly systematized view of Paul's logic; cf. the cautions in Foster 2007, 662; Stamps 2007.

*knowledge* (you know, do you not know?, etc.). Unlike the explicit reminders, these do not necessarily involve a clear link between the stated knowledge and Paul's teaching in every case (e.g. the statement about yeast in 1 Cor 5:6) but merely that the concept was generally familiar. The third type is an (3) *implicit appeal to knowledge*, found in concepts and statements that are fundamental to Paul's argument but not explicated by him in the letter. Like direct appeals to knowledge, the relationship of the implicit appeals and concepts to Paul's teaching is not clear simply from their identification. Indeed, because these apparently known concepts remain largely unstated, they often connote *areas* of knowledge, a shape of Paul's teaching, rather than a detailed account of his teaching (cf. Debanné 2006, 42).<sup>47</sup>

While explicit reminders unambiguously make claims about Paul's previous teaching, the direct and implicit appeals require careful analysis in order to assess their relationship to it. There is no universal criterion whose presence secures a link between these references and Paul's teaching. Rather several different questions must be asked, for example, what is the rhetorical force of the use of these concepts and statements – emotional, logical, foundational, peripheral, somewhere in between? What conceptual framework do these appeals presume especially in concert with each other? How do these appeals relate to Paul's explicit reminders regarding his teaching? Are these concepts or practices widely known in the first century Greco-Roman world?

Direct appeals to knowledge, even more so than explicit reminders or implicit appeals, present the acute problem of determining the referential value of Paul's statements: when Paul says "we know," does he really think the readers know or is he trying to convey (or impose) that knowledge in the very statement itself? However, even if such things could not be taken for granted as *accepted truth*, they still may have been

---

<sup>47</sup> The rhetorical situation of Romans problematizes these criteria somewhat; see ch. 9.

*familiar concepts* to the readers or the appeal would have no foundation. Focusing on Paul's *account* of his teaching allows for possible discrepancy between his presentation and his actual teaching, between *presumed* consent and *actual* consent. Any attempt to bridge that gap can only be made in the context of a larger historical framework involving Paul's whole relationship with a given church.

As noted, I will focus here on three of Paul's letters, 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians and Romans. The value of the Thessalonian, Corinthian and Roman communities for my argument is two-fold. First, 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians represent significantly different rhetorical situations in letters written to Pauline communities at different stages of development. 1 Thessalonians was written to a community of relative neophytes from whom Paul had been prematurely separated (1 Thess 2:17) and there is very little time between the end of Paul's mission there and his composition of the letter. 1 Corinthians, on the other hand, was written to a well-established community among whom Paul had lived and worked for over a year and the letter was written after more time had passed and after other teachers such as Apollos had been in Corinth. These points, along with greatly differing rhetorical situations, inform the ways in which Paul refers to his initial teaching. His reminders and appeals illuminate, and are illuminated by, his rhetorical stance in each letter, providing numerous points of contact as well as various differences.

The second value of these three letters is that while 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians were written to communities that Paul had personally established, Romans was not. What we see in the latter, among other things, is Paul attempting to present "his" gospel (Rom 2:16) in terms that are acceptable to communities he had never visited. In doing this, Paul presumes that certain things are non-controversial (such as the person of Abraham or impending eschatological judgment) while others receive extended defense

(such as his understanding of the law and his construal of salvation history). Both sides of this are valuable as the first suggests points of contact with his Roman readers and the second suggests potential points of conflict. In this way, Romans shows Paul positioning himself within the wider early Christian movement. Notably, however, the three types of appeal identified above do not work in the same way for Romans and accordingly my approach to that letter shifts away from them.<sup>48</sup>

Identifying the material from these letters will not provide a complete or unambiguous reconstruction of Paul's teaching. Indeed, the *ἔνδοξα* of his readers were not entirely supplied by Paul; they were not *tabula rasa* to begin with. However, as noted above, the logical force of the appeals and their location within a (cumulative) conceptual framework are important considerations.

### *Excursus 2: Conversion and sociology: two recent contributions*

It is fitting at this point to discuss briefly the process of conversion, which itself involves many aspects beyond the preaching and teaching of Paul or any other missionary. There have been a number of conversion studies in recent biblical scholarship, often tied to the issue of the "conversion" or "call" of Paul.<sup>49</sup> I want to highlight here two works in particular in relation to this study. The first is Regina Börschel's account of Paul's establishment of the Thessalonian community (2001), which has, to my knowledge, received less of an audience than it should, and the second is Stephen Chester's analysis of the conversion of the Corinthians (2003). These two scholars draw on sociological models according to which they structure their accounts, Börschel especially from Berger and Luckmann and Chester from Anthony Giddens.

---

<sup>48</sup> See the further discussion of this in §9.1.

<sup>49</sup> So Bockmuehl 2010, 189–190; cf. Baslez 2010, 696–700. These include Chester 2003; Crook 2004; Gaventa 1986; Segal 1990; McKnight 2009 and Morlan 2012. Conversion has also been a popular topic outside of biblical studies; cf. Rambo 2009.

However, these differing starting-points do not make their works antithetical, but rather they can be construed in a complementary way.

Börschel attempts to account for the ways in which Paul aids the nascent Thessalonian community in forming their identity, drawing particularly on Berger and Luckmann's notion of the symbolic universe, translated into German as "symbolische Sinnwelt" (or simply "Sinnwelt"). According to Börschel, the identity of a person or community is delimited in both negative and positive terms: "we are not..." as well as "we are..." (Börschel 2001, 12–13). Everything one encounters passes through one's *Sinnwelt*, which constrains interpretation (*Deutung*) in the process of externalizing, objectivizing, or internalizing events and ideas (13). This socially constructed framework also acts prescriptively, providing a sort of teleology for one's actions (14).

Given that these *Sinnwelten* are socially constructed, they are often passed on by means of primary socialization, that is, through one's upbringing (93). However, there is also the possibility of secondary socialization where a mediator of a different symbolic universe (*Sinnweltvermittler*) passes on a new *Sinnwelt* to their converts. In Thessalonica, Börschel argues, there was no "carrier group" (*Trägergruppe*) or society for the Christian *Sinnwelt* prior to the arrival of Paul and so he had to pass on the whole of his deeply Jewish symbolic universe in order for his message to have been understood (94). Indeed, the disjunction between differing *Sinnwelten* can account for miscommunication and misunderstanding on the part of the convert as well as the missionary. In light of this, it is not merely the details of God, Jesus (death, resurrection, parousia), eschatology, etc. that Paul had to pass on, but *also* the framework in which these fit. A failure in the latter task leads to a failure in the former.

Stephen Chester, who does not interact with Börschel's work, draws his framework from the "structuration theory" of Anthony Giddens. This is the theory that

"[o]n the one hand social structures account for the continuities displayed within human social life (reproduction), on the other they are themselves changed by that life (transformation)" (Chester 2003, 37). While Börschel's study emphasizes the cultural and conceptual aspects of conversion, Chester focuses on the social and practical, critiquing the model of Berger and Luckmann for failing to account for "how social change is generated" (35). (The distinction between cultural and social approaches is helpfully elucidated in Rambo 1993, 8–9.) Chester's approach allows for a gradual change as well as the reinterpretation of the missionary's message by the converts in terms familiar to them (Chester 2003, 40, cf. Rambo 1993, 5), where Börschel's account of conversion appears overly binary at times. Significantly, Chester agrees with Börschel that conversion involves more than simply learning new information but also in appropriating "a new set of implicit rules and resources (structures) to be acquired shaping appropriate and competent conduct in a host of contexts" (Chester 2003, 40).

These works show that Paul's preaching and teaching involved much more than passing on the story of the death and resurrection of Christ or a few philosophical precepts. Rather, he presented the converts with a relatively complete *Sinnwelt* that involved a new set of explicit and implicit rules regarding behavior. One further point should be noted, and that is that conversion, in antiquity as also today, is not merely an individual event, but involves a complex relation between the convert, the community from whence the convert comes and whither the convert goes (Chester 2003, 12–18). Further, the fact that the family in antiquity was quite important and carried significance for one's religion also ought not be overlooked.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>50</sup> Cf. Barclay 1997; Baslez 2010, 700–702.

## 2.3 Plan of Study

In concrete terms, the project will proceed as follows. In Part II (chs. 4–8) I will explore the Thessalonian and Corinthian correspondence together. In this section, 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians will be foregrounded as they provide the clearest case studies; 2 Thessalonians has the added difficulty of its contested authenticity and 2 Corinthians represents an even further development of an already complex set of interactions (adding another lost letter to the mix!).<sup>51</sup> After a discussion of the rhetorical situations of 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians (ch. 4), then, the pertinent passages will be explored within the framework of the three types of appeal discussed above: explicit reminders of teaching (ch. 5), direct appeals to knowledge (ch. 6) and implicit appeals to foundational concepts and statements (ch. 7). After delineating the common rhetorical ground in each letter, the results will be compared (ch. 8) to identify local variations and form a set of material that potentially played a role in Paul's trans-local initial teaching, as well as any notable differences.

In Part III, I then compare Paul's teaching identified in Thessalonica and Corinth with Romans, examining the ways in which Paul presumes material from his teaching to be known or unknown by his Roman audience (ch. 9). Points of convergence between the material from the Thessalonian and Corinthian communities and that of Romans will indicate material that Paul thinks he holds in common with other Christian communities. Conversely, material from his teaching that receives significant explanation is indicative of points that Paul may have considered to be problematic for his readers.

However, before turning to the material in Paul's letters, the method outlined above on general terms needs to be tested against the realities of ancient letter-writing and

---

<sup>51</sup> For further discussion of 2 Corinthians, see chapter 4 below.

delivery to assess whether or how the structure of communication might be altered by the letter format (ch. 3).



## Chapter 3

# Finding Paul's Teaching in Letters

Since the task at hand is to look for evidence of Paul's teaching *in his letters*, it is necessary to address some practical complications presented by the context of ancient letter-writing. In other words, we need at least to raise (if not answer) the question, Are Paul's reminders affected by the realities of ancient letter-writing? In particular, what is the significance of co-senders and letter-carriers for Paul's communication with his churches?<sup>1</sup>

Paul's letters defy easy categorization as public (official), private, literary or "Diaspora" letters.<sup>2</sup> Indeed, these categories themselves are hardly cut-and-dried.<sup>3</sup> In terms of length, Paul's letters would be classed among the literary letters,<sup>4</sup> but unlike many literary letters, Paul's writings are *ad hoc* compositions written to actual recipients. In terms of the relationship between the senders and recipients, Paul's letters most closely resemble public/official letters, including the Jewish Diaspora letters,<sup>5</sup> in which an official

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the guideline for the application of ancient rhetoric on letters in Classen 1991, 7.

<sup>2</sup> This fact leads Bauer 2011, 444 to conclude in favor of a distinct letter-culture particular to early Christianity. Doering 2012, 23–24 categorizes letters as documentary (including official, business and private letters), diplomatic and literary letters; cf. Rosenmeyer 2001, 5–12 and Trapp 2003, 3–5. On the ancient distinction between public and private letters, cf. Cicero *Pro flacco* 37.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Rosenmeyer 2001, 7: "it is not enough to admit that *some* letters straddle the categories; in fact, *no* letters fall neatly into separate categories of wholly literary constructions or wholly natural and unedited outpourings of the heart." See Malherbe 1988 for a collection of texts on ancient epistolary theory.

<sup>4</sup> This is true even for Philemon, Paul's shortest letter (Bauer 2011, 388). Notably, Romans is one of the longest "real" letters we have from antiquity and *all* of Paul's letters, with the exception of Philemon, are much longer than a typical papyrus letter and longer even than most of Cicero or Seneca's "literary" letters written with intent to publish (Klauck 2006, 301 n. 2).

<sup>5</sup> Doering 2012, 383–406 refers to Paul's letters as "quasi-official"; cf. Taatz 1991; Niebuhr 1998; Whitters 2001; Klauck 2006, 229–296; Frey 2007, 304–305. The letters adduced in this connection are Jer

(or group of officials) addresses a situation in a community.<sup>6</sup> In terms of content, Paul's letters relate well to "Diaspora" letters and philosophical letters,<sup>7</sup> but they are longer than both. As is well known, they display a confluence of Jewish and Greek influence seen in the prescript (which includes the Jewish "peace" greeting), the content (which has innumerable parallels in Greco-Roman philosophy as well as Jewish literature from the OT to the Bavli) and the use of Greek letter form.

It will be important to keep this understanding of Paul's letters in mind as we turn to two factors in ancient letter writing that pose particular difficulties for the use of audience presuppositions to reconstruct Paul's teaching: namely, multiple authorship and the task of letter-carriers.

### 3.1 Co-Senders and Secretaries

It has long been noted by scholars of ancient letters, even if not always appreciated by New Testament scholarship, that letters with more than one sender (or author) were the rare exception in antiquity rather than the norm.<sup>8</sup> In this light, the presence of named co-senders in the prescript of every non-disputed Pauline letter except Romans, as well as in the disputed Colossians and 2 Thessalonians, is striking and begs for an explanation. Further, even Romans reveals a secondary influence in 16:22 when the secretary Tertius "who wrote this letter" greets the church in Rome. What role did these secondary senders and secretaries play in the composition of the letter? More to the

---

29 (LXX 36):1–23; *Ep. Jer.* (Bar. 6); *4 Bar. (Par. Jer.)* 6:19–25; 7:24–34; *Tg. Jer.* 10:11; 4QApocJer C (4Q386–389), *2 Baruch* 78–87; the Elephantine "Passover Letter" (CAP 21), 2 Macc 1:1–2:18; the book of Esther (Addition F 11) and the letters of Gamaliel in *t. Sanh.* 2.6 and elsewhere (see esp. Sperling 1982). It should be noted that *formally*, these letters do not differ greatly from other Greco-Roman public letters and Doering 2009 notably argues that "Diaspora letter" is a text-pragmatic (rather than formal) genre.

<sup>6</sup> For other public letters, see famously P.Lond. 6.1912; cf. BGU 1.44 P.Oxy. 246; 3794; 3618; 3472; 3689; 2 Macc 1:1–2:18; P.Yadin 52, 57, 59.

<sup>7</sup> A good example of these are Seneca's *Epistulae Morales*, see Klauck 2006, 166–173.

<sup>8</sup> See early on, von Roller 1933, 58–59, 153, cf. Murphy-O'Connor 2009a, 1–2; Richards 2004, 33–36; Stirewalt 2003, 37–44.

point here, is it possible that they contributed knowledge of a more developed set of religious *ἔνδοξα* within a given community than Paul had left with them? In other words, is it possible that the direct and implicit appeals to knowledge might refer to some material that the community had learned from someone other than Paul and of which Paul has been made aware by these other parties?

Beginning with secretaries, E. R. Richards, in his thorough study of the role of the ancient secretary in composing letters, developed a sliding scale of secretarial influence between "author-controlled" and "secretary-controlled" letters.<sup>9</sup> A secretary could be (1) a mere recorder, taking dictation by syllable or, for the very skilled, at speaking pace; (2) an "editor" who takes detailed notes from the sender and drafts the letter from them; (3) a "co-author" to whom the sender gives only catchwords and main argument; or (4) the composer who is simply told that a certain type of letter is to be written.

It is safe to rule out the last option, which would be more common in formulaic letters and especially when the sender is illiterate (*ἀγράμματος*), in which case there is often the so-called "illiteracy formula."<sup>10</sup> Paul, however, was not *ἀγράμματος*, as his personal greetings in 1 Cor 16:21, Gal 6:11 and Phlm 19 show. Furthermore, the general consistency of "rhetorical sophistication" across Paul's letters (Richards 2004, 90–91), regardless of the secretary (or co-sender), indicates that the common denominator is Paul.<sup>11</sup> This pushes the sliding scale very far towards the "author-controlled" use of a secretary as a recorder of dictation, even if Paul did not dictate syllabically. As with many

---

<sup>9</sup> See Richards 1991, 97–101. He is followed by Klauck 2006, 55–60 and Bauer 2011, 98.

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Klauck 2006, 56–57; e.g. P.Oxy. 3689 ll. 23–28, "Aurelia...presented [this notice] and swore the oath. Aurelius Charemon, son of Cornius, wrote this for her because she is illiterate [μη̄ εἰδυίας γράμματα]." Even here, however, the named sender was solely responsible for the contents; cf. Richards 1991, 53–56 on authorial responsibility in antiquity.

<sup>11</sup> It is worth noting that the style of the so-called *Hauptbriefe* is even more consistent, irrespective of differing rhetorical contexts and that the differences between the *Hauptbriefe* and 1 Thessalonians are not great; cf. the numerous points of contact between 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians and Romans noted in the following chapters.

papyrus letters, the only indication that we have of Paul's use of secretary, aside from Rom 16:22 and general plausibility, are the greetings mentioned above.<sup>12</sup> This does not, of course, rule out any input from the secretaries whatsoever, but it does render their contributions to Paul's knowledge of his communities unquantifiable, in the same way that other unnamed sources and rumors may have reached him.

As for co-senders, we noted above that ancient letters with more than one sender are relatively rare, though they are more common in public/official letters, including the Diaspora letter (cf. Doering 2012, 399). One might posit a sliding scale somewhat like that proposed for secretarial influence – ranging from mere mention by way of greetings to the co-sender(s) composing most of the letter. In fact, the examples we do have indicate that not all co-senders played an equal role in the composition of the letter. Several of Cicero's letters, for instance, have more than one person listed in the prescript (e.g. *Ad. fam.* 14.14, 18; 16.11), but the remainder of these letters are in the first person singular and there is no indication that anyone other than Cicero (with his secretary) was involved in writing the letter.<sup>13</sup>

In some official correspondence, the multiple senders lend their authority to the letter. In P.Oxy. 3618, an official letter written in the first person plural, the various sending officials are listed in what appears to be descending order of civic importance, though it is difficult to tell what each sender might have contributed.<sup>14</sup> In the case of the letters of Rabban Gamaliel preserved in *t. Sanh.* 2.6 (and elsewhere), the narrative frame tells us that Gamaliel was sitting with the elders (זקנים) and a scribe (סופר) when the

---

<sup>12</sup> Cf. BGU 1.37; 1.73; 2.450; P.Oxy. 118, 3808; 3818; cf. *P. Yadin.* 52 discussed below.

<sup>13</sup> So Murphy-O'Connor 2009a, 1–2, though he goes on to distinguish Cicero's practice of listing family members in the prescript with Paul's practice.

<sup>14</sup> In P.Oxy. 3618, Aurelius Dio, prytanis of the council, Maximus the syndic (?) and perhaps another sender write regarding the collection of a "contribution" called the *ξυλοσαγγάθος*. There is no reason that all named in the prescript would have had to participate in drafting this short official note, though their authority lends weight to the request for payment.

letters are composed.<sup>15</sup> Further, the letters are written in the first person plural (אנחנו) (מהודעין) and he mentions the collaboration with his colleagues (חברייא). Yet, it is still Gamaliel who dictates to the scribe while the elders are silent. The letter preserved in 2 Macc 1:1–9 is sent by an undifferentiated group of "the Jewish brothers who are in Jerusalem and in the whole region of Judea" (1:1) while that in 1:10–2:18 is sent from "those in Jerusalem and in Judea and the *gerousia* and Judas" and both are written entirely in the first person plural. In these latter two cases, presumably the letter is written on behalf of these large groups and only a representative (group?) composed the letter. Similarly, 4QMMT is presented as a letter written from a "we" group to multiple recipients about halakhic matters of purity and temple worship, though some scholars have tried to associate it particularly with a single author.

Other examples of co-sent letters demonstrate further ambiguity as to the contributions of each person in the prescript. In P.Oxy. 118, although the letter is sent by two people (Saras and Eudaimon to their son, l. 1) and written mainly in the plural (ll. 3, 7–8, 15, 23), the closing greeting is in the singular (ἔρρωσο ἐμοί τε καὶ σοὶ εὐτυχῶς, l. 41) *and* written in a different hand from the scribe.<sup>16</sup> This indicates that only *one* of the named senders signed the letter and perhaps that only one was present while it was being drafted. Thus, while the letter was in the interest of both senders, one of them appears to have taken the lead in writing the actual letter. In P.Oxy. 3094, Sarapas and Gaia write to a friend to inform him of their recent legal plight. The letter begins with a plural greeting (ἀσπαζόμεθά σε τὸ προσκύνημά σου ποιούμεν, ll. 2–3) and the first half of the account of Gaia's various petitions is told in the third person (ll. 6–16). However, in the middle of the letter, the story shifts into the first person *singular* (ll. 17–38) and remains in it until the

---

<sup>15</sup> On these letters see p. 45 n. 5 above.

<sup>16</sup> The change in hand is identified by the editors of the papyrus. The facsimile was not available for me to consult.

final greeting, which is again in the first person plural. The section in the singular includes the revealing statement, which unfortunately is only partially preserved, in which Gaia says, "therefore I write to you so that you might...with [?] me" (διὸ γράφω σοι ἵνα καὶ σύ μοι συν-..., ll. 37–38). Like P.Oxy. 118, this shows that while two people are listed in the prescript, it is the "voice" of Gaia that we hear, at least in ll. 17–38; she is the one writing (perhaps through a scribe) and, as the narrative shows clearly, she is the impetus behind the letter.<sup>17</sup>

From this it seems that the contributions of co-senders, like that of secretaries, is very difficult to quantify. As one would expect, co-sent letters appear to bear the interest and/or authority of those named in the prescript, but beyond that the water becomes murky. Letters with multiple senders, especially outside of public/official letters, demonstrate an ambivalence as to the person and number of the authorial voice – first person singular, first person plural and even third person. It appears that one of those listed in the prescript took the lead in composing the letter, but it is impossible to quantify the previous interaction of the various senders without explicit references in the text.

In the case of the three letters which are the focus of this study, each has a distinct relationship to this problem. 1 Thessalonians is sent from Paul, Silvanus and Timothy, 1 Corinthians includes the enigmatic Sosthenes alongside Paul in the prescript and Romans comes from Paul alone but was written by Tertius (Rom 16:22).

In line with its multiple senders, 1 Thessalonians is written almost entirely in the first person plural, with only three emphatic interjections by Paul (1 Thess 2:18; 3:5; 5:27). Of course, Paul's use of the first person plural includes another group when he uses "we" to include his readers (4:14; 5:5–6, 8, 10) and even all living Christians (4:17).<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup> There is also a possibility that the third person retelling in ll. 6–16 reflects another voice, that of Sarapas, rather than simply a narrative mode.

<sup>18</sup> See the discussion of "I" and "we" in Klauck 2006, 358–360.

Since Silvanus and Timothy accompanied Paul on his recent mission, many of the "we" passages appropriately refer both to their time in Thessalonica (e.g. 2:1; etc.) and injunctions that come from the missionary team together (e.g. 4:1). It may be the case that the Thessalonians had developed in their Christian *ἔνδοξα* in the short interval between Paul's exit and Timothy's return, in which case Timothy could have alerted Paul to this fact. However, the time was short and there is no indication that Timothy undertook any *further* teaching, beyond reinforcing what they already knew. Thus, the Thessalonian knowledge on which Paul was drawing was most probably due to the initial mission there. This is further reinforced by the close connection between Paul's explicit reminders about his teaching and the direct or implicit appeals to knowledge.

Despite their differing number of senders, Romans and 1 Corinthians have an almost identical ratio of singular to plural verb forms, with singular representing over sixty percent in both cases.<sup>19</sup> In fact, the plural prescript of 1 Cor 1:1 is immediately undermined by the singular thanksgiving *εὐχαριστῶ* in v. 4 (so Murphy-O'Connor 2009a, 4). As in 1 Thessalonians and P.Oxy. 118, 3094, this indicates that Paul is speaking for himself and not for any collective "we."<sup>20</sup> However, Paul regularly slips into the first person plural in 1 Corinthians in a variety of situations: rhetorical plurals that include author(s) and audience (5:8; 8:1, 4, 8; 10:8–9, 16–17, 22), general plurals for "we" Christians (2:12–13, 16; 6:3; 12:13; 13:9, 12; 15:49, 51–52), specified plurals as in "we" Paul and Apollos (3:9; 15:11) and even "we" for all people (12:23; 15:32). There is a further ambiguous "we" that could refer to Paul himself in the plural (4:11–13; 9:4–6;

---

<sup>19</sup> Romans: 92 1st sing./58 1st pl. (62.3% singular); 1 Corinthians: 86 1st sing./54 1st pl. (61.4% singular). Statistics based on verbal forms in the NA<sup>27</sup> text. Cf. the table in von Roller 1933, 173 which supports this picture, though he calculates the percentages differently (counting verbs and pronouns separately and basing the percentage on the total number of words in the letter).

<sup>20</sup> There is, of course, more at stake rhetorically in Paul's use of the first person singular; see the discussions in subsequent chapters and cf. *inter alios* Dodd 1999; Lyons 1985.

11:31–32), or may refer to Paul and his team of traveling missionaries (1:18; 2:6–7; 4:8–9; 11:16; 15:15, 19, 30).<sup>21</sup> Romans demonstrates similar tendencies to 1 Corinthians.

Furthermore, we simply do not know who Sosthenes is or what his relationship was to Paul.<sup>22</sup> Perhaps unsurprisingly, this makes his contribution impossible to quantify. There is nowhere in 1 Corinthians that Paul gives any indication of the extent of their collaboration. Moreover, there are no passages in the letter in which Sosthenes' influence would be *necessary*, as all new information Paul gathered about the Corinthian church could well be provided by the other named people: Apollos, Chloe's people and the house of Stephanas.<sup>23</sup> Indeed, it may well be that Sosthenes was part of one of these expeditions and represents the bearer of this information in the letter. In any case, the development of Corinthian theological presuppositions, which Sosthenes and others could have reported to Paul, is regarded by him as mostly illegitimate and he spends much of the letter trying to return the Corinthians to his earlier emphases.

Romans is a different situation entirely as it has no co-sender and all of Paul's information about the current state of affairs in the Roman churches appears to have come from reports – official or not – as he claims to have never visited there before, at least not since his Damascus Road experience (Rom 15:22–29). However, as Rom 16 shows, Paul does personally know a number of Christians in Rome and some of the material he takes for granted may depend on what he expects them to know though, as with all of these

---

<sup>21</sup> Cf. also the conclusions of Verhoef 1996, 420–421.

<sup>22</sup> Some scholars, such as Schlatter 1934, 18–19, identify this Sosthenes with the co-author of 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 1:1). This is an intriguing suggestion especially since Schlatter links Sosthenes' conversion to the missionary efforts of Apollos but it must remain conjectural. Eusebius (*Hist. eccl.* 1.12.1), on the other hand, preserves a tradition that Sosthenes was one of the 70 unnamed apostles.

<sup>23</sup> Murphy-O'Connor's suggestion that Sosthenes' contribution is evident in 1:18–31 and 2:6–16 (Murphy-O'Connor 2009a, 7–10), while possible, could only be compelling if one accepts his assumptions that (1) Sosthenes is a co-author rather than simply a co-sender and that, as such, (2) direct evidence for his voice ought to be found in the text. Neither of these are necessary and the plurals in these passages can be understood as references to Paul's missionary team or Christian teachers more generally.

passages in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians too, each passage will have to be assessed on a case by case basis.

### 3.2 Letter-carriers

Letter-carriers and their roles have been the subject of several recent discussions and have potential bearing for my argument. The question is whether and in what way the letter-carrier was supposed to contribute to the communication of the letter. Was it generally supposed that the carrier would read and/or explain the letter? If so, was the contribution of the carrier indicated in the letter, or was it implicitly built into the letter's structure of communication, with the sender leaving important things unexplained expecting the carrier could complete the information?<sup>24</sup> Or was the carrier simply a courier with no interference in the letter's communication? Where might Paul's letters fit into this framework? To answer these questions, we first need to understand what the task of the letter-carrier was, in general terms, and how they are included in epistolary communication.

The most obvious task of a letter-carrier was, of course, to carry letters. Many letter-carriers were simply travelers who were entrusted with letters by acquaintances or even strangers.<sup>25</sup> In fact, the popularity of letter writing in antiquity is deeply indebted to the fact that travellers regularly doubled as letter-carriers (Klauck 2006, 63). In many other cases, letter-carriers were also responsible for the delivery or retrieval of some goods.<sup>26</sup> This was more common when the letter-carrier was well known to or in the employ of the sender (Richards 2004, 182). In some cases, the letter-carrier was an

---

<sup>24</sup> Some recent scholars have argued (or suggested) that this is precisely the case; e.g. Richards 2004, 181–185; Stirewalt 2003, 16; Wagner 2002, 38; Ward 1994, 102–103. See the discussion in Head 2009b, 279–282.

<sup>25</sup> Cf. BGU 1.38 where Serenos complains of difficulty in finding a carrier and notes that he resorted to hiring one (ll. 11–15). P.Oxy. 3806 ll. 3–5: "Since...is going upstream I judged it necessary to greet you by letter and invite you to write me about whatever you many want [περὶ ὧν ἐὰν θέλητε]."

<sup>26</sup> E.g. BGU 1.33, 1.37, 1.48, 1.73; P.Oxy. 113, 117, 3505, 3642, 3806; P.Yadin 52, 57, 59.

emissary of the sender, authorized (by the letter) to carry out certain actions. Notably, however, in these cases the contribution of the letter-carrier was often explicitly identified in the letter itself, especially if the letter-carrier is to supply information necessary for the completion of the transaction. For example:

"I have sent to you my Blastus, for forked(?) sticks for my olive-gardens. See then that you do not keep him" (BGU 1.37 ll. 3–6).

"Take care that Onnophris [the letter-carrier] buys me what Irene's mother told him" (P.Oxy. 113 ll. 24–26).

"I send you some good melon seeds through Diogenes the friend of Chaereas the citizen, and two strips of cloth sealed with my seal" (P.Oxy. 117 ll. 11–14).

"Sarapas [the carrier] will tell you about the roses" (P.Oxy. 3313 ll. 25–26).

"I have sent sheepskins to you through Didymus and the same Didymus will tell you how many... Let me know how many you received and how much they are going for and how many rush-mats remain from the previous shipment. Tell me all these things through the same Didymus" (P.Oxy. 3505 ll. 3–5, 12–17).

These examples show that in some cases the carrier's task included an oral report (e.g. "Didymus will tell you...") which corroborated the material from the letter (cf. Head 2009b, 297). However, where input from the carrier is required, it appears that the sender included a note to that effect in the letter itself.<sup>27</sup>

Nevertheless, it is true that ancient recipients generally assumed that a letter-carrier would have more information than what was contained in the letter.<sup>28</sup> For example, Seneca complains that he received one letter many months after it was sent so that he could not expect the carrier to remember how Lucilius, the sender, was doing (*Ep.* 50.1; cf. 47.1). Suetonius reports that Augustus structured the imperial postal service so that the original carrier could carry the letter all the way to its destination, enabling the recipient to question the carrier, "if events required it" (*si quid res exigant*, *Aug* 49.3). It is notable that the assumed knowledge of letter-carriers does not necessarily pertain to the letter

---

<sup>27</sup> Interestingly, P.Mich. 1.13 mentions a courier named Iatrokles who delivered wool but did *not* have any further instructions for the recipient as to how it was to be used. Thus, the carrier here explicitly was not aware of relevant information beyond the initial message.

<sup>28</sup> Head 2009a, 217; Richards 2004, 182–183; Stirewalt 2003, 3 n. 15.

itself but simply, in Seneca's case, what Lucilius was up to. Further, Suetonius never explains his cryptic reference to "events" requiring further questioning; perhaps such necessity is signaled by the letter itself. In any case the expected knowledge of the carrier does not include them as a reader of the letter.

But what of the argument that some letter-carriers were expected to read and/or interpret the letter? There is little evidence of a letter-carrier reading the letter to the recipients. The usual practice is accurately represented in Acts 15:30–32, where the authorized carriers, Silas and Judas, deliver the letter (ἐπέδωκαν τὴν ἐπιστολήν) and then it is read by the community (ἀναγνόντες). These carriers, having a certain status and role in their own right as prophets, "encouraged and strengthened" the recipients "though many words."<sup>29</sup> Note here that although the carriers also convey information, they do not read the letter itself and there is no indication that they explained it. There is *some* evidence that letter-carriers could read royal decrees which had been sent in letter form (Xen. *Hell.* 7.1.39, a Persian decree of political benefits) and Josephus preserves a tradition in which the Persian letter regarding the defense of the Jews is made known (or explained, ἐδήλου) by the carriers (*Ant.* 11.286).<sup>30</sup> Of course, such decrees are not letters in the common sense of the word and Paul's writings would hardly qualify as royal decrees. Finally, as Peter Head has noted, the notion that the carrier would often read the letter lacks plausibility especially in the cases where the letter is *about* the carrier (Head 2009b, 297–298); a note especially relevant to letters of recommendation or introduction (e.g. *P.Mich.* 1.6, 1.23, 1.33).

This discussion allows us to create another sliding scale of the role of the letter-carrier between "carrier as courier" and "carrier as communicator." At the most basic end,

---

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Stirewalt 2003, 7 who also notes Thucydides 7.10.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. Head 2009a, 214–215; Stirewalt 2003, 16. Perhaps this is a Persian practice since both examples involve Persian royal decrees.

the carrier is simply a means of epistolary conveyance who will play no role in the letter's communication. In these cases, the carrier does not appear to be named on a regular basis. The opposite extreme is when the carrier is the main locus of information, in which case, the carrier is named and his or her task is stated. In these cases, one might justifiably say that the carrier is not explaining the letter, but the letter is explaining the carrier. This is clearly the case in letters of recommendation. On the same side of the scale but toward the middle lies situations in which the carrier executes some order of business (delivery or retrieval) or explains something about their delivery. In this situation, again, the carrier is again mentioned and the information required of the carrier is specified in the letter. Also in the middle is the carrier as supplier of general information about the sender and his or her situation. Here, the carrier may generally facilitate the reception of the letter, but their contribution does not appear to be built in to the letter. That is, they are not expected to explain the letter itself.

How does all this apply to Paul's letters? The carrier of 1 Thessalonians is not named, though Timothy or Silvanus are both possibilities. Neither does 1 Corinthians name a carrier, though a case could be made for the Stephanas group, since Paul commends them to the Corinthian community (1 Cor 16:15–18). Similarly, Phoebe appears to have carried Paul's letter to the Romans (Rom 16:1–2). In no place in these letters does Paul ever indicate that the letter-carriers are to perform a specific function in relation to the letter itself or some part of its contents. It may be that Phoebe was supposed to facilitate the reception of Paul's letter, perhaps ensuring that it was read, but nothing of the kind is mentioned.

This fact stands in striking contrast with "Paul's" letter to the Colossians. Paul states in Col 4:7–9,

Tychicus will tell you all the news about me; he is a beloved brother, a faithful minister, and a fellow servant in the Lord. I have sent him to you for this very

purpose, so that you may know how we are and that he may encourage your hearts; he is coming with Onesimus, the faithful and beloved brother, who is one of you. They will tell you about everything here.

Even here, however, the task of Tychicus and Onesimus is specified in the letter – they are to provide information about Paul and tell the Colossian church πάντα...τὰ ὧδε, everything that is happening with Paul "here," that is, in prison (v. 9). The carriers thus facilitate the reception of the letter and can speak on "Paul's" behalf, which was perhaps more pressing since he had never been to Colossae, but explaining the letter itself does not appear to be part of their duties.<sup>31</sup>

In light of these observations, then, it seems that although Paul's carriers may well have facilitated the reception of his letters it is unlikely that their contribution was built into the communication structure of 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians and Romans. That is, it is unlikely that Paul would have intentionally left key concepts, beliefs or practices unclear in his writing with the expectation that the letter-carrier would bridge the gap between himself and his recipients. This does not entirely rule out the possibility that a carrier such as Timothy or the people of Stephanas' house might clarify some aspect of Paul's letters, but the dearth of evidence for such a common practice as well as the lack of any indication in Paul's letters themselves, certainly tell against it as an expected practice.

Positively, this means that the implicit appeals to knowledge in 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians and Romans can be treated as they appear, precisely as part of the foundational structure of Paul's letters, which he takes for granted as part of his readers' Christian ἔνδοξα. Of course, Paul may have missed the mark in such assumptions, but such implicit appeals do tell us something of what Paul expects his audience to know, without the aid of explanation from the letter-carrier.

---

<sup>31</sup> This point stands regardless of whether or not Colossians is authentically Pauline.

### 3.3 Summary of Part I

This chapter concludes Part I in which I laid out a method by which one can reconstruct Paul's initial preaching and teaching from his letters. In chapter 2 I argued that one can use the common ancient practice of relying on audience presuppositions to illuminate the assumptions Paul makes about religious knowledge among his audiences. We saw that the use of audience assumptions was emphasized in rhetorical handbooks, and used by Philo, Josephus and the author(s) of 4QMMT. I proposed three types of reference with which to explore Paul's letters: (1) explicit reminders about Paul's initial preaching or teaching, (2) direct appeals to audience knowledge not explicitly linked to Paul's initial teaching and (3) implicit appeals to audience knowledge.

In this chapter I addressed question of whether or not the presence of co-senders, secretaries and letter-carriers disrupts the structure of communication identified above. I argued that these aspects of ancient letter-writing do not greatly affect the rubric of three types of appeal to Paul's teaching, though in a few places they may inject some uncertainty. We now turn to 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians in order to reconstruct Paul's initial preaching and teaching at Thessalonica and Corinth.

# Part II: Formative Instruction in Churches Paul Established: Thessalonica and Corinth

In Part II, I examine 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians (with occasional reference to 2 Corinthians) in order to identify the contours of his initial teaching at each locale, insofar as it appears in the letters. The material is divided according to the type of appeal to Paul's teaching it contains with chapter 5 addressing explicit reminders, chapter 6 addressing direct appeals to knowledge (or ignorance) and chapter 7 addressing implicit appeals to knowledge. These are bookended by an opening comparative discussion of the rhetorical situation in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians in chapter 4 and a summary outline of the results of this section in chapter 8. Each of the chapters begins with a discussion of the Thessalonian and Corinthian material separately before engaging in comparative analysis between the two. The results of this process set the stage for the final phase of the project in Part III, in which I compare these results with the material Paul assumes to be known in his letter to the Romans.



# Chapter 4

## The Rhetorical Situations of Paul's Letters to Thessalonica and Corinth

As an introduction to Part II, in which I examine Paul's preaching and teaching in Thessalonica and Corinth, this chapter aims to set out the rhetorical contexts into which Paul wrote 1 Thessalonians (§4.1) and 1 Corinthians (§4.2). This is followed by a comparison of these rhetorical contexts (§4.3)

### 4.1 The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Thessalonians

#### 4.1.1 Paul in Thessalonica<sup>1</sup>

Paul arrived in Thessalonica c. 49 CE, traveling from the east after a negative experience in Philippi (1 Thess 2:2; Acts 16:12–17:1).<sup>2</sup> He remained working there for a time, the precise extent of which is unclear, established a church composed primarily of Gentiles (1 Thess 1:9) and evidently was forced against his will to leave prematurely (Acts 17:10–13; 1 Thess 2:17),<sup>3</sup> making his work in Thessalonica anomalous with respect to timeframe.

The city Paul encountered had remained strongly Greek,<sup>4</sup> in stark contrast with his

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to commentaries, see the relevant sections of Ascough 2003; Elliger 1978; Hendrix 1991b; Jewett 1986; Riesner 1998 and especially Vom Brocke 2001. On the development of Macedonia as a whole and Thessalonica's place in it, see Papazoglou 1979.

<sup>2</sup> This date is based on the correlation of the data from Paul's letters, Acts 16–18, the Gallio inscription, which likely dates from 52 CE, and the various notices of the edict of Claudius in 49 CE. See the further discussion in §4.2.1.1.

<sup>3</sup> See Hardin 2006 for a discussion of the "decrees of Caesar" in Acts 17:7 that Paul was accused of transgressing.

<sup>4</sup> It retained a court (Βουλή), a public assembly (δῆμος), magistrates (πολιτάρχαι), minted its own coins with Greek legends and only 2% of all the inscriptions found are in Latin (Vom Brocke 2001, 97–99). For inscriptions regarding the πολιτάρχαι, cf. *IG X 2.1* 30–32, 50, 109, etc.; Riesner 1998, 355 n. 12; Vom

previous missionary locale, Philippi,<sup>5</sup> or his subsequent one, Corinth. It was the political center of the province, a *civitas libera* (free city),<sup>6</sup> and a metropolis to boot (Strabo *Geog.* 7.7.4; 7a21). As an important port town, Thessalonica was inhabited by many ethnic and cultural groups including Thracians, Greeks, Romans and Jews (see below) most of whom appear to have contributed to the religious variety present there.<sup>7</sup> Furthermore, its location on the *Via Egnatia* meant that it participated in commerce between the eastern and western empire (cf. Riesner 1998, 339). Finally, several scholars have recently noted the prevalence of voluntary associations in Thessalonica (esp. Ascough 2003).

Unfortunately for modern scholars, due to continuous habitation from its foundation until today, epigraphic and archaeological evidence for all aspects of life in Thessalonica remains scant.<sup>8</sup> Indeed, although the *Via Egnatia* ran through Roman Thessalonica and we know from literary sources that it was an important trading center, there is still no consensus as to the location of the first-century *agora*, since the extant ruins date from the late 2nd century CE (Vom Brocke 2001, 56–59) and the evidence of any economy whatsoever from the first century is very sparse (77–78). This has particular relevance for our discussion of a Jewish presence in Thessalonica, which in turn reflects on the value of the account of Paul's missionary work in Thessalonica given in Acts 17.

#### 4.1.1.1 Jews in the Thessalonian Community?

According to Acts 17:1–15, Paul debated with Jews in the Thessalonian

---

Brocke 2001, 261–265.

<sup>5</sup> On the Roman character of Philippi, see Pilhofer 1995, 92, *passim*.

<sup>6</sup> Pliny the Elder 4.17; *IG* X.2.1.6; Papazoglou 1979, 328; Vom Brocke 2001, 17; cf. Diodorus Siculus 31.8.1–3 on Thessalonica after the initial Roman conquest.

<sup>7</sup> See esp. Edson 1948 and Vom Brocke 2001, 114–142. There were groups that worshiped Dionysius, Cabrii, Heracles, *theos* (Zeus?) *hypsistos*, Aphrodite, Asclepius, Serapis, Isis, Osiris, Anubis and the Roman imperial cult. Despite the Thracian element of the population, there is no extant evidence for worship of the Thracian Rider.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Vom Brocke 2001, 21, 77–78; Edson 1948, 153.

synagogue (vv. 1–3). As a result, "some" Jews were persuaded as well as a "great number" of Gentile God-fearers and "no small number of leading women" (v. 4). However, several scholars argue that this account is misleading since there was no Jewish community in Thessalonica and 1 Thessalonians indicates that the recipients were Gentiles.<sup>9</sup>

It is true that the literary and epigraphic evidence for a Jewish community in Thessalonica is sparse.<sup>10</sup> Perhaps the most famous statement in favor of a Jewish community is found in Philo's reference to flourishing Jewish communities in Macedonia (*Leg.* 281–282). Although he does not specify Thessalonica, it would be strange if there were a sizeable community of Jews in Macedonia and none were in the largest and most prosperous city of the province.

Turning to the epigraphic evidence, it is important to remember that *all* such evidence for the first century is sparse. Furthermore, a small Jewish community that used a private house for their synagogue would very likely leave no archaeological footprint at a site like Thessalonica, remembering that scholars still do not know the location of the first century *agora* which certainly *did* exist.<sup>11</sup> Further, it is worth noting that by the earliest clear epigraphic evidence for a Jewish community in Thessalonica, the second or third century (*IJudO* Mac 15; cf. Nigdelis 1994), there were already multiple synagogues. On a more speculative note, Vom Brocke points out that from the earliest period from which we do have information about the number of Jews in Thessalonica, the Jewish

---

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Ascough 2003, 191–212; Best 1972, 5–6; Richard 1995, 3–7.

<sup>10</sup> See esp. the surveys in Smallwood 1999; Stern 1974; Vom Brocke 2001, 230–232. Most scholars decide in favor of a Thessalonian Jewish community; in addition to those just mentioned, cf. Blumenthal 2005, 101–102; Börschel 2001, 70–71; Elliger 1978, 91–92; Jewett 1986, 119–120; Riesner 1998, 347; Tellbe 2001, 86–90. But note the negative evaluation in, *inter alios*, Ascough 2003, 212; Vahrenhorst 2008, 136–137.

<sup>11</sup> "In theory, any building with adequate room for a sizeable congregation could have served as a synagogue"; Bloedhorn and Hüttenmeister 1999, 271–272. However, there was no need to support a "sizeable congregation" if the congregation itself were small.

population has been proportionally large (Vom Brocke 2001, 232–233). In light of the state of Thessalonian archaeology and its commercial importance to the region, there are no grounds to doubt at least a small Jewish community and synagogue in Thessalonica during the period in question.

Regarding Paul's Thessalonian community, 1 Thess 1:9 is often cited as evidence that the Thessalonian congregation was composed solely of Gentiles.<sup>12</sup> Paul's description of the Thessalonians' conversion as "turning to God from idols to serve the living and true God" certainly seems to imply a Gentile audience. However, it is not necessary that such a statement was meant to characterize every individual in the congregation rather than simply the majority of listeners. Further, as Rainer Riesner notes, the same characterization occurs in 1 Cor 12:2 which was written to a church where the Jewish element is more certain (Riesner 1998, 349, cf. §4.2.1). Another passage brought forward in this context is 1 Thess 2:14 where Paul states that the Thessalonians have suffered at the hands of their *συμφυλέται* in the same way that the prophets, Jesus and Paul suffered at the hands of the Jews.<sup>13</sup> It is often argued that the term *συμφυλέται* refers to fellow *Gentile* Thessalonians since they were members of the same tribes just as Jesus and Paul were members of the Jewish "tribe."<sup>14</sup> However, this is only a necessary inference if one posits a Gentile readership, which is precisely the question at hand, since concept of "fellow tribes-people" could well have had different referents for different groups in an audience that included both Jews and Gentiles and need not be tied down to one or the other.

Taken together, the evidence does indicate a largely Gentile audience for Paul's

---

<sup>12</sup> 2 Thessalonians, if genuine, does not clarify matters. Harnack famously considered 2 Thessalonians to be addressed to the Jewish-Christians in Thessalonica while 1 Thessalonians was addressed to the Gentile Christians. However, this view did not garner many followers, cf. Lake 1910.

<sup>13</sup> On the authenticity of this passage, see *inter alios* Bockmuehl 2001.

<sup>14</sup> So Meyer 1923, 85–86; Vom Brocke 2001, 166; von Weizsäcker 1899-1907, 289.

letter. This corroborates the notice in Acts 17:4 that Paul established a Gentile and Jewish community and, however long he was in Thessalonica, his stay was cut shorter than he would have liked, apparently due to local pressures.

The Acts account suggests that there was no strong continued link with the synagogue, due to the hostility of the Jewish community. How Luke's schematized portrayal played out on the ground, however, is difficult to clarify. In any case, it will become clear as the investigation progresses, that Paul presents the Thessalonian believers as a distinct group, not to be identified with the synagogue or with the Gentile Thessalonians.

#### 4.1.2 Paul's letter to the Thessalonians<sup>15</sup>

Why then did Paul write this letter to the young Thessalonian community soon after arriving in Corinth (c. 49/50 CE)?<sup>16</sup> It appears that the church had experienced some persecution from their compatriots (1 Thess 1:6; 2:14; cf. Acts 17:5–9) and so Paul was initially concerned for their ability to endure under duress (1 Thess 3:1–5). However, Paul was encouraged by the report of Timothy (3:6) and writes to encourage the Thessalonians (3:10; 4:13, 18; 5:11) as well as to address some issues presumably reported to him by Timothy. Indeed, Paul's early departure may have necessitated the letter in part simply because his teaching was accordingly inchoate. Further, it appears that some of the Christians had died (though it is unclear whether or not this happened in as a result of persecution) and these deaths had upset the congregation (4:13–18).

It may also be that Paul felt the need to defend his conduct against criticisms that

---

<sup>15</sup> Like the majority of scholars on 1 Thessalonians, I am unconvinced by the various partition and interpolation theories (*contra* Richard 1995, 12–18 and Pesch 1984). On the literary integrity of the letter, see *inter alios* Bockmuehl 2001; Collins 1984a, 96–135; Haufe 1999, 7; Johanson 1987, 169–172; Jewett 1986, 33–46; Légasse 1999, 44–48; Luckensmeyer 2009, 123–129.

<sup>16</sup> All of these suggestions will be dealt with more fully below in discussions of the relevant passages.

arose in his absence (2:1–12). It is commonly argued that, contrary to earlier scholarship,<sup>17</sup> 1 Thess 2:1–12 is not a refutation of criticisms directed at Paul but a presentation of his conduct for paraenetic purposes, as is common within Greco-Roman rhetoric and paraenesis.<sup>18</sup> However, appeals to Greco-Roman rhetoric and the paraenetic function of Paul's behavior do not preclude the possibility that he is simultaneously defending himself, even if the criticisms do not derive from a concerted counter-effort but are simply "in the air" as common criticisms of public speakers.<sup>19</sup> Given the large amount of space devoted to the subject and the prominent place it has in the letter, it seems most likely that Paul was responding to criticisms that, at the very least, *could* have been leveled against him.

Even so, the tone of 1 Thessalonians is strikingly positive.<sup>20</sup> Paul's letter was intended to spur on the Thessalonian Christians to remain steadfast and to encourage them in the face of persecution. He appears to be complementing and extending the Thessalonians' understanding, and by extension his previous teaching, rather than combating any position in particular.

## 4.2 The Rhetorical Situation of the Corinthian Correspondence

The rhetorical situation of the Corinthian Correspondence is very different from that of 1 Thessalonians. The cultural, ethnic and social composition of the respective cities and their legal status differed substantially. Nevertheless, both were thriving port

---

<sup>17</sup> E.g. Calvin 1996 [1548], *ad loc.*; Denny 1892, 83; Frame 1912, 90; Jewett 1986, 102–104; Milligan 1908, xxxi–xxxii, 16; Rigaux 1956, 57; Schmithals 1972, 145–155.

<sup>18</sup> E.g. Dodd 1999, 212–220; Légasse 1999, 137–138; Malherbe 2000, 154–156; Schoon-Janßen 1991, 62–65; Wanamaker 1990, 91–93; Winter 1993.

<sup>19</sup> Cf. Best 1972, 22; Börschel 2001, 111–112; Fee 2009, 55–56; Nicholl 2004, 91–92; Riesner 1998, 369; Tellbe 2001, 98–99; Weima 1997.

<sup>20</sup> Note the comments of John Chrysostom, *Hom. 1 Thess. 1.2* (PG 62:395): Βαβαί! πόσον τὸ ἐγκώμιον! οἱ μαθηταὶ ἐξαίφνης ἐγένοντο διδάσκαλοι; cf. Bengel 1835, 321.

cities in the Roman empire and served as obvious choices for Paul who tended toward missionary work in urban centers.

#### 4.2.1 Paul in Corinth<sup>21</sup>

After leaving Thessalonica, Paul traveled to Corinth, perhaps arriving in the autumn of 49/50 CE. Unlike at Thessalonica, Paul worked in Corinth for an extended period of time, establishing a Christian community made up of house churches comprising mostly Gentiles (1 Cor 12:2)<sup>22</sup> with an important contingent of Jews (1:14). Some time after being acquitted during the Gallio incident, Paul left Corinth of his own accord (Acts 18:14–18).

The city that Paul encountered in the middle of the first century was starkly different from Thessalonica.<sup>23</sup> Rather than a Greek city, Corinth was a Roman colony with close ties to its mother-land after its reestablishment by Julius Caesar in 44 BCE (cf. Strabo *Geog.* 8.6.23; Pausanias *Descr.* 2.1.2).<sup>24</sup> It is worth noting that, despite the Corinthian Roman self-consciousness, Paul wrote to the Corinthian believers in Greek which suggests that they, or the majority of them, were non-participants in the higher echelons of Corinthian society (cf. 1 Cor 1:26).

In spite of the large-scale destruction of Corinth in 146 BCE, by the time Paul arrived it was again a major commercial center, thanks the nearby *diolkos* (the portage way across the Isthmus), as well the main city in the province and perhaps still in charge

---

<sup>21</sup> In addition to commentaries, see the edited volumes of Friesen, Schowalter and Walters 2010 and Schowalter and Friesen 2005. For helpful discussions of the history, geography and archaeology of Corinth, see Elliger 1978, 200–242; Wiseman 1979 and the contributions in Williams and Bookidis 2003.

<sup>22</sup> So Horrell 1996, 75; Lindemann 2000, 13.

<sup>23</sup> Most of the relevant literary evidence has been helpfully gathered by Jerome Murphy-O'Connor 2002.

<sup>24</sup> Inscriptional and numismatic evidence shows that Latin was the dominant official language prior to Hadrian; see respectively Kent 1966, 19 and Walbank 2003. Several forum temples were dedicated to gods associated with the Julio-Claudian dynasty and perhaps the imperial cult, see esp. Bookidis 2005; cf. Spawforth 1995. There remained, however, worship of Greek and Egyptian gods as well; cf. Elliger 1978, 237.

of the Ithsmian games.<sup>25</sup> As Gordon Fee notes, in the absence of old landed aristocracy in Corinth, a new "aristocracy of money" arose in its place (Fee 1987, 2), leading to an atmosphere of "entrepreneurial pragmatism in the pursuit of success" (Thiselton 2000, 4). This commercial importance led to a culturally diverse city, which included, among other things, a sizeable Jewish community (Philo *Leg.* 281–282).<sup>26</sup> Like many a thriving port city, Corinth was not a little licentious and was known for being cut-throat in business and politics, recurring themes in Paul's first extant Corinthian letter.<sup>27</sup> In addition to aggressive business, it has long been recognized that Corinth was known for their fascination with travelling rhetors and philosophers, leading Bruce Winter, for one, to argue strenuously for connecting Paul's problems in Corinth with the rise of the second sophistic movement.<sup>28</sup>

#### 4.2.1.1 *Acts 18 and the Corinthian community*

The relevance of Acts 18:1–18 for Paul's initial mission in Corinth is hotly debated. As with the Thessalonian account in Acts 17, it is certainly compressed and stylized in accord with the author's particular aims. There are two important elements of that account for our purposes: the composition of the community and the timeframe for Paul's mission.

Regarding the former, unlike the situation in Thessalonica, scholars are almost

---

<sup>25</sup> Cf. Suetonius *Claud.* 25.3; Schrage 1991–2001, 1:26; Weiss 1910, viii–x. However, Fotopoulos 2003, 219 argues that the games were not re-sited until after Paul's visit.

<sup>26</sup> So Weiss 1910, viii; Sellin 1987, 2995; Murphy-O'Connor 2002, 79. Wiseman 1979, 503–504 suggests that the Jewish population would have been swollen during Paul's initial visit due to the Edict of Claudius in 49 CE.

<sup>27</sup> Strabo *Geog.* 8.6.20 emphasizes both of these qualities in Corinth, though his account of cultic prostitution is almost certainly wrong and appears to be influenced by the reputation of old Corinth (cf. Lanci 2005). However, John Fotopoulos 2003, 169–174 has argued in favor of higher than usual promiscuity in Corinth, partially due to the continuing currency of its pre-Roman legacy. See also Horace *Ep.* 1.17.36 for social-political aspirations linked with Corinth.

<sup>28</sup> Winter 1997, 114–230. Cf. Favorinus *Frag.* 98 (on Corinthian eagerness); John Chrysostom *Hom. 1 Cor.* (PG 61.10). See also Litfin 1994, 137–146; Norden 1898, 501.

unanimous in accepting a Jewish contingent among the Corinthian community.<sup>29</sup> It is probable that the *archisynagogos* Crispus of Acts 18:8 should be identified with the Crispus whom Paul baptized in 1 Cor 1:14, in which case he and his household represent an important Jewish influence to which we could add Prisca and Aquila.

The timeframe is more difficult. Acts states that Paul was accused before the proconsul Gallio, who held office for two years sometime between 50–53 CE.<sup>30</sup> These dates are in keeping with a date of 49 CE for the edict of Claudius and the notice that Paul met Prisca and Aquila, recently come from Rome (Acts 18:2), ministered for a year and *then* was brought before Gallio (vv. 11–12).

However, scholars such as Gerd Lüdemann and J. C. Hurd argue that, while not fabricated from whole cloth, the account in Acts 18 combines multiple traditions and conflates information from a number of Pauline visits to Corinth.<sup>31</sup> There is no space here for a full response, but a few comments are in order.<sup>32</sup> Hurd's objection that two different people carry the title *archisynagogos*, Crispus in v. 8 and Sosthenes in v. 17 (Hurd 1965, 31), is easily accounted for by the fact that more than a year has passed in the narrative of Acts between the conversion of Crispus and the mention of Sosthenes. Surely it is *more* plausible that the Corinthian synagogue would have replaced their patron and service leader than that a new person had not been elected within the timeframe of Paul's visit. Further, the crux of Lüdemann's argument rests on disassociating Gallio's stint from the edict of Claudius by dating the latter to 41 CE (Lüdemann 1984, 164–171). However, the

---

<sup>29</sup> For instance, Schlatter 1934, 12 emphasizes the fact that "[d]er älteste Teil der Gemeinde waren somit jüdische Familien."

<sup>30</sup> So Barrett 1991, 4–5; Conzelmann 1975, 12–13. For the text and discussion of the Gallio inscription, see Murphy-O'Connor 2002, 219–221; Fitzmyer 2008, 41–42.

<sup>31</sup> See Lüdemann 1984, 158–262; Hurd 1965, 19–31. Both scholars are following earlier suggestions by John Knox.

<sup>32</sup> On this, see particularly Riesner 1998.

edict is more probably dated to 49 CE,<sup>33</sup> and, even if Lüdemann's dating were correct, Acts 18:2 allows for delay between Claudius' ejection of the Jews from *Rome* and the arrival of Prisca and Aquila from *Italy* (cf. similarly Lindemann 2000, 11).<sup>34</sup>

When the Acts account is combined with the evidence from the Corinthian letters and Romans, a more complete picture emerges that includes some indications as to the social status of the Corinthian Christians, in addition to their cultural background. Though not explicitly mentioned in Acts, the notice of several households – Prisca and Aquila (1 Cor 16:19)<sup>35</sup>, Stephanas (1:16), Crispus (1:14; Acts 18:8); Gaius (Rom 16:23; 1 Cor 1:14), Titius Justus (Acts 18:7) – along with the fact that most homes could not support large numbers suggests that the Corinthian community comprised several smaller house churches, making the Corinthian situation more analogous to the communities in Rome than to that in Thessalonica.<sup>36</sup> Further, this community was composed of people from a variety of social backgrounds – including at least an erstwhile synagogue patron (Crispus),<sup>37</sup> as well as the majority who lacked social clout (1 Cor 1:26–28) – though probably lacking the most wealthy demographic.<sup>38</sup> Thus, Paul's Corinthian church was a geographically divided, culturally and socially mixed community in the midst of a

---

<sup>33</sup> Cf. the conjunction between Suetonius *Claud.* 25.4, Orosius 7.6.15 and Acts 18:3. Lüdemann's rejection of Orosius' account and his source critical reading of Suetonius and Dio Cassius have been heavily criticized by a number of scholars; see Riesner 1998, 157–201; Lampe 2003, 11–16. Botermann 1996 provides the most extensive treatment of the *Judenedikt* and concludes that Dio and Suetonius record two different events, though she refrains from drawing on Orosius' witness.

<sup>34</sup> The alternative chronologies of Hurd and Lüdemann have not garnered wide scholarly assent; cf. Barrett 1968, 4–5; Dunn 1995, 13; Fitzmyer 2008, 37–45; Schrage 1991–2001, 1:29–30. Conzelmann 1975, 7 states simply that Hurd "knows too much."

<sup>35</sup> Of course, they were in Ephesus when Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, but it may be that they had a church in their house in Corinth as well (cf. Klauck 1981, 23–24).

<sup>36</sup> So also Klauck 1981, 30–41; Schrage 1991–2001, 1:30.

<sup>37</sup> While the Corinthian aedile Erastus (Kent 1966, #232) is sometimes associated with the Erastus in Rom 16:23, several serious objections have been raised that make the identification difficult; cf. Elliger 1978, 227–230; Friesen 2010; Weiss 2010 but note the recent support of Welborn 2011, 260–279.

<sup>38</sup> This was influentially formulated by Gerd Theissen in 1974 (ET Theissen 1982) and is now the majority position though with some modifications; cf. Friesen 2005; Horrell 1996, 91–101; Longenecker 2009; Schrage 1991–2001, 1:33; Sellin 1987, 2997–2998; Walters 2005. Note the similarities with the earlier account of Weiss 1910, xvi and von Weizsäcker 1899–1907, 306–307.

burgeoning Roman colony with an important ideological and cultural significance.

## 4.2.2 Paul's letters to the Corinthians

### 4.2.2.1 *How many and when?*

When it comes to the Corinthian correspondence, the student of Paul is perhaps in a unique situation since we not only have a letter that covers a wide range of material (1 Corinthians), but also some indication of how the situation developed between Paul and the Corinthians (2 Corinthians). It is impossible to provide concrete dates for these letters, but sometime between 52–55 CE, perhaps towards the later part of that range, is probable (cf. Schrage 1991-2001, 1:36–37).

There are a number of missing stages in the relationship between Paul and the Corinthians of which we have only hints. As is well known, our 1 Corinthians is actually Paul's second known letter to the Corinthian community (1 Cor 5:9). Further, although 2 Corinthians tells us that after writing 1 Corinthians he had a painful visit with them (2 Cor 2:1), wrote a tearful letter (2:3–4; perhaps 2 Cor 10–13?), and has been reconciled with them (7:7), it is not clear what precipitated these events, nor is the unity of our witness, 2 Corinthians, undisputed.<sup>39</sup> These issues cannot be solved here, if indeed they can be solved at all. Accordingly, this chapter will proceed with the majority position that the whole of 2 Corinthians was written after 1 Corinthians;<sup>40</sup> What is important here, however, is to note that in 1 Corinthians Paul is engaged in discussion regarding the interpretation of his initial teaching as well as, perhaps, his previous letter. Further, 2 Corinthians attests to the fact that Paul appears to have missed his mark in 1 Corinthians:

---

<sup>39</sup> The bibliography here is enormous, but note the two very different recent solutions to the internal difficulties of 2 Corinthians of Thomas Schmeller 2010, 36–38 (1 letter with a corrupted text) and Margaret Mitchell 2005 (five letters).

<sup>40</sup> So Schmeller 2010, 38–40; cf. the extended discussion in Betz 1985, 3–35.

rather than reconciliation, the relationship continued to deteriorate.<sup>41</sup>

For the purpose of Part II, 1 Corinthians will be foregrounded for a number of reasons. First, Paul's continual instruction via letters and visits to Corinth make it difficult to tie aspects of his presumed teaching to the *initial* visit, especially in 2 Corinthians. The second, and related, problem is the uncertain order of the material in 2 Corinthians. This makes its use of presuppositions difficult to assess. However, material from this letter will be brought in occasionally to confirm tendencies in Paul's teaching.

#### 4.2.2.2 *The exigencies of 1 Corinthians*

Why then did Paul write his second (our first) letter to the Corinthians?<sup>42</sup>

According to him, Paul wrote in response to a report from Chloe's people (1:11) and to a letter he received from the Corinthians (7:1; perhaps brought by Stephanas and company, 16:17). Paul may also have received some information from Apollos (Dunn 1995, 18), though he does not say so. The letter from the Corinthians may have been in response to Paul's previous letter (as argued by Hurd 1965, 215 and others), though this is not clear and it is not even certain that Paul's initial letter had reached Corinth by the time the Corinthians' letter had been dispatched (so Fitzmyer 2008, 43). Paul appears to be concerned about two main issues: (1) tensions within the church and (2) tension between the church and himself, though the former dominates and the two concerns clearly overlap.<sup>43</sup> In this light, the letter from the Corinthians may be about internal disagreements over various issues, rather than a response to Paul's previous letter.<sup>44</sup> Paul's

---

<sup>41</sup> So Mitchell 1991, 303; cf. Barrett 1968, 5.

<sup>42</sup> Barring the possibility of a few interpolations (cf. Murphy-O'Connor 2009b, 257–287), I agree with the majority of scholars that 1 Corinthians is a unified letter; see esp. Mitchell 1991; cf. Conzelmann 1975, 4 n. 31; Dunn 1995, 21–23; Hurd 1965, 43–47; Lindemann 2000, 3–6; Schrage 1991–2001, 63–71. For a proponent of the composite view, see Schmithals 1971, 90–96.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. similarly Vos 1996, 88–89; Wilckens 1959, 5–6. This is a *via media* between e.g. Fee 1987, 5–6 and Fitzmyer 2008, 52 who argue for tension with Paul and Mitchell 1991, 302 who argues for tension among the Corinthians.

<sup>44</sup> This is suggested by the analysis of Mitchell 1991, 121–125, *passim*.

tone throughout remains authoritative (e.g. 4:21) but he also carefully seeks reconciliation for all parties (3:5; 9:20–23; 10:31–33).

However, the failure of 1 Corinthians to achieve the intended reconciliation prompts an important possibility: the letter of 1 Corinthians itself alienated the Corinthian believers. Paul attests that he had the capacity to be unclear in his writing in 5:9–13 where he engages in a reinterpretation of his prior letter.<sup>45</sup> This suggests that the understanding presupposed by Paul was not always available to this audience (cf. Mitchell 2010, 18–30). This possibility brings us back to the earlier suggestion that the reconstructed "intended" reader drawn from Paul's use of presumed *ἔνδοξα* may not always match up with historical reality. There are a number of possible reasons for such slippage, from ignorance on the part of Paul regarding the actual situation (cf. Mitchell 1991, 302) to Paul's deliberate re-characterization of his readers. This question will be picked up again in the conclusions to Part II.

## 4.3 Rhetorical Situations and Procedure

### 4.3.1 Comparison of rhetorical situations

As I noted at the outset of §4.2, the rhetorical situations for 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians differ markedly. Perhaps most prominent is the fact that Paul's Thessalonian mission was cut short while the Corinthian mission was not. This undoubtedly affected the extent of teaching Paul imparted in each location.

Further, the cultural make-up of the cities themselves differs, which inevitably affects the Christian communities established there. Although both Thessalonica and Corinth were thriving port cities, the former was very independent as a *civitas libera* with its Greek systems of government while the later was recently re-established as an imperial

---

<sup>45</sup> This remains the case even if the letter had not yet reached the Corinthians, in which case Paul was engaged in *preemptive* reinterpretation, perhaps based on more complete information gained from those affiliated with Chloe and Stephanas.

colony with Roman system of government and close ties with the capital. Notably, the social stratification evident among the Corinthian believers does not appear to be matched by the Thessalonian believers, none of whom can be identified as even marginally wealthy. It may well be related that the factionalism seen in Corinth, whether it is due primarily to social differences or political differences, is not matched in Thessalonica, according to Paul's letter. Rather, that community seems more or less united in their distress, which Paul addresses, the existence of some disorderly members notwithstanding (1 Thess 5:14), while the Corinthians are anything but united and have approached Paul on their own terms in a letter (1 Cor 7:1). However, the oral report Paul receives from Chloe's people (1:11) gives him more information than the Corinthians seem to have divulged voluntarily.

These differing community contexts and exigencies lend a different tone to each letter. Paul writes to the Thessalonians to comfort them in the face of recent community deaths and persecution from their neighbors.<sup>46</sup> He writes to the Corinthians largely in order to reconcile the various factions with one another, but also to address and correct a number of particular issues which were reported to him orally and by letter.<sup>47</sup> Although there appears to be an apology in both 1 Thess 2:1–12 and 1 Corinthians 9, the tone of 1 Corinthians is far more combative (e.g. 1 Cor 4:21) than 1 Thessalonians.<sup>48</sup> (Indeed, 2 Corinthians 10–13 is even more rhetorically aggressive.)

The variations in tone and rhetorical situation are reflected in the ways in which

---

<sup>46</sup> Overly strong definitions of the genre of 1 Thessalonians either as consolation (Chapa 1990; Gerber 2005, 256–261; Tellbe 2001, 104), friendship (Schoon-Janßen 1991, 39–47), or paraenesis (Malherbe 2000, 81–86) are unnecessary and tend to skew interpretation of certain passages such as Paul's apology in 2:1–12.

<sup>47</sup> Mitchell 1991 has argued most strongly for 1 Corinthians as deliberative rhetoric aimed at reconciliation. While here analysis has much to commend it, she tends to undervalue the possibility that 1 Corinthians was written with multiple aims and, accordingly, that it covers more than one topic.

<sup>48</sup> Hurd 1965 famously attributed the harsher tone in 1 Corinthians to the material from the oral report while Paul is more even-keeled on material from the Corinthian letter.

Paul makes use of his initial teaching and preaching. For instance, the issues in 1 Corinthians are so wide-ranging that readers get a glimpse of Paul's teaching on a variety of subjects that are not broached in 1 Thessalonians, nor perhaps during his truncated Thessalonian mission. These differences will be highlighted at the ends of chapters 5–7.

### 4.3.2 Moving forward

It is with the rhetorical situations of Paul's letters in mind that we turn to the exploration of his letters with a view toward identifying his initial instruction. The next three chapters are divided along the lines of the three types of appeal laid out in chapter 2. In chapter 5 I begin by analyzing the explicit reminders of Paul's preaching and teaching in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians respectively. I conclude the chapter with a comparison of the material uncovered in both letters and a discussion of how and why Paul's appeals to his preaching and teaching differ in each situation. These explicit reminders are important for the subsequent chapters because they provide a framework against which to evaluate Paul's more subtle appeals to his readers' knowledge in the direct and implicit appeals to knowledge.

Chapter 6 looks at direct appeals to the knowledge of Paul's audience that is not explicitly tied to his initial preaching and teaching. It proceeds in the same way as chapter 5 with a discussion of the material from 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians followed by a comparison; in this case, the comparison is not only between the different locations but also between the direct appeals to knowledge and explicit reminders to Paul's teaching provided in each letter. In a similar way, chapter 7 explores implicit appeals to important concepts, beliefs and practices.

Chapter 8 summarizes the findings of Part II and draws conclusions leading into the comparison with Romans in Part III.



# Chapter 5

## Paul's Explicit Reminders about his Message

This chapter falls into three parts. First I examine the explicit reminders of Paul's initial mission in Thessalonica (§5.1). This is followed by a similar exploration of the explicit reminders to Paul's preaching and teaching in 1 Corinthians (§5.2). The chapter concludes with a comparison between the materials identified in the two letters and a discussion of how and why they differ (§5.3).

### 5.1 Paul's Teaching in Thessalonica

#### 5.1.1 The character and content of Paul's preaching

In discussions of Paul's missionary preaching, 1 Thess 1:9–10 has regularly been adduced as the summary of summaries for his preaching to the Gentiles.<sup>1</sup> However, in 1963 Johannes Munck challenged this point, correctly arguing for the *ad hoc* quality of Paul's statement, namely, that the context of the letter is what determined the content of the summary.<sup>2</sup> Furthermore, it is important to note that Paul himself does not indicate that these verses summarize his initial preaching but rather other people's account of the Thessalonians' response to his preaching, which he endorses as valuable testimony.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> E.g. Seeberg 1903, 65, 82; Laub 1973, 27–49; Bruce 1982, 18; Légasse 1999, 102. It is often asserted that Paul here uses a traditional formula, though the lexical and syntactical arguments do not carry the necessary weight here (so e.g. Masson 1957, 24; Holtz 1986, 55; Malherbe 2000, 121). Further, similarities to Jewish Diaspora literature are easily explained by the fact that Paul himself was a Diaspora Jew (cf. Bussmann 1971, 56; Holtz 1986, 57; Luckensmeyer 2009, 106–113).

<sup>2</sup> Munck 1963, 108; cf. Hooker 1996. This is similar to Paul's minimalist characterization of his preaching in 1 Corinthians as "the word of the Cross" (1 Cor 1:18); §5.2.1.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. similarly Malherbe 2000, 132. Recently Nebe 2006, 195 restated the traditional view, arguing that 1:9c-10 constitute "das Missionskerygma bei der Gemeindegründung in Thessalonich" but that it is given "narrativ als Handeln bzw. Verhalten der Thessalonicher."

Nevertheless, these verses *do* make important claims regarding the Thessalonians' conversion which have a high probability of corresponding to Paul's teaching (cf. Luckensmeyer 2009, 112–113). Paul states in v. 9 that the Thessalonians "turned from idols to serve the living and true God." This statement suggests that the majority of the audience is of Gentile origin and that they have become monotheistic in the course of their conversion (ἐπιστρέφειν) to Christianity,<sup>4</sup> particularly in light of the fact that monotheism was likely not part of the religious framework for pagan Thessalonians.<sup>5</sup> Indeed, such an iconoclastic monotheism is profoundly Jewish<sup>6</sup> and would have been well known to the small Jewish contingent in the Thessalonian congregation. There may, of course, be an element of intended reinforcement of their (hoped for) monotheistic beliefs, but the tone of the passage is relaxed and the extremely compressed quality of the statement presumes the easy agreement of his readers; if they had not in fact had these experiences, Paul's argument would carry little weight.

In 1:10, Paul indicates that the person of Jesus (specified here as the son of God) his resurrection, his coming from heaven and imminent judgment had a place in the Thessalonians' conversion experience. Unlike the Jewish monotheistic character of v. 9, the Christological emphases of v. 10 would not have been available even to the Jewish Thessalonians before Paul's arrival.<sup>7</sup> Paul says little about any of these general topics in these short verses, though all of these categories – God, Jesus and eschatology – feature

---

<sup>4</sup> Many scholars consider ἐπιστρέφειν to be a technical term for conversion in Hellenistic-Jewish Christianity, e.g. 2 Cor 3:16; Gal 4:9; Acts 3:9; 9:35; 11:21; 14:15; 15:19; 26:18, 20; 28:27; cf. Deut 30:2, 8; 1 Sam 7:3; Jdt 5:19; Tob 13:6; Hos 14:1; Joel 2:12; Zech 1:3; Isa 45:22; Jer 4:1; etc.; so Bussmann 1971, 39; Dibelius 1937, 6; Légasse 1999, 100; Malherbe 2000, 119.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Börschel 2001, 93–99; Bussmann 1971, 41; Nebe 2006, 203.

<sup>6</sup> Exod 20:4; Lev 19:4; Isa 37:19–20; *Jos. Asen.* 11:10–11; Tob 14:6; Wis 14:27; Fee 2007, 39; Malherbe 2000, 120–121; Holtz 1986, 54–61; Bussmann 1971, 44; Rigaux 1956, 390–391.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Bengel 1835, 322. There may, of course, have been some news of the Jesus movement out of Judea, but neither Paul nor Acts 17 gives any indication of any proto-Christian sentiment in Thessalonica at the time of Paul's arrival.

centrally throughout the rest of the letter.

Paul continues to address his missionary work in the following pericope (2:1–16), though little is said concerning the *content* of Paul's preaching or teaching. Paul reminds the Thessalonians in 2:1–13 of his entry (εἴσοδος)<sup>8</sup> and reception, picking up themes already introduced in 1:4–10 and Paul shifts focus in vv. 14–16 from his work to persecution in Thessalonica.<sup>9</sup> 2:13 works as a pivot, then, where Paul turns from a focus on his conduct to thanks for the Thessalonians' reception of his Gospel: they received the λόγος ἀκοῆς ("the word which you heard," see below) as though it were truly the word of God.

Paul presents his team and their work in the best possible light and, importantly, he regularly appeals to the Thessalonians' knowledge ([καθὼς] οἴδατε, μνημονεύειν) of his time in Thessalonica and calls on them as witnesses (ὕμεῖς μάρτυρες), even with God (2:1, 2, 5, 9, 10, 11; cf. Coulot 2006b, 379). For the most part, he does not rely on their knowledge of *what* he said but of *how* he said it, suggesting that the medium was part and parcel of the message: they spoke boldly in spite of previous mistreatment in Philippi (2:2); they were artless and pure in their presentation of God's gospel (vv. 3–6) and although they had the right to be weighty, instead, they gave themselves for the Thessalonians (2:7–8); laboring constantly so as not to be a burden (2:9), Paul was pious, just (or righteous) and blameless among the congregation (2:10); and he exhorted, encouraged and witnessed to them like a father (2:11–12). As will be seen below, many of these themes foreshadow specific instructions that Paul gives to the Thessalonians later in

---

<sup>8</sup> Scholars such as Winter 1993 and Malherbe 2000, 135 argue that this term indicates that Paul is drawing on the "entry" practice of orators. However, the term εἴσοδος does not occur in the oft-drawn parallels with Dio Chrysostom (*Or.* 32.4, 20; 7.10) or Epictetus (*Diss.* 1.30.1; 3.1.1), nor was it a technical term. Notably, Dio himself uses εἴσοδος only to refer to a *place* of entry (*Or.* 1.76–77; 36.34).

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Rigaux 1956, 397. For slightly different divisions of this passage, see e.g. Coulot 2006b, 380 and Holtz 1986, 65.

the letter and this suggests that, whatever the complex motives might be behind this passage, he considers his conduct to be paradigmatic and paraenetic for the Thessalonians.<sup>10</sup>

An analogous description of Paul's work in Thessalonica is found in 1:5 where Paul reminds the Thessalonian believers that the presentation of the gospel was accompanied by power, the Holy Spirit and great conviction (1:5). Unlike 1 Corinthians, little else is said in 1 Thessalonians regarding the Spirit (but cf. 5:19), but this passage suggests that manifestations of the Spirit featured as part of Paul's missionary work.<sup>11</sup>

Returning to 2:1–16, Paul notably characterizes his teaching both as *παράκλησις* (2:3) and *λόγος ἀκοῆς* (2:13). Many scholars have considered *παράκλησις* to refer to Paul's presentation of the Gospel,<sup>12</sup> though such a meaning would not be typical. Rather, exhortation/consolation, often dealing with ethical/moral matters,<sup>13</sup> tends to be an internal phenomenon – from Christians to Christians or Jews to Jews – rather than a description of missionary sermons.<sup>14</sup> Further, *παρακαλεῖν* is used in 2:12 in reference to Paul's work "among the believers" (*τοῖς πιστεύουσιν*, v. 10). It seems then that it cannot be pressed to refer solely to Paul's missionary preaching, but refers more comprehensively to his teaching in Thessalonica (so von Dobschütz 1909, 87). On the other hand, the phrase

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. §4.1.2. Note also 2 Cor 10:11 where Paul correlates his teaching (in his letter) and his conduct.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 2:4; 2 Cor 12:12. Among others, John Ashton 2000, 163–170 has correctly emphasized the role of signs and wonders in Paul's missionary efforts (cf. recently Burke 2011, 146–147); *pace* Schreiber 1996, 252, 266, 277 who argues that *δύναμις* in 1 Thess 1:5 and 1 Cor 2:4 refers to power in words, pointing to 1 Cor 1:22–25 as proof that Paul did not present himself as a miracle worker. However, the view that Paul's words were "powerful" stands in tension with Paul's own account of his speech (2 Cor 10:10) and Schreiber does admit that "Paulus wirklich Wunder gewirkt hat" (270).

<sup>12</sup> So Bengel 1835, 322; Dibelius 1937, 7; Masson 1957, 26; Best 1972, 92; Holtz 1986, 70; Wanamaker 1990, 94; Haufe 1999, 35.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. 1 Thess 4:1; Rom 12:1; etc.. Note that in Luke 3:18, *παράκλησις* is distinguished from *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* with the former referring particularly to the exhortations in 3:10–14.

<sup>14</sup> Holtz 1986, 70 points to Acts 13:15 and Hebrews 13:22 as further examples of missionary preaching being called *παράκλησις*. However, in Acts the Jews presumably do not expect a call for turning to the Messiah but rather some suitable intra-Jewish exhortation. Similarly, Hebrews is written to those who are already part of the nascent Christian movement.

λόγος ἀκοῆς likely does denote Paul's missionary message if there is anything to be gained from parallels in Rom 10:16 and Gal 3:2–5 (cf. Malherbe 2000, 166).

Further illumination of Paul's preaching is found in his specific reminder in 3:3–4, introduced as a means to address the distress of the Thessalonian believers. Paul states that he was concerned that the Thessalonians would be disturbed by "these afflictions" (v. 3a) and that as a result his labor would be in vain (v. 5; cf. 2:1). Whether the afflictions are those of the Thessalonians (1:6; 2:14–16), Paul (2:17–18), or both,<sup>15</sup> what is important is that Paul notes that he had already told them, on more than one occasion (NB the imperfect, προελέγομεν, v. 4), about the imminent and necessary (εἰς τοῦτο κείμεθα, v. 3b) suffering of believers.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, rhetorically, it would hardly aid Paul's case to claim that he had spoken about suffering with the Thessalonians if he had not in fact done so.<sup>17</sup>

In short, 1:5, 9–10; 2:1–16 and 3:4–5 together present a picture of Paul's message and its delivery. He can claim uncontroversially that he preached about turning from idolatry to the one God, imparted (moral/ethical) exhortation and that his artless delivery was accompanied by "power" and the Holy Spirit. Furthermore, this message was received by the Thessalonians as the word of God. Finally, Paul considered the medium of his conduct to be integral to the message he spoke and paradigmatic for the Thessalonian believers, a point that also applies to Paul's teaching on suffering.

---

<sup>15</sup> Thessalonians' afflictions: Bruce 1982, 62; Légasse 1999, 181; Haufe 1999, 57. Paul's afflictions: Holtz 1986, 127–128; Malherbe 2000, 193; von Dobschütz 1909, 134–135. Both: Best 1972, 135–136; Dibelius 1937, 17; Masson 1957, 40.

<sup>16</sup> Even if Paul has his own sufferings in mind here, it is clear that he considers his own experiences paradigmatic and that as the Thessalonians imitate him (1:6; cf. 2:2) they will also experience afflictions.

<sup>17</sup> Similar emphasis on suffering is evident in Paul's other Macedonian community, Philippi (Phil 1:27–30; 3:17; cf. Acts 16:16–40).

### 5.1.2 Paul's ethical instruction: sexual immorality and greed

The indication that Paul's initial teaching involved ethical instruction is confirmed and fleshed out in 1 Thess 4:1–8. Vv. 1–2 introduce a paraenetic section (vv. 3–12), linking this material with 2:12 by the use of the term παρακαλεῖν in v. 1<sup>18</sup> and his notice that the Thessalonian believers have already "received" certain specific injunctions that Paul and company had given (παρελάβετε...τίνας παραγγελίας ἐδώκαμεν ὑμῖν).<sup>19</sup> It may be, as many scholars have suggested, that παραλαμβάνειν is a (quasi-) technical term drawn from Jewish usage that indicates Paul is here citing an established tradition.<sup>20</sup> Raymond Collins, among others, has also pointed to the language of "walking" and "pleasing God" as evoking "the Jewish ethical tradition of which Paul was a part" (Collins 1998, 404–406),<sup>21</sup> and, as will become clear, Paul does draw from the well of Jewish ethical teaching. The relationship with early Christian teaching outside of Paul's influence, however, is more difficult and will be revisited more fully in chapter 9.

When Paul turns to the first set of specific reminders in 4:3–8, he states that the Thessalonians are to keep away from πορνεία (v. 3).<sup>22</sup> Further, they were to do so by learning to gain control of (acquire, κτᾶσθαι) their σκεῦος in holiness and honor (v. 4). While it is notoriously difficult for scholars to identify an exact referent for the term

---

<sup>18</sup> This terminology is a common in Paul's letters; cf. Rom 12:1, 15:30; 1 Cor 1:10; 4:16; 16:15; 2 Cor 10:1; Phil 4:2; Phlm 9–10. On the significance of the παρακαλεῖν formula, see Johanson 1987, 73–75; Bjerkelund 1967.

<sup>19</sup> Numerous scholars have recognized the references in 4:1–2 to Paul's initial teaching; e.g. von Dobschütz 1909, 157; Rigaux 1956, 497–498; Holtz 1986, 152–153; Malherbe 2000, 219.

<sup>20</sup> So Best 1972, 156; Bruce 1982, 78; Ellis 1999, 63–64, 112; von Dobschütz 1909, 157. The parallel with *m. Avot* 1.1 (משה קבל תורה מסיני, ומסרה ליהושע) is often drawn, though it should be noted that the concept of tradition *per se* was widely appreciated in the ancient Mediterranean and likely would have required little explanation; cf. the examples listed in LSJ s.v. παράδοσις 2–3.

<sup>21</sup> Finsterbusch 1996, 108–109, 156–163 goes farther in identifying key terms in 4:1–8 (περιπατέω, ἀρέσκω, θέλημα and πνεῦμα) as part of a *Thorafeld* which indicates that Paul applies scriptural commandments in what follows.

<sup>22</sup> Although the holiness concept surrounds the passage (vv. 1, 7), ἁγιασμός is neither directly tied to Paul's previous teaching nor explicated in the passage. Therefore, it will be discussed in chapter 7.

σκεῦος,<sup>23</sup> that Paul does not expect such a difficulty on the part of his readers (so Fee 2009, 146) is further support for seeing this as part of Paul's initial teaching.<sup>24</sup>

Scholars are divided about whether Paul continues his exhortation on sexual immorality in v. 6<sup>25</sup> or whether he begins a new discussion of greed (or even business ethics).<sup>26</sup> The former position is most probable given the language of purity in v. 7 and the phrase ἐν τῷ πράγματι, which is most naturally read in relation to the matter of πορνεία under discussion.<sup>27</sup> However, certain difficulties remain for those who reject a change of subject. The fact that Paul refers to "all these things" (v. 6b) seems to indicate that multiple issues are at stake.<sup>28</sup> Furthermore, the specificity given to the instruction, "in [this] matter," may result from the fact that Paul had initially given general injunctions against πλεονεξία which he now focuses on the issue of πορνεία. These hints suggest that Paul's reminder about πορνεία also includes a tacit reminder about a wider body of ethical instruction; the *ad hoc* tip of the ethical iceberg (so Vögtle 1936, 41).<sup>29</sup>

The explicit reminder follows in v. 6b when Paul claims that he had previously told (προείπαμεν) the Thessalonian believers that the κύριος is the avenger (ἔκδικος) for

---

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Still 2007, 208–209. Scholars see σκεῦος as a reference to one's wife (Carras 1990, 308–311; McGehee 1989, 83; Rigaux 1956, 500), the human body (Baltensweiler 1963; Fredrickson 2003; Konradt 2001), or male genitalia (Elgvin 1997; Légasse 1999, 217–218; Smith 2001). Interpreting σκεῦος as the human body has the benefit of including the implications of the other two options without undue specificity.

<sup>24</sup> It is worth remembering the conclusion from §3.2 that there is no evidence that interpretation by letter-carriers was built into the structure of epistolary communication, except where explicitly indicated.

<sup>25</sup> E.g. Rigaux 1956, 510; Collins 1984b, 317–319; Haufe 1999, 71–72; Hock 1999, 161; Légasse 1999, 222–225.

<sup>26</sup> E.g. Bengel 1835, 325; Seeberg 1903, 9–10; Vögtle 1936, 40–41; Dibelius 1937, 21–22; Koester 1979, 43; Richard 1995, 188.

<sup>27</sup> See the insightful discussion in Malherbe 2000, 232–233. Additionally, the negative articular infinitive signifies the (negative) purpose of previous instructions, functioning like a ἵνα μή clause (cf. BDF §399).

<sup>28</sup> So *inter alios* Börschel 2001, 252; *pace* Rigaux 1956, 511.

<sup>29</sup> Although it is impossible to be certain that the underlying material is an oft-positated *Lasterkatalog* (so Deidun 1981, 247), there is remarkable thematic overlap with catalogues in 1 Cor 6:9–10 as well as Jewish catalogues, see below. For parallels in Greco-Roman catalogues, see Kamlah 1964, 115–148.

"all these things." This statement illuminates the fact that Paul's ethical teaching and his teaching on divine judgment were closely linked,<sup>30</sup> a point that is also evident in 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 5:1–5) and perhaps Romans (Rom 1:18).<sup>31</sup>

This pericope, then, fills in the picture already outlined in 1 Thess 1–3. When he came to the Thessalonians, Paul's preaching and teaching included certain specific injunctions (*παραγγελίας*) that appear to have covered a number of vices of which two are mentioned and one is the main focus in 4:3–8, namely, *πορνεία*.

*Excursus 3: εἰδολωλατρία, πορνεία and πλεονεξία*

In line with Collins' observation noted above, numerous scholars have noted that these three vices recur in Jewish literature with striking frequency, so often that Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr considers them quasi-catechetical (*katechismusartige*).<sup>32</sup> There is a long Jewish tradition warning against sexual immorality that early Christians naturally continued.<sup>33</sup> In light of Paul's ubiquitous condemnation of idolatry (cf. 1 Thess 1:9; 1 Cor 6:9–11, 10:14; Rom 1:18–2:2), the common practice in biblical and second temple Judaism of tying together sexual immorality and idolatry (e.g. Hos 1:2; Mic 1:7; Wis 14:12–13) – where a breakdown in one suggested a failure in the other (*T. Sim.* 5:3) – is remarkable. Notably, these were often identified specifically as *Gentile* sins,<sup>34</sup> as indeed does Paul in 1 Thess 4:5 and 1 Cor 6:9–11. These vices are related to later Rabbinic

---

<sup>30</sup> While 4:6 does not necessitate *eschatological* judgment (cf. 2:16), it seems like the most plausible reading given the future orientation of the other references to judgment (1:10; 5:2–3).

<sup>31</sup> The resonance between Paul's statement here and the Old Testament is so strong that some have considered the statement to be an allusion to Psalm 94:1 (e.g. Collins 1998, 408; Capes 1992, 152), though the recurrence of the judgment theme in Jewish literature tells against an overly narrow identification.

<sup>32</sup> Niebuhr 1987, 232–233; cf. Berger 1972, 331–332, 337, 391–392, *passim*; Rosner 1994, 51–52; Finsterbusch 1996, 31–33; Bockmuehl 2000, 168–169; Horrell 2005, 141, 149.

<sup>33</sup> E.g. Prov 5:3–4; Tob 4:2; Sir 41:17; *T. Jud.* 18:2–6; *T. Reub.* 4:6; cf. Berger 1972, 307–326, 380–395; Reinmuth 1985, 22–27; Niebuhr 1987, 232–233; Börschel 2001, 247.

<sup>34</sup> Deidun 1981, 93; cf. Reinmuth 1985, 25, 41; Klawans 2000, 43–60.

discussions of the Torah for the Gentiles.<sup>35</sup>

Not incidentally, εἰδωλολατρία and πορνεία do not occur in Greco-Roman vice-catalogues. Dahl 1977, 179 and Jewett 2007, 300 argue that the confession of one god was also shared with "Greco-Roman theory of religion" (Jewett) among the "educated" (Dahl).<sup>36</sup> Although certain Greek and Roman thinkers tended towards a type of philosophical monotheism and some Greek authors also relativised the value of cultic images,<sup>37</sup> this was hardly the common view (cf. Newton 1998, 115–174) and εἰδωλολατρία did not feature in vice lists. Further, the archaeological evidence demonstrates that, whatever certain philosophers may have promulgated, Greek and Roman cities were replete with images of the gods (as Jewett acknowledges elsewhere in his commentary). Dahl 1977, 180 correctly notes that the monotheism presented in the Old Testament and Jewish tradition is substantially different from the Greek philosophical counterpart.

Additionally, criticisms of the use of prostitutes tended to focus on matters of self control and potential negative consequences rather than moral objections.<sup>38</sup> This is not exclusively the case, as Musonius Rufus (12) and Epictetus (*Diss.* 2.4) do teach against adultery on moral grounds (cf. Malherbe 1992). Of course there are numerous counter examples, suggesting that Musonius Rufus and Epictetus were exceptions that prove the rule.<sup>39</sup> The term πορνεία properly referred to prostitution, a practical/legal rather than moral designation (cf. Demosthenes *Fals. leg.* 200, 287). On the other hand, Michael Wolter 2010, 6 has correctly noted that πόρνη in Jewish thought referred more generally

---

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Bockmuehl 2000, 168–169; Finsterbusch 1996, 158–165.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. the earlier work of Peterson 1926 who locates the origin of the εἷς θεός formula of Rom 3:30 in pagan Greek acclamations.

<sup>37</sup> E.g. Plutarch *Superst.* 168D-E; *Is. Os.* 377E, 379D, 382B-C; Burkert 1987, 91–92.

<sup>38</sup> E.g. Xen *Mem.* 1.5.4; Cleanthes Frg. 562 *apud* Plutarch *Adol. poet. aud.* 33C-D.

<sup>39</sup> E.g. Cicero *Cael.* 20[48]; Plutarch *Conj. Prae.* 16 [140b], 18 [140c]; Hippocrates *Epid.* 122.

to a woman who had sex with anyone who was not her husband, rather than a professional designation. Recently, James Hanges 2012, 408–409 argues that Paul's teachings on sexuality were "more than moral; they are actually purity regulations in the sense that disobedience precludes full participation in the cult, as 1 Cor 5 clearly demonstrates." As such, Hanges continues, they were an integral part of Paul's transfer of "cultic traditions rooted in...Judaism" into "a Greek context."

Finally, unlike the other two vices, *πλεονεξία* was commonly decried in Greek and Roman thought.<sup>40</sup> Menander captures the common sentiment in his usually pithy manner: "seize equality and flee greed" (*ἰσότητα δ' αἰροῦ καὶ πλεονεξίαν φύγε*, *Mon.* 1.672). Nevertheless, criticisms of greed or unjust material gain also have roots in pre-hellenistic Jewish tradition and continue throughout the first century and beyond.<sup>41</sup> Notably, Philo who had extensive contact with Greek thought still rooted his teaching on *πλεονεξία* exegetically (e.g. *Leg. all.* 3.166; *Dec.* 155). Therefore, while greed is a common vice in the ancient Mediterranean world, it also fits well within the broader framework of Jewish ethical paraenesis (cf. Rosner 2007 who emphasizes the importance of Jewish moral teaching for interpreting "greed" in Pauline letters) that Paul passed on to the Thessalonians and the Corinthians (see §5.2.2).

### 5.1.3 Paul's social instructions: love and the quiet life

In 4:9–12 Paul turns to a reminder of his communal and social instructions, beginning with a general discussion of *φιλαδελφία* in vv. 9–10a, followed by more specific reminders of social conduct. This passage is delimited by the initial phrase *περὶ*

---

<sup>40</sup> Isocrates *Or.* 12.55.6–8; Demosthenes *Olynthiaca* 2.9.7; Aristotle *Pol.* 1302b; Chrysippus *Frag. moral.* 323.13–14; Plutarch *Inim. util.* 91C [citing Pythagoras]; *Frat. amor.* 482E.

<sup>41</sup> E.g. Hab 2:9; Ps 119 [118]:36; Jer 22:17 [translating *עצב*]; *Let. Arist.* 277; 3 *Bar.* 13:3; *T. Levi* 14:6; *T. Jud.* 21:8 [cf. 18:2]; *T. Gad* 2:4; cf. *עצב* in CD 8:7 [par. 19:19]; 1QHa 18:24–25; 11Q19 57:8–10.

δέ which signifies a change to a new topic<sup>42</sup> and 4:13 changes the topic with *περὶ τῶν κοιμωμένων*. Further, it is unified internally by the fact that the injunction in v. 10b (*παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ ὑμᾶς*) refers back to the topic of *φιλαδελφία* introduced in v. 9 while also governing the infinitives that follow in v. 11. This passage is explicitly identified as a reminder in v. 11b where Paul notes that what he wrote is "just as we commanded you."<sup>43</sup>

In 4:9, Paul states "Now concerning *φιλαδελφία*, you have no need [for us] to write you since you yourselves are taught by God [*θεοδίδακτοι*] to love one another" (v. 9). At first glance the commonness of fraternal love in Greco-Roman discourse and the neologism *θεοδίδακτοι*<sup>44</sup> appear to undermine a close connection between *φιλαδελφία* and Paul's initial teaching. However, several considerations make the link highly probable. With respect to *φιλαδελφία* in antiquity, the discussions of fraternal love in Greco-Roman texts are consistently limited to *genetic* siblings rather than extended communities (see Excursus 4 below). In contrast, the love which Paul claims the Thessalonians are practicing extends not only to the other Thessalonian believers but to believers from the whole of Macedonia (v. 10a). This use of *φιλαδελφία* is linked, conceptually as well as lexically, to the designation of community members as "brethren" that was current among the Thessalonian believers.

Additionally, the term *θεοδίδακτος* does not rule out Pauline instruction. While the precise frame of reference for the term is debated,<sup>45</sup> what is important here is *how*

---

<sup>42</sup> See the discussion of this phrase in §6.2.2.

<sup>43</sup> On the unity of this passage, see Burke 2003, 203–205, cf. Richard 1995, 214. Fee 2009, 162 argues that the closing reminder in v. 11b forms an *inclusio* with vv. 1–2.

<sup>44</sup> This passage is the first occurrence of the term *θεοδίδακτος* in Greek literature and later uses in *Barnabas* and the later Church fathers appear to be dependent on it; cf. Légasse 1999, 234 and Witmer 2006.

<sup>45</sup> Of the various proposals – references to the Dioscuri (Kloppenborg 1993), philosophical ideals of being *αὐτοδίδακτος* (Malherbe 2000, 244–245; cf. with a slightly different angle Koester 1979, 40), or the prophetic tradition of divine instruction by God's Spirit (cf. Isa 54:13) – I find the latter the most convincing, though a subversive reference to being "self-taught" is not out of the question. See esp. Witmer 2006.

such divine instruction might have taken place. Some argue that the term θεοδίδακτος includes instruction from the Holy Spirit, given the proximate reference in v. 8,<sup>46</sup> which could be corroborated by 1 Cor 2:14–16, while others simply note that God is "somehow the ground of...love."<sup>47</sup> Additionally, some scholars have considered the term to be a reference to the teaching of Jesus (cf. John 13:34) in light of Paul's prayer in 3:12 that "the Lord [=Jesus] will cause you to increase and abound in love for one another."<sup>48</sup> This is, however, a tenuous connection. Notably, Paul himself does not clarify the mechanics of such teaching (Holtz 1986, 175).

There are, however, factors which indicate that an appeal to Paul's previous teaching is not excluded. First and foremost is the fact that elsewhere in 1 Thessalonians Paul equates his own teaching with the word of God, including the immediately preceding v. 8 (cf. 2:13; 4:1–2). Furthermore, this point stands beside, rather than against, the above explanations. That is, Paul's teaching to love inevitably draws on the fact that his command to "love" was fundamental in Judaism, principally stated in Lev 19:18 but with a rich *Nachleben*,<sup>49</sup> including in the teachings of Jesus. Additionally, Paul's teaching could be confirmed or strengthened by the Holy Spirit, with neither element supplanting the other. Indeed, in 4:1–8 Paul connects his teaching with the will of God, draws on a tradition of Jewish moral exhortations and confirms it with an appeal to the Holy Spirit (so Burke 2003, 208–209). In light of these considerations and the unity of 4:9–12, then, there are strong reasons to think that Paul taught the Thessalonians about fraternal love as a communal virtue.<sup>50</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> E.g. von Dobschütz 1909, 177; Bruce 1982, 90; Weima 1996, 116; Aasgaard 2004, 159; Witmer 2008, 157–158.

<sup>47</sup> Collins 1984b, 349; cf. Spicq 1956, 510; Milligan 1908, 52.

<sup>48</sup> Börschel 2001, 259; Holtz 1986, 174; Witmer 2008, 158–159.

<sup>49</sup> On this see esp. Berger 1972, 80–136; cf. Kugel 1987.

<sup>50</sup> Cf. similarly Aasgaard 2004, 157; Légasse 1999, 235; Malherbe 2000, 244; Witherington 2006,

Building on this discussion of φιλαδελφία, Paul turns to specific reminders 4:10b-12. As in 4:1, Paul again says that he wants the Thessalonians "to abound even more" in love, suggesting that his instructions are intended to remind and reinforce rather than supply entirely new information. This suggestion is corroborated by Paul's explicit statement at the end of v. 11, "just as we commanded [παρηγγείλαμεν] you."<sup>51</sup>

This "abounding" in love is spelled out in three specific ways: to earnestly seek to live a quiet life, to attend to their own affairs and to work with their [own] hands (v. 11).<sup>52</sup> Notably, Paul's injunction to work with one's hands mirrors his own example given in 2:9–10, strengthening the suggestion in chapter 4.1.2 that Paul viewed his conduct as paraenetic, even when accompanied by teaching. The ethic of v. 11 is complemented in v. 12 by general social motivations of walking "in a seemly manner towards outsiders [πρὸς τοὺς ἕξω]" and not being dependent on anyone.<sup>53</sup>

However, the relation of v. 12 to Paul's reminder is more difficult to ascertain. On one hand, the second justification, "that you might be dependent on no one,"<sup>54</sup> could link again with Paul's example in 2:9, suggesting that it too played a role in his teaching. On the other hand, the fact that the purpose clause *follows* Paul's explicit reminder may indicate that such wider motivations – witness to "outsiders" and lack of dependence – constitute new information. Similar ambiguity surrounds 5:14–15 where Paul instructs the Thessalonians concerning internal and external social ethics. Caution, then, dictates

---

119–120; Witmer 2008, 156.

<sup>51</sup> So e.g. Dibelius 1937, 23; Malherbe 2000, 255; Börschel 2001, 261.

<sup>52</sup> The relation of the five infinitives in vv. 10–11 are difficult to determine. The best possibilities are that φιλοτιμεῖσθαι governs either ἡσυχάζειν alone or the succeeding three infinitives (cf. von Dobschütz 1909, 178–179). The former seems most plausible to me; *pace* Dibelius 1937, 23; Haufe 1999, 75; Rigaux 1956, 520.

<sup>53</sup> Many scholars have noted the social aspect of these instructions, though they disagree as to the precise implications. For recent discussions, see *inter alios* Ascough 2003, 183; Börschel 2001, 263–264; Légasse 1999, 238; Malherbe 2000, 246–252.

<sup>54</sup> The ambiguity of μηδενός (masculine or neuter) is not important since having need of nothing entails being dependent on no one and *vice versa*.

restraint in drawing any connection between these specifics and Paul's initial teaching. In any case, it is evident that Paul did instruct the Thessalonian believers to live a quiet life during his initial work in Thessalonica, perhaps to avoid the kind of persecution they were currently undergoing.

#### 5.1.4 Summary of explicit reminders in 1 Thessalonians

Thus far some important elements of Paul's teaching in Thessalonica have been identified. Paul preached about turning from idolatry to monotheism ("the living and true God"), the resurrection and coming of Christ from heaven and impending judgment ("the coming wrath"). Further, Paul's teaching was accepted by the Thessalonians as the word of God which may suggest that Paul also presented it as such.

In light of the persecution of the Thessalonian believers, Paul reminds them of his previous teaching about suffering, his instructions regarding love for fellow believers, the quiet life and his example of working diligently in the face of persecution.<sup>55</sup>

Finally, Paul considers a large portion of his teaching to be *παράκλησις* and as such it involved a number of ethical teachings on topics such as sexual morality and greed (probably among others). These topics were probably not random – Paul's primary emphasis on sexual morality in 4:3–8, for example, may have been linked to his perception of various cult practices (e.g. Dionysiac celebrations) and imagery (e.g. Cabrius and Aphrodite) present in Thessalonica<sup>56</sup> as well as with common Jewish notions of idolatry and its attendant sins (cf. §4.1.1).

The fact that Paul explicitly brings up these aspects of his initial teaching again in this letter suggests (at least) two things. First, these items formed part of the Thessalonian Christians' knowledge base, their Christian *ἔνδοξα*, and as such were available for Paul's

---

<sup>55</sup> The view that a teacher's conduct was paradigmatic was wide spread in antiquity; e.g. Plutarch *De liber educ.* 4B-C; Kirschner 1986; cf. p. 66.

<sup>56</sup> So Harrison 2002, 75; Ulonska 1987; Vom Brocke 2001, 130–131.

rhetorical purposes of encouragement, in both senses of the word: consolation and exhortation. Second, these topics were likely those which needed reinforcement and clarification (cf. Bengel 1835, 325). The reason for such a need, however, is unclear. It may be that Paul simply did not finish discussing these topics due to his abrupt removal from Thessalonica. Conversely, it is possible that the Thessalonian situation had changed since Paul's time there or that the Thessalonians simply had not been able to appropriate some of Paul's teaching due to cultural distance. Be that as it may, the topics represented in these explicit reminders are not representative of all of Paul's teaching in Thessalonica since their appearance is determined by specific, rather than systematic, concerns.

## 5.2 Paul's Teaching in Corinth

### 5.2.1 The character and content of Paul's preaching: the word of the cross

Paul refers to his preaching and teaching in 1 Corinthians with general descriptors of his message, often in the present tense, and specific notices about his work in Corinth. This section will focus on the latter, though the former may also illuminate Paul's work in Corinth, depending on their literary and rhetorical context.

The first explicit reminder about Paul's initial preaching in 1 Corinthians is in 2:1–2. Paul states here that, rather than convey the "mystery of God" in speech or wisdom that the Corinthians might have identified as superior (ὕπεροχί), "I determined not to know anything among you except Christ, and him crucified" (2:2).<sup>57</sup> That this is a reference to Paul's preaching is clear and widely accepted.<sup>58</sup> Paul goes on to claim that he worked

---

<sup>57</sup> Bockmuehl 1990, 160–161 notes that Paul's reference to "mystery" is "quite akin to contemporary Jewish terms used to speak of God's eschatological design for the salvation of his people." Cf. 1QH 9:23; 12:13; 1QS 4:18; *1 Enoch* 103:2; etc. The text here is uncertain and may read μαρτύριον (S<sup>2</sup> D F G, etc.) rather than μυστήριον (with 1946 S\* A C, etc.).

<sup>58</sup> Fitzmyer 2008, 172; Lim 1987, 147; Lindemann 2000, 53; Mitchell 1994, 70; Schlatter 1934, 98; Schrage 1991–2001, 1:224; Vos 1996, 103.

among the Corinthians with weakness, fear and much trembling, noting that his "message and preaching" (ὁ λόγος μου καὶ τὸ κήρυγμά μου) were not accompanied by persuasive rhetoric but by proofs (ἐν ἀποδείξει) of the Spirit and power.<sup>59</sup> Scholars have long noted the contrast here between Paul's message and Greco-Roman rhetoric,<sup>60</sup> or some aspect thereof, and it is important for Paul's argument that he re-appropriates the common rhetorical term ἀποδείξις (proof) and applies it to the apparently non-verbal confirmations of his message, undermining the Corinthian emphasis on rhetoric.<sup>61</sup> However, Paul takes this contrast even further in 3:1–2 where he makes it clear that his decision to focus on a crucified Christ was made of necessity, since his audience was not able to handle more than the "milk" he gave them to drink, though in certain circumstances he does provide βρῶμα.

Three things are immediately relevant for our project. In 2:1–5 (and elsewhere in 1 Corinthians), Paul takes it for granted that his readers would accept this claim about his initial preaching.<sup>62</sup> Further, it is highly likely that Paul's claims here are rhetorical overstatement; during his eighteen months or so in Corinth, he certainly spoke about more than "Christ and him crucified." While this appears to have been the (or a) foundational theme (cf. 2 Cor 1:19), it is not the whole of Paul's teaching and it is emphasized here as part of Paul's argument against Corinthian factionalism rooted (at least partially) in misconstrued "wisdom."<sup>63</sup> Indeed, in 2 Cor 4:5 Paul claims that he

---

<sup>59</sup> Cf. the discussion of 1 Thess 2:1–16 above. Rather than "the Spirit and power," this phrase could be a hendiadys for "spiritual power"; Lindemann 2000, 56.

<sup>60</sup> Cf. already Calvin 1996 [1548], *ad loc.*; Weiss 1910, 46; Schlatter 1934, 98. Cf. John Chrysostom *De sac.* 4.6, noted in Norden 1898, 493–494.

<sup>61</sup> See Aristotle *Rhet.* 1355a; cf. Pogoloff 1992, 138; Anderson Jr. 1996, 240; Vos 1996, 105; Thiselton 2000, 221.

<sup>62</sup> Cf. Pickett 1997, 62. Stamps 2002 emphasizes the constant appeal to a "christological premise" in 1:4–2:5.

<sup>63</sup> Mitchell 1994, 70–71 in particular rightly emphasizes the importance of rhetorical context on the way in which Paul frames his gospel references in 1 Corinthians. For the role of "wisdom," see below. This is not to discount the social aspects of these divisions, emphasized by *inter alios* Horrell 1996 and

preaches "Christ as Lord," highlighting a different aspect of his gospel in a different context. Therefore, one needs to be wary of taking Paul's rhetoric at face value.<sup>64</sup> Finally, Paul's initial ministry in Corinth involved spiritual demonstrations, at least including charismatic manifestations (cf. §6.2.2.3).

These passages fall within a larger section (1:17–2:5; 3:1–4) that appeals to the Corinthians' conversion from a variety of angles as a non-controversial base for Paul's arguments for unity.<sup>65</sup> Particularly notable is 1:17–25 for the way in which it characterizes and illuminates Paul's message. In v. 17, Paul shifts the emphasis from the *fact* of factionalism to the underlying problem of misplaced value in "wisdom" and rhetorical skill:<sup>66</sup> "For Christ did not send me to baptize but to proclaim the gospel (εὐαγγελίζεσθαι), not in skillful speech [οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου], lest the cross of Christ be made empty." Verse 18 picks up on Paul's reference to his preaching (γάρ), calling his message "the word of the cross" which stands in contrast to the previous σοφία λόγου and is only acceptable to those who are being saved.<sup>67</sup> After a citation of Isa. 29:14 and some rhetorical questions which emphasize the foolish wisdom of God (vv. 19–20), Paul again explicitly refers to his preaching in terms of "the foolishness of the message" (τῆς μωρίας τοῦ κηρύγματος, v. 21).<sup>68</sup>

---

Theissen 1982. Brookins 2011 has recently argued that the "wisdom" and the social divisions can be attributed to Stoic education among the wealthier Corinthian believers.

<sup>64</sup> Taking these statements at face value is a problem in the analysis of Litfin 1994, 187–199.

<sup>65</sup> Vos 1996 emphasizes that these passages ought to be read in the light of 1:10 and function within 1:10–3:4 as a means to combat Corinthian factionalism, cf. Sellin 1982, 69; Mitchell 1991, 198–199; Debanné 2006, 213.

<sup>66</sup> So Litfin 1994, 187; Debanné 2006, 213; cf. earlier Bengel 1835, 103. The works that address the relationship of 1 Cor 1:17–2:5 and Greco-Roman rhetoric are legion. Aside from the commentaries, see e.g. Anderson Jr. 1996, 221–248; Lim 1987; Litfin 1994; Mitchell 1991; Pogoloff 1992; Vos 2002; Winter 1997.

<sup>67</sup> So *inter alios* Fee 1987, 68; Vos 1996, 96; Fitzmyer 2008, 152; cf. earlier Wilckens 1959, 6 and Conzelmann 1975, 41.

<sup>68</sup> Although some recent interpreters have argued that Paul is referring to the rhetorical *form* of the proclamation (e.g. Litfin 1994, 198–199), the elucidation of the κήρυγμα in v. 23 suggests that the *content* of the message is the dominant concern here (with Lindemann 2000, 46; Schlatter 1934, 89; Schrage 1991–2001, 1:181). Note also the objective genitive τοῦ σαυροῦ in v. 18 which identifies the content of the

This message is further elucidated in contrast with signs demanded by "Jews" and wisdom sought by "Greeks" (v. 22): "we preach Christ crucified" (v. 23). The "we" here is enigmatic and Jerome Murphy-O'Connor has suggested that it is a reference to Paul and his co-sender, Sosthenes (Murphy-O'Connor 2009a, 6–7). However, the parallel with 2:2 and present tense κηρύσσομεν, which lends a generality to this statement, suggests that the "we" should be viewed more generally in reference to Paul himself, Paul and his co-workers, or simply Paul and "those being saved" in opposition to the "Jews" and "Greeks."<sup>69</sup> This indicates, then, that the centrality of Jesus' crucifixion (not to the exclusion of his resurrection, cf. 15:3–4) was a general description of Paul's message (NB the present tense) which also pertained to his ministry in Corinth (2:2). Several other explicit reminders support this, as in 1:6–7 where he refers to "the testimony of Christ" which was "established" (ἐβεβαιώθη) among the Corinthians and the "revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ" which they have received (ἀπεκδεχομένων). Note also 3:10–11 where Paul, the wise architect, claims to have laid the irreplaceable "foundation" of Christ. As David Horrell notes, "We may state with confidence that Paul's message centered upon the death and resurrection of Christ" (Horrell 1996, 77).

This confidence is only deepened by turning to the most commonly discussed explicit reminder of Paul's preaching in this letter, 1 Cor 15:1–11.<sup>70</sup> Although this passage is significant for what it says about Paul's relationship with earlier Christian tradition,<sup>71</sup> among other things, in fact much of what it says was already indicated in the first four chapters of the letter. Paul notes that he is reminding the Corinthians about "the gospel

---

message (Barrett 1968, 561).

<sup>69</sup> Cf. the various discussions in Fitzmyer 2008, 153; Schrage 1991-2001, 1:184–185; Weiss 1910, 32. The suggestion in Bengel 1835, 104 that the "we" refers to Paul and Apollos is intriguing in light of the reconciliatory tone and Paul's attempt to unite the factions on common ground.

<sup>70</sup> See Schrage 1991-2001, 4:3–7 for extensive bibliography up to 2001.

<sup>71</sup> Cf. Bussmann 1971, 86–87, 106; Seeberg 1905, 43. Bengel 1835, 164: "uno ore, omnes apostoli."

which I preached to you, which you received, in which you stand, and through which you are saved" (15:1–2). However three important additional points do emerge. The content of this gospel is that "Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures, and that he was buried and that he was raised on the third day according to the scriptures" (15:3–4). Thus, in addition to Christ's death, emphasized in general terms in 1:18–2:5, Paul's preaching included both a particular interpretation of that death – it was ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν (cf. 15:17; 1 Thess 5:10)<sup>72</sup> – and Christ's resurrection. Notably, the verb ἐγείρω is in the passive in v. 4, which implicitly includes the agency of God, which Paul does explicitly note in v. 15: "we witnessed...that [God] raised Christ."

He goes on to add that Cephas, the twelve and many others including Paul have seen the risen Christ (vv. 5–8). The centrality of this narrative is indicated by the fact that Paul transmitted this tradition to the Corinthians ἐν πρώτοις, among the things of first importance (v. 3).<sup>73</sup> Further, the positive reception of this message, already noted in vv. 1–2, is restated in the conclusion of this passage, v. 11: "therefore, whether I or they [an undefined entity], thus we preach and thus you believed." As has been noted by numerous scholars, the truth of this tradition and its place in Paul's gospel is not in question, but rather it provides the base for Paul's subsequent argument about the resurrection (15:12–58).<sup>74</sup> Indeed, it appears that some of the Corinthians had questioned the general resurrection of believers and yet managed to maintain the bodily resurrection of Christ

---

<sup>72</sup> The precise significance of this phrase is difficult to identify and it is clearly an elliptical formulation. Given the further discussion in 15:17, Christ's death evidently removed believers from their sins, in which case the phrase must mean something like "for the sake of [removing we who believe from] our sins." See, similarly, Breytenbach 2003, 474 who argues that Jesus's death "for us" should be understood as the termination (*Beendigung*) of the sinful human life and the basis for a new relationship with God (cf. 470 "um die Auswirkungen ihrer Sünden zu tilgen"). See the further discussion in §9.3.2.1.

<sup>73</sup> A point widely recognized, from Bengel 1835, 163 to Fitzmyer 2008, 545.

<sup>74</sup> Conzelmann 1975, 250; Senft 1979, 187; Fee 1987, 714; Mitchell 1994, 74; Eriksson 1998, 243, *passim*. However, recently Wayne Coppins 2010 has emphasized the element of reinforcement intrinsic in such a reminder.

(vv. 12–14).<sup>75</sup>

### 5.2.2 The Corinthians' conversion: belief, baptism and receiving the Spirit

We turn now from a discussion of Paul's initial preaching to the question of the Corinthian Christians' conversion experience. Given that the mode by which the Corinthians entered the community was inevitably shaped for them by Paul,<sup>76</sup> how did they make the transition from their various backgrounds into Paul's nascent Corinthian community? What action, if any, did Paul's preaching elicit from them? What rituals were involved in the conversion process? Three elements emerge clearly when these questions are applied to Paul's explicit reminders to his time in Corinth: faith/believing (*πίστις/πιστεύειν*), baptism and the Holy Spirit.

First, as has already been noted in relation to 1 Cor 15:1–11, the response elicited by Paul's preaching was one of believing (15:2, 11). In the first instance this means that the Corinthians believed (or trusted) that Paul's message was true.<sup>77</sup> In v. 11, Paul notes that his message, and that of other Christian preachers, about the death, resurrection and manifestations of Christ, was believed by the Corinthians: οὕτως κηρύσσομεν καὶ οὕτως ἐπιστεύσατε. The aorist ἐπιστεύσατε is notable in contrast with the present κηρύσσομεν in that it denotes an action that has already taken place.<sup>78</sup> Thus believing the gospel

---

<sup>75</sup> The issues to which Paul was responding in 1 Cor 15 will be addressed in §7.3.3.

<sup>76</sup> As Rambo 1993, 7 correctly notes, "conversion is what a group or person *says* it is. The process of conversion is a product of the interactions among the convert's aspirations, needs and orientations, the nature of the group into which she or he is being converted, and the particular social matrix in which these processes are taking place" (emphasis original).

<sup>77</sup> This sense of *πιστεύειν*, *viz.* trusting that a message from or about a god was true, was widespread in both Greco-Roman and Jewish religious discourse; cf. Barth 1982 and Lohse 1977 respectively. See also the classic account in Bultmann and Weiser 1968, 175–182, 197–202, *passim*.

<sup>78</sup> Fitzmyer 2008, 553 argues that this is an ingressive aorist, emphasizing that the belief continued beyond the initial decision. Still, the emphasis of the whole passage is on the past event, laying the accepted foundation for the subsequent argument. Cf. Bengel 1835, 164 on 15:11 and Schrage 1991–2001, 1:291; Thiselton 2000, 300 and Wolff 1996, 66 on ἐπιστεύσατε in 1 Cor 3:5. This reading of the aorist ἐπιστεύσατε stands whether one emphasizes verbal aspect or more complex pragmatic concerns; see the debate between Stanley Porter and Buist Fanning in Porter and Carson 1993, 26–62.

message preserved in 1 Cor 15:1–11 is presented as an integral part of their conversion experience. This suggests that Paul included in his gospel preaching some appeal for belief, though his earlier account of the Gospel does not mention it.

However, Paul also notes that, at their conversion they believed *through* Paul's preaching, indicating that the final object of belief or trust is not the message itself. "What then is Apollos? And what is Paul? Servants through whom you believed [δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε]" (3:5; cf. 1:12). Although in other letters Paul specifies the object of faith, whether it is faith in Christ<sup>79</sup> or faith in the future resurrection (Rom 6:8; 1 Thess 4:14), he goes into no such detail in 1 Corinthians. Nevertheless, in light of the fact that Paul presumes to know the response to Apollos' preaching and given that he refers to Christians simply as "believers" (οἱ πιστεύοντες) in 14:22, it appears that believing was foundational for the Christian life in Paul's mind.

At some point after believing Paul's message, the Corinthian converts were baptized.<sup>80</sup> Paul notes that he himself baptized some of the early (and prominent?) converts (1 Cor 1:14–16) such as Crispus (cf. Acts 18:8), Gaius (cf. Rom 16:23) and the house of Stephanas (cf. 1 Cor 16:15).<sup>81</sup> It is not clear who performed the baptisms for the rest of the converts, but his preceding exclamation in 1 Cor 1:13 – "were you baptized into the name of Paul?" – indicates that Paul regards the rest of the Corinthian Christians

---

<sup>79</sup> The πίστις Χριστοῦ debate is still in process with some arguing for the objective genitive (e.g. Harrisville 2006; Matlock 2007; Wolter 2011, 76–78) and others the subjective genitive (famously Hays 1983; cf. Peterman 2010; Whitenton 2010). Interestingly, F. Gerald Downing 2010 has argued that trying to separate these two options is the wrong way forward. Rather, he argues, having faith in or trusting someone is inextricably linked to their faithfulness or trustworthiness.

<sup>80</sup> If the book of Acts is accurate in its depiction of conversion, then baptism followed very closely on acceptance of the gospel. Hartman 1997, 60 argues that Paul's claim in 1:14 that he did not baptize many indicates that there was a long period of instruction between acceptance of the message and baptism. However, this is more than one can legitimately pull from such a cryptic text.

<sup>81</sup> The identities of these people are not uncontested; see e.g. Weiss 1910, 20–21; Schlatter 1934, 75–76; Fee 1987, 62–63; Lindemann 2000, 41–42; Fitzmyer 2008, 146–147.

as baptized, including those converted by Apollos and others.<sup>82</sup> In this way, 1:13 is a clear reference to Paul's initial preaching and call for conversion and it shows his rhetorical claim to know only "Christ crucified" to be hyperbolic, to say the least.

Further, Paul's rhetorical question indicates that it was into the name of Christ (Jesus) that they were baptized.<sup>83</sup> While the precise meaning of being baptized "into the name" of Christ is difficult, appeals to later texts such as Col 2:12 or the introduction of a "magical" view of baptism are problematic.<sup>84</sup> Rather, the most one can infer from 1:13–16 is that baptism was a transfer ritual through which the baptized becomes "of Christ" (1 Cor 3:23).<sup>85</sup> If Paul and company had not required and taught about baptism as an entry ritual, there would have been no reason for the Corinthians to adopt this one-time ritual immersion on their own.<sup>86</sup> Indeed, although there may have been precedent for ritual immersion in Jewish proselyte baptism, it is impossible to be certain<sup>87</sup> and baptism was hardly the norm for conversion in Greco-Roman religions.<sup>88</sup>

---

<sup>82</sup> So Horrell 1996, 82; Schlatter 1934, 196.

<sup>83</sup> This is widely accepted; e.g. Wilckens 1959, 12; Schnackenburg 1964, 18; Wedderburn 1987, 51; Fitzmyer 2008, 146; for comparison, cf. 1 Cor 6:11 Gal 3:27 and for contrast, see the reference to being baptized εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν in 1 Cor 10:2.

<sup>84</sup> In particular, Chester 2003, 337–342 has argued that the Corinthians did not hold to any kind of "magical sacramentalism."

<sup>85</sup> The notion of being "called into fellowship with his son, Jesus Christ our Lord" (1:9) could also be read as a reference to the change of affiliation in baptism; cf. similarly Barrett 1968, 47; Conzelmann 1975, 35–36; Dunn 1970, 117; Fee 1987, 61. Hartman 1997, 37–44 argues convincingly that the formula "in/into the name" arose out of the Hebrew שם/בִּלְשֵׁם which occurs in ritual and worship context to denote the theological framework for the act (cf. van de Sandt and Flusser 2002, 285–289; Wolter 2011, 133–134). However, to discount the possible influence of a common Greek idiom, namely "to the account of" (cf. Dunn 1970, 117–118), upon later usage within a Greek context, as Hartman does, is unwarranted.

<sup>86</sup> This relates to the vexing issues of "baptism for the dead" in 15:29, on which see §7.3.6.3.

<sup>87</sup> The evidence for Jewish proselyte baptism is scant and often inferred by interpreters (e.g. Seeberg 1905, 98–104; Schnackenburg 1964, 7 and van de Sandt and Flusser 2002, 277–278); cf. Epictetus *Diss.* 2.9.20; *Sib. Or.* 4:165; 8:314–316; *m. Pesach.* 8.8 (par. *m. Ed.* 5.2); *Gerim* 1.1–4. It remains the case, however, that the date and content of these texts are problematic and they give no solid indication of how widespread the practice was in the first century. At Qumran, רחץ/טבל is used for regular ritual purification, with no particular emphasis on baptism as an initiatory rite. Notably, the account of initiation and apostasy in 1QS 1:16–3:13 does not include washing as an initiatory rite and treats purification by water (3:4–5, 9) only in terms of its lack of effectiveness to those outside the Yachad.

<sup>88</sup> Lustrations in ritual/sacrificial contexts were of course common, but immersion (or washing more generally) was not common as an initiatory rite (cf. Burkert 1987, 78–79). For the former, cf. Plutarch *Is. Os.* 381D; for the latter, cf. Apuleius *Metam.* 11.23 and perhaps *Herm.* 4.4 (cf. Oepke 1964, 531–532).

It is significant, as Lars Hartman has noted, that although Paul regularly alludes to baptism, the references are almost always in service of some other argument, a fact that applies to this passage as well. This indicates that the event of baptism, with its accompanying "into the name" formula, forms the religious  $\epsilon\nu\delta\omicron\zeta\alpha$  upon which Paul can build *other* arguments (cf. Hartman 1997, 52, 60). However, it is not clear from 1:14–16 what Paul's teaching on baptism might have included aside from it being the entry ritual and being baptized "into the name of Christ." This pushes us to examine another reminder about the Corinthians' baptism in 12:13 which also includes the third element: the place of the Spirit in conversion.

In 12:13, Paul justifies his previous statement regarding the body of Christ (v. 12) though an appeal to the Corinthians' baptism: Christ is one, regardless of his many parts, "for we were all baptized in [or by] one Spirit into one body...and we all drank [were watered?] with one Spirit." Several aspects of this verse merit mention in relation to our project. In the first place, it is clear from this verse that the Spirit is involved in baptism (perhaps as some sort of agent) and that the first person plural indicates that this was not limited to the Corinthians.<sup>89</sup> Here, as elucidated in some other passages (e.g. 1 Cor 12:7; 2 Cor 1:22; 5:5; cf. Gal 3:2–3), we learn that partaking of the Spirit is, for Paul, a *sine qua non* for the Christian life and conversion.<sup>90</sup> Further, baptism and the Spirit incorporate the believer "into one body" which appears to be linked with being baptized "into the name of Christ," perhaps entailing a quasi-mystical concept of participation (cf. Hartman 1997, 80). However, this particular aspect, *viz.* baptism *into one body*, may not have featured in

---

Chester 2003, 277 notes that "there is no evidence that anything like [Christian] baptism existed among the mystery cults"; and cf. now Graf 2011.

<sup>89</sup> *Pace* Dunn 1970, 129–131, there is no reason to think that Paul does not have actual baptism in mind here. See recently Chester 2003, 281–283.

<sup>90</sup> So Fee 1987, 603; Fitzmyer 2008, 478; Horn 1992, 175; Horrell 1996, 84–86; Schrage 1991–2001, 3:216.

Paul's initial teaching as body imagery was common in antiquity and had already been introduced in 12:12.<sup>91</sup>

However, there is a question as to the referent of the drinking imagery in v. 13b: does it still refer to baptism or is there a shift to an allusion to the Eucharist? While there is a certain appeal to the second option, since drinking more readily fits the ritual of the Eucharist than baptism,<sup>92</sup> Christian Wolff rightly notes that the aorist ἐποτίσθημεν is strange in reference to the Eucharist, which was an ongoing ritual, whereas baptism was a single past event (Wolff 1996, 299). Further, several scholars have noted that there is an ambiguity in the meaning of the verb ποτίζειν such that it can refer to providing a drink but also to irrigating a field.<sup>93</sup> If the latter meaning can inform Paul's use here, then being drenched with the Spirit is surely a fitting image for baptism by submersion.<sup>94</sup> This closely links the act of baptism and the reception of the Spirit (so Chester 2003, 280–283).

Some scholars have argued, on the basis of parallels in Gal 3:26–28 and Colossians 3:9–11, that the formula "neither Jew nor Greek, neither slave nor free" constituted part of a baptismal formula or teaching which Paul used and which he shared with other early Christian teachers.<sup>95</sup> Although the second point goes well beyond the evidence since the evidence for such a "formula" cannot be demonstrated from any writings outside the Pauline corpus and texts which are likely influenced by it (so Wolff 1996, 299), the first point is more suggestive. If these antithetical pairings constituted part of Paul's teaching, then we have an example of, perhaps, the *ipsissima verba* of Paul's

---

<sup>91</sup> See further §6.2.4.3.

<sup>92</sup> For a defense of this view, cf. Schlatter 1934, 346–347.

<sup>93</sup> E.g. Dunn 1970, 131; Hartman 1997, 67; Thiselton 2000, 1000–1001.

<sup>94</sup> Most scholars think that there is no shift from baptismal/conversion imagery; e.g. Fitzmyer 2008, 478–479.

<sup>95</sup> See the discussions and bibliography in Hartman 1997, 87–88 and Wolff 1996, 299.

teaching. However, the fact that none of these three texts (1 Cor 12:13; Gal 3:26–28; Col 3:9–11) are the same may suggest that the lists themselves are *ad hoc* rather than fixed. Further, the coherence of Paul's argument in 1 Cor 12 does not *require* that these be part of the Corinthian ἔνδοξα since the argument for unity in diversity is rooted in his reference to one baptism and one Spirit, and not the specific illustrations given. Nevertheless, a decision regarding the place of these antithetical pairs in Paul's initial teaching, including the omitted male/female pair, cannot be made on the basis of this passage alone and I will return to it in my discussion of 1 Cor 11:2–16 below (§6.2.3).

The final text to investigate in the discussion of the Corinthians' conversion is 6:9–11. This passage is important in a number of respects and I will return to it several times in the course of this study. Paul opens the passage in vv. 9–10 with a list of those who will not inherit the kingdom of God, including such staples as πόρνοι, εἰδωλόλατραι and πλεονέκται, among many others (cf. §5.2.3 and chapter 7).<sup>96</sup> Significantly, Paul then turns to his Corinthian readers and states, "some of you were these things" (v. 11). This is a clear characterization of some of the Corinthian Christians *before* their conversion since Paul continues with three emphatic contrasts: ἀλλὰ ἀπελούσασθε, ἀλλὰ ἡγιασθητε, ἀλλὰ ἐδικαιώθητε. Numerous scholars argue that ἀπελούσασθε<sup>97</sup> is a clear reference to baptism, especially in light of proximate reference to the "name of the Lord Jesus Christ" and the "Spirit of God."<sup>98</sup> However, some are more skeptical, arguing that these verbs do not need to refer to baptism specifically any more than conversion more generally.<sup>99</sup> Given the references to agency (or instrumentality) of the Spirit and the "name of the Lord Jesus

---

<sup>96</sup> Note the similarities with 1 Thess 1:9; 4:3–8.

<sup>97</sup> The difficulty of the middle voice here is usually solved by the observation that passive forms of λούειν are very rare and that the parallelism with the following two passives indicates that ἀπελούσασθε ought also to read as such; cf. Barrett 1968, 141; Conzelmann 1975, 107; Fee 1987, 245 n.31.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Weiss 1910, 154; Schlatter 1934, 196; Hartman 1997, 63; Lindemann 2000, 140–141; Schrage 1991–2001, 1:433; Chester 2003, 140; Fitzmyer 2008, 258.

<sup>99</sup> So Dunn 1970, 121; Fee 1987, 246–247; Thiselton 2000, 453–454.

Christ," which are linked closely with other appeals to baptism in 1 Corinthians noted above, it is hard to imagine that the Corinthians would not have understood a reference to baptism here. It is true, though, that these verses constitute a general overview of (some of) the Corinthians' conversion: they were idolatrous sinners who were not to inherit the Kingdom, *but* they were cleansed, set apart as God's people and put in right status before God. The separation involved in this conversion will be picked up again in the discussion of implicit appeals to knowledge (chapter 7).

These passages show that the Corinthians' conversion experiences, which Paul refers to included three key elements. First, their response to Paul's message was one of believing Paul's message. Second, they were baptized "in the name" of Christ, which constituted their entry into the community and, third, this was closely linked with the experience of the Spirit.

### 5.2.3 Paul's "ways," traditions and the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον

In closing his main discussion of factionalism (1 Cor 1–4), Paul exhorts the Corinthians to imitate him (4:16), his first imperative since 1:10. He then states that he has sent Timothy to "remind you of my ways in Christ Jesus, just as I teach everywhere in every church" (4:17). The enigmatic phrase "my ways in Christ Jesus" has attracted the attention of scholars for well over a century.<sup>100</sup> The close connection between v. 17 and the previous exhortation to imitate Paul (v. 16; cf. 11:1) suggests that, at the very least, the "ways" included a reference to Paul's own conduct (cf. 2 Cor 10:11).<sup>101</sup> However, the final clause (καθὼς πανταχοῦ ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ διδάσκω) indicates that these "ways" also involve verbal communication.

Several things merit further discussion. Notably, Paul has sent Timothy to *remind*

---

<sup>100</sup> See Seeberg 1903, 1; von Weizsäcker 1899-1907, 2:262.

<sup>101</sup> So, Schrage 1991-2001, 1:360. In §4.1.2 we saw that Paul considered his conduct to carry paraenetic weight with the Thessalonians.

the Corinthians of his "ways," which does not necessitate that they were forgotten, but nevertheless indicates that Paul had previously discussed and exhibited them during his mission.<sup>102</sup> This may go some way towards accounting for the ambiguity of Paul's reference to the "ways."<sup>103</sup> Furthermore, the fact that Paul claims to teach these "ways" in "every church" indicates that he has specific teachings in mind.<sup>104</sup> It is going far beyond the evidence to argue with Seeberg that these "ways" were a fixed early Christian ethical framework drawn from early Judaism (Seeberg 1903, 1–20), but the trans-local use of this teaching is certainly suggestive.

Many have noted that "my ways" has possible undertones of Jewish ethical materials – from the OT references walking in "the ways of God" (ללכת בדרכיו/ πορεύεσθαι ἐν ταῖς ὁδοῖς)<sup>105</sup> to the "two-ways" traditions<sup>106</sup> to a reference to halakah.<sup>107</sup> This view is supported by 6:9–11 wherein Paul's contrasts the Corinthians' current status with a list of vices that characterized "some" of their former lives. In line with contemporary Jewish moral teaching, the vice list in 1 Cor 6:9–10 emphasizes issues of idolatry, sexual immorality and greed (cf. Excursus 3). It is not necessary to link each specific sin in vv. 9–10 with Paul's initial teaching, though such a link is possible.<sup>108</sup> However, the fact that no two vice catalogues in Paul's letters are the same suggests that

---

<sup>102</sup> So Bengel 1835, 116; Lindemann 2000, 116.

<sup>103</sup> Castelli 1991, 109 notes that "one is hard-pressed to produce a univocal, concrete expression of what exactly the Corinthians are being called to imitate," which, she argues, is evidence for her thesis that Paul's mimesis-language is part of his exclusive power game.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Schrage 1961, 19 who also draws attention to the παραγγελία in 1 Thess 4:2.

<sup>105</sup> Deut 8:6; Isa 2:3; Hos 14:9; Mic 4:2; Tob 3:2; Bar 3:13; CD 2:15; 1QS 1:2; cf. Castelli 1991, 110; Conzelmann 1975, 92 n. 21; Fitzmyer 2008, 224; Schrage 1991-2001, 1:359

<sup>106</sup> Deut 30:15–18; Jer 21:8; *T. Asher* 1:3–5; *Did.* 1:1; cf. 1QS 3:18–19 with respect to the "two spirits"; cf. Weiss 1910, 119–120 who mentions this interpretation but rejects it. On this, see esp. van de Sandt and Flusser 2002.

<sup>107</sup> Note the links between "ways" and "walking" in the OT passages noted above; cf. Barrett 1968, 17; Fee 1987, 189 n.37; Lietzmann 1931, 22; von Weizsäcker 1899-1907, 2:262

<sup>108</sup> E.g. Kamlah 1964, 13 considers this a clear reminder of baptism, in connection with v. 11.

they are not fixed catechetical lists, but *ad hoc* lists formed from a common well of material.<sup>109</sup> Rather, what the account shows more clearly is that the Corinthians' conversion involved (or should have involved) moral transformation in these general areas. Otherwise, how could we account for the fact that some Corinthians practiced those things but no longer do? This, in turn, indicates that Paul's preaching did in fact include moral exhortation and 6:9–10 appears to give us a picture of Paul's "ways" about which Timothy is to remind the Corinthian believers.

Following the discussion of εἰδωλόθυτα in 8:1–11:1, Paul turns to praise and censure of the Corinthian Christians based on their adherence or deviance from "the traditions" which he imparted to them: "I praise you because you remember everything from me and you hold to the traditions [τὰς παραδόσεις] just as I handed them over [παρέδωκα] to you" (11:2, cf. v. 23). This *captatio benevolentiae* sets the stage for the new information given in 11:3–16 (θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι) as well as the correction in 11:17–34. It is hard to say to what precisely these traditions refer (if indeed he has specific traditions in mind),<sup>110</sup> but the fact that Paul immediately moves on to discussions of communal gatherings and worship in 11:3–34 (which he continues in chs. 12–14), may indicate that the traditions he has in mind pertain specifically to such gatherings. In any case, the instructions Paul imparts for public prayer and prophecy for women and men evidently were not included in the previously given traditions (see §6.2.3).

However, the tradition which Paul cites in 11:23b-25, regarding the institution of the Lord's Supper (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον), not only *was* imparted to the Corinthians during Paul's initial ministry, but was evidently a practice shared with communities not directly

---

<sup>109</sup> The oral transmission and performance of such lists has been suggestively explored by Draper 2008, a preferable development to trying to revive "catechetical" hypotheses from C. H. Dodd and E. G. Selwyn as does Thiselton 2000, 442.

<sup>110</sup> On the "traditions" as *captatio benevolentiae* see Fee 1987, 500; Fitzmyer 2008, 408; Lindemann 2000, 238.

affiliated with Paul (11:23a).<sup>111</sup> The purpose in Paul's quotation is to combat Corinthian malpractice with respect to this celebration (11:20). While there are a number of uncertainties regarding what *exactly* the Corinthians were doing that Paul found so objectionable, only a few points need to be noted here. First, it is clear that Paul is unhappy with the current Corinthian practice since it leads, in his view, to the despising of God's church and shaming the poor (11:22).<sup>112</sup> Second, Paul thinks that continuing to celebrate the Lord's supper in their fashion brings judgment on them (vv. 27–34), perhaps even eschatological judgment, as the current community divisions are part of making the true believers manifest (v. 18b-19).<sup>113</sup> Ultimately for Paul, the Corinthian practice does not even qualify as the Lord's Supper at all (v. 20).<sup>114</sup> The precise problem with Corinthian practice is difficult to isolate, but Paul's principal corrective, summed up in 11:33, is aimed at a lack of hospitality during the Lord's supper that has arisen since his departure: "my brethren, when you come together to eat wait for [or welcome] one another."<sup>115</sup>

The tradition cited by Paul forms part of the readers' *ἔνδοξα* and constitutes the foundation for Paul's subsequent argument.<sup>116</sup> The rhetorical context of this citation

---

<sup>111</sup> Most scholars agree that Paul's reference to receiving the tradition *ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου* specifies the Lord as the originator of the tradition, thus not excluding mediation through other Christians, rather than indicating direct revelation (e.g. from Weiss 1910, 283 to Schröter 2009, 92). However, Watson 2007a argues for direct revelation, though his efforts to dissociate the language of "receiving" in 11:23 and 15:3 are not convincing.

<sup>112</sup> The arguments of Klauck 1982, 296–297 that Paul is fighting against an overblown sacramentalism are unconvincing; see Klinghardt 1996, 292–293; cf. p. 98 n. 84.

<sup>113</sup> Cf. 1 John 2:19. The overtones of eschatological judgment in Paul's statement here are not often recognized, but note Collins and Harrington 1999, 422; Klauck 1982, 289.

<sup>114</sup> See Hofius 1989, 206; cf. Engberg-Pedersen 1991, 611; Neuenzeit 1960, 29.

<sup>115</sup> Cf. also the discussion of eating *τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον* and becoming drunk in the presence of *οἱ μὴ ἔχοντες* (11:21–22). Most scholars posit the lack of hospitality to run along social lines (often following Theissen 1982, 152–153), though with differing accounts of the shape of the Corinthian meal; cf. Engberg-Pedersen 1991, 596–597; Hofius 1989; Horrell 1996, 102–105; Lampe 1991; Winter 2001, 143–144. In support, many point to similar social distinctions in common meals for associations; e.g. Chester 2003, 246–252; McRae 2011; Meeks 2003, 158; Schröter 2009, 85. However, a few scholars have linked the division within the Lord's supper with political, factional divisions within the Corinthian community; cf. Klinghardt 1996, 293–295; Walters 2010. For a recent discussion of these options (without mention of Klinghardt/Walters), see Smith 2010.

<sup>116</sup> So Eriksson 1998, 186; Lindemann 2000, 248; Debanné 2006, 226–227.

requires that it be extremely close to (if not exactly the same as) the celebration which Paul initiated while with the Corinthian community, otherwise his appeal to their memory would undermine his efforts.<sup>117</sup> It was "handed over" to them just as he "received" it.<sup>118</sup> The citation itself has three parts: the historical notice, the bread-rite and the cup-rite. The opening notice – "The Lord Jesus, on the night he was handed over" – suggests that the Corinthians knew the general context surrounding "the night he was handed over," though it is hard to know where that knowledge stopped. Schrage, for instance, argues that the notice was simply part of the tradition and so cannot be pressed for evidence of the Corinthians' knowledge (Schrage 1991-2001, 3:31–32). However, this passage combines with Paul's emphasis on the death (and resurrection) of Christ (noted above) to imply a narrative context beyond the parts that Paul actually narrates.<sup>119</sup>

The tradition continues with the bread-rite, consisting in blessing and breaking (i.e. distributing) the bread, which appears to have opened the communal meal. This is indicated by the adverbial *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι* in 11:25 which separates the cup-rite from what precedes.<sup>120</sup> Further, the bread tradition is linked with an interpretation of Christ's death, noting that his body is *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν* (v. 24; cf. 15:3), a compressed allusion to the fact that Jesus' death was for the benefit of the Corinthians.<sup>121</sup> In the same way (*ὡσαύτως*), the cup is blessed (cf. 10:16, *τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν*) and linked with Christ's death as the "new covenant in my blood" (11:25). Both the bread-rite

---

<sup>117</sup> Accordingly, Hofius 1989, 204 considers the citation to be *unverändert*.

<sup>118</sup> Cf. 1 Thess 4:1–2 and p. 82 n. 20.

<sup>119</sup> Cf. Aitken 1997, 368; Horrell 1996, 151–152; Lindemann 2000, 254. The tendency of Smith 2003, 188–191 to oppose "historical" with "mythological/theological" in his discussion of the opening notice, "on the night he was handed over," is unhelpful since these are not mutually exclusive categories. Something can be a historical notice and yet still carry mythological/theological freight.

<sup>120</sup> This is stated forcefully by Hofius 1989, 216; cf. similarly Tomson 1990, 141; Theissen 1982, 152; *pace* Neuenzeit 1960, 30–31; Schrage 1991-2001, 3:14–15.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. 1 Thess 5:10; Meeks 2003, 158.

and the cup-rite are done "in remembrance" of Jesus, a recalling and re-presentation of the significance of his death for the community.<sup>122</sup> Paul glosses the tradition in v. 26 (NB the shift to the second person), stating that in celebrating the Eucharist, the Corinthians are in fact proclaiming the death of the Lord "until he comes," i.e. until the Day of the Lord (cf. 1:8; 3:13; 5:5). While the proclamation may have referred to the act of celebration itself,<sup>123</sup> to some accompanying narrative about Christ's death,<sup>124</sup> or a combination of the two (Schrage 1991-2001, 3:46), whatever proclamation accompanied the celebration is not included for us. Finally, Paul suggests in 10:16 that beyond "remembrance" or "proclamation," there is an element of participation in the blood and body of Christ which brings unity.<sup>125</sup> This participatory aspect may be linked with the appropriation of the significance of Jesus' death within the community.

These parts together constitute the aetiology for the Corinthian Christian community<sup>126</sup> and a link is often made with the Passover meal, which also demonstrates concern over the order of blessings during a common ritual meal.<sup>127</sup> While this connection is uncertain and hotly debated,<sup>128</sup> it should be noted nevertheless that the aetiological and

---

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Engberg-Pedersen 1991, 606; Meeks 2003, 158; Schrage 1991-2001, 3:41. This bears resemblance to the common refrain in Jewish tradition to "remember" (זכרון/זכר) what Y<sup>HWH</sup> had done for the people; see Exod 12:14; Num 10:10; 15:40; Deut 7:18; 8:2; 15:15; 1 Chron 16:12, 15; Jdt 8:26; 1 Macc 4:9; Ps 77:12–20; 103:18; etc. See also Thiselton 2000, 878 who affirms an analogy with Passover. Engberg-Pedersen 1991, 606 notes, however, that ritualization like that seen in the words of institution was relatively common and warns against situating it too firmly in any particular (Hellenistic) tradition.

<sup>123</sup> So Bengel 1835, 147; Engberg-Pedersen 1991, 603; Smith 2003, 199.

<sup>124</sup> So Conzelmann 1975, 201; Neuenzeit 1960, 132–133.

<sup>125</sup> Note also the language of participation in "the cup" and "the table" of demons in 10:21; cf. Wolter 2010, 7. The link between Eucharist and participation differs from the pairing of participation and baptism in Romans 6.

<sup>126</sup> So Hofius 1989, 203; cf. Aitken 1997, 370; Smith 2003, 188.

<sup>127</sup> See esp. Betz 1990; cf. Fitzmyer 2008, 430–431; Neuenzeit 1960, 143–154; Thiselton 2000, 871–874; Weiss 1910, 285; Winter 2001, 150. For a thorough discussion of the parallels with Hellenistic cult-meals, see Klinghardt 1996 and Klauck 1982.

<sup>128</sup> For instance, one problem is that the four cups of wine at the Passover (cf. *m. Pesach*. 10) cannot easily be mapped onto the much simpler rite in Corinth. Indeed, opening and closing common meals with blessings was not limited to Passover but also pertained to Sabbath meals and other common meals.

Notably, Klinghardt 1996 and Smith 2003 argue forcefully that the meal pattern followed by the

fundamental importance both of the Passover and the Lord's Supper do permit analogy, even if direct patterning is harder to establish.<sup>129</sup> Both in Paul's account and that of the synoptic Gospels,<sup>130</sup> the words and actions of Jesus stand as the foundation of a continued practice, in the same way that the events of Passover stand as the foundation for later celebration and "remembrance" (cf. Exod 12:1–20; *m. Pesach.* 10.4).<sup>131</sup> The fact that the bread-as-body represents the vicarious quality of Jesus' death and that Jesus' blood is a "new covenant" – a concept with important links to the Old Testament, Jewish tradition and Paul's own theology<sup>132</sup> – indicates that the meal was central to the formation and practice of the community. Or, rather, it should have been; though the Corinthians have fallen far short of this in Paul's eyes.

It appears, then, that Paul passed on the tradition of the Lord's Supper to the Corinthians with a specific order, liturgical formulae and theological significance. Indeed, this is the earliest such ritual we have for Christianity and Paul's explicit indebtedness to others (11:23a) provides precious insight into the flow and use of such traditions in the early church.<sup>133</sup>

---

Corinthians was that of the general hellenistic meal. One wonders, however, whether their homogenization of all first-century hellenistic meals truly offers an analytic advance over previous models or whether it would have been recognized by those practicing the meals in antiquity; cf. the criticisms of Smith in Hurtado 2003.

<sup>129</sup> In fact, this is largely the point of Betz 1990 who is more concerned with the theological links between the exodus Passover elements (Ex 12–13) and the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor 11:17–34, than with actual meal practice which he notes is not identical (241).

<sup>130</sup> Most scholars argue that the accounts in Mark and Matthew, at least, are independent of Paul; cf. the excursus in Wolff 1996, 265–273; cf. Hofius 2002, 193–201 and note the helpful comparative chart (including Justin Martyr, Hippolytus and Syriac liturgy) in Lietzmann 1931, 59. Van Cangh 1996 argues that Paul has altered the original version which is found in Mark. Less plausibly, Watson 2007a has argued that Paul's account is the original, received by direct revelation, which Mark has reworked.

<sup>131</sup> This context is not considered by Smith 2003, 189 who argues that the memorial meal of the Epicureans is the "closest parallel" to the Lord's supper. However, the text adduced in support (p. 58), Diog. Laer. 10.18, bears little resemblance to 1 Cor 11:23b–25 beyond the bare fact of instituting a common meal.

<sup>132</sup> "New covenant" is present, as is well known, in Jer 31:31; cf. CD 6:19. For Paul's use of covenant language, which does not often occupy a central place in his letters but seems to be important to his theology, see Rom 9–11; 2 Cor 3:6–18; Gal 4:24; cf. the more comprehensive discussion in Wright 1991.

<sup>133</sup> One might also mention 7:17 with the explicit reminders of Paul's teaching: Εἰ μὴ ἐκάστῳ ὡς

### 5.2.4 Summary of explicit reminders in 1 Corinthians

From these explicit reminders we have gleaned a remarkably detailed picture of Paul's preaching in Corinth, the conversion of (at least some of) the Corinthian Christians and further ethical and liturgical materials. Paul continually emphasizes the centrality of his "word of the cross" during his mission in Corinth, and we saw that although this probably does reflect a crucial part of his message, it is the rhetorical demands of the letter that prompted such a singular focus here. Paul made use of traditions which he received concerning the death, resurrection (by God's agency) and subsequent appearances of Christ.

Paul's preaching included a call to faith, to which the Corinthian Christians responded positively and he taught about baptism as the rite of entry into the Christian community. Baptism was performed "into the name of Christ." Belief and baptism were accompanied by the experience of receiving the Spirit, which was very important to the Corinthian community, as seen in Paul's discussion of πνευματικά (see §6.2.2.3).

Furthermore, Paul imparted ethical teachings, which he refers to as "his ways in Christ Jesus" which included at least such general topics as πορνεία and εἰδωλολατρία. Finally, Paul imparted a number of traditions, some of which he commends the Corinthians for keeping (and which are, accordingly, not elucidated), while he chastises them for deviating from the tradition of the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον which he established while with them.

These aspects form a framework of ἔνδοξα upon which Paul bases various arguments and addresses a number of problems in Corinth. In fact, these items in large

---

ἐμέρισεν ὁ κύριος, ἕκαστον ὡς κέκληκεν ὁ θεός, οὕτως περιπατεῖτω. καὶ οὕτως ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις πάσαις διατάσσομαι. However, while Paul may have "ordered" it so in his communities, the fact that he addresses it here (1) with no mention of it being a reminder and (2) with the present tense διατάσσομαι, suggests that he did not do so at Corinth. See Chester 2003, 95–105 for a discussion of this passage in relation to Paul's notion of conversion.

part provide a general framework for the material from the direct and implicit appeals to knowledge, among which there is a number of allusions to aspects of Paul's teaching already discussed.

### 5.3 Paul's Explicit Reminders in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians

In turning to a comparison of Paul's explicit reminders about his teaching in these letters two points need to be emphasized at the outset. First, and importantly, these reminders do not, in and of themselves, signify that the teaching to which they refer was more foundational than other material Paul passed on. Neither are they to be considered comprehensive. The fact that something occurs in an explicit reminder is entirely due to the exigencies of a given rhetorical situation. This leads to the second point. Although these reminders provide the most explicit, and thus the clearest, picture of particular materials that Paul imparted to his converts, they are brought up because, in many cases, Paul evidently thought that his audience needed the reminder. Even when the element of reinforcement is absent, the element of re-application is present (e.g. 1 Cor 15:3–8). Indeed, while the explicit reminders will provide a framework for our assessment of direct and implicit appeals to knowledge in subsequent chapters, this material includes teachings that did not "stick" for Paul's communities and there is an intrinsic element of reinforcement in making the reminder explicit.

The differences between Paul's reminders about his teaching in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians are immediately striking. In the first place, the material covered in 1 Corinthians is much broader than that in 1 Thessalonians. Paul refers to specific traditions (11:2), in particular the Lord's Supper and Paul's gospel, which the Corinthians also hold in common with other early Christian communities. In the account of Paul's mission in Thessalonica there is no mention of "belief" as the response, nor do the explicit reminders

mention baptism or the reception of the Spirit.<sup>134</sup> Paul's explicit reminders of his teaching in 1 Corinthians have all of these things. However, the divine epithet "living and true" which emphasizes monotheism in 1 Thess 1:9 is absent from the explicit reminders in 1 Corinthians. Further, the emphasis on love apparent in Paul's communal and social instructions is absent from the above Corinthian materials. Finally, while 1 Thess 1:10 introduces the topic of the *parousia*, which is so important for the rest of the letter, 1 Corinthians contains no such explicit eschatological reference in the above material.

This discrepancy is helpfully illuminated by the rhetorical situation of each letter. In the case of 1 Thessalonians, Paul writes to a community of recent converts who were under external pressure from their pagan and Jewish neighbors (see §4.1.2). In such a situation, there was not yet space for philosophical speculation such as that which prompted Paul's recourse to the gospel in 1 Cor 15. Further, the Thessalonian community, being under duress, did not have the luxury of factional infighting and politics that the Corinthians did in a situation where they had been judged innocuous by Gallio. On a related note, the factions in Corinth appear to have been linked to the influence of other teachers, a phenomenon that had yet to occur in Thessalonica.

In addition to differences of omission, Paul also makes different use of the same material in each letter, again linked with the rhetorical situations.<sup>135</sup> In 1 Thessalonians, Paul reminds the community that they converted to the true God to "wait for his son from heaven, whom he raised from the dead" (1 Thess 1:10). This evokes the same narrative to which 1 Cor 1:18–22; 2:1–5; and 15:3–8 refer. However, while it is used in 1 Corinthians to emphasize the certainty of the future resurrection (1 Cor 15) or the foolishness of the message (1:18–22; 2:1–5), Paul refers to the resurrection of Christ to remind the

---

<sup>134</sup> On the mention of the Spirit in 1 Thess 4:8, see §7.2.4.

<sup>135</sup> Paul's use of *pars pro toto* (or synecdoche) to evoke a whole narrative while emphasizing a particular aspect has been explored helpfully by Mitchell 1994.

Thessalonians that the risen Christ is the one who will "rescue us from the wrath to come" (1 Thess 1:10). For the Corinthians Paul aims his reminders aim at correction, for the Thessalonians, at hope. Similarly, the emphasis on God as the "living and true God" is designed to reinforce the power and authority of God in the face of persecution.

In the light of the starkly different rhetorical situations, the commonalities between Paul's explicit reminders of his teaching in each letter are remarkable. Although the emphases of Paul's references are different, Paul spoke in both places about Christ's death and resurrection, the latter accomplished by God. Further, in both situations he felt the need to recount various aspects of his conduct during his initial mission, revealing that the gospel message was accompanied by the power of the Holy Spirit. For the Thessalonians this preempts criticism against sophistry while for the Corinthians it responds to criticism for the lack (!) of sophistry. This is linked with the fact that Paul holds himself and his conduct up as the example to imitate both for the Thessalonians and the Corinthians. With respect to the latter, and in light of the relationship breakdown between himself, Peter and the church in Antioch (cf. Gal 2:11–13), Paul's use of himself as an example involves some irony since the focus of the letter is on unity and humility within the church. Perhaps pointing to himself – in a rhetorical situation in which his own status was in question and in which his actions in Antioch could have been known (especially if the Cephas group were in fact linked with Peter) – worked against Paul, contributing to the apparent failure of 1 Corinthians to reconcile the groups to himself.

That these various elements of Paul's teaching were put to different use attests to their fundamental importance.<sup>136</sup> Paul's use of the story of Christ's death and resurrection and the demonstration and presence of the Holy Spirit shows that they impinge upon

---

<sup>136</sup> Note the similar comments on the importance of the cross in Galatians and 1 Corinthians in Wolter 2011, 125.

multiple areas of the Christian life, from hope to humility. This also indicates that the context and emphases which these elements acquire in Paul's letters do not clearly reflect the shape or context in which they were originally presented.<sup>137</sup> One would do well to observe, however, that the foundational quality of these teachings is not demonstrated merely by their being an explicit reminder to Paul's teaching, but in the fact that they are cited to achieve different goals in more than one context.

Perhaps even more notable than these shared foundational narratives and experiences are the similarities between the moral teachings mentioned explicitly in each letter, in particular the evident overlap on the subjects of idolatry, sexual immorality and greed,<sup>138</sup> which I identified above (Excursus 3) as common *topoi* in Jewish moral exhortation. What is significant here is the fact that although the Corinthians were evidently practicing sexual immorality (1 Cor 5:1; 6:12–20), flirting with idolatry (8–10) and being greedy (socially, politically and perhaps materially, 11:21–22), making these reminders an obvious choice, the Thessalonians were not (1 Thess 4:1). The re-statement of these issues in 1 Thessalonians, before any transgressions had actually taken place, indicates that these moral strictures were of fundamental importance for Paul's understanding of the life of believers. The precise nature of this importance will be discussed further in chapter 7.

### 5.3.1 Moving forward

The items identified in this chapter have the strongest claim to being part of Paul's initial teaching at Thessalonica and Corinth. The direct and implicit appeals to knowledge (chs. 6 and 7 respectively) are much more difficult to link with Paul's teaching precisely because they lack an explicit tag such as "as I said to you before." Therefore, the explicit

---

<sup>137</sup> Cf. the comments of Calhoun 2011, 96 on the use of theological formulae.

<sup>138</sup> Idolatry: 1 Thess 1:9; 1 Cor 6:9; Sexual immorality and greed: 1 Thess 4:3–8; 1 Cor 6:9–10.

reminders provide a framework within which (and against which) to explore Paul's more subtle appeals to the knowledge of his readers.

Importantly, the above material, taken alone and cumulatively, implies a broader context than the points explicitly mentioned by Paul. As we saw in Excursus 2, conversion involves more than accepting a few propositions, whether historical or theoretical, but rather whatever propositions there may be are included within a broader understanding of the world, a symbolic universe. In this way, the direct and implicit appeals often flesh out the points which explicit reminders introduced. Those which do not easily fit within a context suggested by the latter will necessarily have a more tenuous relationship with Paul's initial teaching. This creates a sort of graded evaluation with explicit reminders furnishing the most certain information, direct and implicit appeals closely tied to the certain information inhabiting the second level and those with no clear link having the least certainty. However, as will become evident in chapter 7, even implicit appeals with no direct tie to Paul's explicit reminders of his teaching can be more or less probable based on a number of other contextual considerations.

## Chapter 6

# Paul's Direct Appeals to Knowledge

Moving on from the last chapter's concern with explicit *reminders* of Pauline teaching, this chapter turns to other evidence for presumed understanding, beginning with direct *appeals* to such knowledge. These include phrases such as "you know," "you have no need for us to say anything," "we do not want you to be ignorant," "now concerning," and "do you not know." Such appeals make certain claims regarding the knowledge of the audience which need to be evaluated for their rhetorical force and connection with Paul's initial teaching. To that end, this chapter follows the same format as the previous chapter, beginning with an exploration of the material from 1 Thessalonians (§6.1) and 1 Corinthians (§6.2) respectively before closing with a comparative analysis (§6.3). New in this chapter, however, is the element of comparison with the explicit reminders in order to assess the way in which this material is related or unrelated.

### 6.1 Appeals to the Thessalonians' Knowledge

In 1 Thessalonians, such direct appeals to knowledge occur only in 4:13–5:11, the main eschatological discourse.<sup>1</sup> In these verses we begin to get a fuller picture of Paul's initial teaching on the *parousia* already mentioned in the letter (1:10; 2:19; 3:13). As will be seen, references to knowledge are both positive and negative, things the Thessalonians know (4:14; 5:1) as well as those which they do not (4:13). Importantly for this study, these two pericopes display a mix of *new* information bolstered by appeals to *previous*

---

<sup>1</sup> The recurrent phrase "you know" in 2:1–12 might be seen as a general appeal to knowledge, though in fact the content of what is known is without exception information about Paul and his team's conduct during their time in Thessalonica.

teaching and shared understanding.

### 6.1.1 On resurrection and timing (4:13–18)

Paul's encouragement regarding the dead Thessalonian Christians and the *parousia* of Jesus highlights a lacuna in the Thessalonians' knowledge with the phrase οὐ θέλομεν δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, a common Pauline tag.<sup>2</sup> It is not immediately clear, however, whether the lacuna involves a particular emphasis or an entire topic "concerning those who are sleeping" (so Barclay 2003, 133).

What is it, then, that the Thessalonians did not know? Some scholars have argued that the Thessalonian Christians lacked knowledge of (or belief in) the bodily resurrection of believers (as opposed to that of Jesus) either because some had adopted a gnostic, spiritualized interpretation of the resurrection (e.g. Harnisch 1973, 22–27) or because Paul did not teach about it at the founding of the community (resulting in the Thessalonians' belief that those who did not survive until the *parousia* would not be saved).<sup>3</sup>

Regarding the former, if the future bodily resurrection were actively being disputed, as at Corinth, it seems strange that Paul would not have addressed the problem at its root.<sup>4</sup> It is more likely that Paul had not taught about the resurrection, perhaps due to his truncated time in Thessalonica. However, if this were the case, it is striking that Paul's only direct statement of Christian resurrection *per se* is a brief mention in v. 16 (Best 1972, 181). Lüdemann argues that in v. 14 Paul "keeps the focus on the statement concerning the *parousia*" and presents this as proof that he did not preach about the resurrection due to his imminent eschatological expectation (Lüdemann 1984, 219). If the

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Rom 1:13; 1 Cor 10:1; 12:1; 2 Cor 1:8.

<sup>3</sup> E.g. Barclay 1993, 516; Dibelius 1937, 23; Lüdemann 1984, 212; Nicholl 2004, 36–37.

<sup>4</sup> See also the critique of Lüdemann 2003, 148–151. On 1 Cor 15, see §7.3.3.

Thessalonians' concerns were rooted in a lack of knowledge about the resurrection of believers, why would Paul deliberately avoid reassuring them about that and merely affirm their belief in *Christ's* death and resurrection (v. 14; cf. 1:10)?<sup>5</sup> Although the idea that God will "lead" the dead implicitly includes resurrection,<sup>6</sup> Lüdemann is right that Paul's emphasis remains fixed on the *parousia*. In this light another interpretation should be sought.<sup>7</sup>

Another possibility is that the Thessalonians are concerned not about the ultimate resurrection (and thus salvation) of the dead but about their participation in the glorious *parousia* of the Lord. Paul addresses the problem of the *relative priority* of the living rather than the *absolute priority*.<sup>8</sup> Additionally, Paul does not try to *correct* the Thessalonians' understanding but to *complete* it, perhaps as a result of leaving Thessalonica too early.<sup>9</sup> Paul states in v. 15 that the living will have absolutely no priority (οὐ μὴ φθάσειν) over the dead and that before the believers are snatched up (ἀρπάζειν) "the dead will rise first in Christ."<sup>10</sup> It is still not clear precisely what the Thessalonians were concerned about – whether participation in the interim messianic reign,<sup>11</sup> the ability of the dead to be "assumed" at the *parousia* (Plevnik 1984), or simply participation in the glorious *parousia*-event<sup>12</sup> – as each has its problems. However, given the cursory

---

<sup>5</sup> So Schreiber 2007, 334–336; John Barclay 2003, 136 states that Lüdemann's theory "steps so far into the realm of speculation that our steps become very insecure."

<sup>6</sup> With *inter alios* Laub 1973, 125; Green 2007, 17–18 *pace* Lüdemann 1984, 218–219.

<sup>7</sup> Lüdemann also pushes Paul's eschatological expectation too far, since Paul also admits the unexpected arrival of the Day of the Lord in 5:2; see esp. Riesner 1998, 387–393.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Plevnik 1997, 96–97 who argues that Paul did teach about the resurrection, but his emphasis on the assumption of the faithful posed problems for the Thessalonians who had difficulty understanding how the dead believers could be assumed at the *parousia*; cf. also Laub 1973, 124; Frame 1912, 164 *pace* Harnisch 1973, 27.

<sup>9</sup> So Haufe 1999, 81; Laub 1973, 130.

<sup>10</sup> For this interpretation of οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ see Konstan 2007. This corresponds with the sense of διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ in v. 14; Coulot 2006a, 503.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Dupont 1952, 40–41; Hoffmann 1966, 232; Best 1972, 181.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Adams 2006, 13; Green 2007, 20; Schreiber 2007, 348.

treatment of resurrection *per se* (note the different authoritative tone in 1 Cor 15) and the emphasis on priority ("first...then") it is probable that knowledge of resurrection was not at the root of the Thessalonians' worries. On the contrary, it is likely that Paul *had* included teaching about the resurrection of Christians along with the *parousia* (v. 14); the Thessalonians were concerned about the relation between the two.<sup>13</sup> The physical or spiritual state of those resurrected is not directly addressed though parallels with 1 Cor 15 could suggest a bodily resurrection (cf. §7.3.3).

### 6.1.2 The coming day of judgment (5:1–11)

Paul begins 5:1–11 with the phrase *περὶ δὲ τῶν χρόνων καὶ τῶν καιρῶν*, probably continuing to respond to some concern raised by the Thessalonian congregation (cf. 1 Cor 7:1; 7:25; 8:1) perhaps transmitted by Timothy in his report to Paul (1 Thess 3:6). Commentators are nearly unanimous in seeing the phrase "times and seasons" as a stock phrase drawn from Jewish eschatological (or apocalyptic) discourse (cf. Dan 2:21) referring to the end-times.<sup>14</sup> In the immediate context, it is a circumlocution for the "Day of the Lord which is coming like a thief in the night" (v. 2) which Paul claims that the Thessalonians know well (*ἀκριβῶς*).<sup>15</sup>

The question thus arises: how could Paul presume that the Thessalonians were aware that Day of the Lord would come "like a thief in the night?" On one hand, some notion of the Day of the Lord may have already been familiar to the small contingent of Jews and God-fearers among the Thessalonian believers. The concept of *יום יהוה* goes back at least to the time of Amos (Amos 5:18–20) and is a regular fixture in Jewish

---

<sup>13</sup> So Coulot 2006a, 501; Laub 1973, 130; Luckensmeyer 2009, 271; Merklein 1992, 405–40.

<sup>14</sup> E.g. von Dobschütz 1909, 204; Collins 1984a, 163; Nicholl 2004, 50. The concept of the Day of the Lord is another way to address the *parousia*; Luckensmeyer 2009, 275.

<sup>15</sup> Pace Wenham 1995, 307, this phrase is not a "tradition indicator" but simply a reference to the Thessalonians' knowledge. The origin of their knowledge and its relationship to tradition (either Pauline or pre-Pauline) must be determined on other grounds.

eschatology, most often with an emphasis on judgment.<sup>16</sup> In the LXX, *יום יהוה* became *ἡμέρα (τοῦ) κυρίου* and from there was easily appropriated by early Christians, with Christ in place of God as the "Lord" (e.g. 1 Cor 1:8; 5:5; Acts 20:20/Joel 3:31).<sup>17</sup> Indeed, Paul's metaphor about the Day of the Lord as thief is unique to early Christianity and likely comes from an early Jesus tradition (cf. Matt 24:43; Lk 12:39; 2 Pet 3:10; cf. Rev 3:3; 16:15).<sup>18</sup> Therefore, even if there were some familiarity with the concept within Jewish circles of the community, the distinctly Christian spin (with Christ as the "Lord") and the metaphor of the thief in the night must have been delivered by Paul and company.<sup>19</sup>

It is the aspect of the "Day's" judgment that Paul addresses in v. 4 where he emphatically contrasts the Thessalonians (*ὑμεῖς δὲ, ἀδελφοί*) with those outside who are headed for destruction, balancing the scales for a community under duress (1:6).<sup>20</sup> In this case, the contrast indicates a lacuna in the Thessalonian Christians' understanding of the "times and seasons." According to Paul, the Thessalonians are "not in darkness," vulnerable to the destructive day (5:4), but they are in fact "children of light and children of the day" (v. 5). The repetition of "day" in v. 5 indicates that Paul is emphasizing the saving quality of the Day of the Lord for the Thessalonians over against Paul's apparent previous emphasis on judgment (Rigaux 1956, 552).

One final point is worth noting here. In Paul's theological grounding for the

---

<sup>16</sup> E.g. Isa 13:6, 9; Ezek 13:5; Joel 1:15; 2:11; Mal 4:5; Zeph 2:2; cf. 1QpZeph 1:1; *Pss. Sol.* 15:11–13; cf. e.g. Rigaux 1956, 555; Holtz 1986, 212; Wanamaker 1990, 179; Légasse 1999, 283. On the concept of the Day of the Lord itself, see Hoffmann 1981; Ishai-Rosenboim 2006; von Rad 1965, 119–125.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Collins 1984a, 163; Rigaux 1975, 326; Wanamaker 1990, 179.

<sup>18</sup> See esp. Tuckett 1990, 171; cf. *inter alios* Collins 1984a, 165; Aejmelaeus 1985, 29; Kim 2002b, 231–232; Luckensmeyer 2009, 289.

<sup>19</sup> So Bruce 1982, 109; Holtz 1986, 212; Luckensmeyer 2009, 288–289.

<sup>20</sup> Numerous scholars have noted the contrast here; e.g. Hendrix 1991a, 110–111; Riesner 1998, 386–387; Nicholl 2004, 56–57; Luckensmeyer 2009, 275, 291.

encouragement throughout 5:1–11, he returns to the Thessalonians' belief in the death and resurrection of Jesus, already mentioned in 1:10 and 4:14. Paul states that the ground of the Thessalonians' confidence in their salvation is that they have been appointed for it by God "through our Lord Jesus Christ who died" (5:9–10). This compressed reference to the death and resurrection narrative is applied differently, however, as Paul emphasizes not the resurrection *per se* but the fact that Jesus' death was for the benefit of believers (ὕπερ ἡμῶν; 5:10).<sup>21</sup>

### 6.1.3 Summary of direct appeals to knowledge in 1 Thessalonians

The direct appeals to knowledge are fewer than Paul's explicit reminders of his teaching and his implicit appeals to knowledge, but they shed important light on the Thessalonian Christians' knowledge base. Notably, for all the apparent emphasis that eschatological matters received from Paul while he was in Thessalonica, there remained some crucial lacunae in the Thessalonians' understanding of the *parousia* and resurrection. The precise nature of these lacunae is of course difficult to pinpoint, but it seems that Paul taught about the bodily resurrection of Jesus (cf. 1:10) as well as the bodily resurrection of Christians. However, the relationship between the final resurrection and the *parousia* of Christ was unclear to the Thessalonians and this, perhaps coupled with the persecution of their pagan neighbors (Barclay 1993, 515–516), caused the church much grief. Further, the Thessalonians seem to have grasped the notion of the Day of the Lord as judgment, but were concerned about how this would work out for them. Whether Paul overemphasized judgment or the Thessalonians simply misunderstood him, in 4:13–5:11 Paul tries to reframe the perspective of the Thessalonians as "children of the day." Finally, the belief in Jesus' death and resurrection appeared as the grounds for both encouragements (4:14; 5:9–10), demonstrating again that the most fundamental beliefs

---

<sup>21</sup> See further §§5.2.1, 9.3.2.1.

have implications for multiple areas of thought (cf. §5.3 above). Thus, within 1 Thessalonians, Paul alludes to the death and resurrection of Jesus to provide hope for ultimate (eschatological) rescue (1:9–10; 5:9–10) and to provide hope for the resurrection of the dead at Christ's *parousia* (4:14–18).

Finally, it is important that the material identified above is linked closely with the framework provided by the explicit reminders. In 1 Thess 1:9–10 Paul recalls the Thessalonian believers' conversion from idols to the one God, to wait for his son from heaven whom he raised. This "nutshell" is a highly condensed formulation that draws on a framework for the *parousia* which is further elucidated in 4:13–5:11, both in terms of the *parousia* and of the Day of the Lord. Further, 1:10 alludes to the importance of the resurrection of Jesus, which forms the foundation for the encouragement in 4:13–5:11 regarding the Thessalonian believers' participation and status in that apocalyptic, eschatological moment. In this way, the basic framework of the Thessalonians' knowledge outlined by that particular explicit reminder in 1:9–10 provides conceptual space within which the material from Paul's direct appeals to knowledge can fit.

## 6.2 Appeals to the Corinthians' Knowledge

In contrast with 1 Thessalonians, there is a large number of direct appeals to knowledge in 1 Corinthians.<sup>22</sup> The majority of these, however, are fraught with rhetorical ambiguity. Paul regularly uses the phrase *περὶ δὲ* to introduce familiar topics, but how far does such familiarity extend and in what way do these topics relate to Paul's initial teaching and/or the letter received from the Corinthians (1 Cor 7:1)? In his discussion of

---

<sup>22</sup> This stands in marked contrast also with 2 Corinthians which has only one direct appeal to the Corinthians' knowledge: "For you know [γινώσκετε] the grace of our Lord, Jesus Christ; namely that although he was rich he became poor for your sake so that you might become rich by his poverty" (2 Cor 8:9). The *περὶ δὲ* formula and the question *οὐκ οἴδατε*, so common in 1 Corinthians, are entirely absent in 2 Corinthians. Perhaps the increasingly antagonistic rhetorical situation in 2 Corinthians did not afford such appeals to the knowledge of the interlocutors.

idolatry and food sacrificed to idols (1 Cor 8–10), Paul twice states οἴδαμεν ὅτι, "we know that we all have knowledge...we know that there are no idols in the world and that there is no God but one" (8:1, 4). Who, though, is to be included in the first person plural? We saw above (§3.1) that the significance of the oscillation between the first person singular and plural in 1 Corinthians is not always clear. Paul also makes negative statements of knowledge in 1 Corinthians, presumably indicating the ignorance of the audience on a given subject (10:1; 11:3; 12:3; cf. 1 Thess 4:13).

Finally Paul employs the rhetorical question οὐκ οἴδατε ὅτι ten times (1 Cor 3:16; 5:6; 6:2–3, 9, 15–16, 19; 9:13, 24). But when Paul asks such a pointed question, does he really expect his audience to know, or is it an attempt to impart new information in a striking fashion?

This section will begin by looking at the only clearly affirmative statement of "you know" in 1 Corinthians (12:2). Following this I explore the various *περὶ δὲ* constructions to determine the extent to which knowledge of Paul's founding mission is in view. I then turn to Paul's negative statements of knowledge (e.g. "I do not want you to be ignorant that...") before closing with a discussion of the rhetorical question, οὐκ οἴδατε.

### 6.2.1 "You know that when you were Gentiles..."

In 1 Cor 12:2 Paul states baldly, "You know [οἴδατε] that when you were Gentiles, whenever you were enticed you were lead away to mute idols."<sup>23</sup> This passage clearly points to a time *before* the Corinthians' conversion in a similar contrast to that seen in 6:11, though there Paul nuances his claim with *τινες* (cf. §5.2.2). Further, the negative appraisal of idols assumes a post-conversion point of view (cf. 1 Thess 1:9; §6.2.2.2). In fact, this verse is a narrative of the Gentile Corinthians' conversion *in nuce* (cf. Vos 1993,

---

<sup>23</sup> The syntax of this sentence is not straightforward as the temporal clause ὅτε ἔθνη, lacks a verb, on the assumption that the participle ἀπαγόμενοι is periphrastic and requires the verb ἦτε; cf. Fee 1987, 576–577; Thiselton 2000, 911–912.

263, 268). With that, it assumes a significant cognitive shift on the part of these Corinthians which deserves comment.

It is important for Paul's characterization of the Corinthian community that *they know* that they *were* Gentiles and, by implication, *that they are Gentiles no longer*.<sup>24</sup> In the first place, this shift requires a re-orientation of their conception of humanity so that there is a category of ἔθνος, Gentile. Such a category is supplied from the Jewish concept of the idolatrous "nations" apart from whom Israel stands,<sup>25</sup> manifest also in the typical Jewish binary distinctions of Jew and Gentile which Paul makes use of elsewhere.<sup>26</sup> Furthermore, the shift Paul presupposes requires that the Corinthians identify as a group apart from the Gentiles, the place typically reserved for the Jewish people.

This verse, then, suggests that part of the Corinthians' conversion included a re-construal of humanity and a re-ordering of their self-identification as *not* Gentiles. I will return to the Corinthian community self-understanding in chapter 7, but it is significant that Paul brings it to the fore here in an effort to differentiate their behavior with respect to spiritual utterance (12:3) from their behavior in pagan cultic contexts.<sup>27</sup>

## 6.2.2 "Now concerning...": Paul's response to familiar topics

As I have noted several times thus far, the formula *περὶ δέ* is common in ancient Greek writing – from literature to basic letters – as a means to introduce a new topic familiar to the readers or listeners. A large amount of relevant data for this point has been gathered by Margaret Mitchell (1989), who convincingly demonstrates that the *περὶ δέ*

---

<sup>24</sup> See Chester 2003, 93 n. 147 who claims that 1 Cor 12:2 is a "clear expression of this distinction" between the Corinthian community and Gentiles and notes that "Paul speaks of being a Gentile in the past tense." Paul's assumed distinction between the Corinthian community and other groups is addressed more fully in ch. 7.

<sup>25</sup> Note Exod 19:5 (LXX): ἔσεσθέ μοι λαὸς περιούσιος ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ἐθνῶν; cf. Lev 18:24, 28; 20:23; Deut 4:33–35; 6:14; 7:6; 1 Sam 8:5; 2 Sam 7:23; Ezra 6:21; Tob 14:6; Wis 14:11, 15:15, etc.

<sup>26</sup> So Fitzmyer 2008, 457. Rom 3:29; 9:24; 1 Cor 1:23; Gal 2:14–15; cf. his use of Ἕλληνα in place of ἔθνος in Rom 1:16, 2:9–10; 3:9; 10:12; 1 Cor 1:22, 24; 10:32; 12:13; Gal 3:28; Col 3:11.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. further §6.2.2.3 below.

formula, *in and of itself*, does not indicate a response to a written letter, or even necessarily any question from the recipient.<sup>28</sup> "[T]he *περὶ δέ* formula is nothing more or less than a way of introducing a topic the only requirement of which is that it be readily known to both writer and reader" (Mitchell 1989, 236).<sup>29</sup>

This is an important observation as far as it goes. However, it leaves open the question as to whether the *περὶ δέ* formula in *1 Corinthians* indicates Paul's responses to Corinthian questions (written or oral). Clearly it does so in 7:1 when the genitive following the preposition is the phrase *ῶν ἐγράψατε*. However, the connection between the formula and the Corinthian letter is already tenuous by 7:25 (*περὶ δὲ τῶν παρθένων*).<sup>30</sup> Is the formula used here because a specific question was asked about the virgins or did Paul bring it in here simply by attraction to the earlier use in 7:1? Accordingly, scholars are increasingly reticent to link the *περὶ δέ* formula to the Corinthian letter, noting simply that they appear to constitute a response to some sort of question or issue familiar to the congregation.<sup>31</sup> For the purposes of this study, the most important point is the fact that the *περὶ δέ* formula introduces a topic that is familiar to the readers. In this way, the introductory phrase functions as a direct appeal to the Corinthians' knowledge.

#### 6.2.2.1 Concerning *ῶν ἐγράψατε* (7:1)

In 1 Cor 7:1, Paul introduces an issue raised by the Corinthians in a letter he received, presumably carried by one of the groups mentioned in 1 Corinthians. The logical and syntactical structure of 7:1–2 suggests that Paul introduces the topic of their written questions (*περὶ δὲ ῶν ἐγράψατε*), repeats a position taken by the Corinthians (it is

---

<sup>28</sup> This was the view prevalent among scholars for most of the 20th century; e.g. Weiss 1910, 169; Schlatter 1934, 208–209; Hurd 1965, *passim*; Conzelmann 1975, 115.

<sup>29</sup> Her point is further supported by similar transitions in Hebrew between halakhic decisions in 4QMMT, noted earlier (§2.2.3).

<sup>30</sup> So rightly Héring 1962, 57; Mitchell 1989, 256.

<sup>31</sup> E.g. Fotopoulos 2005, 620; Keener 2005, 62; Fitzmyer 2008, 277.

good for a man to abstain from sexual intercourse) and then qualifies their position with his own teaching (note the contrastive δέ).<sup>32</sup> Although elsewhere Paul engages with fictive interlocutors in diatribe style (1 Cor 15:35; Rom 2:17–29; 3:1, 9, *passim*) as is common also for Epictetus (e.g. *Diss.* 1.4.16; 1.19), it seems unlikely that the position stated in 7:1b does not represent the views of at least *some* in Corinth since it follows directly on his reference to their letter.<sup>33</sup> The closely related περὶ δέ clause in 7:25, concerning virgins, notably does not precede a citation of a Corinthian position, thus providing no more information about the views of the Corinthians.<sup>34</sup>

These passages tell us little about the actual content of Paul's initial preaching and teaching. Indeed, the fact that he goes into such detail, making an effort of supply authority for his statements (7:10, 16) and noting where he has none (vv. 25, 40), suggests that this is new information for the Corinthians. However, the very fact that the Corinthians asked Paul about these issues, at least in general terms, indicates the important fact that they understood their new belief in Christ to impinge on this area of their life. In a direct way, this says more about how the Corinthians viewed Paul, as marriage and family was a common topic among philosophers and rhetors in antiquity.<sup>35</sup>

---

<sup>32</sup> This appears to be the majority position among scholars today; see Yarbrough 1985, 93–94; West 1987, 20; Fee 1987, 273; Deming 1995, 110; Schrage 1991–2001, 2:59–60; Still 2004, 29; Fotopoulos 2005; but see the arguments of Caragounis 1996 and Fitzmyer 2008, 278. The traditional view, well represented by Origen (*Fr. 1 Cor.* 33.23–24), sees 7:1b as the Corinthian position that Paul strongly affirms, while the "concession" (συγγνώμη, v. 6) is for the benefit of the weak; cf. Bengel 1835, 124.

<sup>33</sup> The connection with Epictetus has led some to refer to this as a "diatribe-like style" (e.g. Deming 1995, 115; Fitzmyer 2008, 338; Witherington 1995, 187). On Epictetus' dialogical diatribe, see below §9.2.2. Hurd 1965, 275 suggested that the view that "it is good for a man not to touch a woman" in fact represents Paul's original teaching which he now is forced to qualify due to his apparent *volte-face* in his intermediate letter (5:9). However, this reconstruction is tenuous, at best, and goes far beyond the passage itself.

<sup>34</sup> Richard Oster has attempted to tie the celibacy of Corinthian believers to the "pattern" of sacral celibacy among devotees of Egyptian gods (Oster 1992, 58–64). However, this view does not easily fit with the discussion of πόρνη in 1 Cor 6:12–20.

<sup>35</sup> So the often noted discussion in Musonius Rufus 13ab (which begins with the prompt, βίου καὶ γενέσεως παίδων κοινωνίαν κεφάλαιον εἶναι γάμου); cf. Plutarch *Conj. Prae.*; Dio Chrysostom *Or.* 38.15.7–8 (as an analogy for civic harmony); Philo *Spec. leg.* 1.138. See the numerous examples adduced in Deming 1995, 50–107.

Be that as it may, the gap between Jewish and Gentile sexual ethics was perceived to be so enormous by many Jewish observers (including Paul, cf. 1 Cor 5:1) that it would be surprising if Paul had not said anything about it.<sup>36</sup> We already noted above (§5.2.1–2) the moral transformation involved in conversion, recounted by Paul in 1 Cor 6:9–11, in which sexual immorality composed an important part of the "before" picture.

If this is correct, then what we see here is another instance of Paul missing his communicative mark. Earlier in the letter (5:1–13), Paul addresses a striking example of *πορνεία* and has to clarify the instructions in his previous letter concerning separation from sexually immoral people (*πόρνοι*, v. 9). The Corinthians apparently took this instruction to mean the sexually immoral *outside* the church (v. 10) – in perverse connection with Paul's own statement in 6:11 that they are no longer *πόρνοι* – while permitting (even boasting about) the sexual immorality *within* the church (vv. 2–6). So also, the translation of typically Jewish views of marriage and sexuality<sup>37</sup> onto the Corinthian Gentiles was not immediately successful in Paul's view. Rather than engaging in legitimate and useful sexual intercourse within marriage, it seems that the men were abstaining from sex with their wives and engaging in it with prostitutes (1 Cor 6:15–19).<sup>38</sup>

#### 6.2.2.2 Concerning *εἰδωλοθύτα* (8:1, 4–6)

The next issue addressed by Paul, that of *εἰδωλοθύτον*, is also introduced with a *περὶ δέ* clause in 8:1, 4.<sup>39</sup> As with 7:1, these introductory formulae are followed by

<sup>36</sup> E.g. *Let. Arist.* 152; Yarbrough 1985, 29–7 and Excursus 3.

<sup>37</sup> E.g. *Lev.* 18:1–20; *T. Lev.* 9:9–10; *T. Reub.* 5:5; *T. Naph.* 8:7–10; *Tob* 4:12; *Philo Spec. leg.* 1.138; *Dec.* 121–126; *Opif. mund.* 151; *Gen. Rab.* 51.9. A particularly striking parallel is *m. Ketub.* 5.6–7 in which minimum requirements are given for intercourse within marriage and upper limits for abstention for Torah study. Cf. Schrage 1991–2001, 2: 67–68; Weiss 1910, 171–173. See Thomas 1992, 426–428 for a comparison of "die restriktive Sexualmoral" in *Ps.-Phoc.* 205 and 1 Cor 7.

<sup>38</sup> This practice is in line with Plutarch's advice to married couples (*Conj. Prae.* 16 [140b], 18 [140c]). However, Michael Wolter 2010, 6 has argued that *πόρνη* in v. 15 should be understood "im Sinne des hellenistisch-jüdischen Sprachgebrauchs," as any woman who has sex with a man other than her husband. Nevertheless, in either case, the contrast between approving illicit sex and avoiding licit sex remains.

<sup>39</sup> The numerous problems raised by 1 Cor 8:1–11:1 are well known and solving them is

statements in line with the position of (at least some of) the Corinthians,<sup>40</sup> though it is impossible to be certain if the information was conveyed to Paul by letter or oral report.<sup>41</sup> Paul states in 8:1b, "We know that we all have knowledge" and in v. 4b, "we know that there is no such thing as an idol in this world and there is no God but one." Whether the word οἶδαμεν is part of a Corinthian "slogan" or simply Paul's affirmation of these points, as far as they go,<sup>42</sup> he characterizes his interlocutors as strict monotheists – in some ways even more strict than Paul himself turns out to be (10:19–22).<sup>43</sup> However, Paul responds that "this knowledge is not in everyone" (8:7) and that, in fact, some have a weak συνείδησις that could be violated in eating (cf. 8:10–13).<sup>44</sup>

8:1–7 indicates two things about the community that Paul has in view. On one hand, one group of the Corinthians had taken Paul's own monotheism to its logical conclusion; if there was only one true God, then idols truly were the mute, impotent objects of Jewish polemic (8:4–5; cf. 12:2).<sup>45</sup> Thus, the creed-like statement in v. 6 – which further explicates the "strong" Corinthian position in light of Paul's qualification in

---

(thankfully) well beyond the scope of this dissertation. In addition to the commentaries, see the various treatments in Cheung 1999; Fotopoulos 2003; Garland 2003; Gooch 1993; Newton 1998; Phua 2005; Shen 2010; Smit 2000; Willis 1985 and the continually underrated contribution of Tomson 1990, 151–220.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Lietzmann 1931, 37; Fee 1987, 365; Hofius 1997, 99; Fotopoulos 2003, 191–195, 208–220.

<sup>41</sup> John Fotopoulos 2005 has recently argued in detail that 1 Cor 8:1–9 constitutes the *partitio* for 8:1–11:1, introducing each topic of discussion with a statement of the Corinthian position and his modification of it (modifying the arguments of Smit 2000, 67–81). His analysis of the text is generally convincing, though the technical practice of a rhetorical *partitio* may not be appropriate to sub-sections in letters.

<sup>42</sup> Most scholars opt for the latter, e.g. Fee 1987, 365; Schrage 1991–2001, 2:229; Keener 2005, 73; Fitzmyer 2008, 338, 340. Some, however, choose the former, e.g. Fotopoulos 2005, 629; Still 2004, 29 n. 45.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. Fotopoulos 2003, 235, 249; Gooch 1993, 93; Héring 1962, 69.

<sup>44</sup> Scholars of Paul's use of συνείδησις tend to opt for συνείδησις as internal judge or law-giver, a moral consciousness (cf. Pierce 1955, 25; Eckstein 1983, 312; Bosman 2003, 263). The common translation of συνείδησις by "conscience" is problematic since both the term had a non-reflexive sense meaning simply "to know" or "to be aware" (what Lewis 1960, 182–187 referred to as the "weakened branch"; cf. LSJ s.v. 2, 3, 4). Cf. Tomson 1990, 159–162 who argues that the concept underlying συνείδησις here is the Rabbinic notion of מַחְשַׁבָּה (thought, intention).

<sup>45</sup> E.g. Isa 37:19–20; Wis 13–15; 1 Cor 12:2; cf. Phua 2005, 50–90; Schrage 1991–2001, 3:122; Wolff 1996, 283. See also Excursus 3.

v. 7 – includes only God and Jesus with no room for other cosmological beings.<sup>46</sup> Further, this "confession" includes the epithet ὁ πατήρ for God and describes him as the creator – ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα – and the goal of believers – ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν.<sup>47</sup> In parallel, the Lord Jesus Christ is attributed a mediatory role in creation, analogous to that seen in Col 1:15–20,<sup>48</sup> and a mediatory role in the believers' access to God (so Schlatter 1934, 256). The fact that this is the theology of some of *the Corinthians* is remarkable.

On the other hand, Paul represents the "weak" Corinthian brothers and sisters as henotheists or monolatrists, that is, those who worship or acknowledge only one god out of a larger group of gods. They are not necessarily in conflict with those who have "knowledge" and they may well affirm the confession in v. 6, though Paul thinks they have not quite got over their previous worship of idols. Thus, in seeing their fellow believers eating εἰδωλοθύτα, they are built up (οἰκοδομηθήσεται, v. 10) to commit idolatry in eating as an act that acknowledges the idol as such.<sup>49</sup>

These two points indicate that Paul's community had, in terms drawn from 1 Thessalonians, turned from idols to serve the living and true God (1 Thess 1:9–10), even if some had not yet come to terms with monotheism-proper. This God is the creator God who Paul and the Corinthians refer to as "the father," a relationship he has with Jesus as well as Paul and the Corinthians (1 Cor 1:3). Among a community composed largely of

---

<sup>46</sup> On this verse, see esp. Hofius 1997 followed by Fotopoulos 2003, 214. However, Hofius does not adequately address where (or, from whom) the Corinthians might get such a theological formulation, apart from his appeal to Deut 6:4 (the Shema) and 10:17 (Hofius 1997, 106–108).

<sup>47</sup> For the Greco-Roman and Jewish material on god as father, see §7.2.2 below.

<sup>48</sup> Hofius 1997, 99–102 is right to emphasize the ontological implications of this verse, which are downplayed by the more existential interpretation of Schrage 1991-2001, 2:241–245.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Bockmuehl 2000, 168–169; Cheung 1999, 128; Fotopoulos 2003, 249–250; Gooch 1993, 95–97 who rightly argue that Paul is coherent in his rejection of intentionally eating food offered to idols. There remains the intractable problem of whether or not the Corinthians themselves were divided on the issue of εἰδωλοθύτων or whether Paul inferred the problem from the information he was given. See the discussion and charts of scholarly positions in Fotopoulos 2003, 4–37, 41–45 who opts for recognized internal division.

Gentiles, these items have a high probability of featuring in Paul's initial teaching.

Furthermore, the inclusion of Jesus Christ as Lord and agent of creation (8:6) is a striking addition to an otherwise traditionally Jewish formulation and could only have come from Paul and his missionary team during their mission.<sup>50</sup> Thus, whether the "strong" were Jews, Gentiles or a combination of them (perhaps among the wealthier members?), their foundational confessions can be traced with high likelihood to Paul's missionary work.<sup>51</sup> Notably, Paul does not dispute the truth of these statements, but the practical application of Corinthian knowledge with respect to εἰδωλοθύτων and weak brethren.<sup>52</sup> While Paul does correct the cosmology of the Corinthians with his emphasis on the demonic (10:14–22), he does not "correct" their monotheistic theology.

It is striking, after Paul spent over a year with the Corinthian believers, that such an issue could still rear its head. Did Paul not address eating food sacrificed to idols while in Corinth?<sup>53</sup> If idolatry in general *was* a topic covered by Paul (cf. the vice list in 6:9), how could such a basic issue not have been raised? If he did cover it, what has gone wrong that he needs to address it again? Is this an example of miscommunication caused by cultural dissonance, namely, that the Corinthian converts simply did not grasp what Paul had said? Although these questions may not have definitive answers, there are a few hints that Paul had originally addressed the issue of εἰδωλοθύτων. In the first place, the

---

<sup>50</sup> These points may be strengthened by noting the fact that 8:6 appears to be an expansion of the *Shema* (Deut 6:4) to include Jesus within the most fundamental confession of Jewish monotheism (cf. de Lacey 1982; Hofius 1997; Lincicum 2010, 138–140; Wright 1991, 120–136). This suggests *both* that the Gentiles would not have known the confession on their own *and* that the Jewish (or Gentile god-fearing) believers would not have added Jesus to the formula without encouragement from some early Christian teacher. That 8:6 is an adaptation of the *Shema* was also advocated by James Dunn 1998, 253, though he rejected this view in a panel discussion at the 2011 BNTS Conference in Nottingham.

<sup>51</sup> However, the theory that 8:6 was part of a baptismal confession (as suggested *inter alios* by Wolff 1996, 176) remains conjectural.

<sup>52</sup> This correction of "knowledge" here parallels similar argumentation in 1 Cor 4:6–21; cf. Still 2004.

<sup>53</sup> This seems to be the position of Bruce Winter 2001, 269–301, though he never states it explicitly; cf. the critique in Fotopoulos 2003, 219.

fact that 8:1 begins with the *περὶ δέ* clause indicates the readers' familiarity. Further, their familiarity extends not simply to food associated with local cults, but to the term *εἰδωλοθύτον*, which already carries a tone of negative judgment and which was not in circulation in non-Jewish pre-Christian Greek literature.<sup>54</sup> Finally, it is worth remembering that sacrifices were ubiquitous in Greco-Roman antiquity, no less in Corinth, and that sacrifice *eo ipso* implied sacrificial food.<sup>55</sup> In this light it is highly probable that Paul had already addressed the issue while present (so Fotopoulos 2003, 219–220). The reasons for its recurrence remain unclear.

### 6.2.2.3 Concerning *πνευματικά* (12:1)

Chapters 12–14 of 1 Corinthians raise a number of issues, some of which will be dealt with below as implicit appeals.<sup>56</sup> Of these, only the expected knowledge of spiritual things, *πνευματικά*, will be addressed here. Although the genitive *τῶν πνευματικῶν* in 12:1 could in theory be either masculine (spiritual people) or neuter (spiritual things), on analogy with 14:1, it should probably be understood as neuter referring to spiritual things, in this specific case, the division and use of *χαρίσματα* (12:4).<sup>57</sup>

The *περὶ δέ* formula signals the expected familiarity of *πνευματικά* to his readers. However, unlike 7:1 and 8:1, 4, this formulaic introduction is not followed by a statement of a Corinthian position but instead by an indication that what follows is *not* fully known or understood by them (*οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν*; cf. 1 Thess 4:13). This curious juxtaposition is difficult to account for in terms of the demands it makes on the Corinthians' knowledge. If this topic was brought by the Corinthians, either in their letter

<sup>54</sup> So Newton 1998, 179–183; cf. Schrage 1991-2001, 2:217; Weiss 1910, 214.

<sup>55</sup> See the discussion of Greco-Roman sacrificial practice in Klauck 2000, 12–37.

<sup>56</sup> In particular, the assumptions Paul makes about the structure and praxis of communal worship in the Corinthian community in connection with issues of leadership in 16:15–18.

<sup>57</sup> So Héring 1962, 122–123; Conzelmann 1975, 204; Schrage 1991-2001, 2:117–119; Fitzmyer 2008, 457 but see Horn 1992, 184–185 and Wire 1990, 135 for alternative arguments.

or in oral report, then the statement of ignorance would best be understood as responding either to the particular questions posed or to lacunae identified by Paul, though perhaps unknown to the Corinthians themselves. However, the identification of this topic with Corinthian a question is not certain and should not be pressed.

The statement of Corinthian ignorance is followed by a reminder of their lives before conversion (12:2) and the following verse appears to expound the lacking information concerning "spiritual" utterances (διὸ γνωρίζω ὑμῖν ὅτι..., v. 3). It is hard to say why Paul felt the need to clarify the things one could utter under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit and scholars are divided about whether any Corinthian believer was in fact saying ἀνάθεμα Ἰησοῦς, whether it was something heard from the pagan Corinthians, or whether it is simply a rhetorical extreme.<sup>58</sup> The third seems the simplest option since the first requires that some Corinthian believer was cursing the object of his worship (cf. 1 Cor 1:2) and the second includes a step with no direct warrant in the text. In this light, it was likely an obvious point for his Corinthian audience that those speaking in the Spirit could not say "Jesus is cursed" but would say "Jesus is Lord"; in fact the point is so obvious that it is hard to imagine that Paul would have explicitly included it in his initial teaching. In this sense, 12:1–3 probably constitutes a "new" statement of a previously unstated assumption, apparently by way of introduction to the issue of multiple gifts and one Spirit.<sup>59</sup> However, even if 12:1–3 contains genuinely novel information, the subsequent discussion of the use and relative merits of gifts throughout chs. 12–14 suggests that 12:3 is not *all* the Corinthians did not know περὶ τῶν πνευματικῶν.

What, then, *did* the Corinthians know? The very fact that scholars have spent so

---

<sup>58</sup> For various discussions, see Brockhaus 1975, 156–160; Fee 1987, 581; Fitzmyer 2008, 455–456, 459–460; Schrage 1991–2001, 2:122–126.

<sup>59</sup> So similarly Vos 2002 who argues that 12:1–3 constitutes the rhetorical introduction to the subsequent material with v. 3 as the *propositio* introducing the fact that all spiritual utterance is controlled by the same Spirit (259).

much time debating the gender of πνευματικῶν indicates that knowledge which would render this term immediately intelligible was presumed rather than provided by Paul. The term πνευματικά appears to be an umbrella term which covers various manifestations of the Spirit (12:7), including gifts (χαρίσματα), services (διακονίαι) and deeds (ἐνεργήματα, vv. 4–6), each of which can be further broken down as seen in the lists in vv. 8–11, 28–30.<sup>60</sup> Paul goes to great lengths first to emphasize that "gifts" are apportioned by God and stem from the same Spirit – eliminating the possibility of using these manifestations as status symbols since "you are [collectively] the body of Christ and parts of the whole" (12:27) – and then to relativize all these manifestations in favor of love as the greatest gift (12:31–13:13). He then returns to a concrete discussion of the practicalities of using such gifts in corporate worship (14:1–40).

Notably, Paul never explains what any of these gifts are, though presumably "healing" is straightforward enough, nor does he tell the Corinthians to use them in corporate worship. Rather, as suggested by the περὶ δέ clause in 12:1, he speaks to the Corinthians as though they already know and are doing these things: such as spiritual utterances, prophecy, miracles, discernment of spirits (vv. 7–11). Apparently this also extends to the roles within the church such as apostles, teachers, supporters (ἀντιλήμψεις) and administrators (κυβερνήσεις, vv. 28–30).<sup>61</sup> In spite of the fact that he would rather prophecy, Paul's thanksgiving that he speaks in tongues more than the Corinthians (14:18–19) reveals that he himself participates in the worship practices represented here, a view confirmed by 2 Cor 12:1–10 and elsewhere.<sup>62</sup> Certainly, mantic prophecy and

---

<sup>60</sup> Strangely, although some scholars rightly differentiate between πνευματικά and χαρίσματα (e.g. Holmberg 1978, 120), few take any account of the other terms διακονίαι and ἐνεργήματα.

<sup>61</sup> The question of the implicit community structure in Corinth will be addressed more fully below.

<sup>62</sup> Nicklas 2010 emphasizes the role of prophecy in Paul's self-understanding and in his argumentation in passages such as 1 Thess 4:15–17 and 1 Cor 15:51 (cf. also Sandnes 1991, 68–69, 240), though he never explicitly calls himself a prophet (*nie ausdrücklich Prophet nennt*). Similarly, Schreiber 1996, 274–277, *passim* argues that, although Paul practiced *Wundern*, he never used miracles as proof nor

other manifestations of a divine presence were not confined to early Christianity; it flourished in certain Jewish and Greco-Roman religious contexts, though not ubiquitously.<sup>63</sup> However, this passage suggests that Paul introduced the Corinthian converts to religious practice in which these manifestations had a role.<sup>64</sup> What Paul counters in 1 Cor 12–14 are issues concerning order during worship gatherings and striving for gifts that were seen as "greater" (cf. 12:31), evidently a part of their concern for status rather than communal well-being (14:12, 19).<sup>65</sup>

#### 6.2.2.4 *The collection (16:1)*

Paul's compressed reference here to the collection (λογεῖα) for the poor believers in Jerusalem also begins with a *περὶ δέ* formula. It is very difficult to date when Paul began work on the collection and, accordingly, it is impossible to say whether he had already spoken of it during his initial work in Corinth. It is often argued that the "concern for the poor" enjoined upon Paul by the leaders in Jerusalem (Gal 2:10) precipitated the collection,<sup>66</sup> though strong arguments have recently been levied against that position which make it unlikely. For instance, why in this case is the gap so large between the

---

presented himself as a miracle worker. Note, however, 2 Cor 12:12 where Paul reminds the Corinthians that "signs of an apostle," including *σημεῖα τε καὶ τέρατα καὶ δυνάμεις*, were an important part of his proclamation.

<sup>63</sup> For Jewish religious ecstatic practices, see Ezek 1:1–28, *passim*; Zech 6:1–7; 4Q403 (Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice); *T. Job* 48–50; *1 Enoch* 14:8–25, *passim*; *T. Levi* 2.6; 4Q213a frg. 2.15–18 (cf. Horn 1992, 211–214); and note the later *b. Hag.* 14b–15b with more developed traditions of *Merkabah* and *Hekhalot* mysticism, on which see Halperin 1988 and Rowland and Morray-Jones 2009, 219–498. For Greco-Roman parallels, see e.g. Euripides *Bacch.* 298–301; Plato *Tim.* 71e–72b; Plutarch *Is. Os.* 364E–F; cf. Burkert 1987, 109–111; Schrage 1991–2001, 2:119–120 and Horst 1985 who lists numerous parallels with Acts 2 which are relevant here too. Forbes 1995 finds the parallels with the Jewish evidence more closely related to Christian prophecy and glossolalia, but emphasizes that Christian mantic prophecy was almost entirely peculiar to early Christianity. See also the now classic work of Aune 1983 who discusses Greco-Roman and Jewish prophecy at length in comparison with early Christianity, noting that Christian prophecy was not limited to mantic expressions.

<sup>64</sup> So Zeller 2009, 239 *pace* Horn 1992, 291, *passim*.

<sup>65</sup> Bornkamm 1952, 113–123 emphasizes Paul's motivation of edification here and in 11:17–33; cf. earlier Bengel 1835, 161.

<sup>66</sup> E.g. Berger 1977, 195–198; Eckert 1981, 72; Georgi 1994, 30, 37, *passim*; Joubert 2000, 88–90, 114–115; Kim 2002a, 148.

event reported in Gal 2:10 and the collection in Corinth, which Paul is still hammering out in 2 Cor 8–9?<sup>67</sup> Why do the earliest patristic interpreters such as Tertullian (*Marc.* 5.3.6) fail to associate Gal 2:10 with the Jerusalem community?<sup>68</sup> In line with these criticisms, Bruce Longenecker has recently argued quite plausibly that Paul introduced the collection to the Corinthians in his initial (lost) letter noted in 1 Cor 5:9 (Longenecker 2010, 338–344). This could account for the very basic advice provided by Paul (set some money aside on the first day of each week) which would have more obviously been covered while he was in Corinth, had the "collection for the saints" already been in progress.

On the other hand, if Gal 2:10 does refer to the Jerusalem collection, as most scholars have argued, one is still left with the fact that Paul's advice in 1 Cor 16:1–4 is extremely basic and no reason as to why he did not cover such essentials during the time he was with them. This may well render the connection between the Jerusalem collection and Paul's initial teaching tenuous. Perhaps he had merely flagged it as a future event, with details to follow, but this is not the only possibility since there is still the intermediate communication noted in 5:9 to take into account. Therefore, on either reading of Gal 2:10 and 1 Cor 16:1, it is very difficult to tie the topic of the collection to Paul's initial teaching.

#### 6.2.2.5 Summary of *περὶ δέ* passages

On the whole, then, the *περὶ δέ* formula does not *in itself* reveal anything about Paul's initial teaching.<sup>69</sup> However, it does introduce familiar topics to the Corinthians and,

---

<sup>67</sup> Note also that 2 Cor 8:10, 9:2 indicate that the Corinthians began their preparations to give only a year before those passages were written. While it is possible that this year span reaches back to Paul's initial time in Corinth (c. 49–51 CE), on a more conventional dating of 1 and 2 Corinthians (c. 54–57 CE) the gap is more conspicuous.

<sup>68</sup> See especially the incisive discussion of Longenecker 2010, 157–182; cf. the similar view of Wedderburn 2002 who sees at least a weak conceptual link between Paul's collection and Gal 2:10.

<sup>69</sup> Notably, 1 Cor 16:12 *περὶ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ* is clearly not a reference to Paul's time in Corinth.

in two cases (7:1; 8:1–6) it is followed immediately by Paul's characterization of a view present among the Corinthian believers. The topics that can be traced with high probability to Paul's initial teaching are those of food offered to idols (8:1–6) and spiritual manifestations in corporate worship (12:1). With less certainty, the topic of marriage and sex (7:1) is likely to have featured in Paul's teaching. In the case of idolatry and sex, the direct appeals to knowledge can be linked with explicit reminders of the Corinthians' conversion, in particular the moral and ethical instructions noted in 4:17 and fleshed out in 6:9–11.<sup>70</sup>

### 6.2.3 "I do not want you to be ignorant...": Paul and Corinthian ignorance

There are three statements indicating Corinthian ignorance in 1 Corinthians: "I do not want you to be ignorant, brothers, that our ancestors all were under the cloud..." (10:1); "Now, I want you to know that the head of every man is Christ, but the head of every woman is man" (11:3); "I do not want you to be ignorant [about spiritual things]" (12:1).<sup>71</sup> In all three cases, Paul's language suggests *prima facie* that the Corinthian believers *lack* knowledge about the subsequent topic.<sup>72</sup> These passages, then, might provide *negative* information about Paul's initial teaching and preaching by ruling out the topics discussed.

Regarding 10:1–5, suffice it to say here that the interpretation of the exodus narrative to link the "same spiritual bread" and "the same spiritual drink" with the Corinthians through the "rock which is Christ" was not included in Paul's initial teaching

---

<sup>70</sup> Cf. §5.2.2–3.

<sup>71</sup> 12:1–3 was discussed adequately above (§6.2.1, §6.2.2.1) and needs no further comment here.

<sup>72</sup> *Pace* Fitzmyer 2008, 456, "I don't want you to be ignorant" is not simply litotes meaning "I want to emphasize this." The formula is clearly emphatic, it arrests the readers' attention, but at the very least it also indicates a new view or interpretation of previously known material; cf. §6.1.1 above.

and it is applied here *ad hoc* for the issue surrounding idolatry.<sup>73</sup>

Turning to 11:2–16, as noted above (§5.2.2), Paul's instructions here have an ambiguous relationship to his initial teaching in Corinth.<sup>74</sup> On the one hand, vv. 3–16 appear to be new information, while there may be an underlying reference to his teaching regarding Jew/Greek, slave/free and male/female alluded to in 12:13. The first point is indicated primarily by two factors. First, 11:3 stands in contrast with v. 2; the Corinthians are already holding to the imparted traditions but Paul now wants to add another (θέλω δὲ ὑμᾶς εἰδέναι ὅτι...<sup>75</sup>). Second, the detail and variety of arguments in vv. 3–16 show Paul in an effort to persuade the Corinthians of something which they would not otherwise have accepted. In this respect, the importance of this passage for our current inquiry is simply this: Paul, in his establishment of the Corinthian church, did not pass on a tradition regarding male or female head-covering during prophecy and prayer. Additionally, the notion of "headship" and the relative "glory" of men and women also did not feature. Not only that, it is likely that Paul *could not* have passed on such a tradition since, at most, the churches had only a "custom," rather than an active prescription regarding the matter (v. 16).<sup>76</sup>

On the other hand, several scholars have argued that the issue at stake here is the interpretation of Paul's initial teaching to the Corinthians seen also in Gal 3:28: "In Christ there is...neither male nor female."<sup>77</sup> In this case, Corinthian women were praying and prophesying "unveiled" in imitation of male community members, which Paul addresses

---

<sup>73</sup> On the implied knowledge of the underlying exodus narrative, see §7.3.5.

<sup>74</sup> Although some scholars continue to argue that Paul is concerned about hair-length and style (e.g. Murphy-O'Connor 1988; Horsley 1998, 152; MacGregor 2009), this is unconvincing for a variety of reasons, detailed in Edsall 2013a.

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Jervis 1993, 238; Keener 2005, 91; Wire 1990, 116.

<sup>76</sup> Cf. Bengel 1835, 142. Wire 1990, 129 also notes the lack of *constructive* custom mentioned by Paul.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. Barrett 1968, 247; Hurd 1965, 282; Wire 1990, 137; Jervis 1993, 234.

by reinforcing gender distinctions on theological (11:3–4), creational (vv. 7–9) and customary grounds (vv. 5–6, 13–15). However, his concession in v. 11 regarding the interdependence of man and woman *in the Lord* remarkably undercuts these appeals and the fact that Paul includes it suggests that this point is one on which he and the Corinthians are in agreement, however detrimental it may be to his argument. This passage, then, reflects Paul's re-interpretation of his initial teaching in order to combat what he viewed as its illegitimate application by the Corinthians.<sup>78</sup>

#### 6.2.4 "Do you not know...": Rhetorical flourish or sarcastic reminder?

As noted earlier, the question οὐκ οἶδατε occurs no less than ten times in 1 Corinthians. Interestingly, the concentration seen in 1 Corinthians is not matched in any other text from antiquity.<sup>79</sup> There is much debate regarding the rhetorical force of this question with most scholars arguing that it is a more or less clear appeal to what the readers knew (even if they were not actively drawing on that knowledge)<sup>80</sup> and others considering it a "rhetorical device."<sup>81</sup> Some scholars even go as far as linking the content of the questions with the content of Paul's initial teaching.<sup>82</sup>

However, the οὐκ οἶδατε question does not always make the same demands on the audience's knowledge, nor does it have a single rhetorical force.<sup>83</sup> This is the case in spite

---

<sup>78</sup> For this argument in more detail, see Edsall 2013a.

<sup>79</sup> This is based on a search of Greek texts from Homer to Libanius (4th cent. CE) and Latin texts from Plautus through Augustine.

<sup>80</sup> Beside commentaries, cf. Grant 1961, 60–61; Gärtner 1965, 57; McKelvey 1969, 100; de Lacey 1991, 403; Hogeterp 2006, 326; Vahrenhorst 2008, 146.

<sup>81</sup> Esp. Fee 1987, 146 n.4. However, in practice Fee deals with each occurrence on a case by case basis, allowing that occasionally the question can refer to actual knowledge (412); cf. Bultmann 1910, 65; Conzelmann 1975, 104; Senft 1979, 74, 85.

<sup>82</sup> E.g. Böttrich 1999, 415. In all these studies, however, any appeal to ancient literature aside from references to Epictetus and/or diatribe are conspicuously absent, including specialized studies that focus on parallels between various Greco-Roman authors and the New Testament; e.g. Bonhöffer 1911; Mussies 1972; Norden 1898; Sharp 1914; van der Horst 1980.

<sup>83</sup> For an extended discussion of relevant examples from Greek texts, see Edsall 2013b.

of the fact that, grammatically, the question presupposes an affirmative answer. Rather, with respect to the former, the question has two functions: (1) to introduce known information into a discussion or (2) to introduce unknown information into the discussion. The known information can be either general (often proverbial) information about the world or humanity<sup>84</sup> or information that is specific to the speaker, interlocutor and their context.<sup>85</sup> Furthermore, unknown information can be introduced either as an emphatic conclusion drawn from the preceding discussion or with no previous preparation at all, often in an intentionally striking way.

The rhetorical aims of the "do you not know" question varies between and within these possibilities. Known information is regularly introduced as a base for further discussion, often by way of analogy, or as a reminder of something the interlocutor knows, but is not actively applying to the situation at hand, at least in the view of the speaker. The latter use has stronger overtones of reproof than the former, even to the extent of a threat. New information introduced as an emphatic conclusion is typically presented as a conclusion that the interlocutor ought to have reached on his or her own, though in fact they had not.<sup>86</sup> It often contains an element of condescension. Introducing new information with the question "do you not know?" with no preparation is the most stark of the uses; the element of critique is strongest here. The rhetorically "presumed" information is *not* known to the interlocutor and in fact is at times directly contrary to what the interlocutor thinks.<sup>87</sup> Often in these cases, the topic introduced by the question "do you not know" is expanded in further discussion to explain the unexpected new

---

<sup>84</sup> E.g. Epictetus 3.5.5; Plato *Rep.* 338D; *Cratylus* 391e; Philo *Fug.* 27; Xenophon *Mem.* 1.3.12; 1.6.7; Libanius *Or.* 49.17.

<sup>85</sup> E.g. Dio Chrysostom *Or.* 21.3; Plutarch *Antony* 28.11; Sophocles *Ajax* 1291; Xenophon *Mem.* 2.7.6; 3.13.5; *Cyr.* 3.1.22–23.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. Epictetus *Diss.* 1.19.5; 2.5.26; 2.8.12; 3.2.11; Plato *Cratylus* 398C; *T. Abr.* 6:5 (long recension); *Vita Aesopi G* 11:1–3; Xenophon *Mem.* 1.3.13; 1.6.5.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Dio Chrysostom 4.29, 64; 9.16; 10.10.5; Teles (with οὐκ ὀπίσ) 33.4; 45.4.

information (e.g. Plato *Crat.* 398c), though it is also used to mock (Philemon Frag. 44).

One other rhetorical use, which is harder to isolate in the sources, might be termed "coercive bluff." In this case, the speaker "presumes" consent in their audience on a certain topic, which he or she knows to be new information, but never goes on to elucidate it. Thus, the question introduces an unknown point as though it were obvious in an effort to assert his or her authority over the interlocutor by means of censure or shame. For such a rhetorical move to be effective, however, the speaker would need to be in some position of authority or the point must be sufficiently plausible to the audience otherwise there is no reason that the audience would not simply reject the power move, not recognizing the validity of the claim to their ignorance. In light of these various options, blanket statements about the referential value of the question must be avoided and each passage in which Paul asks οὐκ οἶδατε must be evaluated in its own context. For ease of analysis, I have grouped the passages according to the categories listed above.

#### 6.2.4.1 *General knowledge*

Three of Paul's οὐκ οἶδατε questions introduce generally known information as an analogy and so do not refer to his teaching. These are 9:13 in reference to the common practice of priests eating sacrificial meat,<sup>88</sup> 9:24 in reference to athletic races and 5:6 in reference to the principles of leaven. The latter is more complex, however, and requires a short discussion.

Paul asks in 5:6, "Do you not know that a little leaven leavens the whole lump?" The properties of leaven were well known in antiquity and as such the image appears to

---

<sup>88</sup> Note the numerous stipulations in Lev 1:1–7:38 and see the discussion of Greek and Roman sacrifices in Klauck 2000, 12–42. The fact that Paul points to Lev 7:6–15 in 1 Cor 10:18 in his warning against idolatry (βλέπετε τὸν Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα) suggests that the Jerusalem temple was likely in view *for Paul* (cf. Lincicum 2010, 127). Further, Hogeterp 2006, 351 has noted that the term θυσιαστήριον does not occur in non-Jewish Greek texts in reference to temple sacrifices. However, in 1 Cor 9:13, two descriptions are used in parallel, the first of which uses typical sacrificial vocabulary and the second of which is (arguably) more distinctly Jewish.

be introduced as an analogy to further Paul's point.<sup>89</sup> However, two points problematize this reading. First, it is likely that Paul had the Passover imagery, explicitly mentioned in vv. 7–8, in mind already in v. 6. Second, Paul clearly presents leaven as a bad thing, which is common in Jewish and early Christian texts, but less so in Greco-Roman texts.

To take the second point first, a suggestive parallel to Paul's negative evaluation of leaven can be found in Plutarch *Quaest. rom.* 289F.

Leaven is itself also the product of corruption (ἐκ φθορᾶς), and produces corruption in the dough with which it is mixed; for the dough becomes flabby and inert, and altogether the process of leavening seems to be one of putrefaction; at any rate if it goes too far, it completely sours and spoils the flour.

The fact that leaven could work too much and spoil the dough is a fact of life that would have been well known, even if not everyone would have explicitly attributed its rising action to corruption.<sup>90</sup> Furthermore, the connection between the analogy and the main point is often surprising or jarring in other Greek uses of this rhetorical question. This surprise serves to capture the interlocutor's attention.<sup>91</sup> In this case, then, the analogy to leaven would have been even more striking had the readers held uniformly positive views of leaven. As for whether Paul has Passover in mind in v. 6, this point does not settle the matter since the Passover context is not explicitly stated until v. 7, in which case it functions as an expansion of v. 6 in a new, or perhaps more focused, direction. This suggests, then, that leaven was intended as a common analogy.

#### 6.2.4.2 *Context-specific knowledge*

In three passages Paul seems to use the οὐκ οἶδατε question to introduce context specific information that is likely linked with his initial teaching (6:2–3, 9, 15).

---

<sup>89</sup> Indeed, many scholars argue that 5:6 is some sort of ancient proverb; e.g. Schrage 1991-2001, 1:379.

<sup>90</sup> See the neutral descriptions in Hippocrates *Diaet.* 42.5; Aristotle *Gen. an.* 755A.

<sup>91</sup> For instance, the analogy between a donkey and a tyrant in Epict. *Diss.* 1.19.5 or Socrates' analogy between a beautiful boy and a scorpion in Xenophon *Mem.* 1.3.12–13.

In his discussion of litigation among the Corinthian believers, Paul twice uses the οὐκ οἶδατε question with striking content.

Does someone among you dare, having a case against another, to be judged by the unjust and not by the saints? Or do you not know that the saints will judge the world? And if the world will be judged by you, are you incompetent of judging lesser matters? Do you not know that we will judge the angels, to say nothing of living things? (6:1–3)

The questions in vv. 2–3 hardly qualify as general knowledge as 5:6 does. There is no preceding argument, beyond the introductory statement, from which they draw a conclusion and no subsequent explanation of eschatological judgment. In terms of the rhetorical possibilities identified above, these observations rule out most uses of general knowledge, new information as a conclusion and even starkly introduced new information. Of course, this leaves open the option of "coercive bluff," which may seem the simplest solution here.<sup>92</sup> However, in the rhetorical context of 1 Corinthians, such a bluff would be risky since the personal authority required by Paul for such a move was being questioned by some of the Corinthians. Even as the "founder" of the Corinthian community, his authority is fragile and, although established previously, "is thereafter subject to winds of influence" (Hanges 2012, 458). If Paul were relying on these points being plausible to the Corinthians, this still leaves us with the problem of how such a thing could be plausible to Gentile believers. What sort of conceptual framework would have to be in place?

The notion of the "saints" participating in some sense in the eschatological judgment is not unprecedented within Judaism or Early Christianity.<sup>93</sup> It remains difficult

---

<sup>92</sup> Fee 1987, 233 n. 17, who is very skeptical of relying on οὐκ οἶδατε questions to reconstruct the Corinthians' knowledge, comes close to this position.

<sup>93</sup> For Christianity, cf. Matt 19:28; Luke 22:30. For Judaism, cf. *1 Enoch* 95:3; 1QpHab 5.4; 4Q418 frg. 69, 2.7–9; cf. Barrett 1968, 136; Keener 2005, 15. The image of judging the angels is admittedly harder to locate. The explanation of Williams 2009, 117–118 (following Mach 1992, 257) seems to be the most plausible, namely that the judging of angels is linked to the "angelification" of the community at the *parousia*, noted by Paul's mention of transformation in 1 Cor 15:51.

to be certain, but of the rhetorical options discussed above, it appears that context specific information fits best. Thus, Paul expects his readers to know that the saints will judge the cosmos and the angels because he had in fact told them something to that effect. With respect to the coercive interpretation one has to ask, if Paul's point is to shame his readers, would the Corinthians have felt stung by the fact that they did not know an esoteric point of Jewish eschatology. However, if Paul had in fact told them about their role in the final judgment, it is not hard to imagine this point being relegated to the fringe of their theology by the Gentile Corinthians for whom such notions would have been almost entirely foreign.

Turning to 6:9, I have already discussed this passage in relation to Paul's initial ethical teachings in Corinth (§5.2.3). There I noted that the transformation from the vices in vv. 9–10 to the current status of the Corinthian believers in v. 11 strongly indicates that Paul had taught about the vices listed, even if not with the precise terminology. Paul's picture of some of the Corinthians' before conversion is introduced with the question, "Or do you not know that the ἄδικοι will not inherit the kingdom of God?" (v. 9). In the post-conversion light, the Corinthians were well aware that the ἄδικοι of v. 9 were excluded from the kingdom, even though Paul felt that they were not appropriately reflecting this knowledge in their actions (note that ἄδικοι plays on ἀδικεῖτε in v. 8 and ἐδικαιώθητε in v. 11). It is in fact precisely this disjunction between what the Corinthians knew, at least in theory, and their current behavior that Paul highlights with the "do you not know" question (so Bengel 1835, 120).

Finally, in 6:12–17 Paul engages with an interlocutor in a way that resembles Epictetus' diatribes, with positive statements (e.g. "Everything is permitted to me") which are then immediately controverted or qualified ("but not everything is advantageous"). Paul states that "God raised the Lord and will raise us by his power" which he follows

with the question "Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ?" (6:14–15). Paul goes on to argue that members of Christ should not also be members of a prostitute and asks "do you not know that the one who cleaves to a prostitute becomes one body with her?" which he then justifies with a citation of Gen 2:24 (1 Cor 6:16–17).<sup>94</sup>

The logic of this passage is compressed and difficult to follow, but Paul sets up the idea of being one with a prostitute in v. 13 by saying "the body is not for sexual immorality [πορνεία] but for the Lord and the Lord is for the body." The question in v. 15 then builds on this by introducing the notion of participation in Christ into the discussion. This serves as the basis for the specific proscription against going to prostitutes and as such presumes the readers' consent. It may be that there is enough in the preceding three verses to justify imagery of participation, but if the Corinthians were not already familiar with it the shift from being raised by God to being members of Christ would be quite jarring. These two points suggest that the Corinthians already knew, to some extent, that they were members of Christ, if not necessarily in precisely the same language. Further indications could be found in the descriptions of baptism in 1:13–14 and 12:13, as I suggested above (§5.2.2), which indicate that the Corinthians established a common bond with other believers and with Christ in baptism, and Paul's eucharistic reference to "the cup of blessing which we bless" and "the bread which we break" in terms of sharing in Christ's blood and body (10:16).<sup>95</sup>

However the relationship between Corinthian knowledge and Paul's teaching on this point is problematized by the fact that the "body" metaphor was common in Greco-Roman discourse. Margaret Mitchell, on the one hand, has demonstrated the importance of the "body" metaphor in deliberative rhetoric (Mitchell 1991, 157–164) and, on the

---

<sup>94</sup> On the term πόρνη, see p. 126 n. 38 above.

<sup>95</sup> Debanné 2006, 226–227 points to 1 Cor 10:16–17 as evidence that unity of Christians in Christ as members of his body was present in Paul's "catechetical tradition."

other, Michelle Lee<sup>96</sup> has emphasized the Stoic parallels to Paul's discussion. Thus, it may be that Paul had introduced the Corinthians to the notion that they were "members of Christ," but it could be possible for him to presume consent on this point simply by the fact that it was a common and accessible metaphor. Further, when this point is combined with the baptismal and eucharistic imagery (1:13–14; 12:13; 10:16), it may be that the link forged in baptism and celebrated in the Eucharist was easily described in terms of a common metaphor rather than originally including participation language. Importantly, though, it should be noted that the "body" imagery is not *explicitly* introduced until later in the letter,<sup>97</sup> and Paul's "body" imagery has deeper theological roots than appeal to a general metaphor would suggest. In any case, the prevalence of the body metaphor, does not in itself prove that it was not part of Paul's initial teaching, since there is no reason its common use could not extend to Paul too. The fact that Paul's language of "members" is neither prepared for nor elucidated in the context, but rather is stated as a premise for further discussion suggests that, as far as Paul knew, the Corinthians already understood themselves as members of Christ.

#### 6.2.4.3 *Drawing a conclusion*

The first οὐκ οἴδατε question, in 1 Cor 3:16, is used to draw an emphatic conclusion from what precedes it. After detailing various efforts to build on the foundation of Christ, Paul exclaims, "Do you not know that you are God's temple and the Spirit of God dwells among you?" (3:16). Many scholars argue that Paul had previously passed on the notion that God's people constituted a temple.<sup>98</sup> However, the rhetorical context of this statement is like those instances in which the author introduces new

---

<sup>96</sup> Lee 2006, 29–58; cf. Martin 1995, 3–37.

<sup>97</sup> So Lindemann 2000, 147. Schrage 1991-2001, 2:25 n. 316 is right, however, that a division between this language of "members" and the metaphor of the body would be unduly compartmentalized.

<sup>98</sup> E.g. Barrett 1968, 90; Böttrich 1999, 415; Gärtner 1965, 57; de Lacey 1991, 403; Schrage 1991-2001, 1:305; Vahrenhorst 2008, 146; Wolff 1996, 74.

information by way of drawing a conclusion from a previous discussion (cf. note 86 above).<sup>99</sup> From v. 9, Paul builds towards the conclusion that the Corinthians are the temple of God based around two points: (1) the notion that Corinthians had received the Spirit (which they have already experienced, cf. 12:13) and (2) the metaphor of the building.<sup>100</sup> Thus the οὐκ οἴδατε question in 3:16 draws the conclusion from the previous material which Paul thinks is important for the Corinthians to realize, *viz.*, they are God's temple.<sup>101</sup>

In 6:19, Paul returns to the body/temple imagery with the question "Do you not know that your [plural] body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which you have from God and you are not your own?" It might be argued that the recurrence of the temple imagery indicates that it constitutes context specific information rather than new information. Further justification could be found in that the notion that a body could be the home of God is not common outside of Paul's writings. However, Epictetus, for one, makes similar claims about the physical embodiment of some aspect of the divine (Epictetus *Diss.* 2.8.12). Furthermore, 6:19 is a personalization of the point already made in 3:16,<sup>102</sup> namely, that possessing the Spirit of God makes one into a temple, with temple imagery being easily comprehensible to everyone in the Roman empire and elsewhere and already introduced by Paul earlier in the letter.

#### 6.2.4.4 *Stark introduction of new information*

In 6:16, following immediately on the context-specific information in v. 15, Paul

---

<sup>99</sup> Many scholars acknowledge the continuity of thought in vv. 3–17; e.g. McKelvey 1969, 98; Yinger 1999, 223.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Lindemann 2000, 88; Thiselton 2000, 307, 315; Wolff 1996, 69.

<sup>101</sup> It should be noted that building language was common in early Christianity and Paul even alludes to it in Gal. 2:8, 18 and Rom 15:20. But the fact that it is not consistently employed further suggests that it did not form a part of some early Christian catechetical material. The fact that the building-metaphor was a widespread *topos* in Greco-Roman rhetoric on unity provides a further conceptual structure into which Paul's argument could fit for the Corinthian believers; cf. Mitchell 1991, 99–111.

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Fee 1987, 264; Fitzmyer 2008, 269–270; Thiselton 2000, 474.

presumes no consent with his οὐκ οἶδατε question. This is indicated by the immediate explanation in v. 17. The reader who would admit participation in Christ, perhaps in some mystical way, will not necessarily admit participation in a prostitute. The justification for such logic is provided in the Genesis citation in v. 17, which is itself emphatically introduced by the question in v. 16.<sup>103</sup> This use of an emphatic rhetorical question that is elucidated by an appeal to scripture finds a parallel in Philo's writing.<sup>104</sup> So, in 6:16 Paul introduces a new justification for his argument by means of an emphatic οὐκ οἶδατε question.

#### 6.2.4.5 Summary of "Do you not know..."

From these passages it is evident that Paul's use of the question "do you not know" runs the gamut of referential possibilities outlined above. At least three times (5:6; 9:13, 24) Paul uses οὐκ οἶδατε to introduce well-known points for the purpose of analogy. A further four times Paul appears to introduce known, context-specific information (6:2–3, 9, 15). The rhetorical force of these passages is to censure through a reminder (the believers' role in the final judgment, the status of the ἄδικοι, the believers as "members" of Christ) in order to align their behavior with what they already know. Twice (3:16; 6:19) Paul uses the question to draw a conclusion from previous material, first with respect to the community as a temple and derivatively with respect to the individual as a temple. Finally, Paul uses οὐκ οἶδατε to introduce new information which he subsequently justifies by appeal to scripture (6:16).

Where then did the Corinthians get the context-specific information that Paul expects them to know? From whom did they learn that the saints will judge the world and

---

<sup>103</sup> On the citation of Gen 2:24 itself, see §7.3.5 below.

<sup>104</sup> Cf. Philo *Leg. all.* 2.46: "Do you not see that even in the case of Rachel (that is to say of outward sensation) sitting upon the images, while she thought that her motions came from the mind, he who saw her reproved her. For she says, 'Give me my children...'"

the angels, that ἄδικοι will not inherit the kingdom of God and that the Corinthians are members of Christ? The fact that Paul is so emphatic about these points, which are very loaded theological items, indicates that he himself holds these positions and expects the Corinthians to do so as well, so much so that calling them to mind will motivate them to alter their behavior. The easiest explanation is that these items featured as part of Paul's initial preaching and teaching. It is, of course, possible that knowledge of these points came from elsewhere, but we have no other source indicated and the close link in 6:9 with the Corinthians' conversion, noted earlier, places at least that point among Paul's initial teaching with very high probability.

### 6.2.5 Summary of direct appeals to knowledge in 1 Corinthians

Before summarizing the results of my investigation of direct appeals to knowledge in 1 Corinthians, it is worth recalling the framework suggested by Paul's explicit reminders of his teaching. In the previous chapter we saw that Paul's preaching emphasized the death and resurrection of Jesus, which included subtle reference to the agency of God. Further, his teaching included ethical exhortation (including his "ways," 4:17) that resulted in the shift from being πόρνοι, εἰδωλόλατραι, etc. to being washed, set apart as holy (ἀγιάζεσθαι) and made right (6:9–10). Paul's preaching, moreover, was accompanied by the Holy Spirit, which was also imparted to the Corinthian believers. Additionally, Paul passed on the practices of baptism and the Eucharist. Each of these elements carries with it implicit context (theological, narrative, or other) with which I will try to link Paul's direct appeals.

The ethical/moral teaching touched on in the explicit reminders is further expanded here. The Corinthian questions about marriage and sex (7:1) are linked with Paul's teaching on sex and the issue of εἰδωλωθύτων (8:1) is clearly tied to Paul's teaching on idolatry (cf. 6:9–11). (In fact, 6:9–11, which was discussed in chapter 5, is also

introduced by a direct appeal linked with Paul's teaching.) In the course of addressing the issue of εἰδολωθῦτον, Paul characterized his readers as those who understood idols as nothing, God as the creator God and father and Jesus as Lord and agent in creation (8:4–6). This creed-like statement, in content if not precisely in form, likely originated with Paul and as such he does not controvert these statements but rather their application by a group in Corinth.

Further, in 12:2, Paul confirms that a movement from idolatry was part of the Corinthians' conversion and, importantly, he suggests that they no longer consider themselves Gentiles. The cognitive shift signified here is striking and the fact that Paul reminds the Corinthians of this *past* identity and practice underlines his continued efforts to affect their *present* identity and practice. However, the fact that the Corinthians "*were* Gentiles" receives no justification and, indeed, Paul claims that they know it.<sup>105</sup>

In Paul's explicit reminders, we saw that receipt of the Spirit characterized the conversion experience of the Corinthians. Here, the presupposed views of the Spirit are further illuminated with respect to manifestations during corporate worship. It was seen that Paul himself introduced the Corinthians to worship characterized by spiritual gifts including prophecy, glossolalia, healing, etc. Related to communal worship is the celebration of the Eucharist, which involved some sort of communal participation in Christ, as we noted earlier (§5.2.3). This may well provide the framework within which to understand Paul's direct appeal to knowledge regarding being "members" of Christ in 6:15; though the commonness of the "body" metaphor makes it difficult to be certain about this connection.

This leaves matters that Paul did not include in his initial teaching – such as his interpretation of the exodus narrative (10:1–11) and male/female head-coverings or

---

<sup>105</sup> Issues of community self-understanding will be addressed again in chapter 7.

"headship" (11:3–16) – and those that do not find a framework in his explicit reminders. This latter group is composed of Paul's striking suggestions in 6:2–3 that the "saints" will judge the created order and the angels. Nevertheless, I argued that, rhetorically, the "do you not know" questions here make the most sense if they are drawing on knowledge which Paul actually expected the Corinthians to possess. Moreover, the implicit appeals will support the argument that eschatological matters featured in Paul's initial teaching and preaching in Corinth.

Finally, we saw above that formulae such as *περὶ δέ* and *οὐκ οἶδατε* do not guarantee a link with Paul's initial teaching or even, in the case of *οὐκ οἶδατε* in 6:16, actual knowledge of the audience. Rather, each appeal to knowledge, both positive and negative, had to be assessed on its own, within the rhetorical context of the passage.

### 6.3 Paul's Direct Appeals to Knowledge and his Initial Teaching

Once again, as in Paul's explicit reminders, there are remarkable differences between Paul's appeals to his audiences' knowledge in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians. The heavy accent on eschatology in the latter is almost entirely absent from explicit and direct appeals in 1 Corinthians. Paul's emphasis on eschatology in 1 Thessalonians is for the purpose of reframing the Thessalonian believers' expectations in light of their fundamental belief in the resurrection of Jesus (1 Thess 4:14; 5:9–10). The tone is one of complementing previous instruction for the purpose of encouragement (4:18; 5:11). Nevertheless, there is an element of correction insofar as Paul thinks the Thessalonians have misunderstood the significance of Jesus' resurrection and so misinterpreted the deaths of some members of their community.

The only eschatological references in the above material from 1 Corinthians are Paul's striking rhetorical questions in 1 Cor 6:2–3: "Don't you know that the saints will

judge the world" and "the angels?" The purpose of these appeals is to align the Corinthians' behavior with their knowledge. This use of the οὐκ οἶδατε question was also seen in 6:9 and 6:15 regarding Corinthian lawsuits and sexual misconduct. The tone of these corrections is much harsher than the gentle encouragements in 1 Thess 4:13–5:11 and in 1 Cor 6:2–3, 9, 15 Paul is not attempting to correct their *understanding* of these matters. Rather, he assumes they understand the eschatological role of believers, etc. but are not actively applying this understanding to their behavior.

Similarly, the ethical and moral instructions Paul mentioned in 1 Cor 4:17 and 6:9–11 are further illuminated in Paul's discussion of εἰδωλωθῆτον (8:1–6) where it becomes apparent that Paul had played the unreality of idols against the "one God, the father" and "one Lord Jesus Christ" (8:6; cf. 12:2; 1 Thess 1:9–10). Again, Paul does not correct the Corinthians' theological position *per se* but criticizes their application of it; since not all have the knowledge promoted in 8:4–6, the behavior of those who eat idol-food harms their "weaker" members (8:7). Further, Paul complements the Corinthian monotheism by emphasizing an expanded cosmology that includes the demonic (10:19–22).<sup>106</sup> Paul also introduces πνευματικά, a topic linked with the reception of the Spirit at baptism from the explicit reminders, to correct the chaotic and overly status-conscious behavior of the Corinthians during corporate worship.

Interestingly, every direct appeal to knowledge in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians is introduced for the purpose of correcting the given matter in some way, either in theological framework or practical application. In light of this, the few points of contact between the appeals in these two letters is not surprising; Paul was addressing very different needs within each community.

However, it is important to note that we see a continuation of a phenomenon noted

---

<sup>106</sup> Knowledge of the angels and demons is discussed more fully in chapter 7.

in Paul's explicit reminders; namely, foundational teachings such as the resurrection of Christ or turning from idols to the one God are used for a variety of purposes. The resurrection, which was used in 1 Thess 1:9–10 generally to emphasize Jesus' rescue from the coming wrath, is applied more specifically to the future resurrection of believers in 4:13–18 and the status of the Thessalonian believers as "children of the day" (5:1–11). As I will show in the next chapter, Paul also uses the resurrection of Jesus to justify the future resurrection in 1 Cor 15, though to very different effect. In a different way, the monotheistic framework recalled and reinforced by Paul in 1 Thess 1:9–10 is present in 1 Cor 8:1–6, but there the encouragement is absent and in its place is criticism for the lack of care for those who struggle with the implications of such monotheism for food sacrificed to idols.

Of the three types of appeal discussed in these chapters, Paul's direct appeals to knowledge most clearly reflect the differences in rhetorical situations and tone of the letters. However, in the two subsequent chapters this material will be integrated with the other references to produce a more complete picture of Paul's teaching in Thessalonica and Corinth. This more integrated view will enable us to compare the whole picture of Paul's teaching in each letter more adequately.



# Chapter 7

## Paul's Presupposed Audience: Implicit Appeals to Paul's Teaching

### 7.1 Identifying Implicit Appeals: Some Guidelines

In turning to Paul's implicit appeals to knowledge, the emphasis of the discussion shifts from the stated to the unstated, that is, from what Paul claims that his audience knows to what he simply presumes they know with no further justification.<sup>1</sup> Of course, the number of things Paul presumes of his readers are legion and it is far beyond the scope of this chapter to identify them all. Rather, what we are after are implicit appeals to items of belief, practice, custom, etc. that were important within nascent Christianity and have a reasonable chance of being linked with Paul's teaching. These include theological topics (such as Christology, God, resurrection, eschatology), specific and repeated characterization of the community (as in direct sibling address), or specific practices or community structure (e.g. the holy kiss). What makes appeals to such matter "implicit" is that they receive no explanation *in spite of the fact that it would probably be unintelligible to the majority of a community without prior introduction*. Further, many of the topics addressed in this chapter are those which we know to be important from wider early Christian use (e.g. Paul as Apostle).

In this way, an implicit appeal is important when it is a "loaded" term that Paul does not bother to explain. While these may have claim to a link with Paul's teaching, there is also the possibility that they could be traced to general knowledge or practice in

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the discussion in §2.2.4.

first-century Thessalonica or Corinth. Accordingly, I will proceed with caution in assessing their connection with Paul's initial teaching. If the concept, belief or practice can be placed firmly within the framework presupposed by explicit reminders of his teaching (complemented by his direct appeals to knowledge) then a link is plausible. Further, each topic is not to be taken in isolation but considered in connection with the presupposed conceptual framework suggested by all the elements together. Although there remains an inevitable subjective element in the selection of topics to examine, these rough criteria are relatively broad while keeping the discussion manageable.

## 7.2 Implicit Appeals to Knowledge in 1 Thessalonians

### 7.2.1 Paul as a "weighty" apostle

Paul refers to himself, and perhaps to Timothy and Silas as well,<sup>2</sup> as an apostle only once in 1 Thessalonians (2:7). In fact, this is the only reference to any notion of an apostle at all in the letter.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, in spite of the fact that there was probably no "normative definition" of "apostle" when Paul wrote 1 Thessalonians,<sup>4</sup> he clearly expects his readers to know what he means. Indeed, Paul's statement in 2:7 occurs in a section (2:1–12) that is shot through with explicit reminders of his work in Thessalonica. Verse 7a is a parenthetical clause in a sentence that runs from v. 5 through 7b ("but we were like infants in your midst")<sup>5</sup> and which states at the beginning that Paul is leaning on the Thessalonians' memory (καθὼς οἴδατε; v. 5). The fact of Paul's apostleship serves an

---

<sup>2</sup> So Holtz 1986, 77–78 and Malherbe 2000, 144; but cf. the contrasting views of Becker 1993, 79–80; Haufe 1999, 37; Légasse 1999, 123 n. 3 and Rigaux 1956, 418.

<sup>3</sup> Incidentally, 2 Thessalonians does not make any reference to Paul's status as an apostle. If it is non-Pauline, this is a notable contrast with the other so-called Deutero-Paulines and Pastorals, all of which present Paul as an apostle.

<sup>4</sup> So Schütz 1975, 34; cf. Gerber 2005, 119–122.

<sup>5</sup> On the structure, syntax and textual matters of 2:5–8 see esp. the cogent remarks of Fee 2009, 66–71; cf. Gerber 2005, 288–291; Schmidt 2009.

explanatory function, providing the reason Paul's authority could be "weighty."<sup>6</sup> These factors together suggest that Paul had told the Thessalonians what an apostle is, including its connotations of authority, and included himself among them.

This is further supported by the absence of an analogous use of the term in Greek literature, where it is used with a variety of meanings and only rarely in reference to a messenger of any kind.<sup>7</sup> As for the oft-positd Palestinian Jewish institution of religious messengers, שלוחים, it is very difficult to demonstrate an *institution* as such, though there is some precedent and notable parallels.<sup>8</sup> Even if there were a generally fixed pattern for שלוחים, it is highly unlikely that the majority of Thessalonian Gentiles would have been aware of it or that שליח could be adequately translated by ἀπόστολος. In any case, whatever the ultimate background for apostleship within the nascent Christian movement, apostleship was pre-Pauline; he inherited it, perhaps in Antioch (cf. Becker 1993, 79), and passed it on in Thessalonica.

## 7.2.2 God our father

At three places in 1 Thessalonians Paul refers to God as "our father" – the prescript, thanksgiving,<sup>9</sup> and twice in the prayer in 3:11–13 – and nowhere does he explain or justify such language.

---

<sup>6</sup> For the use of ὡς as a causal conjunction ("inasmuch as, since"), see LSJ *s.v.* B, IV.

<sup>7</sup> As in Herodotus *Hist.* 1.21.4; 5.38.8; Plutarch *Phoc.* 11.1. Other meanings include an expedition (military and naval), a list of colonists and a colony in Dionysius of Halicarnassus 7.5.3, 9.59.2; and 7.13.3 respectively. Note also the "sending" of Jewish emissaries: Josephus *Ant.* 17.300. See Rengstorff 1964, 407–408.

<sup>8</sup> For instance, John the Baptist and Jesus both sent out messengers on their behalf that look very much like שלוחים. The notice in 2 Chr 17:7–9 is often adduced as evidence for the שלוחים (cf. 1 Kings 14:6; CD 11:2, 18–19) though C. K. Barrett rightly states that "The Jewish evidence for a שליח institution in the New Testament period is thus scanty," Barrett 1978, 95; cf. the more positive evaluation of Krauss 1905.

<sup>9</sup> While some argue that the thanksgiving runs from 1:2–3:10 (Malherbe 2000, 103–105; cf. Schubert 1939, 16–27) or that there are two or three discrete thanksgivings (so respectively Pesch 1984 and Lambrecht 1990), I am more convinced that the thanksgiving (as a semi-formal element) extends from 1:2–10 and that the repeated thanks in 2:13 and 3:9 are simply thanksgivings within the body of the letter (so Frame 1912, 72).

The designation of God as "father" had deep roots in Judaism and may even be linked to the exodus tradition where Israel is called God's "firstborn son" (בני בכרי ישראל; Exod 4:22–23), though it becomes more common in the post-exilic period.<sup>10</sup> However, the notion that a god was the father of all people and gods has similarly strong ties to Greco-Roman religion as far back as Homer (Zeus as πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε; *Od.* 1.28; *Il.* 1.544) as well as appearing in Plato's *Timaeus* (28C), Epictetus (*Diss.* 1.3.1) and mystery religions (Schrenk and Quell 1967, 952–955). In fact, in the presentation of Paul in Acts 17:22–31, it is precisely the notion of the fatherhood of God that Paul uses to bridge the gap between himself and his audience (Acts 17:28).

What *is* uniquely Christian, however, is the notion that God is the father of *Jesus* (1 Thess 1:1, 10). This conception is linked to the Christological significance of Jesus being the son of God and this particular relationship cannot be simply subsumed under the common notion of God as father of all, in more general terms. As such, this designation of God *the father of Jesus* most likely featured in Paul's initial teaching.

### 7.2.3 Jesus, his titles, his death and his teachings

The issues surrounding the relationship between Paul and Jesus and the significance of Paul's use of Christological titles are difficult and far too large to address fully in this dissertation. Accordingly, the goal of this section is much more modest: it seeks to ascertain whether the various implicit appeals to knowledge about Jesus reveal more clearly the role he played in Paul's teaching in Thessalonica, beyond the information gained from the explicit reminders and direct appeals to knowledge discussed earlier. Paul refers many times to Jesus as Lord and Christ, mentions his death at the hands of the Jews (2:15) and makes a remarkable appeal to "a word of the Lord" (4:15).

---

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Isa 9:6; 43:6; 63:16; 64:8; Jer 31:20; Mal 1:6; 2:10; Wis 5:5, *Jub.* 1:28 (4Q216 4.8–9), etc. This was also very common in Philo's writings (Schrenk and Quell 1967, 956–958), who was of course deeply influenced by Plato's *Timaeus*.

### 7.2.3.1 *Jesus the Lord and (the) Christ*

The significance of the terms κύριος and χριστός in Paul's letters is a particularly intractable problem, made more difficult here since the most significant passages discussed in this regard are not found in 1 Thessalonians. Paul refers to "Christ" ten times and "the Lord" 24 times with only 5 passages where the two are used together (1:1, 3; 5:9, 23, 28). In both cases the epithet is "pre-Pauline" insofar as he was not the first to apply it to Jesus. At no point in the letter is the significance of these titles explained or defended, indicating that they were not controversial titles for Jesus in the eyes of the Thessalonians (cf. Bultmann 1952, 125). Indeed, many of the occurrences are formulaic (1:1, 3; 2:19; 3:2, 11–13; 5:9, 23, 28).

With respect to the κύριος title, it is notable that, unlike some of Paul's other letters, there is no indication that the title refers to anyone but Jesus in 1 Thessalonians. The pairing of "God the father and our Lord Jesus (Christ)" in 1:1 and 3:11, 13 indicate that the primary reference of "Lord" is Jesus and serves in some way to *distinguish* Jesus from God.<sup>11</sup> If this is the case, there are two particularly remarkable passages in which concepts usually linked with God in Jewish thought are applied to Jesus. The first is in 4:6, discussed earlier, in which Paul states that he told the Thessalonians that "the Lord is the avenger." In this passage it is in fact Jesus who is the "Lord" and thus Paul taught that not only is Jesus the one who rescues (1:10), but he is also the one who judges. In this light, the reference to the "coming wrath" in 1:10 suggests that Jesus is (at least) the agent of God's coming wrath (Hurtado 2003, 117).

This view is corroborated by the second stock phrase drawn from Judaism: the Day of the Lord. In 5:2, Paul notes that the Thessalonians have no need of instruction on

---

<sup>11</sup> So Tuckett 2001, 59; cf. already von Dobschütz 1909, 169.

the "times and seasons" since they know about the coming of the "Day of the Lord." Given the exclusive use of the title for Jesus in the rest of the letter and the lack of indicators for a change of subject, it is highly likely that the "Lord" here is Jesus rather than a reference to YHWH.<sup>12</sup> Here again, the notion that Jesus is the judging "Lord" finds its place in Paul's initial teaching. Further, there appears to be conceptual overlap between the role of Jesus and the role of YHWH in the OT, though it is hard to say if such an overlap would have been clear to his readers.

Further, Paul reminds that the injunctions given to the Thessalonian Christians were given "in/through the Lord Jesus" (4:1–2). While the precise meaning of the phrase is difficult, what is clear is that the authority of "the Lord Jesus" was meaningful to the Thessalonians.<sup>13</sup> If, as argued above, Paul taught that Jesus was the coming judge and savior (cf. 5:9), this provides some context for his authority with respect to the moral and ethical requirements elucidated in 4:1–12.<sup>14</sup>

As for the term *χριστός*, a large number of scholars argue that the term was essentially reduced to a proper name by the time of Paul, especially in the context of Gentile mission.<sup>15</sup> It is certainly true that in 1 Thessalonians Paul puts almost no theological emphasis on the term, but it is equally clear that he expected the Thessalonian Christians to understand that Jesus is "Christ" and vice versa, as seen by the absolute uses of *χριστός* (2:7; 3:2; 4:16). This indicates that it featured as part of his initial teaching, though how much of the title's original royal and national overtones was preserved and passed on by Paul is difficult to say.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> So Hurtado 2003, 113; cf. §6.1.2 above.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Collins 1998, 406; Laub 1973, 51.

<sup>14</sup> It is commonly noted that Paul often calls Jesus "Lord" in hortatory contexts, relying on his authority; Hurtado 2003, 117; Moo 2005, 188; Tuckett 2001, 56.

<sup>15</sup> E.g. Bultmann 1952, 124; de Jonge 1988, 114, 166; Dunn 1977, 43; Hengel 1995, 1–2; Légasse 1999, 66–67; Rigaux 1956, 171–172; von Dobschütz 1909, 61.

<sup>16</sup> An increasing number of scholars argue that Paul preserves elements of the OT and Jewish

### 7.2.3.2 *The death of Jesus*

So far, we have seen that Paul covered the bare facts about Jesus, namely, his death, resurrection, coming judgment and his titles (to an uncertain degree). Beyond these points, there are two passages that may suggest further teaching by Paul about Jesus including details about *how* he died (rather than the mere fact *that* he died) and his earthly teachings.

In 2:14–16, Paul speaks against the Jewish persecutors of the churches in Judea, noting that the Thessalonian Christians are undergoing the same treatment at the hands of their fellow Thessalonians. In v. 15, Paul extends his condemnation of these Jewish persecutors by stating that they are to be identified with those "who killed the Lord, Jesus, and the prophets." It is clear that imagery of killing the prophets has deep roots in intra-Jewish polemic and may have been used by Jesus himself (Matt 23:29–32), while the charge that the "Jews" killed Jesus appears variously within early Christianity.<sup>17</sup> Such easy familiarity on Paul's part may be able to account for the apparent ease with which he makes this statement, offering no justification or explanation. However, it would not account for his audience's familiarity, which he clearly presumes. Rather, the passing statement indicates that Paul had provided details about the circumstances of Jesus' death, and indeed perhaps that of the prophets, during his time in Thessalonica (cf. 1 Thess 1:6; Still 2012).<sup>18</sup>

---

background for *χριστός*; Hurtado 2003, 98–101; Schnelle 2005, 438–439; Moo 2005, 187; Tuckett 2001, 46–47; Wright 1991, 41–55; cf. also Hengel 1995, 4–7. However, see *inter alios* Chester 2007 and de Jonge 1986 for counterarguments.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. Furnish 2007, 69; Rigaux 1956, 445–447; Wanamaker 1990, 114–115.

<sup>18</sup> Such lack of explanation would perhaps be even more striking to the Jewish constituent in the Thessalonian church, had Paul not already addressed the subject during his initial work there. Wenham 1995, 319–326 goes so far as to argue that this passage draws on a tradition of Jesus' teaching preserved in Matt 23:29–38 and Luke 11:47–51, but his arguments are not convincing.

### 7.2.3.3 *The teachings of Jesus*

Paul's knowledge and use of Jesus' teachings is a vexed problem with no consensus in sight.<sup>19</sup> While a number of passages have been proposed as citations of (pre-)Synoptic material in 1 Thessalonians, such as 1 Thess 4:15–17 with Matt 24:30–31 (see §7.2.5), it is Paul's reference to the Day of the Lord as a thief (5:2; cf. Matt 24:43; Luke 12:39) that garners the widest assent.<sup>20</sup> Further, this reference occurs within a direct appeal to knowledge, discussed above, which reaches back to Paul's teaching in Thessalonica. The question is, then, when Paul spoke about the Day of the Lord as a thief in the night, did he pass it on as a word of Jesus, or simply as part of the contemporary Christian tradition in which he worked?

Given that Paul's reception of Jesus tradition is complex, involving direct and indirect influence from Old Testament and Jewish traditions, Jesus tradition and early Christian confessions,<sup>21</sup> it is difficult to be certain whether or not Paul considered the thief metaphor to be part of Jesus' teaching without explicit attribution. On balance, however, the fact that the logion of the thief in Matt 24:42–43 (par. Luke 12:39) is widely thought to be genuine<sup>22</sup> and is appropriated by other New Testament authors (2 Pet 3:10; Rev 3:3; 16:15) gives weight to Paul's intentional use and transmission of it. Further, this statement is closely linked with Jesus' role as eschatological judge which is a recurring theme in Paul's explicit reminders and direct appeals throughout 1 Thessalonians.

---

<sup>19</sup> I should, however, like to register my skepticism about positions that posit an (almost) complete ignorance of Jesus' teachings on Paul's part. Note the various cautious affirmations of a connection between Jesus and Paul in Still 2007.

<sup>20</sup> Note the otherwise rare agreement here between Aejmelaeus 1985, 29–30; Tuckett 1990, 176 and Wenham 1995, 307.

<sup>21</sup> This general picture has recently been reinforced by Detlef Häusser 2006, who nevertheless does not 1 Thess 5:2. Note his chart on 364.

<sup>22</sup> So France 2007, 942; Hagner 1993-1995, 720; Luz 2001-2007, 3:216–217.

#### 7.2.4 The gift and gifts of the Holy Spirit

As noted in chapter 5, the Holy Spirit featured as part of the Thessalonians' conversion experience. In 1:5 Paul claims that his message came "in power and the Holy Spirit" and again in v. 6 that the Thessalonians received Paul's message "in great affliction with the joy of (from) the Holy Spirit." Paul mentions the Spirit only two other times, both times introducing further information that he expects the Thessalonian community to know.

At the end of the first paraenetic subsection (4:1–8), Paul grounds his instructions in the authority of God – "the one who rejects [this teaching] does not reject a human but God" – which is itself grounded in the Thessalonian Christians' experience: "God, who gives his Holy Spirit to you" (4:8). Given the dearth of explicit discussion of the Holy Spirit in 1 Thessalonians, the force of Paul's statement rests on the reality of the Thessalonians' experience of the Holy Spirit and their knowledge that the Spirit is a gift from God. While the latter was a feature of Jewish eschatological expectation (cf. Holtz 1986, 167), it is likely that such information also played a role in Paul's teaching.

Paul again mentions the Spirit in 5:19–21. Much has been written about the phrase "do not quench the Spirit" and the impetus for Paul's writing.<sup>23</sup> Although the exact meaning is uncertain (so Holtz 1986, 265), the parallelism in vv. 19–20 indicates that quenching the Spirit, for Paul, is despising prophecy (so Fee 2009, 217). He balances these statements with injunctions to "test everything, cling to the good, put off every kind of evil" (v. 21–22). The generality and balance of these reminders makes it difficult to know why Paul mentioned prophecy, but it may be related to the fact that he considers it the greatest of the charismatic gifts (1 Cor 14:1–5). In addition to teaching the

---

<sup>23</sup> In addition to commentaries, see Börschel 2001, 302–314; Horn 1992, 127–129; Jewett 1986, 100–102; van Unnik 1968.

Thessalonians about God's gift of his Spirit, 5:19–22 shows further that he had addressed prophecy and suggests that other such *charismata* were also addressed.<sup>24</sup>

### 7.2.5 Apocalyptic eschatology and cosmology

I have noted throughout these chapters that the *parousia* and eschatological expectation were an important part of Paul's teaching in Thessalonica. This section explores the imagery Paul uses to describe this event (3:13; 4:15–17) and determines whether it illuminates a more detailed view of Paul's instruction on the subject.

In 3:13, Paul prays that "the Lord" (v. 12) might "strengthen your hearts [to be] blameless in holiness...at the *parousia* of our Lord Jesus, with all his holy ones." Although the majority of translations take the reference to "holy ones" to be "saints" (KJV, ASV, NRSV, NET, ESV, NASB, Luther), it is highly probable in this eschatological context that it refers to angelic beings.<sup>25</sup> This is a remarkably compressed apocalyptic statement that receives no explanation, though the apocalyptic quality of the *parousia* receives some expansion in 4:15–17.

As noted above, 4:15–17 is presented as new information intended as encouragement regarding the fate of "those who are sleeping." Given that the "word of the Lord" *per se* (vv. 15–17) does not appear to form part of Paul's initial teaching, it lies outside the scope of this chapter to discuss its origin (the earthly Jesus, the exalted Jesus, a Christian prophet, Paul's own revelation),<sup>26</sup> or the distinction between the "word" and Paul's explanation.<sup>27</sup> However, some comments on the conceptual background of Paul's

---

<sup>24</sup> Cf. van Unnik 1968 who suggestively argues that πνεῦμα in 5:19 is a reference to mantic practices (ἐνθουσιασμός) which parallel glossolalia.

<sup>25</sup> See Matt 24:30–31 (par. Mark 13:27); Sir 42:17; 45:2; *I Enoch* 1:9; 9:3 (in Ethiopic tradition, see Nickelsburg 2001–2012, 202; 9:4 in some Greek traditions, but omitted from Black's edition); 14:23; *passim*; *Apoc. Sedr.* 16:9; *T. Levi* 3:3; 4Q405 f6.5; cf. Malherbe 2000, 214; Williams 2009, 115–116; though Dan. 7 uses ἄγιον/יםִיִּקָּדֵשׁ to refer to God's people; cf. Isa 41:16 (LXX).

<sup>26</sup> In addition to commentaries, see Hofius 2000, 163–164; Kim 2002b; Coulot 2006a, 505; Schreiber 2007, 328–329.

<sup>27</sup> See Lüdemann 1984, 221–225; Nicholl 2004, 32–33.

description of the *parousia* are pertinent. Some scholars argue for parallels with imperial ideology and the formal Hellenistic reception (*ἀπαντήσις*),<sup>28</sup> which could undermine the need for previous Pauline teaching as the source for this *parousia* imagery. However, an exclusively Hellenistic or imperial explanation does not do justice to the entire passage.<sup>29</sup>

The images in vv. 15–17 are strikingly in line with Jewish apocalyptic and theophanic thought<sup>30</sup>: heavenly trumpet,<sup>31</sup> the archangel,<sup>32</sup> the descent of the Lord from heaven,<sup>33</sup> and the assumption of the faithful.<sup>34</sup> While this does not rule out the possibility of Hellenistic influences on Paul's language,<sup>35</sup> it suggests that his previous teaching included at least some introduction to this Jewish conceptual framework or that this part of the letter was likely very difficult to understand for the largely Gentile audience.<sup>36</sup> In fact, as noted briefly above (§6.1.1), beyond a general apocalyptic tone, some scholars have suggested that this passage draws specifically on the Jesus tradition preserved in Matt 24:30–31.<sup>37</sup> Paul may have such a tradition in view, but minimal verbal

---

<sup>28</sup> On which see especially Gundry 1996; Harrison 2002; Oakes 2005, 315–316; see Cook 2006, 527–529 on Greco-Roman negative reactions to Paul's apocalyptic assumption imagery.

<sup>29</sup> Nor is it claimed to do so by the scholars in the previous note. As Harrison 2011, 50–51 correctly observes, there is a "profusion of Jewish apocalyptic imagery" in this passage which is combined with allusions to the imperial cult. However, Harrison underestimates the role of Paul's prior teaching in his anti-imperial interpretation of this passage. Cf. the complaint in Moss and Baden 2012, 204 that "perhaps we have been too quick to dismiss apocalyptic and eschatological analogues" for this passage.

<sup>30</sup> Laub 1973, 127; Dupont 1952, 47–79. Some earlier scholars drew connections with a concept of the *Urmensch* or *Himmelmensch* seen for example in *1 Enoch*; e.g. Dibelius 1937, 26.

<sup>31</sup> Exod 19:16, 19; Isa 27:13; Joel 2:1; Zeph 1:14–16; Zech 9:14; *Pss. Sol.* 11:1; *4 Ezra* 6:23; *Apoc. Mos.* 22, 37; *Sibyl* 4.173–174; *Tg. Ps.-J.* Ex 20:18; *b. Ber.* 15b, cf. Bockmuehl 1991 and earlier Box 1912, 75.

<sup>32</sup> Dan 10:13; 12:1; *4 Ezra* 4:36f; *1 Enoch* 1:9; CD 2:5–6; *Apoc. Mos.* 38; Mark 8:38; Matt 24:31; Rev. 15:1.

<sup>33</sup> Exod 19:18–20; 34:5; Ps 144:5; Mic 1:3; Adams 2006; Evans 1993.

<sup>34</sup> *T Ab.* (b) 8:2–3; *Apoc. Zeph.* 1 (*apud* Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 5.11.77); Richard 1995, 229–230; Wanamaker 1990, 172–175; Plevnik 1984. On assumption, ascension and heavenly journeys, see Himmelfarb 1993, 47–71; Lohfink 1971, 51–74. For a detailed description of apocalyptic, see Rowland 1982, 9–189.

<sup>35</sup> Légasse 1999, 264–265 argues that both sides of the coin are important; cf. Rigaux 1956, 548.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Williams 2009, 116. This difficulty could perhaps be somewhat mitigated by the small Jewish influence within the congregation.

<sup>37</sup> E.g. de Jonge 1988, 36; Wanamaker 1990, 171; Wenham 1995, 306; cf my discussion of 1

correspondence with Matt 24, which is limited to "trumpet," "heaven" (occurring in Matthew's citation of Dan 7:13) and perhaps "(arch)angel," which are also common in Jewish apocalyptic writings, weakens an argument for direct dependence (so Tuckett 1990, 176–182). In any case, the specific "word of the Lord" used here by Paul is *new* for the Thessalonians (1 Thess 4:13), while he bases it on the Thessalonians' existing knowledge base which appears to have included a Jewish apocalyptic cosmology (see Rowland 1982, 78–123). Indeed, the reference to "holy ones" in 3:13 and an "archangel" in 4:16 may even suggest that Paul went beyond mere mention of angelic beings into some discussion of their hierarchy.<sup>38</sup>

Closely linked to the Jewish cosmology evident in Paul's discussion of the *parousia*, are Paul's two references to Satan (2:18; 3:5), both of which occur within Paul's account of his attempts to be reunited with the Thessalonians and his sending of Timothy (2:17–3:10). The language of Satan is uniquely Jewish (and, derivatively, Christian) and has no parallel in Greco-Roman thought (cf. Williams 2009, 15).<sup>39</sup> In 2:18, Paul states that his attempts to return to Thessalonica have been hindered (ἐγκόπτειν) by Satan. Again, and more remarkably, Paul refers to Satan in 3:5 in voicing his concern that "the tempter" (ὁ πειράζων) might lead the Thessalonians astray and his labor would be "in vain" (εἰς κενόν). Although the substantive use of the participle πειράζων to refer to Satan is rare in Jewish and early Christian literature, his role as the tempter was common (Brown 2011, 43–55, 138). What is so remarkable about this reference is that in order for the

---

Thess 5:2 (§7.2.3.3 above).

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Williams 2009, 116: "This mention of the archangel presupposes familiarity with the Jewish tradition of either four (3 *Bar.* 4.7) or seven chief angels (1 *En.* 20.1–7)."

<sup>39</sup> For a thorough discussion of Satan in Jewish sources, see Brown 2011, 23–69; cf. Day 1988, 147–159; Sacchi 1990, 211–232; Williams 2009, 87–92. Troels Engberg-Pedersen 2010, 92–98 argues that while Paul's *Geisterwelt* is deeply indebted to Jewish apocalyptic, it is not necessarily in conflict with a Stoic-like cosmology, though he admits that Satan falls "completely outside of anything one may find in Stoicism or Platonism" and that there is not a "one-to-one match between, say, Stoicism and Paul" (101–102).

Thessalonians to understand Paul's meaning, at least some of them would have had to be so familiar with Satan and his activities that such a circumlocution would have elicited the correct understanding (cf. 2 Thess 2:9). As Derek Brown has recently suggested, "Paul's ability to refer to Satan in a pithy manner apart from any theological explanation indicates that Paul and his readers shared greater knowledge about the figure than we find in the letter" (143).<sup>40</sup>

## 7.2.6 Community structure and praxis

So far, we have already noted that certain practices appear to have been in place in Thessalonica, such as communal worship and prophecy (cf. §7.2.4). This section will explore further the possibility that Paul imparted a structure to the Thessalonian community (§7.2.6.1), the practice of prayer (§7.2.6.2) and the "holy kiss" (§7.2.6.3).

### 7.2.6.1 Church hierarchy?

Paul's statements in 5:12–13 have long been debated especially with regard to the structure of Pauline communities and the historical development of church offices into the later monarchical episcopate (cf. Ign. *Smyrn.* 8:1–2; *1 Clem.* 44:1–4). "I ask you, brothers, εἰδέναι those who labor among you and προϊσταμένους you in the Lord and admonish you and to esteem them most highly in love because of their work. Be at peace with each other." A major difficulty in this passage, which we have noted elsewhere in the letter, is that Paul provides no explanation for his instructions (cf. Börschel 2001, 269). This has led to discussions of the meaning of his terms (e.g. εἰδέναι, προϊσταμαι), arguments about the official or voluntary nature of the actions described and the relation of v. 13b to the preceding statements. For our purposes, the question is not about the structure of Pauline communities but rather about what the letter reveals about Paul's instructions on church

---

<sup>40</sup> This quotation was originally in reference to Rom 16:20 but applies equally well to 1 Thessalonians and indeed to 1 Corinthians.

structure prior to leaving Thessalonica.

First, it should be noted that Paul does not address a group of leaders but the congregation as a whole (ἀδελφοί; v. 12). Furthermore, as the masculine participles show, Paul does not explicitly speak of offices or even activities but of those *doing* particular activities.<sup>41</sup> The term κοπιᾶν (and cognates) is a common word for physical labor that Paul uses regularly in its literal sense (1 Thess 2:9; 1 Cor 4:2), for his missionary work (Gal 4:11; 1 Cor 15:10) and for the labors of others on behalf of a community (1 Thess 5:12; Rom 16:1, 12).<sup>42</sup> The third term νοουθετεῖν, roughly analogous to Paul's preferred term παρακαλεῖν, refers to moral or ethical instruction and is evidently the responsibility of the entire community (5:14; cf. 4:18; 5:11).

Nested between these general terms for work within the community is the contested term προϊστάμαι. While some scholars argue strongly for the meaning "to be over" or "to be in authority" (cf. *CIG* 3540; P.Tebt 5.3.58; *OGIS* 728)<sup>43</sup> many others have emphasized another well-attested meaning: "to care or provide for" (cf. Rom 12:8; 16:2).<sup>44</sup> Still others correctly note that the dichotomy between care and leadership is false and that, as Ulrich Brockhaus famously put it, "rather, it seems likely on the whole that the term προϊστάμαι describes either a caring authority or an authoritative caring."<sup>45</sup> Another area of consideration is the social and educational stratification that would lend itself to a natural leadership structure similar to that of patronage.<sup>46</sup> Furthermore, Harry

<sup>41</sup> So Brockhaus 1975, 108; cf. Hainz 1972, 37–38; Maier 1961, 81.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. LSJ s.v. κοπιᾶω; Börschel 2001, 269; Holtz 1986, 242; Laub 1973, 70–71.

<sup>43</sup> E.g. Ascough 2003, 176–177; Rigaux 1956, 577–578; cf. earlier Milligan 1908, 71–72.

<sup>44</sup> E.g. Dibelius 1937, 30–31; Best 1972, 225; Hainz 1972, 38; Laub 1973, 71–72; Richard 1995, 268; von Campenhausen 1997 [1969], 64–65; Collins 1998, 411; Malherbe 2000, 314. Cf. LSJ and BDAG s.v. προϊστημι for both definitions.

<sup>45</sup> "Es spricht vielmehr alles dafür, daß das Wort προϊστάμαι eine fürsorgende Autorität oder eine autoritative Fürsorge beschreibt"; Brockhaus 1975, 106–107, my translation; cf. Börschel 2001, 269; Haufe 1999, 101; MacDonald 1988, 57; Holtz 1986, 243; Holmberg 1978, 99–100.

<sup>46</sup> So Brockhaus 1975, 106; Chapple 1984, 220–224; Jewett 1986, 103; Wanamaker 1990, 193; Meeks 2003, 134; cf. Hendrix 1991b. Ascough 2003, 176–177 suggests that the community structure was

Gamble notes that texts (including Paul's letter to the Thessalonians) were a central part of early Christianity and argues that literacy "was undoubtedly a primary desideratum of Christian leaders and teachers from the earliest days" (cf. 1 Thess 5:27; Gamble 1995, 9).

However, it is not clear that a designated group of leaders actually existed when Paul wrote to the Thessalonians. First, he does not mention any names such as Jason (Acts 17:5–9; cf. 1 Cor 16:15) and gives no explicit indication that he appointed specific people to specific roles.<sup>47</sup> In fact, it is not even clear that a specific group of people are in mind rather than a *type* of person whom the Thessalonians are to recognize, i.e. those who fulfill the functions of leaders.<sup>48</sup> Thus, it is possible that Paul is in fact providing new information about how the Thessalonians are to structure their community,<sup>49</sup> perhaps ratifying an inchoate structure already present in the nascent community. In this case, εἰδέναι can take a meaning close to its typical usage and the passage can be read as a two step process of leader selection: "*first* identify [know] those who labor...and [*then*] esteem them highly in love on account of their work." Finally, the admonition to peace ἐν ἑαυτοῖς fits this reading as Paul's caution against strife in the choosing of leaders.<sup>50</sup> Therefore, nothing demands that Paul included explicit instruction on community structure in his initial teaching at Thessalonica, though tacit institution of group responsibilities cannot be ruled out either. If Paul's timeframe in Thessalonica was as brief as Acts 17 suggests, it is hardly surprising that he had not set up a fixed leadership structure among the Thessalonian believers.

---

taken over from the existing voluntary association in which Paul ministered.

<sup>47</sup> So Wanamaker 1990, 1953; Holmberg 1978, 106–107; Laub 1973, 85.

<sup>48</sup> So Malherbe 2000, 310–312; Börschel 2001, 269–270.

<sup>49</sup> Cf. Holtz 1986, 248; Börschel 2001, 269.

<sup>50</sup> There is a difficult variant here between αὐτοῖς (either with smooth or with rough breathing) and ἑαυτοῖς. However, the text makes little difference to this argument.

### 7.2.6.2 *Prayer in Thessalonica*

At the beginning of his closing rapid-fire instructions in 5:16–22, Paul exhorts the Thessalonian Christians to "rejoice always, pray unceasingly, give thanks in every situation, for this is God's will for you in Christ Jesus." Paul noted earlier in the letter that he is joyful (3:9), prays unceasingly (1:2; 2:13) and often gives thanks (1:2; 2:13; 3:9) and the recurrence of these themes here (cf. also the *θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ* in 4:1) indicates that Paul is recalling this previous material (cf. Witherington 2006, 164–165). However, it seems likely that, although prayer was a familiar facet of Greco-Roman religion,<sup>51</sup> Paul would have addressed the issue in a specifically monotheistic way in his initial teaching (so Best 1972, 235). Indeed, in light of the fact that Paul considered his conduct to be paradigmatic for his converts (cf. §4.1.2), it is highly probable that various facets of prayer featured often during Paul's work in Thessalonica (cf. Malherbe 2000, 329).

### 7.2.6.3 *The "holy kiss"*

Paul closes his letter with an enigmatic reference to a "holy kiss" (cf. Rom 16:16; 1 Cor 16:20; 2 Cor 13:12). The lack of any explanation for such a practice here, or indeed anywhere in the New Testament, suggests that the custom was already known to the Thessalonian community (so Holtz 1986, 272). Unfortunately, this same lack of explanation extends throughout the NT, making any conclusions regarding this custom highly conjectural. One possibility that fits well with the Thessalonians' distinction from "the Gentiles" (cf. 4:5, see below) is that such a kiss functioned as a ritual boundary, identifying those who were out and those who were in (Penn 2005, 58, 80, *passim*).

---

<sup>51</sup> See Euripides *Andro.* 1117; Herodotus *Hist.* 1.48.6; Xenophon *Hell.* 3.2.22; Timaeus *Frag.* 10.4; Diodorus Siculus 31.11.2; Plutarch *De supe.* 166B; cf. LSJ s.v. *προσεύχομαι*; Burkert 1987, 73–77.

### 7.2.7 The Thessalonian community's self-understanding

The question remains, what can we determine about the self-understanding of the Thessalonian community to whom Paul entrusted his teaching about God, Jesus, the Holy Spirit, ethical behavior and a Jewish apocalyptic cosmology (including discussion of angelic beings)? This is particularly tricky given that the self-understanding of a person or community does not reside entirely at the level of conscious thought. Nevertheless, Paul does address a group of people who saw themselves as distinct from other people in some way, with a particular group ethos. This is evident in the terms with which Paul addresses the community and attributes he ascribes to them, in each case without explanation or justification. As T. J. Deidun rightly notes, "[w]e may assume that the epithets applied to a community, especially when unaccompanied by explanation or apology, correspond at least in some measure with the understanding which that community has of itself" (Deidun 1981, 3). Further, these elements need to be assessed together rather than in isolation in order to come to terms with the cumulative thought-complex they evoke.

In short, Paul portrays the Thessalonians as the elect people of God who are, and are to remain, holy and distinct from the "Gentiles who do not know God" (4:5). Paul addresses them as an ἐκκλησία and regularly calls them ἀδελφοί. In 1:4, Paul states that the reason for his thanksgiving on behalf of the Thessalonians is that "we know [εἰδότες], brothers beloved by God, of your election [τὴν ἐκλογὴν ὑμῶν]." In 4:1–8, Paul states that the Thessalonians are already acting in accordance with Paul's teaching, and that this involves their "sanctification" (vv. 3, 7) and moral separation from Gentiles (v. 5). The distinction between the Thessalonians and other groups appears again in 4:13 where they are distinguished from "the rest who have no hope."<sup>52</sup> So also in 1 Thess 5:1–7 Paul

---

<sup>52</sup> Contrary to a number of scholars (e.g. Ascough 2004, 522; van Houwelingen 2007, 310), Paul is not concerned here with whether various non-Christian groups *felt* hopeful but rather he considered all those not in Christ not to have an *objective* hope of resurrection (with e.g. Barclay 2003, 138–139; Coulot

distinguishes between the Thessalonians and the "others" who are "children of the night." As John Barclay has noted, the "insistent contrasts between the two categories of humanity" are similar to the common Jewish binary division between Jew and Gentile (Barclay 2003, 142–143).

In this respect, 1 Thess 4:5 is particularly illuminating. The distinction between God's people and the Gentiles is seen in that the latter "do not know God" (1 Thess 4:5; cf. 4:9), a point that has its roots in Jewish tradition (Jer 10:25; cf. Acts 14:16–17), and therefore display their "passionate lust" rather than holiness.<sup>53</sup> Far from being an "unfortunate slip" (as Hock 1999, 163 suggests), Paul here shows his hand: the Thessalonians are distinct from Gentiles precisely as the holy people of God.<sup>54</sup> This is remarkable in a community *composed almost entirely of Gentiles*.

Although the background for these various designations, taken individually, are notoriously difficult to pin down, taken together they assume a markedly Jewish quality.<sup>55</sup> Further, these references fit in with the broader Jewish apocalyptic framework noted above. Nevertheless, in the case of especially widespread terminology such as ἐκκλησία and ἀδελφός, the very diffusion of this language may well have made Paul's introduction of it that much easier to grasp by the Thessalonians.

#### *Excursus 4: Election, holiness, ἐκκλησία and ἀδελφός*

While the term ἐκλογή is relatively rare, the concept of "election," a particular group being chosen by God, is a quintessentially Jewish notion, especially prevalent in

---

2006a, 502; Légasse 1999, 246). See Wright 2003, 32–84 for various Greco-Roman views of death and their rejection of bodily resurrection.

<sup>53</sup> So Laub 1973, 55; Börschel 2001, 247–248.

<sup>54</sup> With *inter alios* Holtz 1986, 160 and Horrell 2005, 134; *pace* Malherbe 2000, 231.

<sup>55</sup> With Barclay 2003, 143; Börschel 2001, 244; Collins 1998, 408; Deidun 1981, 27; *pace* Hock 1999, 166.

the second temple period but reaching back to exilic and pre-exilic times;<sup>56</sup> Indeed, the notion of election was brought together with Gods' love for Israel already in Hosea (1–3; so Börschel 2001, 143). Notably, while such a designation was common in Jewish circles, it is very rare as a religious concept in Greco-Roman materials.

In much Jewish thought, election was inextricably bound with another key defining attribute of the people of God, namely, holiness, and both concepts were further linked with the notion that Israel (as the people of God) was distinct from the surrounding nations (cf. Lev 20:22–26; Deut 14:2). Holiness occurs regularly in Jewish tradition as an attribute for God, the result of his actions and as a requirement for God's people.<sup>57</sup> It involved a ritual and moral separation from the unclean Gentile world (cf. Lev 20:26) which persisted in early Christianity.<sup>58</sup> Further, the recent work of Bohlen 2011 has argued forcefully that the designation ἄγιοι in Paul's letters stems from the Jewish conception of Israel as God's holy people. I already noted how Paul's reminder regarding sexual immorality in 1 Thess 4:3–8 was closely linked with holiness (ἁγιασμός) and the boundary between the Thessalonian believers and the "passionate lust" of the Gentiles. (See Excursus 3 on πορνεία, εἰδωλωλατρία, πλεονεξία and Jewish moral teaching.)

Notably, although a notion of holiness, something dedicated to a god or cultic use, was part of Greco-Roman religion (Vahrenhorst 2008, 129, 138–139), holiness in this sense was not tied to moral or ethical demands as in Judaism and Christianity (cf.

---

<sup>56</sup> E.g. Deut 4:37; Isa 41:8–9; 65:9; *I En.* 1:1, 3, 8; 3:7–8; *Sib. Or.* 2:175; 3:69; 1 Esd. 7:2; CD 2:14–16; 1QM 10:9–10; 1QS 1:3–5; *T. Jud.* 21:5; *T. Benj.* 10:10; so Börschel 2001, 144–145; Bruce 1982, 13; Holtz 1986, 45 n. 77; Wanamaker 1990, 77, cf. Patrick and Shogren 1992; Schrenk and Quell 1967.

<sup>57</sup> God as holy: Ex 15:11; Lev 19:2; 20:7; 1 Chr 16:35; 1 Sam 2:2; Tob 3:11; 1QM 12:8; God's sanctification: Gen 2:3; 20:7; 21:15; 1 Esd 1:47; 2 Macc 1:25; Requirement for holiness: Ex 13:2; Lev 19:6; 22:31; Lev 19:2; 20:7; Deut 5:12; 1 Esd 1:3; Jdt. 6:19; Tob 8:15; 1QS 11:8; 1QM 10:10. On this, note especially the survey in Bohlen 2011, 20–66 who emphasizes the eschatological aspect of the designation, cf. Malherbe 2000, 238; Weima 1996, 103; Best 1972, 159; Rigaux 1956, 501.

<sup>58</sup> E.g. Rom 12:1, 1 Cor 1:2; 1 Thess 3:13; 4:3–7; Heb 10:14; 1 Pet 1:15; 2:5–9; Rev 4:8), cf. Koester 1979, 43; Collins 1998, 407; Börschel 2001, 244, 253–254. On this, see esp. Klawans 2000; Klawans 2006, 54–56.

Harrington 2001, 180–190) nor was the term ἅγιος particularly common, with ἱερός or ἄγνός being preferred (Burkert 1987, 269–271). Further, the term ἁγιασμός is "not used outside Biblical and Christian literature" (Koester 1979, 43 n. 22).

That Paul refers to a chosen and holy community as ἐκκλησία and ἀδελφοί would seem to place the latter two items within the Jewish social and moral framework of the former two. As is often noted, the term ἐκκλησία served in the LXX as a common translation for לְהָקֵף, thus designating the assembly of the people of God.<sup>59</sup> Some scholars, however, point to the Greek use of the term ἐκκλησία,<sup>60</sup> used in reference to Greek civic life as well as appearing occasionally in reference to voluntary associations which often mimicked their surrounding civic structures.<sup>61</sup> Further, Michael Wolter 2011, 270–272 (*inter alios*) argues that the use of ἐκκλησία in the LXX cannot form the direct backdrop for Paul's use of the term since there it is only used in reference to the entire, gathered congregation of Israel and not sub-groups thereof. However, the plural ἐκκλησίαι in 3 *Bar.* 16:4, LXX Ps 25:12 and 67:27 may indicate that the term had been appropriated from the LXX with less specific parameters and the Qumran community is well known for their appropriation of the term לְהָקֵף as a reference to their assemblies (e.g. CD 11:22), though the link remains tentative. Nevertheless, it is not necessary that Paul (or his readers) understood ἐκκλησία in specifically Deuteronomic terms, but it is important that the term itself does fit within the wider Jewish *Sinnwelt* to which Paul alludes. Further, with whatever overtones it may have had, it is implausible that the Thessalonians or Corinthians should *both* refer to themselves as ἐκκλησία on their own without input from Paul. In fact, the almost complete absence of the term in Romans may suggest that it was

---

<sup>59</sup> E.g. Börschel 2001, 162–165; Dunn 1998, 537–543; Horbury 1997, 5, 12–13; Trebilco 2012, 166–169.

<sup>60</sup> E.g. Schrage 1991-2001, 1:102; Campbell 1948.

<sup>61</sup> Cf. Van Kooten 2012; Ascough 2003, 148; Cotter 1993, 103–104; Hellerman 2005, 88–109.

not a ubiquitous group designator within early Christianity (see §9.3.8).

Similarly, scholars point to Greco-Roman notions of siblingship as the backdrop for sibling language in Paul's letters.<sup>62</sup> However, a quick dismissal of Jewish tradition as a source for Paul's usage (as in Aasgaard 2004, 5, 306) is unwarranted since there is a consistent stream of Jewish authors who use sibling language for their religious community, among whom is also Jesus.<sup>63</sup> On the other hand, fictive-sibling language was not common among voluntary associations (Ascough 2003, 76–77). Notably, one of the very few uses of *φιλάδελφος* (or cognates) for non-genetic siblings prior to 1 Thess 4:9 (cf. Rom 12:10) is found in 2 Macc 15:14, where Jeremiah is described as "one who loves the brothers [*φιλάδελφος*] and prays greatly for the people and the holy city." Otherwise the term is restricted to genetic siblings.<sup>64</sup> Although Philip Harland 2005, 499–500 has pointed to two possible occurrences of a fictive *φιλάδελφος* on Greco-Roman grave inscriptions, he also acknowledges, with David Noy, that it is more common within Jewish inscriptions (*JJudO* III Syr70 with notes *ad loc.*). Noy remarks that *φιλάδελφος* is "a fairly common epithet in Jewish inscriptions" which may at times refer "to a more general love of 'brethren' in the sense of the whole Jewish community" as in certain synagogue materials.

Furthermore, there is a great deal of continuity between various emphases in Greco-Roman discussions of siblingship and Jewish use of fictive-sibling language in ethical and theological discourse. For instance, the emphasis on love,<sup>65</sup> mutual support<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>62</sup> Aasgaard 2004; Burke 2003; Hellerman 2001.

<sup>63</sup> Lev 19:17–18; 25:25–39; Deut 15; Is 66:5; Jer 34:8–17; Mic 5:2; 1 Esd 1:5–6; Tob 1:3, *passim*; Jdt 7:30; 1QSa 1.18; 1QS 6:10, 22; CD 6:17–20; Matt 5:22–24, *passim*; cf. now Trebilco 2012, 38–46.

<sup>64</sup> Plutarch *Frat. amor.*; Sophocles *Ant.* 526–527; Aristotle *Eth. nic.* 8.12 [1161b]; Diodorus Siculus 17.34.3; Philo *Legat.* 87; *Ios.* 218–219; cf. Aasgaard 1997; Betz 1978; Burke 2003, 98–100, 110–117; Klauck 1990.

<sup>65</sup> Lev 19:17–18; *Jub.* 35:9 [in Denis' Greek edition, Black and Denis 1970], 20; Tob 4:12–13; *T. Zeb.* 8:5; Plutarch *Frat. Amor.*

and maintenance of one's religious heritage.<sup>67</sup> Paul's easy use of fictive-sibling language for his communities suggests that they adopted this language as part of their communal self-understanding. In conjunction with the other aspects discussed above, a Jewish contribution of fictive-sibling language seems likely indeed (cf. Börschel 2001, 242). The commonness of sibling language in the Greco-Roman world would have certainly made its introduction easy for Paul and may have linked up with an already extant use of sibling language among the Jewish communities in Thessalonica and Corinth.

### 7.2.8 Implicit appeals and the framework of explicit reminders

Paul's characterization of the Thessalonian community is subtle and nowhere receives full discussion within the letter. This implies that such a characterization would not have been entirely foreign to the Thessalonian Christians. His implicit appeals to their knowledge provide further details related to Paul's explicit references to his teaching (§5.1.4) and his direct appeals to knowledge (§6.1.3). God was identified as the "father" of Jesus, Paul and the Thessalonians (1:1, 3: 3:11, 13). Jesus' titles were clearly familiar to the Thessalonians, though as I noted the precise significance of these is difficult to determine. Paul's message about the death and resurrection of Jesus was accompanied, fittingly, by some narrative of his passion (2:14–15). The Holy Spirit, which accompanied Paul's message, was shown as a gift from God to the Thessalonians (4:8) and somehow involved in the process of prophecy (5:19). In addition to prophecy, Paul also passed on the practice of prayer, probably in some sort of gathered worship setting.

The eschatological themes Paul imparted were presented with an apocalyptic cosmology including angelic beings and cosmic events such as the descent of the Lord to earth. This eschatological framework was linked to the community's self-understanding as

---

<sup>66</sup> Lev 25:25–46; Deut 15; Sir 29:1–10; Tob 1:3; Aasgaard 2004, 67–70.

<sup>67</sup> Lev. 19:17; Jdt 8:12–24; Barclay 1997; Osiek and Balch 1997, 36; Helleman 2001, 52–53.

a group distinct from the ignorant and immoral Gentiles (4:5, 13) who were bound for judgment (5:3). Paul indicated that the community referred to itself as an ἐκκλησία, composed of ἀδελφοί, who were set apart by God to be holy. Such an eschatological division is related to Paul's initial teaching about the inevitability of suffering (3:3–4). This group is also marked off by group-specific customs such as the "holy kiss."

## 7.3 Implicit Appeals to Knowledge in 1 Corinthians

### 7.3.1 Paul the apostle

It was already suggested above that the Corinthians knew the meaning of the term ἀπόστολος, as indicated by its inclusion as a recognized "gift" among the πνευματικά in 12:28.<sup>68</sup> Paul applies the designation to himself four times in 1 Corinthians.

In the letter's prescript Paul notes that he is "called [to be] an apostle of Jesus Christ by the will of God" (1:1). In 4:9, Paul includes himself among the apostles who are on display for the world. Further, in 9:1–2 Paul poses the question, with οὐ to imply an affirmative answer, "Am I not an apostle?" and then states "If I am not an apostle to others, at any rate I am to you." While the latter may simply be a hypothetical statement, it may also suggest that his apostleship is limited to those to whom he was sent.<sup>69</sup> This parallels Paul's similar discussion of his parent-child relationship in 4:14–15; there may be many παιδαγωγοί for the Corinthian believers, but only one father.<sup>70</sup> Together, these images indicate that Paul's role as an apostle is one of authority and that he expects the Corinthians to view it as such. Finally, in 15:9, Paul notes that he is the "least of the apostles" and not worthy of the title, though even his self-deprecating references affirm

---

<sup>68</sup> See §6.2.3 above.

<sup>69</sup> Cf. Conzelmann 1975, 152. This would parallel the definition of an apostle in Origen *Comm. John* 32.17.205.1–206.1: ἀλλ' ὁ ἀπόστολος, ὡς περ τοῦ ἀποστείλαντός ἐστιν ἀπόστολος, οὕτως τισὶν πρὸς οὓς ἀποστέλλεται μόνοις ἐστὶν ἀπόστολος; cf. *m. Ber.* 5.5: שְׁלֵחוֹ שֶׁל אִם כְּמוֹתוֹ.

<sup>70</sup> See Gerber 2005, 425–428 who emphasizes the unique role in which this metaphor depicts Paul and its relation to similar foundational metaphors throughout 1 Cor 3–4.

that he is indeed an apostle.<sup>71</sup>

Although Paul does appear at times to defend his status as an apostle (e.g. 9:1–27), at no time does he clarify what the term means nor does he clarify why he attributes it to himself. It may be that we glimpse some justification in 1:17 when he states οὐ γὰρ ἀπέστειλέν με Χριστὸς βαπτίζειν ἀλλὰ εὐαγγελίσεσθαι, but whether he explicitly made this connection for the Corinthians is impossible to say. Scholars often connect Paul's concept of apostleship to seeing the risen Jesus and being commissioned by him (cf. 1 Cor 9:1),<sup>72</sup> but even there Paul never makes an explicit connection between his *seeing* the risen Jesus and his apostleship. Indeed, the over 500 "brothers" of 1 Cor 15:6 saw Jesus and are not designated apostles and, as we saw in the previous chapter, Timothy may be included as an apostle (1 Thess 2:7) in Paul's mind which makes drawing any definite conclusions from 9:1 and 15:8–9 difficult. What *is* relatively clear is that Paul referred to himself as an apostle while with the Corinthians and explained what it meant to be one.

## 7.3.2 Jesus, his titles and his teachings

### 7.3.2.1 Jesus' titles

Although Jesus' titles "Christ" and "Lord" are included in Paul's explicit reminders of his teaching (e.g. 2:2; 11:23; 15:3), as in 1 Thessalonians, the titles themselves are never explained. Aside from general comments about the use of Christological titles in Paul's letters, then, can anything more be said about the use or significance of these titles for the Corinthians?<sup>73</sup>

There are several passages which are potentially significant for understanding the

---

<sup>71</sup> So rightly, Fee 1987, 734; Thiselton 2000, 1210; cf. von Campenhausen 1997 [1969], 33.

<sup>72</sup> E.g. Schütz 1975, 35, 281; Brockhaus 1975, 97; Fee 1987, 395; Gerber 2005, 124; Fitzmyer 2008, 356; cf. the excursus in Thiselton 2000, 669–673.

<sup>73</sup> Cf. §7.2.3.1 above for general comments on the titles.

presumed Christology of the Corinthians, though they are all very difficult to link with Paul's initial preaching or teaching. For instance in 2:8 Paul refers to Jesus as "the Lord of Glory," a phrase used in second temple Judaism for God.<sup>74</sup> Again, in 2:16, Paul cites Isa 40:13 – "who has known the mind of the Lord, who will advise him" – which originally referred to God and follows it up with "but we have the mind of Christ." It is interesting, as we noted above (§7.2.3.1), that Paul often uses the title "Lord" to distinguish between Jesus and God (cf. 1 Cor 8:4–6). If this is the case here, Paul interprets Isaiah's statement about God with reference to Jesus.<sup>75</sup> That is, v. 16b effectively answers Isaiah's question with "we do." This suggests a willingness on Paul's part to test the edges of traditional Jewish monotheism. However, as interesting as these points may be, there is nothing in the text that clearly links them with Paul's initial preaching and teaching. As has been seen variously throughout this chapter, it is not unusual for Paul to take epithets, titles and texts that referred to God in their original setting and apply them to Jesus. There is no reason that these precise points had to be known to the Corinthians prior to Paul's letter.

One text, however, can be linked more easily with Paul's initial work in Corinth. In the letter's prescript, Paul includes with himself "all those who call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place" (1:2). This phrase, ἐπικαλεῖν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου, is drawn from the LXX in which it was used in worship and supplication to God, and even featured as part of the eschatological vision of renewal in Joel and Zephaniah.<sup>76</sup> However, where the "Lord" of the LXX is the God of Israel, for Paul and the Corinthians it is now Jesus Christ.<sup>77</sup> Notably, the verb ἐπικαλεῖν was occasionally used in non-Jewish

---

<sup>74</sup> *I En.* 22:14; 27:3, 5; cf. Ps 23:8, 10; 1QM 12:8; 19:1; 1QHa 26:9, 11, 33 where the phrase is "king of glory" (מֶלֶךְ הַכְבוֹד); cf. Garland 2003, 97.

<sup>75</sup> So Capes 1992, 139–140; Tilling 2012, 115 n. 52, but note the hesitancy in Hurtado 2003, 112.

<sup>76</sup> Joel 2:32; Zeph 3:9; Zech 13:9; In worship: Ps 105:1; 116:4, 13, 17; 1 Chr 21:26; Supplication: 1 Kings 18:24; 2 Kings 5:11; Lam 3:55; cf. Steyn 1996, 482. Note also Paul's citation of Joel 2:32 in Rom 10:13.

<sup>77</sup> Cf. also the discussion of the "day of the Lord" below.

Greek literature with the meaning of summoning or invoking a God, though it is more commonly used in secular contexts such as courts.<sup>78</sup> That Paul never clarifies what he means by this indicates that he expects this phrase, even the practice itself, to be accepted among his audience.<sup>79</sup> Whether it is simply another way to refer to prayer or it involves a liturgical element is not explicated in the text, though these are not mutually exclusive options.

### 7.3.2.2 *Jesus' teachings*

The goal here is not to identify all the various possible allusions to Jesus tradition in 1 Corinthians, but simply to ask whether there are any traditions of Jesus' teaching that Paul passed on to the Corinthians. We already noted above that the tradition of the Lord's supper was passed on to the Corinthians (11:23–25).<sup>80</sup> 1 Cor 9:14, which is explicitly tagged as a command from the Lord, has often been linked with Jesus' teaching "the worker is worthy of his wages" (Mt 10:10; Lk 10:7).<sup>81</sup> However, it cannot be linked with Paul's initial teaching due to its place in the surrounding context. In 9:13, as we noted above, Paul uses the question "do you not know" to introduce well-known information about attendants at sacrifices as an explanatory analogy for v. 14. In other words, Paul's command from the Lord in 9:14 is the point for which v. 13 is a proleptic explanation. Thus, although the Lord ordered that "those who proclaim the gospel should live from the gospel," it appears that this point was unknown to the Corinthians.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Cf. Herodotus 2.39; 3.8; LSJ *s.v.* ἐπικαλέω.

<sup>79</sup> So Deidun 1981, 13; Schrage 1991-2001, 1:105.

<sup>80</sup> I find the suggested allusions in 1 Cor 4:12–13 (cf. Mt 5:43–44; Lk 6:27–28) and 1 Cor 13:2 (cf. Mt 17:20; cf. Holtz 1991 and Wenham 1995, 81–83, 251) to be very faint at best and quite possibly not present (cf. Neiryneck 1996) and so I am omitting them from extended discussion.

<sup>81</sup> E.g. Dungan 1971, 16–21; Fitzmyer 2008, 365; Holtz 1991, 384.

<sup>82</sup> Fee 1987, 412 notes the analogical connection between vv. 13 and 14 and states that "the casual way in which Paul introduces" the command of the Lord may suggest that the Corinthians were already aware of it. However, he notes that it "simply cannot be known" (412 n. 97).

The appeal to Jesus' teaching on which scholars are most unanimous is in Paul's judgment on marriage and divorce: "But I command to those who are married – not I but the Lord – a woman ought not separate from her husband...nor should a husband divorce his wife" (7:10–11).<sup>83</sup> However, in the whole of chapter 7 Paul is occupied with responding to Corinthian questions on marriage (cf. 7:1) by providing his judgments on a variety of situations. This suggests that while Paul appears to have had Jesus' teaching on divorce in mind while formulating his response, this was not something he had already passed on to the Corinthians. Indeed, in chapter 7 Paul nowhere indicates that he is reminding the Corinthians of something he had previously told them.

Aside from these negative results, Paul's use of Jesus' teaching in the letter which he had not previously passed on to the Corinthians actually indicates that appeals to Jesus' teachings were not a novelty to them. This is supported by the fact that Paul *did* pass on at least the tradition of the Last Supper to the Corinthians as the words of the Lord. As in many other aspects of Paul's letters, this suggests that we are dealing with merely the tip of the iceberg when it comes to Paul's transmission of Jesus traditions, though it is extremely difficult to say more.

### 7.3.3 Eschatological errata

This discussion of Corinthian eschatological presuppositions is closely linked in theme and argument with the eschatological presuppositions of the Thessalonians discussed in the previous chapter. The most obvious discussion of eschatological matters in 1 Corinthians is in Paul's response to those who say "there is no resurrection from the dead" (1 Cor 15), which was touched on above and will be addressed further below. However, references to eschatological topics are found scattered in the first six chapters

---

<sup>83</sup> Cf. Mk: 10:9–12; Mt 19:6, 9; 5:31–32; Lk 16:18. Even so-called minimalists such as Neiryck 1996 agree that this is a reference to Jesus' teaching.

as well. In particular, Paul makes three references to the "Day of the Lord" (1:8; 3:13; 5:5), a concept he never bothers to explain.

The first passage, at the close of the letter's thanksgiving (1:4–9), is closely linked with a reminder of Paul's preaching. "Just as the testimony of Christ was established among you...having received the revelation of our Lord Jesus Christ, who will establish you until the end blameless in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ" (1:6–8). As is well known (and noted in chapter 6 above), the concept of the Day of the Lord, as a day of eschatological judgment, is drawn from Old Testament prophetic texts and was widely used within the apocalyptic strain of second temple Judaism.<sup>84</sup> However, Paul has expanded the formula here from "day of the Lord" (cf. 1 Thess 5:2) to "day of *our* Lord *Jesus Christ*." Again in 5:5, Paul mentions the "day of the Lord," this time in his discussion of ejecting the wicked person from the community (1 Cor 5:1–13). He states that the Corinthians ought to hand the offender over to Satan (see §7.3.4 below) for the destruction of the flesh "so that the spirit might be saved on the day of the Lord." In these passages, the day of the Lord is one of judgment, but also of salvation.<sup>85</sup>

This point is made also in 3:12–13 wherein Paul states that the work of those who build on the foundation of Christ will be known for what they are, "for the day will show it" (3:13). Interestingly, the full formula of "day of the Lord" is shortened to simply "the day" with no noticeable change in meaning. Further, the notion of judgment present in 1:8 and 5:5 is present in 3:12–13, this time accompanied by the imagery of fire which will test the integrity of each builder's work. While it is true that the image of a testing fire is not absent from Greco-Roman materials,<sup>86</sup> fire is a very common element of theophany

---

<sup>84</sup> Cf. Fee 1987, 43; Fitzmyer 2008, 199; Kuck 1992, 179; Lindemann 2000, 31–32. See the references cited above in §6.1.2.

<sup>85</sup> Notably, these are the two themes in Amos' discussion of the Day of the Lord (Amos 5:18–20), though he is emphasizing the judgment in the face of those who were hoping for salvation.

<sup>86</sup> On gold tested by fire, e.g. Ovid *Tristia* 1.5.25–26; Maximus of Tyre 11.2ab; cf. Kuck 1992,

and judgment in Jewish writings.<sup>87</sup> Given the connection between the eschatological "day of the Lord" and the judgment by fire, it would appear that there is no move beyond the eschatological/apocalyptic framework. It is very striking that Gentile Corinthian believers would have known anything about the Day of the Lord, apparently so well that only "the day" was required as a reference (cf. Thiselton 2000, 313), and that Jewish Corinthian believers would have construed it as the day of the Lord *Jesus*. These points probably originated with Paul's initial preaching and teaching, a point suggested by the close connection in 1:6–8 between Paul's "testimony of Christ" and the day of the Lord.

Another concept that is closely linked to, if not synonymous with, "the day of the Lord" is *παρουσία*, the coming of Christ. In contrast with 1 Thessalonians where Paul uses the term four times (2:19; 3:13; 4:15; 5:23), in 1 Corinthians he only uses it once. In the midst of Paul's explanation of resurrection to the Corinthians, after his statement that Christ was raised from the dead (15:20) and his introduction of the Adam-Christ typology (15:21–22), Paul states that "Each [is raised] in their own order: Christ the firstfruits, then those of Christ at his *parousia*" (15:23). This linking of Christ's *parousia* and the eschatological resurrection "seems to be a natural combination of two eschatological expectations [final resurrection and Christ's return], yet in Paul's letters it is found only twice," here and in 1 Thess 4:16–17 (Holleman 1996, 203). In both passages Paul treats the eschaton in apocalyptic terms (cf. Eriksson 1998, 263). The meaning of the term *parousia*, like the "day of the Lord," is taken for granted by Paul,<sup>88</sup> who moves on to

---

181. Note this use also in Jewish literature, cf. Sir. 2:5.

<sup>87</sup> E.g. Exod 19:18; Isa 9:19; 29:6; 30:27, 30; 33:14; Jer 6:29 (which combines the imagery of refining and judgment); 17:27; 21:14; Ezek 15:6; 21:31; 38:19; Mic 1:4; Nah 1:6; Ps 11:6; CD 2:5–6; 1QS 2:7–8; 4:11–13; 1QpHab 10:3–8; 4Q185 frags. 1–2 1.7–9; Jdt. 16:17; Bar 4:35. The element of divine judgment is lacking from the Stoic notion of conflagration, which has again been put forward as relevant background esp. by Engberg-Pedersen 2010, 31–38. See further on this below.

<sup>88</sup> Of course, the term *parousia* itself would have been intelligible also from the context of the arrival of a monarch; cf. Harrison 2011, 56–59.

explain that death itself is a "power" to be defeated by Christ,<sup>89</sup> presumably demonstrated by the resurrection of believers.<sup>90</sup> It is the latter that is the whole point of Paul's argument in 1 Cor 15.

This chapter of 1 Corinthians raises another question. Although there are numerous theories about *why* some of the Corinthians denied a future bodily resurrection of believers,<sup>91</sup> it is more important here to ask, *from what* were the Corinthians deviating? Here identifying the similarities and differences between 1 Cor 15 and 1 Thess 4:15–17 is instructive. I have already noted that the only two places in the Pauline corpus where the *parousia* and the resurrection of believers are explicitly connected are 1 Cor 15:23 and 1 Thess 4:16–17. However, the similarities extend beyond this. When Paul tells the Corinthians a "mystery" in 15:51, his subsequent statements have a structural similarity to his "word of the Lord" in 1 Thess. He says, "we will not all sleep, but we will all be changed, in an instant [ἀτόμῳ], in the blink of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound and the dead will be raised imperishable and we will be changed" (1 Cor 15:51–52). In 1 Thess 4:16–17 Paul says

At the cry of the archangel, at the trumpet of God, the Lord himself will descend from heaven and the dead will rise first in Christ; then we who are living... will be snatched up... to meet the Lord... And thus we shall be with the Lord forever.

In both passages, there are two groups at the time of the resurrection, the living and the

---

<sup>89</sup> Cf. esp. de Boer 1988, 121–122 who argues that this view of death was precisely what was new for the Corinthians in this passage.

<sup>90</sup> There is no indication here that Paul is concerned with a general resurrection of believers *and* non-believers; cf. de Boer 1988, 103; Fee 1987, 749–750; Hofius 2008, 122–127; Schrage 1991–2001, 4:167.

<sup>91</sup> Some scholars argue that Paul is trying to refute a very "realized" eschatology – a denial of the resurrection due to their belief that they were already living the resurrection life (so Tuckett 1996). Others maintain that some of the Corinthian Christians have denied the bodily resurrection of Christians, perhaps due to a strict body/spirit dualism (so Hoffmann 1966, 242–243; Holleman 1996, 40; Sellin 1986, 30–37, 188, *passim*). Asher 2000 has argued that the denial of resurrection was due to the fact that the Corinthians considered bodily resurrection to violate the law of cosmic polarity, that terrestrial material could not enter the celestial realm (89, *passim*). For a detailed and incisive account of these options, aside from that of Asher, see Wedderburn 1987, 6–37.

dead, both of whom are to be bought into proximity of the Lord, stated previously to the Corinthians in 15:27–28, 50. In both passages, the resurrection of the dead is mentioned before the events pertaining to the living. Finally, in both passages the crucial link for Paul's argument is the connection between belief in Christ's resurrection and the future resurrection of believers (1 Thess 4:14; 1 Cor 15:12–19).<sup>92</sup> Paul's argument in 1 Corinthians hinges on the fact that the resurrection of Christ is essentially the same kind of resurrection as that of the believers and, thus, that his resurrection leads to theirs (cf. 2 Cor 4:14).<sup>93</sup>

The differences are also notable. In 1 Thessalonians, Paul uses a profusion of apocalyptic imagery and emphasizes the relative time of the resurrection of the dead and the assumption of the living. However 1 Cor 15 presents a much more philosophical discussion of resurrection, with *a reductio ad absurdum* in 15:12–19, arguments from scriptural authority (vv. 20–28), arguments from experience (vv. 29–34) and arguments about the nature and transformation of various bodies (vv. 35–49).<sup>94</sup> 1 Thessalonians makes no mention of the philosophical problem of perishable flesh and the imperishable inheritance; 1 Corinthians plays down the temporal distinction between resurrection of the dead and the transformation of the living and uses less apocalyptic imagery, though such imagery *is* still there.<sup>95</sup> Indeed, resurrection itself is part of a Jewish apocalyptic framework.<sup>96</sup>

Importantly, the principal difference in content between 1 Thess 4:15–17 and 1 Cor 15 is found precisely at the point in each passage where Paul directly addresses the

---

<sup>92</sup> On these parallels, cf. Schrage 1991-2001, 4:170; Sellin 1986, 46–49.

<sup>93</sup> So Bengel 1835, 163; Sellin 1986, 292.

<sup>94</sup> Cf. Eriksson 1998, 232–278 for a thorough analysis of the rhetorical flow in 1 Cor 15.

<sup>95</sup> As Fitzmyer 2008, 567 notes on 15:24–28, these verses "certainly have apocalyptic trappings."

<sup>96</sup> Cf. the discussion of Jewish views on resurrection, which were by no means monolithic, in Stemberger 1972 and Wright 2003, 129–206.

issues that gave rise to the discussions in the first place: the relative eschatological advantage of the dead and living (1 Thess) and the philosophical justification of the resurrection (1 Cor). In 1 Corinthians, Paul is clearly going to great pains to present the resurrection body in terms of "transformation" (15:35–57; cf. 2 Cor 5:1–4) which is his effort to accommodate himself to the objections of his interlocutor in v. 35: "But someone will say 'How are the dead raised? And in what kind of body are they coming?'"<sup>97</sup> As Troels Engberg-Pedersen correctly notes, "Paul attempts to fill in the basic, 'apocalyptic' and rudimentarily cosmological account given in 1 Thessalonians by drawing on material from his philosophical context" (Engberg-Pedersen 2010, 12).<sup>98</sup> This suggests that the teaching introduced by Paul to the Thessalonians is basically the same teaching that Paul is now justifying with philosophical discussion in 1 Cor 15; he did, after all, write 1 Thessalonians while in Corinth (so Nordgaard 2011, 351).

Finally, it is worth noting that Paul closes his final greeting in 16:22 with the Aramaic phrase *maranatha*. While it is not clear exactly how this term ought to be interpreted – "Our Lord, come" or "Our Lord has come" – many scholars opt for the former as an eschatologically oriented prayer, noting a potentially similar liturgical use in Didache 10:14 and an analogous Greek construction in Rev 22:20 (ἔρχου κύριε Ἰησοῦ).<sup>99</sup>

---

<sup>97</sup> Paul's accommodation in this passage is well emphasized in Asher 2000, 89, 205, *passim*; cf. Sellin 1986, 48–49.

<sup>98</sup> Cf. also the conclusion of Williams 2009, 306 that 1 Cor 15 "reflects the emergence of Paul's Jewish apocalyptic background, in which images of the angelic realm...were imposed on the the horizon of human hopes." However, Engberg-Pedersen's argument that 1 Corinthians 15 represents a shift in Paul's own thought toward a Stoic cosmology is more difficult. As I noted above (p. 181 n. 87), his appeal to the Stoic conflagration omits a crucial element of Paul's eschatological vision, namely judgment. Engberg-Pedersen 2010 underestimates the inevitable change in conceptual structure that occurs when philosophical concepts from one tradition (Greek philosophy of various stripes) are brought together with another (Jewish apocalypticism). In fact, he rightly concludes that Paul did not share the Stoic ontology of God but that his was "just the Jewish God" (61). Nevertheless, the implications of this for Paul's possible appropriation of a Stoic pneumatology, as it were, are not fully appreciated in his analysis.

<sup>99</sup> Cf. Fee 1987, 838–839; Fitzmyer 1981. Schrage 1991–2001, 4:464–465 is agnostic about whether it is a prayer or an element of a *Bannformel*. Eriksson 1998, 291–296 sees *Maranatha* as a prayer linked with the previous curse, effectively making it a part of a *Bannformel*. Prof. Markus Bockmuehl suggested to me in conversation that "our Lord come" could also have the meaning of "come into our midst" in a worship setting rather than "come back."

Either way, for Paul to use an Aramaic phrase in a Greek letter written to a largely Gentile audience strongly suggests that he expected them to know it, perhaps because he used it while with them. Otherwise they would have been very much in the dark.

This discussion illuminates several important aspects of Paul's initial teaching and preaching in Corinth. First, Paul introduced the Corinthian believers to the notion of a future day of judgment which he referred to as "the day of the (our) Lord (Jesus Christ)" and the *parousia* of Christ. This day would be accompanied by various apocalyptic elements such as the sounding of the "last trumpet," the resurrection of dead believers and the subjection of "powers and authorities," to which Paul adds Death in 1 Corinthians as part of his argument for resurrection in the face of misunderstanding and denial. The fact that Paul states earlier in passing that "The God who raised the Lord will also raise us through his power" (6:14) supports the argument that the resurrection of believers was part of Paul's initial teaching, but clearly it was not understood and ultimately denied by some Corinthians. Perhaps, they affirmed the language of "resurrection" but simply interpreted it philosophically in a way that was more familiar.<sup>100</sup> Finally, Paul may have passed on to the Corinthians an Aramaic prayer for the *parousia*, perhaps as a liturgical formula, though the text does not completely rule out other possible sources such as Apollos or some other interloping teacher.

#### 7.3.4 Satan, angels and demons

Part and parcel with the apocalyptic worldview seen in Paul's discussion of the day of the Lord, he also makes several references to angels, demons and Satan and never explains who they are or what they do.<sup>101</sup> In 4:9 Paul states that God has made "us" (Paul

---

<sup>100</sup> This fits with the thesis of Chester 2003 that the Corinthians construed their religion in terms familiar to them as a way to deal with the cultural dissonance between Paul's gospel and their pagan heritage.

<sup>101</sup> In this respect, it is worth noting the common apocalyptic ascent motif, complete with 3-tiered (or more) heaven, in 2 Cor 12:1–10, though at that point in Paul's very heated and ironic rhetoric he may

and the apostles) to be "a spectacle (θέατρον) for the world, both for angels and humanity." There is precedent in Jewish cosmology to see the angels as spectators for God's work in the world, but Paul does not explain it here.<sup>102</sup> Rather, he assumes that the Corinthians would understand it. If this passage were alone it could be quite plausible that Paul simply overshot his communicative mark here, but again in 1 Cor 11 he brings up the role of angels in his instructions on head-coverings, already discussed above. Paul notes that "man was not created on account of woman but woman on account of man; because of this fact [διὰ τοῦτο] a woman ought to have authority on her head *because of the angels*" (11:9–10). Again, scholars often point to the Qumran community for the idea that angels are present among the community of worshipers,<sup>103</sup> though the notion that angels are spectators could also be in play. However, Paul does not clarify his meaning. Rather, he assumes that the Corinthians will not be lost by such compressed arguments which suggests that he expects them to know something about angels and their cosmic and communal role.

The same is true of Paul's references to Satan in 1 Corinthians. In his instructions to eject the member who was sleeping with his step-mother Paul tells the Corinthians to "hand such a one over to Satan for the destruction of the flesh so that the spirit will be saved on the day of the Lord" (5:5). This suggests that Satan is somewhere outside the community, possibly as the overlord for the rulers of the present age (cf. 1 Cor 2:8), but Paul expects a lot from his readers. Similarly in his instructions regarding abstinence

---

well be trying to impress and confound rather than relying on a previously held concrete cosmology.

<sup>102</sup> Fee 1987, 175 states that the meaning "is not entirely discernable" but suggests a link with the observational role of angels in Job. Keener 2005, 46 n. 98 argues that it is simply a hendiadys for "everyone."

<sup>103</sup> Cf. CD 15:17; 1QSa 2:8–9; 1QM 7:6; 12:1, *passim*. See Fitzmyer 1971; Keener 2005, 94. However Schrage 1991–2001, 2:516–517 and Héring 1962, 106–107 argue that this is a reference to the danger that angelic beings posed, especially to women, as seen in the incident of the watchers in *1 Enoch* or *Jubilees*.

within marriage, Paul states that a husband and wife should only separate for a time and only by common consent "lest Satan tempt you because of your lack of self-control" (7:5).

The ease with which Paul refers to angels and Satan, the close ideological connection between angelic beings and an apocalyptic worldview and the fact that such concepts are not widespread outside Jewish circles (cf. §7.2.5 above) all indicate that they form part of the Corinthian believers' *ἔνδοξα*. Further, the fact that there is no indication that these concepts are new to the Corinthians suggests that these *ἔνδοξα* can be traced back to Paul's initial teaching.

More difficult are Paul's references to "demons" in 1 Cor 10:20–21. In warning against idolatry with reference to Israel in the desert (1 Cor 10) he refers to demons four times in the space of two verses and nowhere else in the letter. The term *δαιμόνιον* has a long history in Greek literature and is related to the more common *δαίμων*, neither of which were commonly used with negative associations.<sup>104</sup> However, Paul clearly presumes a negative evaluation of "demons" in view in 1 Cor 10:20–21 and it has been argued that 10:20–22 is part of an allusion to Deut 32:17, 21 in which the *δαιμόνια* are played off against the true God of Israel (cf. Lincicum 2010, 163–164). Further, while the framework for the *δαιμόνιον* may be difficult to evaluate on its own, the link with Paul's references to angels and Satan places the demonic within the cumulative picture of a presumed Jewish apocalyptic worldview.

### 7.3.5 "It is written...": Paul's use of scripture in Corinth

The purpose of this section is not to parse out the various citations and allusions in 1 Corinthians, which would be a book in its own right.<sup>105</sup> Rather, the issue at stake here is

---

<sup>104</sup> See the long list of examples in LSJ *s.v.* *δαιμόνιον* and (esp.) *δαίμων*; cf. Schrage 1991-2001, 2:444–445 nn. 376–377; Engberg-Pedersen 2010, 93–94.

<sup>105</sup> On this, see esp. Stanley 1992 who is building on the work of Koch 1986 and others. For Paul's

whether Paul passed on the scriptures to his Corinthian converts and if so, in what way?

In this respect, the first point to be noted is the presence of "the scriptures" in 1 Cor 15:3–4, discussed above as part of Paul's initial teaching. Indeed, v. 3a states that Paul passed on the tradition in 15:3b-7 among the things of first importance (ἐν πρώτοις). At the heart of this tradition is the fact "that Christ died for our sins according to the scriptures [κατὰ τὰς γραφάς] and that he was buried and that he was raised on the third day according to the scriptures [κατὰ τὰς γραφάς]" (15:3c-4). The repeated "according to the scriptures" stand in clear parallel and appear to provide some sort of prophetic proof for the events described.<sup>106</sup> The fact that Paul declines to say *which* scriptures he has in mind has led to a number of conjectures, often with scholars trying to link the scriptures alluded to by Paul specifically with death "for our sins" and rising "on the third day."<sup>107</sup> However, there are at least two considerations which should give one pause in this endeavor. First, the plural γραφαί suggests that there was not only one passage in view and accordingly that Paul has in mind here a general pattern of scripture.<sup>108</sup> Second, Paul simply does not let us in on the secret.

Nevertheless, this formulaic tag tells us something important about the role of scripture in Paul's initial teaching and preaching: *it was presented as a prophetic authority*. The Corinthians both knew what the scriptures were and that, according to Paul at least, they laid out the pattern for the death and resurrection of Christ. That much is clear. Furthermore, it is incredibly hard to account for such a position of authority if Paul had not *demonstrated* their prophetic value. In other words, Paul's initial preaching and

---

use of Deuteronomy, see Lincicum 2010, 117–168 and for Isaiah, see Wilk 1998.

<sup>106</sup> Koch 1986, 322, *passim* speaks of scripture as *der Zeuge des εὐαγγελίου* and Bonsirven 1939, 267 as *les oracles divins*.

<sup>107</sup> The top choices are identified as Isa 53:5 with v. 3 and Hosea 6:2 with v. 4. See the discussions in Koch 1986, 232–239 and Schrage 1991-2001, 4:41–42 though they both reject these interpretations.

<sup>108</sup> This appears to be the majority position; cf. Koch 1986, 286; Eriksson 1998, 95; Thiselton 2000, 1190; Schrage 1991-2001, 4:34; Fitzmyer 2008, 546.

teaching included actual texts alongside the formula "according to the scriptures," a point corroborated by the account in Acts 18. It is true that we do not know what the texts mentioned in 15:3–4 were, but we are on fairly safe ground to assume that there *were* some.

A basic familiarity with scriptures as an authority is further substantiated by the rhetorical weight Paul places on his numerous explicit citations and the variety of contexts in which they are used (so Thiselton 2000, 159–160). These citations are drawn primarily from the Pentateuch (with emphasis on Genesis and Deuteronomy), Psalms, Isaiah and the minor prophets.<sup>109</sup> Marc Debanné, among others, has recently shown that citations and figures from scripture function as the premises for several of Paul's enthymemic arguments both for the Corinthians' self-understanding and for moral instructions.<sup>110</sup> It is notable that these citations are most often introduced by *γέγραπται*, with some simple connector such as *ὡς*, which presumes the reader knows *where* it is written, i.e. the Jewish scriptures. Only once in 1 Corinthians does Paul refer to a citation more specifically as coming from "the Law of Moses" (9:9) and his reason for doing so there is not clear. Although it is surely illegitimate to simply take all of Paul's citations and argue that the Corinthians were already familiar with them (so, rightly, Stanley 2004, 75 n.1), the fact that the atmosphere of 1 Corinthians is permeated with scriptural references supports the point above that the Corinthians knew and accepted the scriptures as an authority and were familiar with at least some specific passages or stories. Indeed, given that there was probably a Jewish contingent within the Corinthian church as well as

---

<sup>109</sup> Cf. the tabulations in Michel 1929, 12–13; Bonsirven 1939, 278, 280–281; Koch 1986, 48–56; Wagner 2011a, 156. Passages with introductory formulae: 1 Cor 1:19 (Isa 29:14), 31 (Jer 9:22–23); 2:9 (Isa 64:4?); 3:19 (Job 5:12–13); 3:20 (Ps 93:11); 9:9 (Deut 25:4); 10:7 (Exod 32:6); 14:21 (Isa 28:11–12); 15:45 (Gen 2:7), 54–55 (Isa 25:8; Hos 13:14). To these one might add 6:16 (Gen 2:24) which is only introduced with *γάρ* and 15:27a (Ps 8:7) which is followed by the interpretive comments "when it says..."

<sup>110</sup> Debanné 2006, 228–229 notes especially 1 Cor. 9.9–10 and 1 Cor. 10.11–12; cf. also Koch 1986, 258–273; Wilk 1998, 112–119. On the use of scripture for ethics in 1 Cor, see esp. Rosner 1994; Rosner 1996; cf. Lincicum 2010, 137.

Gentiles with a previous attachment to the synagogue, such familiarity is hardly surprising. A few examples will have to suffice.

In 1 Cor 15:21–22, 44–49 Paul uses, for the first time in his extant letters, the well-known Adam–Christ typology as an argument for the close link between Christ's resurrection and the future bodily resurrection of believers. At no time does Paul explain who Adam is and only in his attempt to bring out the first man–last man parallel in v. 45 does Paul indicate that Adam was the first man, altering the text of Gen 2:7.<sup>111</sup> In fact, Paul begins his discussion allusively, arguing "for since death [came] through a person, also resurrection from the dead [comes/will come] through a person" (15:21).<sup>112</sup> The second half of that statement is the point of Paul's argument in the whole of chapter 15 and it is the first half that provides the grounds for it (ἐπειδή). Paul does not explicitly mention Adam until v. 22 which provides a parallel argument: "For just as all died in Adam, in this way also all will be made alive in Christ." As is clear from passages such as 6:9–10, the "all" in 15:22 is not intended to incorporate all humanity, but all believers and the notion that resurrection comes "through a person" is similarly elliptical. The compressed nature of this passage has led Wolfgang Schrage, for one, to argue that the Adam–Christ typology had already been introduced to the Corinthians by Paul (Schrage 1991-2001, 4:162). While this is not a necessary conclusion, since the elements missing from this statement are supplied elsewhere in the letter,<sup>113</sup> the implicit appeal to Adam in v. 21 and the passing reference in v. 22 indicate that Paul expected the Corinthians to be familiar with the figure of Adam, which also implies a much larger narrative context of creation.

---

<sup>111</sup> On Paul's use of Gen 2:7 here, see esp. Stanley 1992, 208–209.

<sup>112</sup> The tense of this sentence is difficult to determine since the Greek lacks verbs.

<sup>113</sup> The fact that resurrection comes through a person is the burden of proof for 1 Cor 15 and vv. 20–21 act as a sort of thesis statement for the rest of the chapter and are not fully clarified until the end.

The creation narrative is also drawn on two times earlier in the letter. In his instructions regarding head-coverings, Paul makes a similar argument to that seen in 15:21–22 when he states that a woman is the glory of a man because "man does not originate from woman, but woman from man. For man was not created on account of woman but woman on account of man" (11:8–9). The strength of this argument rests entirely on the Corinthians' familiarity with the creation narrative, specifically the account in Gen 2. Earlier in the letter, Paul uses a reference to Gen 2:24 as an argument that one who joins with a *πόρνη* becomes one body with her (1 Cor 6:15–16). We noted earlier (§6.2.4) that the rhetorical flow of 6:15–16 places v. 16a as new information, emphatically introduced by means of the *οὐκ οἴδατε* question, which is then explained by the citation in v. 16b. In the absence of any introductory formulae, it remains an open question whether every member of the Corinthian congregation would have understood v. 16b as a citation. However, it falls easily within the range of context implied by 15:21–22, 44–49 and 11:8–9.

Perhaps the most striking use of scripture in 1 Corinthians is in Paul's exodus account in 10:1–13. Before turning back to the issue of food sacrificed to idols in 10:14 and following, Paul uses the story of Israel's exodus and time in the desert (primarily with material from Exodus and Numbers) as a way to warn the Corinthians against idolatry and rebellion against God. He begins by referring to Israel as "our fathers," including the Corinthian believers in some sort of continuity with the people of God (10:1).<sup>114</sup> Then, he quickly alludes to five details of the exodus narrative without explanation of what they are: the cloud (v. 1; Exod 13:21), passing through the red sea (v. 2; Exod 14), manna (v. 3; Exod 16:4), drinking water from a rock (v. 4; Num 20:1–13); and the punishment of the

---

<sup>114</sup> With, e.g. Deidun 1981, 31; Fee 1987, 444; Goppelt 1982, 141–142; Lindemann 2000, 217; Schrage 1991–2001, 2:383, 388 *pace* Debanné 2006, 228.

Israelites (v. 5; Exod 32).<sup>115</sup> As Richard Hays rightly notes, Paul is not narrating the story, he is arguing from it (Hays 2005b, 8) and vv. 1–5 highlight the themes that Paul is about to apply more specifically to the Corinthian situation. This indicates that Paul takes it for granted that the exodus narrative forms part of the Corinthian believers' *ἔνδοξα*. And, as Chris Stanley has rightly pointed out, "Though it is certainly possible that Paul was mistaken about what the Corinthians knew, we should probably give him the benefit of the doubt unless the evidence indicates otherwise" (Stanley 2004, 75). In this case, as with the examples about Adam above, the audience simply would not have been able to follow Paul's argument had they not been familiar with the narratives and characters to which he refers.<sup>116</sup>

It is notable that even scholars who are famously critical of Paul's use of scripture allow for a greater than usual knowledge in the case of the Corinthians. As Harnack put it, "When reading the letters to the Corinthians in comparison with other letters of Paul one gains the certain impressions that the apostle reveals in them his own lively and manifold relation to Scripture" (Harnack 1995 [1928], 41). He went on to explain that this was due to the extended period of time Paul was in Corinth and to the nature of the problems there.<sup>117</sup> However, Harnack also argued that the knowledge presupposed by Paul – creation, fall into sin, prophecy and Law, the old covenant – "could be mentioned in the first part of a single missionary sermon, because what matters were not the details but only the great facts as such" (Harnack 1995 [1928], 44–45). From this he concludes that Paul did not pass on the Jewish scriptures as an *Erbauungsbuch* (book of edification) to his Gentile congregations, however it may have informed his own thought.

---

<sup>115</sup> Hickling 1996 argues that the whole of 1 Cor 10:1–10 is linked specifically with Exodus 32, though he does acknowledge other possibilities.

<sup>116</sup> With relation to the presumed knowledge of the exodus and wilderness narrative, Paul draws on a presumed knowledge of the Passover in 5:7–8.

<sup>117</sup> This is similar to the position of Stanley 2004, 75–77; cf. Hickling 1996, 372–737.

A full response to Harnack's position is beyond the scope of this section and unnecessary due to several recent discussions.<sup>118</sup> A few points should be made, however. First, Harnack is correct in identifying the main contours of the scriptural narrative which Paul presupposes, though the argument that Paul could have (or would have) covered it in the beginning of a single sermon does not necessarily follow. This leads to the second point: there are passages which suggest that Paul considered the scriptures to be of continuing value to the Corinthians beyond prophetic proof-texts. In 1 Cor 9:9, during Paul's use of himself as the example for the Corinthians to imitate, Paul cites Deut 25:4 as proof that he is entitled to compensation for his ministry.

Who ever fights from their own resources? Who plants a vine but does not eat the fruit? Or, who shepherds sheep and does not drink the milk? I don't speak merely in human terms, do I? Or doesn't the Law say these things? For in the Law of Moses it is written "Do not muzzle the ox while treading." (1 Cor 9:7–9)

Paul goes on to state that God is not concerned with the ox, but that "It was written for us" (v. 10).<sup>119</sup> Whatever else may be happening here – typological, allegorical or analogical interpretation – this is a clear use of a specific scriptural injunction as a guide for conduct in which the value of the text for the Christian readers is affirmed (so rightly Lincicum 2010, 133).<sup>120</sup>

Paul provides a similar view of the value of scripture in 10:1–13. The narrative of the Exodus, knowledge of which is presupposed by Paul, is applied in 10:6–13 to the

---

<sup>118</sup> See Koch 1986, 88–91; Lincicum 2010, 123; Rosner 1994, 191–194; cf. earlier Michel 1929, 114–134, 142–159; Bonsirven 1939, 267–272.

<sup>119</sup> Some scholars see this phrase with the subsequent ὅτι as introducing another citation (e.g. Lindemann 2000, 205). The problem is that what follows is not a citation and the parallel with Sir 6:19 adduced by the editors of the NA<sup>27</sup> is not close. Rather, the ὅτι should be seen as explanatory: "It was written for us because..." (so Fitzmyer 2008, 364).

<sup>120</sup> In this connection one might also mention 1 Cor 4:6 "In order that you might learn τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται." Although it is not certain, the best explanation which takes γέγραπται in the way Paul most often uses it is to read the verse as a highly elliptical reference to scripture, either in general (Bengel 1835, 114; Michel 1929, 131; Schlatter 1934, 153–155, 286), as cited in a previous section (Hooker 1964) or specifically Paul's citation in 1:31 (Wagner 1998). (However, see Welborn 1987 for arguments for a general maxim.) If this is the case, then scripture as "the things that are written" stands as a rule for conduct.

Corinthian situation by means of typology.<sup>121</sup> The events recounted in vv. 1–5 became types of the Corinthian Christians. Both Israel and the Corinthian believers had shared the same spiritual life, linked with God and Christ, evoked by Paul with reference to baptism and the Eucharist. However, the point of Paul's exhortation is that the typology ends there; the Corinthians are exhorted not to fail where Israel did. He exhorts them not to practice idolatry, not to engage in sexual immorality, not to test Christ (!), not to grumble *καθώς τινες αὐτῶν* (10:7–10). He goes on to note that these things happened to them *τυπικῶς*, in the fashion of types (i.e. as a pattern for future repetition), "but they were written for us upon whom the ends of the ages has come" (v. 11). This view of scripture, that the events in it were written down for Paul and the Corinthians, suggests ongoing engagement rather than a simple narrative overview at the beginning of a sermon. These passages do not prove that Paul had already passed on such specific typological information about the exodus narrative, though that is possible. Instead, they show Paul extolling the value of scripture for continued use in the Corinthian community rather than informing the Corinthians that the scripture has such value.

All of this together suggests that Paul indeed used the Jewish scriptures as part of his initial teaching and preaching among the Corinthians. This included scriptures as a prophetic and moral authority directly relevant to the lives of the Corinthians. But given the limited access to texts and low literacy in antiquity, how could Paul accomplish this? While it is conjectural, some scholars have argued that Paul made his own collection of excerpted biblical citations which he used in composing his letters and teaching.<sup>122</sup> On the

---

<sup>121</sup> This terminology has the advantage of being linked with terms that Paul actually uses, though it is not unproblematic. Fitzmyer 2008, 385 has argued that this passage is not true developed "typology" as used by later writers and Koch 1986, 216 has noted that *τύπος* is not a fixed term for Paul.

<sup>122</sup> Cf. Koch 1986, 247–255; Stanley 1992, 257; Wagner 2011b, 163–164. This is a muted version of the *testimonia* hypothesis seen most famously in the work of J. Rendel Harris 1920 and revived by Albl 1999. For review and criticism, see Lincicum 2008.

other hand, a convert like Crispus, if Acts 18:8 gives us reliable information about his social status as a patron of the synagogue, may have had the means to provide some or all of the scriptural scrolls and a general familiarity with scripture and its main contours was probably already present in some converts before Paul arrived in Corinth. And of course the literacy of most of the Corinthian believers was probably not very high. However, Paul suggests in 1:26 that some were in fact wise, powerful and well-born, at least in comparison with the rest, and this would have brought the privileges of literacy.<sup>123</sup> Further, the fact that Paul is writing a letter to Corinth in the first place means that he expected *someone* in the community to be able to read, especially in the light of our investigation after the role of letter-carriers in chapter 3 above. Indeed, Harry Gamble has suggested that "in the early period, just as later on, it appears that those who exercised leadership usually possessed the skills of literacy" (Gamble 1995, 9).

### 7.3.6 Praxis and structure in the Corinthian church

Already in the explicit reminders of Paul's teaching and his direct appeals to knowledge, we have seen something of the praxis of the Corinthian church. Paul taught the Corinthian believers about baptism, he handed over the tradition and practice of the Lord's Supper and introduced them to communal worship in which there were manifestations of the Spirit of God in prophecy, tongues and other miracles (δυνάμεις). This section will explore some further details of communal worship in Corinth taken for granted by Paul, followed by a discussion of the structure of the Corinthian community. This section will close with a brief look at two more enigmatic practices mentioned by Paul: baptism for the dead (15:29) and the holy kiss (16:20).

#### 7.3.6.1 *Ecstatic manifestations, singing and liturgical elements*

---

<sup>123</sup> See the discussions in Gamble 1995, 1–10 and Lincicum 2010, 25–27. The difficulties involved in discussions of literacy and orality are addressed in some detail in Botha 2004 and Camp 2004.

As we noted above (§6.2.2.3), in 1 Cor 12 Paul refers to Corinthian communal worship in which spiritual manifestations of prophecy and tongues are well known and highly regarded. In chapter 14, Paul discloses several more details of Corinthian worship practices. He states, "Therefore, let the one who speaks in a tongue pray that they might interpret. For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prays but my mind is without benefit [ἄκαρπος]" (vv. 13–14). Paul goes on to recommend praying (and singing) with one's spirit *and* one's mind (v. 15). This suggests that glossolalia was a form of ecstatic prayer used in communal worship, if perhaps not limited to that, which was distinct from prayer in natural speech, which Paul also presupposes.<sup>124</sup> Notably, Paul does not exhort the Corinthians to pray in tongues but presupposes that it is something they practice and, similarly, he does not explain the notion of prayer in normal speech but simply provides a new topic for those endowed with glossolalia. In chapter 6.2.2.3 we noted that prayer was a common facet of Greco-Roman religion and it stands to reason that Paul had to do little by way of explaining prayer as a basic practice. However, it is unlikely that Paul would not have introduced prayer within a monotheistic framework and even less likely that he would not have prayed himself during their worship gatherings. Indeed, as he notes in 1 Cor 14:18, Paul himself speaks in tongues and if such speech is a prayer as in vv. 13–14, then he provided an example for the Corinthians in prayer both in tongues and normal speech.

The mention of singing (ψάλλω) in v. 15 anticipates Paul's further description of communal worship in vv. 26–33. He concludes his discussion of the use of spiritual gifts in chapters 12–14 with a quick outline of the way in which communal worship ought to be conducted.<sup>125</sup> Whenever they come together (συνέρχομαι, cf. v. 23; 11:17) various

---

<sup>124</sup> Schrage 1991-2001, 3:397 correctly notes that the prayer in question here is "das Gebet im Gottesdienst."

<sup>125</sup> Cf. Fee 1987, 689 who notes the corrective element in Paul's summary.

members have a psalm (ψαλμός), teaching (διδασχί), revelation (ἀποκάλυψις), tongue or interpretation (ἐρμηνεία). Paul exhorts the Corinthians that these elements, which are not a comprehensive list,<sup>126</sup> ought to be done for the edification (οἰκοδομή) of everyone (v. 26). He then proceeds to give instructions for the proper use of glossolalia and prophecy – a maximum of two or three and always one at a time – with their attendant tasks of interpretation and discernment which involve others in the community (vv. 27–32). Paul concludes that this type of decorum best represents the God of peace and is the practice of "all the churches of the saints" (v. 33).<sup>127</sup>

As with the lists of πνευματικά in 1 Cor 12, Paul does not explain any of these items, but presumes that they are currently in use (cf. Brockhaus 1975, 148). He is not introducing new forms of worship, but rather correcting apparently disruptive excesses with respect to prophecy and glossolalia. Singing was a common worship practice in antiquity both among Jews and in Greco-Roman religion, though the latter preferred the term ὕμνος to ψαλμός.<sup>128</sup> Although ψαλμός and its related verb ψάλλω properly refer to the playing of musical instruments, specifically stringed instruments, the term also became shorthand in Greek-speaking Judaism for songs of praise to God, undoubtedly influenced by the translation of מזמור by ψαλμός in the LXX.<sup>129</sup> It is difficult to say what kind of song is in view here, whether it refers to pre-composed (or perhaps scriptural) psalms or more spontaneous hymns, but it is clear that Paul expected no such confusion

---

<sup>126</sup> Brockhaus 1975, 148 emphasizes that this is not a picture of the ideal gathering nor a comprehensive picture of communal worship, "sondern er zählt kurz einige ihm wesentliche Elemente des Normalgottesdienstes auf, um sofort die Mahnung, um die es ihm eigentlich geht, hinzuzufügen."

<sup>127</sup> Whether or not vv. 34–35 are an interpolation, the facts that early manuscripts almost universally understood v. 33b to go with 33a rather than v. 34 (cf. Payne 1995; Payne 1998) and that in the transposition to after v. 40 *only* vv. 34–35 are moved, tell against the paragraph division assumed by NA<sup>27</sup>. However, I am inclined towards the interpolation hypothesis; cf. *inter alios* Fee 1987, 699–705.

<sup>128</sup> See their respective entries in LSJ; cf. the oft cited *Homeric Hymns to Demeter*.

<sup>129</sup> Note the parallel use of ᾄδω and ψαλμός in Jdt 16:1; cf. *T. Abr* 20:12 (long recension) where the angels are described as ψάλλοντες τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον; cf. Schrage 1991-2001, 3:466 n.458. The technical meaning was also still in use, cf. *T. Job*. 14:1–2, 4.

on the part of his audience.<sup>130</sup>

Paul provides further information on Corinthian meetings with his cryptic reference to "the amen," which the *ιδιώτης* is unable to say (14:16). The articular reference to *the* amen (τὸ ἀμήν), a term borrowed from Hebrew and often used in liturgical settings, indicates that this is a fixed liturgical element of communal worship beyond a simple exclamation.<sup>131</sup> In fact, several scholars posit that this liturgical element was taken over from synagogue worship.<sup>132</sup> In this case, the *ιδιώτης* is a person who is expected to participate in a liturgical element of communal worship and as such must be at least a sympathizer, hence one who is not fully trained, though it remains highly likely that "the one who fills the place of the *ιδιώτης*" is simply a reference to those who are unable to understand inspired speech.<sup>133</sup>

Here then we see a more complete picture of the Corinthian communal worship presumed by Paul. While there is an abundance of spiritual utterance and ecstatic manifestations, it is not without its few liturgical elements, hinted at by the reference to τὸ ἀμήν. Further, the meetings involved singing and teaching (some of which may have been prepared before hand), praying in tongues (probably in addition to natural speech) and prophecies (probably related to "revelations"). Paul stresses the need for order and decorum, but he never controverts any of these elements *per se*. These points, along with

---

<sup>130</sup> Most commentators argue against a reference to OT Psalms here, e.g. Brockhaus 1975, 148 though Fee 1987, 690 is more extreme in attributing everything to spontaneous inspiration. Wolff 1996, 338–339 argues that inspiration need not preclude reflection and composition and Thiselton 2000, 1135 refers to the use of scriptural psalms as a "strong possibility." Schrage 1991–2001, 3:446 concludes that it is neither extemporaneous singing in tongues nor OT psalms, but a reference to Christian songs which nevertheless have thoroughly Jewish origins or were patterned on OT examples.

<sup>131</sup> So Fitzmyer 2008, 517; cf. Hanges 2012, 399 who draws analogies to common practices during Greco-Roman cult transfers.

<sup>132</sup> Cf. Conzelmann 1975, 239; Lindemann 2000, 305; for a slightly different angle, see Tomson 1990, 144 arguing for a link with the daily synagogue blessing.

<sup>133</sup> Cf. esp. Fee 1987, 672–673. The parallel between *ιδιώται* and *ἄπιστοι* in v. 23 suggests that a different group of people is in view here; cf. Lietzmann 1931, 73.

Paul's inclusion of himself in vv. 14–19, indicate that Paul had introduced communal worship roughly along these lines during his initial work with the Corinthians. Further, Paul notes that his views on orderly communal worship extend throughout the early church (15:33).

### 7.3.6.2 *Corinthian community structure*

Two passages in 1 Corinthians directly address issues that can be considered in terms of community structure (12:28–30; 16:15–18). In 12:28–30, Paul lists a number of functions to which God has appointed members of the churches, beginning with apostles, prophets and teachers, which Paul lists as first, second and third, and followed by a less obviously ordered list that includes helpers (ἀντιλήμψις) and organizers/guides (κυβέρνησις) among gifts of healing and glossolalia. The functions designated here of care and guidance were not limited to communal worship, as might be suggested by the context, any more than being an apostle was limited to such a setting.<sup>134</sup> Rather, they designate the sort of practical work that keeps a community functional and as such would have been recognized by the community. Notably, once beyond the first three roles (apostles, prophets, teachers), the roles listed are clearly not titles, but refer to functions within the community.<sup>135</sup> Although it is likely that certain people fulfilled these functions in a particular way, as Paul indicates in vv. 29–30 and as suggested by the privileging of apostles, prophets and teachers, it is also possible that a person could do more than one.<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>134</sup> For ἀντιλήμψις as care and κυβέρνησις as organization and guidance, cf. Brockhaus 1975, 109–110; Hainz 1972, 86; MacDonald 1988, 57–58. Thiselton 2000, 1019–1021 argues that the former refers to administrative help, probably carried out by patrons and the latter refers to the ability to formulate strategies. More anomalous is the view of Greeven 1977 [1953], 359 that κυβέρνησις was involved in the guiding and illumination of prophecy.

<sup>135</sup> While ἀντιλήμψις and κυβέρνησις could conceivably be titles, though probably not in this form, this is not so with δυνάμις, χαρίσματα ἰαμάτων, or γένη γλωσσῶν.

<sup>136</sup> So MacDonald 1988, 57. Many scholars argue for a distinct group of prophets or teachers; Brockhaus 1975, 97–98; Conzelmann 1975, 245; Holmberg 1978, 9; slightly differently Luz 2010, 64 and n. 31; Fitzmyer 2008, 526. Others argue that the gifts were not so specifically located in particular people; Fee 1987, 694; Hainz 1972, 88.

In 16:15–18 Paul's discussion of community structure becomes more explicit. He begins with an exhortation (παρακαλῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς, ἀδελφοί, v. 15a) which he resumes again in v. 16: "Now I exhort you, brothers and sisters...that you submit yourself to such persons and to everyone who works and labors with them." The people whom Paul has in view are exemplified by Stephanas and his house, as Paul makes clear in v. 15b. He reminds the Corinthians of the foundational place of Stephanas' house within the Corinthian community as the first-fruits (cf. 1:16). Moreover, and more to the point for community structure, they have devoted themselves to the service of the saints. Paul does not elaborate on what this service might have been, but several scholars have suggested that Stephanas was a patron of the Corinthian church in which case he may have used his house for gatherings and provided some of the help and guidance discussed above.<sup>137</sup> In any case, Paul clearly recognizes certain persons as worthy of leadership positions, including those who were not a part of Stephanas' house (v. 16), and instructs the Corinthians to do the same in v. 18: "Recognize [ἐπιγινώσκετε] such persons."

The distinction between "offices" and "functions" that is often drawn is not particularly helpful in discussions of community structure and encourages an overly binary view.<sup>138</sup> Any office is at least partially defined by its function and those who cease to fulfill the function of that office lose it. In the case of the Corinthians, the fact that there is (1) a designated function, (2) recognition of the role and its authority by Paul and (3) the intended recognition by the community certainly shades towards the typical definition of "office" (cf. Holmberg 1978, 112). This does not mean that the terminology

---

<sup>137</sup> See Chow 1992, 96–97 who emphasizes the role of patronage in the Corinthian church. Fitzmyer 2008, 625 suggests that the service was financial support, but then unnecessarily links "the saints" in v. 15 with the saints in Jerusalem. For a counter-position, see esp. Longenecker 2010 who emphasizes Paul's concern for the *local* poor.

<sup>138</sup> For example, Conzelmann 1975, 298 argues that there are no offices "but functions, services...there is no organization, but voluntary subordination." But this introduces a false dichotomy that can be traced back to the famous disagreement between Adolf von Harnack and Rudolf Sohm. Their principle essays and the subsequent debate up to the 1970's has been gathered in Kertelge 1977.

for church functions or offices was fixed or even extended beyond the boundaries of a particular community, *but it does suggest that when Paul left, there was some sort of community order in place.*

As with 1 Thessalonians in the previous chapter, the structure of the Corinthian community is hard to identify with any certainty. Unlike in Thessalonica, Paul was in Corinth for a year and a half and it seems *prima facie* implausible that no relational structure emerged during that time as members distinguished themselves by their service or gifts and attained a measure of authority as a result (cf. MacDonald 1988, 55). As in 1 Thessalonians, however, Paul's terminology does not appear to be fixed for those in leadership positions, but reflects a more functional approach, though such a functional view is not necessarily in conflict with those who advocate for the emergence of offices at this stage.

### 7.3.6.3 *Baptism for the dead*

1 Cor 15:29 is a *crux interpretum* primarily because what it seems to say is difficult to relate to the rest of Paul's theology or the New Testament more generally. On the surface, Paul appears to refer to the Corinthian practice of baptism on behalf of those who have already died: "Otherwise, what will they do who are baptized for [ὑπέρ] the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why are they being baptized for them?" In spite of recent attempts to clarify the meaning of this verse in context, it remains as obscure as ever. As alternatives to vicarious baptism for those already dead, scholars have suggested that it refers to the practice of baptism over the top of graves (Bengel 1835, 170), baptism to be reunited with lost loved ones (Thiselton 2000, 1242–1249), baptism to smooth the journey of dead Christians into the afterlife (DeMaris 1995), baptism due to the influence of dead Christians (Reaume 1995, 475), baptism because of the witness of the apostles who are "the dead" (White 1997; reiterated in White 2012), baptism on behalf of

catechumens who died prior to reaching baptism (Fee 1987, 767) and many other options. Others have pointed to the later Gnostic practice of baptism for the dead as seen, for example, in Chrysostom's homily on 1 Corinthians (*Hom. in Epist. I ad Cor.* 40.1). Nevertheless, the sentence in its most natural reading does suggest vicarious baptism,<sup>139</sup> however difficult that may be to understand historically or theologically.<sup>140</sup>

Many scholars rightly note that, whatever the case may be, Paul expects the Corinthians to be familiar with the practice such that he can use it as his final clinching argument for the *fact* of the future resurrection since he moves on to the *mode* beginning in v. 35.<sup>141</sup> This point indicates one key aspect that rules out many suggestions: baptism for the dead must necessitate a future bodily resurrection.<sup>142</sup> As we noted above (§7.3.3), throughout 1 Cor 15 Paul reframes the apocalyptic *parousia* of Christ and the resurrection of the dead with arguments more acceptable to the Corinthians who had no such apocalyptic framework. In this case, one might be tempted to attribute baptism for the dead directly to Paul's influence, since he presents himself as understanding it better than the Corinthians. However, this is speculative and scholars are still no nearer to understanding what the practice actually entailed. Until then, its relationship to Paul's initial teaching must remain open.

#### 7.3.6.4 The "holy kiss"

We already encountered the "holy kiss" in 1 Thess 5:26 and the reference in 1 Corinthians 16:20 is equally elliptical. This custom was shared with the Thessalonian community and presumed for the Roman churches as well (Rom 16:16). The later

---

<sup>139</sup> See esp. Chester 2003, 294–299; cf. Héring 1962, 170; Fee 1987, 764.

<sup>140</sup> Many scholars have noted that there is no historical precedent for such vicarious baptism; esp., Zeller 2009.

<sup>141</sup> Cf. Fee 1987, 767; Lindemann 2000, 350; Schrage 1991–2001, 4:239–240; Fitzmyer 2008, 580.

<sup>142</sup> So Chester 2003, 298–299. In White's recent survey of all the interpretive options for 15:29, he rightly emphasizes this point; White 2012, 390.

connection of this kiss with the Eucharist (Justin *Apol.* 1.65.2) cannot be linked back to the Pauline communities with any degree of certainty (so Lindemann 2000, 387) and Conzelmann's argument that the reference to the kiss is an indication that the letter was to be read at the community meeting (Conzelmann 1975, 299–300) remains conjectural. It appears, however, that the kiss was some sort of community identification, that may have demonstrated unity with the church apparently regardless of social rank (so Klassen 1993).

#### 7.3.6.5 *Summary*

While the most important elements of communal worship were established in Paul's explicit reminders and direct appeals to knowledge, these more subtle presumptions shed light on a more complete picture of the Corinthian community. Their worship services included at least one liturgical element and a variety of contributions, though it is striking that he makes no reference to scripture reading or interpretation in 14:26–33. Further, the community had some sort of structure based around certain functions which carried with them some authority that was recognized by Paul and, presumably, by the community. The fact that Paul recognized such authority and the fact that he was in Corinth for so long both suggest that Paul himself imparted some leadership structure to the Corinthians, even if it was highly focused on the carrying out of particular functions. Finally, the Corinthians practiced the widespread "holy kiss," which may stem from Paul's time there, though it was not limited to his mission as Rom 16:16 shows, and the much more enigmatic "baptism for the dead" which has an unknown relationship to Paul's teaching and preaching.

#### 7.3.7 The Corinthian community's self-understanding

The self-understanding of the Corinthian community has already been touched on in various ways in the preceding material. Conversion rituals such as baptism,

foundational teaching such as the tradition regarding the death of Christ "for our sins," and conceptual frameworks such as an apocalyptic cosmology are inevitably bound up with a religious community's self-understanding.<sup>143</sup> However, given the divisions among the Corinthian believers, it is not clear that there was a monolithic communal self-understanding. Rather, what we see in 1 Corinthians is Paul characterizing his audience in a particular way, presuming a particular self-understanding, while subverting aspects of (some of) the Corinthians' own views of themselves.

Key concepts in Paul's characterization of his readers are present already in the prescript: Paul writes to the ἐκκλησία in Corinth which has been made holy in Christ Jesus and is called a holy people (1:2). This constellation of concepts is familiar from our discussion of 1 Thessalonians above, and the other related qualities such as the separation intrinsic to holiness, avoidance of πορνεία and idolatry and sibling language accompanies them in 1 Corinthians as well.<sup>144</sup> This is a remarkably Jewish framework for a community composed mostly of Gentiles, especially when one takes into account the fact that Paul presumes an apocalyptic cosmology (including Day of the Lord) and that he presumes that the Corinthians understand themselves to be addressed by the Jewish Scriptures. Of course, this Jewish framework is also distinctly Christological insofar as they have been washed, made holy and made righteous only "in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ" (6:11).

As I stated above (§7.2.7), these elements on their own are notoriously difficult to pin down to a particular backdrop because they are so widespread. However, they are *not* on their own and the cumulative framework which fits these disparate elements is profoundly Jewish.<sup>145</sup> It is worth noting that the two major moral issues dealt with in the

---

<sup>143</sup> Again, Rambo 1993, 3 and Börschel 2001, 138 are pertinent in this respect.

<sup>144</sup> See Excursus 3 and 4 above.

<sup>145</sup> The importance of the cumulative picture is not appreciated often enough by scholars who tend

middle of 1 Corinthians are related to πορνεία (5:1–7:40) and idolatry (8:1–11:1) and the remaining social issues could be construed in terms of greed. Indeed, πορνεία and idolatry are the only two vices that the Corinthians are told to flee (6:18; 10:14, cf. Wolter 2010, 6–7). I argued above that these were not only common paraenetic topics in Judaism and Paul's letters, but that they were tied to Jewish presentations of Gentiles (cf. Excursus 3).

In 1 Cor 6:9–10, Paul reminds the Corinthians of the sorts of ἄδικοι who will not inherit the kingdom of God with a list of ten vices of which four refer to sexual morality, three to greed of various sorts and one is idolatry, leaving out only two: the drunk and the slanderer.<sup>146</sup> In v. 11 he goes on to say "and some of you were these things but you were washed, but you were made holy, but you were made righteous in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ and in the Spirit of our God." At this point it is also worth recalling the cognitive shift implied in 1 Cor 12:12 (§6.2.1) in which the Gentile believers are *no longer* Gentiles who worship idols. Here again, then, Paul sets his readers apart from the ἄδικοι who are characterized as idolatrous Gentiles.<sup>147</sup>

This distinction is also implicit in 5:1 in which Paul exclaims that the man sleeping with his stepmother is an example of πορνεία "which is not even among the Gentiles."<sup>148</sup> Indeed, as the oft cited passage from Gaius *Institutes* (1:63–64) indicates, if the woman was ever legally married to the man's father, the relationship was illegal according to Roman law.<sup>149</sup> This appeal to Gentiles sensibilities is not intended to validate

---

to deal with these issues piecemeal; however, see Conzelmann 1975, 22.

<sup>146</sup> Note the similar vice-list in Ps.-Phoc. 3–5; cf. Thomas 1992, 428–429; Conzelmann 1975, 106 and Niebuhr 1987, 15–20, who discusses the role of the Decalogue in the formulation of the list.

<sup>147</sup> Cf. Senft 1979, 80; *pace* Schrage 1991–2001, 1:433 who argues that the passage refers to the devastating power of particular, concrete sins rather than a moral separation from the *massa perditionis*.

<sup>148</sup> Scholars are divided on what exactly the relationship was between the man and the "wife of his father," incest-proper or some more technical infraction; see the excursus in Lindemann 2000, 123–124.

<sup>149</sup> This is the position of most commentators (e.g. Fitzmyer 2008, 234–235) and remains plausible. However, Wolter 2010, 2–3 has argued that because such a relationship was illegal, it would not have been tolerated by the Corinthian civic leaders. Rather, he suggests that the γυνή τινα τοῦ πατρός was the father's concubine and that the relationship commenced after the father's death.

their morality, but to critique the Corinthians more sharply; they have been separated from all manner of sexual immorality and made holy (6:9–11) and as such it is all the more condemning that in this respect they are worse than the idolatrous Gentiles.<sup>150</sup> Here again, like the Thessalonian community, the Corinthian believers are contrasted with the Gentiles, though they are almost entirely made up of Gentile believers.<sup>151</sup> A similar view of the Corinthian community is put forward in 2 Cor 6:14–7:1.

However, unlike in 1 Thessalonians, the Corinthians are contrasted with *both* the Gentiles *and* the Ἰουδαῖοι in 1:22–24. The Jews and Gentiles demand that the message from God fit their various expectations of signs or wisdom, but "the called" (v. 24) who are also "we who are saved" (v. 18) are a *tertium quid* composed of members from both groups but being coterminous with neither (cf. 2 Cor 2:15–16).<sup>152</sup> Further, in conversion and baptism, the Corinthian believers separate themselves as God's holy people (cf. 1:2).

Given that the Corinthian believers were an ethnically mixed group comprising both Jews and Gentiles, Paul's presentation of them as the people of God, *distinct* from both groups, is apt. Nevertheless, despite his efforts to define the Corinthian community over against the Ἰουδαῖοι, the cumulative picture of their self-understanding is much closer to the multifaceted Judaism of the first century Mediterranean Diaspora than any other particular group. They are, according to Paul's characterization, the holy people of God, his ἐκκλησία, who are distinct from all other groups and who consider their relationships in terms of siblingship.

However, it is worth noting that the emphasis on πορνεία and idolatry are topics which Paul is covering *again* in the letter which indicates that the Corinthians were

---

<sup>150</sup> So rightly Horrell 2005, 142; cf. Conzelmann 1975, 96; Deidun 1981, 28.

<sup>151</sup> Cf. Lindemann 2000, 122; Schlatter 1934, 170.

<sup>152</sup> So Horrell 2005, 139–140; Wolter 2010, 2. Müller 1966, 246–248, however, argues that ultimately this amounts to a binary view of humanity that is shared with Jewish apocalyptic traditions.

continuing to have trouble with them (so Fee 1987, 197). Further, the Corinthians themselves appear to have placed emphasis on wisdom, knowledge and being spiritual (πνευματικός) as important parts of their religious identity (3:1; 8:1–7; 12–14), qualities that Paul tried repeatedly to subsume under his emphasis on love and edification (8:1–2; 10:23; 12:31–14:1; 14:3–5). Importantly, although Paul was combating a particular self-evaluation in Corinth, none of the elements he combats stands in direct conflict with the cumulative self-understanding outlined above.

### 7.3.8 Implicit appeals and the framework of explicit reminders

These implicit appeals to knowledge are, for the most part, closely linked with the framework provided by Paul's explicit reminders (§5.2.4) and direct appeals to knowledge (§6.2.5). The structure of the community, with functional officials in the role of "helpers" and "administrators," however, stands outside the above framework, as does the "holy kiss" which is clearly known but notoriously difficult to place. Within the above framework, Paul refers to himself as an apostle without any justification for such an appellation which suggests that he considers it part of the Corinthians' knowledge base, which is in fact corroborated by the various gifts/roles listed in 12:28–30. Furthermore, the communal worship in view for most of chapters 12–14, linked with the receipt of the Spirit in Paul's explicit reminders, is illuminated with Paul's sketch in 14:13–32: in addition to the glossolalia and prophecy, there is singing of psalms, teaching, revelations (perhaps given by the prophets) and at least one liturgical element in "the amen." In this passage, it is the *manner* of communal worship that is at stake rather than the individual elements, which Paul takes for granted as known to the Corinthians.

Within the framework suggested by Paul's preaching about Christ and the traditions about him fits also the quasi-liturgical formula of "calling on the name of the Lord Jesus" (1:2). Further, the teaching of Jesus regarding the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον provides

a suggestive framework within which Paul's other clear appeal to Jesus' teaching on marriage (7:10–11) finds a place. This is not because 7:10–11 can be tied to Paul's initial teaching and preaching, but rather because it indicates that Paul thought that appeals to Jesus' teachings would be intelligible to his audience.

The apocalyptic cosmology and eschatological framework noted earlier is fleshed out in Paul's passing references to the Day of the Lord as a day for judgment with fire, the *parousia* of Christ accompanied by the resurrection of believers, Satan, angels and demons and, perhaps, the Aramaic liturgical acclamation *Maranatha*. More obliquely related to the eschatological framework is Paul's use of scripture, which he considers to have continuing relevance for those "upon whom the end of the ages has come" (10:11). Indeed, scripture plays an authoritative role in the community for prophetic, Christological and moral matters.

All of these details, from the central emphasis on the traditions in Paul's explicit reminders to the Hebrew/Aramaic phrases used only in passing, were imparted to a community which, according to Paul's characterization, considered themselves to be the holy people of God, a group distinct from Jews and Gentiles (though comprising members from both groups) who addressed one another with sibling language. They are God's ἐκκλησία, who understand themselves to be addressed by the Jewish scriptures and who ought to conceive of their hope within the apocalyptic framework of the coming of the Lord with angelic trumpets, resurrection and assumption of the faithful (here in changed bodies).

## 7.4 Comparative Analysis of Paul's Presupposed Audience

The differences between implicit appeals in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians are relatively minor. In the first place, the omission of certain topics in §7.3 above is simply due to the fact that those topics were covered in other types of references within 1

Corinthians. For instance, the notion that God is the "father" identified in 1 Thess 1:1, etc. occurs in 1 Cor 8:6, a direct appeal to knowledge (§6.2.2.2). Also, the discussion of the gift of the Holy Spirit and *πνευματικά* in 1 Thess above is paralleled by the direct appeal to knowledge in 1 Cor 12:1 (§6.2.2.3). Furthermore, the allusion to the narrative of Jesus' passion in 1 Thess 2:14–16 is treated more fully in explicit reminders in 1 Cor 11:23–25; 15:3–8.

Other differences are more remarkable, though they still do not greatly affect our reconstruction of Paul's formative instruction. The more comprehensive view of church praxis in 1 Corinthians, including many details regarding communal worship and the more obscure practice of baptism for the dead, is easily accounted for from two complementary angles. In the first place, it may be that Paul's truncated visit in Thessalonica prohibited him from passing on the developed practices of communal worship seen in Corinth. Second, whether or not Paul had imparted similar practices to the Thessalonians, he evidently did not consider disruptions during communal worship to be a problem. In the case of baptism for the dead, it is likely that some influence other than Paul's led to that practice and so it is not surprising that 1 Thessalonians (and every other Pauline letter, for that matter) lacks any indication of it.

The most significant difference is that 1 Thessalonians contains no reference to scripture. If, as I argued in §7.3.5 above, Paul passed on the Jewish scriptures to the Corinthian believers as a prophetic and moral authority, is it likely that he did not do so in Thessalonica? There is the possibility that Paul simply had not broached the topic of the scriptures in Thessalonica. But, in 1 Cor 15:3–4, Paul identifies an appeal to scripture as an integral part of the gospel message which he passed on among the things of first importance. Furthermore, the content of Paul's gospel in 1 Cor 15:3–4 is well established in 1 Thessalonians (1:9–10; 4:14; 5:9–10). This overlap suggests that the lack of direct

appeal to scripture in 1 Thessalonians should not be pressed as an argument from silence. In the rhetorical context of 1 Thessalonians, evidently Paul did not feel the need to appeal to scripture, though his injunctions regarding holiness, sexual morality, the Day of the Lord and the one "living and true God" are clearly rooted in it and may well have been introduced initially with reference to scripture.

Beside the differences, it is immediately clear from a look at the section headings of this chapter that there is a large amount of overlap between the implicit appeals in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, indeed, more so than in the explicit reminders or direct appeals to knowledge. This tells us that, despite the various differences in the rhetorical context of each letter, Paul presumes that both groups have a large amount of material in common on which he relies as the substructure for his communication. In the case of 1 Corinthians, the chronological distance between the letter and Paul's visit presents a problem in trying to trace the implicit appeals back to his initial preaching and teaching specifically. This is especially true in light of the fact that other teachers such as Apollos had spent time in Corinth and Paul could have been made aware of their teaching from Stephanas and company or from Chloe's people. However, as in chapter 6, those topics which can be linked closely with explicit reminders can be included more confidently in Paul's initial teaching. Additionally, the similarities between the implicit appeals in 1 Thessalonians and those of 1 Corinthians enable us to connect those similar elements more securely with Paul's initial formative teaching.

In Thessalonica and Corinth, Paul presented himself as an apostle, a role which carried the authority to preach and establish communities of those who believed in his message. In both cases, the titles "Christ" and "Lord" were applied to Jesus, whose death and resurrection were central to the message, and in both cases it is equally difficult to say whether or not Paul spent any time explaining them during his teaching. Paul passed

on at least some teachings of this Lord Jesus to the Thessalonians and Corinthians, though it is impossible to be certain of the extent to which Paul knew or used these traditions beyond the few hints he provides in the letters. The fact that Paul passed on these elements to his communities is hardly surprising since they are also shared with almost every New Testament author.

More striking are the similarities in apocalyptic cosmology and community self-understanding shared between the two, dominantly Gentile, communities. We saw above that Paul presumes his readers to be familiar with at least some elements of Jewish apocalyptic eschatology. The extent of their knowledge is, of course, difficult to delimit, but without such an apocalyptic framework Paul's references to angels, Satan, eschatological trumpets, the descent of the Lord and the resurrection and assumption of the faithful would have been entirely unintelligible to his audience. In fact, 1 Cor 15 well demonstrates the kind of difficulty a Gentile convert might (and evidently did) have with the concept of resurrection, since Paul is at pains throughout the chapter to explain a fundamentally apocalyptic eschatological event in philosophical terms acceptable to his readers.<sup>153</sup> These apocalyptic eschatological elements are linked in both letters with explicit reminders of Paul's teaching and direct appeals to knowledge which include resurrection and eschatological judgment. The discussion of the *parousia*/Day of the Lord in 1 Corinthians above (§3.3) is further paralleled by direct appeals in 1 Thess 5:2, etc. which clearly stem from Paul's initial formative teaching.

In 1 Thess 5:1–6 and 1 Cor 6:9–11, among other places, Paul's eschatological teaching is explicitly linked with the presumed identity of the community as distinct from

---

<sup>153</sup> In Paul's answer to the Corinthian arguments, he places his views on resurrection in the stream of thought represented by 2 Maccabees in which "[d]ie Auferstehung ist leiblich, aber nicht eine Auferstehung eben desselben Leibes" (Stemberger 1972, 24), in contrast with more simplistic presentations in *1 Enoch* and *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (50, 71) and, perhaps, 1 Thessalonians; cf. similarly Wright 2003, 347–356, who earlier argues for physical transformation in 1 Thessalonians as well (217).

other groups. Notably, even in 1 Corinthians, where Paul is addressing behavior which he regards as not adequately different from their neighbors (1 Cor 5:1; 6:2; 9–11, etc.), it is evident that the Corinthians still took their distinct status to heart (e.g. 5:9–11). Paul directly addresses both communities as an ἐκκλησία and, much more commonly, as ἀδελφοί. In both cases, he characterizes these distinct ἐκκλησίαι of brethren as holy (1 Thess 3:13; 5:23; 1 Cor 1:2, 30; 6:11, etc.), while at the same time exhorting them to the same ends (e.g. 1 Thess 4:1–3; 1 Cor 3:17). Further, the notion of "election" present in 1 Thess 1:4, though not prevalent, may be indicated by the passing reference to "choosing" (ἐκλέγεσθαι) in 1 Cor 1:27–28. The recurrent vices in each letter are πορνεία and idolatry, both in Paul's initial teaching *and* subsequent reinforcement, and are concerns shared with many other Jewish writers in the second temple period. It is especially with respect to these vices that Paul's communities are distinct from the practices of the Gentiles.<sup>154</sup>

In 1 Corinthians, the Corinthian community is further distinguished from the Ἰουδαῖοι (1:22–24), a point that Paul may allude to in 1 Thess 2:14–15 in his reference to the "Jews who killed Jesus." Notably, the "churches of God in Judea" (2:13) are distinguished from these Jews by the fact of their persecution.<sup>155</sup> However, the Judean churches and Jews are at the same time identified as συμφολέται and, if a distinction is intended, the theme is less prominent in 1 Thessalonians than in 1 Corinthians. Nevertheless, this distinction is especially remarkable in light of the many points of contact between Paul's teaching and Judaism.

---

<sup>154</sup> In connection with this, it is worth noting that love is an important virtue in each letter (1 Thess 4:9; 1 Cor 13:1–14:1), which is clearly identified as part of Paul's formative instruction in Thessalonica, and that Paul identifies love as the fulfillment of the Law. See further, Reinmuth 1985.

<sup>155</sup> In fact, scholars such as Steve Mason and Philip Esler have recently emphasized the value of translating Ἰουδαῖος as "Judean," that is, one whose identity and practices are oriented around Judea, the Law and, more specifically, Jerusalem (cf. Mason 2007, esp. 484–486; Esler 2003, 62–74). Insofar as the "Churches of God in Judea" were no longer oriented around Jerusalem and the temple cult, if that is indeed the case, they were no longer "Judeans" in this revised sense. This does not mean, however, that they would not have *self*-identified as Ἰουδαῖοι.

# Chapter 8

## Summary and Conclusions on Paul's Formative Instruction

This chapter concludes Part II by drawing together the various materials identified in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, providing a more complete picture of Paul's formative instruction. I summarize this briefly with reference to the pertinent sections of chapters 5–7, followed by a brief analysis of some problems Paul seems to have faced in teaching the Thessalonians and Corinthians. The outline and analysis serves as the base for the comparison between Paul's teaching and his letter to the Romans in Part III.

### 8.1 Outline and Character of Paul's Formative Instruction

There is substantial overlap in Paul's teaching present in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. In both cities Paul taught about God as the one true God the father (both of Jesus and of believers),<sup>1</sup> Jesus as Christ and Lord who died "for us," was raised by God and will come again imminently as judge.<sup>2</sup> The concept of participation in Christ which featured in Paul's teaching to the Corinthians (see §6.2.4) is not addressed in 1 Thessalonians. Although the perplexing and non-elucidated phrase ἐν Χριστῷ (1 Thess 1:1; 2:14; 4:16; 5:18) could reflect such a concept, as is often argued (e.g. recently Wolter 2011, 241–246) and indeed is in keeping with larger structures of Paul's theology, this must remain speculative as a historical judgment about the content of Paul's teaching in Thessalonica. The Holy Spirit featured in Paul's formative instruction as accompanying

---

<sup>1</sup> Thessalonians: §§5.1.1, 7.2.2; Corinthians: §§5.2.1, 6.2.2.

<sup>2</sup> Thessalonians: §§6.1.2, 7.2.3.2; Corinthians: §§5.2.1, 7.3.3.

his preaching, a gift to the believers from God and itself a bestower of gifts such as prophecy and glossolalia.<sup>3</sup> According to Paul, he preached his gospel as an apostle and without sophistry.<sup>4</sup>

Additionally, Paul taught on moral/ethical topics, which included prohibitions against εἰδωλολατρία, πορνεία and πλεονηξία as well as the virtue of love and advice on more practical matters of social intercourse.<sup>5</sup> Further practical issues such as communal worship were established by Paul in Corinth, and perhaps in Thessalonica, though his truncated visit may not have allowed time for full instruction on these matters. According to 1 Corinthians, more complete instruction in communal worship also included certain liturgical elements such as "the amen."<sup>6</sup> So also with respect to community structure, Paul's instructions to the Thessalonians appear more inchoate. In both places, the community marker of the "holy kiss" featured in his teaching.<sup>7</sup>

These teachings, and especially those relevant to eschatology, were passed on in the language of apocalyptic Judaism, including remarkable imagery for which Gentiles from a pagan background would have had little or no conceptual framework without intentional instruction. Paul passed on to the Thessalonians and Corinthians an apocalyptic cosmology (or at least important elements of one) that included the *parousia* of Jesus as the Day of the Lord which was to be accompanied by the resurrection of believers, though in each location different issues arose precisely around this point. Notions of heavenly assumption, eschatological judgment, angelic beings and the person of Satan are all quintessentially Jewish and, as we saw, all can be linked with Paul's

---

<sup>3</sup> Thessalonians: §7.2.4; Corinthians: §§6.2.2.3, 7.3.6.1.

<sup>4</sup> Thessalonians: §5.1.1; Corinthians: §5.2.1.

<sup>5</sup> Thessalonians: §§5.1.2–3; Corinthians: §5.2.2.

<sup>6</sup> Corinthians: §7.3.6.1.

<sup>7</sup> Thessalonians: §7.2.6.3; Corinthians: §7.3.6.4.

formative instruction.<sup>8</sup>

The communities to whom Paul entrusted this teaching are also characterized in substantially the same terms. The Corinthians and the Thessalonians are ἀδελφοί who comprise an ἐκκλησία connected with other ἐκκλησίαι of believers. They are, and are to be, a holy community, set apart from Jews and Gentiles in terms of their belief in the gospel *and* their moral conduct.<sup>9</sup>

The cumulative picture of Paul's teaching in both locations, though not comprehensive, is remarkable for what it shows about the recurrent themes, and so the character, of his formative instruction. Two themes in particular, which have been variously proposed as the center of Pauline theology, are notably lacking in either one or both of the letters. The concept of "justification" is entirely absent from 1 Thessalonians and occurs only in one passing reference in 1 Corinthians (6:11). Similarly, the notion of participation in Christ is absent from 1 Thessalonians, unless it is compressed in the "in Christ" formulations as is often asserted, though it featured as part of Paul's formative teaching in Corinth and sees significant development in the Adam-Christ typology (1 Cor 15:21–22) which is picked up again in Romans 5.

Although many elements of Paul's teaching have parallels in a wide variety of sources, both Greco-Roman and Jewish, the cumulative character is deeply rooted in Judaism.<sup>10</sup> Paul's teaching carries with itself, and functions within, a symbolic universe, in which there is one God who has a chosen, holy people set apart from all others. This people awaits the definitive, eschatological intervention of God in a coming day of judgment and salvation. Worship of other gods, epitomized in idolatry, must be rejected

---

<sup>8</sup> Thessalonians: §7.2.5; Corinthians: §§7.3.3–4.

<sup>9</sup> Thessalonians: §7.2.7; Corinthians: §7.3.7.

<sup>10</sup> This point offers some vindication to the views of Alfred Seeberg 1903 who emphasized the debt which early Christian *Sittenlehre* and *Glaubensformel* owed to second temple Judaism. See, however, the critiques in §1.3.

categorically – so too the sexual immorality and rapaciousness which characterize the "rest who do not know God." The cosmos is populated with angelic beings, benevolent and malevolent, and God himself has a Spirit which he bestows upon his people for various tasks.

However, these similarities with first-century Judaism make the differences all the more striking. Perhaps most obviously from the perspective of an ancient observer, Paul's communities in Corinth and Thessalonica were predominantly Gentile with a smaller Jewish contingent, rather than the reverse which may have been the case with a synagogue. Further, on the theological level, the insertion of Christ into the Jewish *Sinnwelt* did not simply add a new element, but altered the position of other elements.<sup>11</sup> For instance, while Paul passed on scriptures to the Corinthians (and, as I argued, probably to the Thessalonians as well), obedience to Torah is no longer the covenant boundary. Circumcision and Sabbath are not addressed at all in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. Paul's failure to mention the reading of scripture in his account of corporate worship in 1 Cor 14:26–33 stands in striking contrast with what we know of Jewish worship practice in the first century CE, though one ought to be careful about pressing an argument from silence.<sup>12</sup> Indeed, the covenant boundaries have been reoriented around the death and resurrection of Jesus,<sup>13</sup> as have the eschatological expectations. In these letters, Paul is not the apostle of God, but of Jesus and his message is centered on the "word of the cross."<sup>14</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> Cf. the analysis in Wolter 2011, 14–23.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Josephus *Apion* 2.175; Philo (*apud* Eusebius *Praep. ev.* 8.7.12–13); *Legat.* 156; Dautzenberg 1975, 274–288; Schrage 1991–2001, 3:441–442.

<sup>13</sup> It is probably true that Paul's lack of emphasis on the majority of legal materials in the Torah is also informed by Jewish halakhah for Gentiles, which applied only select prohibitions, such as abstaining from idolatry, sexual immorality, murder and eating blood. On this, see Bockmuehl 2000, 145–173; Finsterbusch 1996; Tomson 1990.

<sup>14</sup> But note Gal 1:1 – Παῦλος ἀπόστολος... διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ θεοῦ πατρὸς...

## 8.2 Paul, his Converts and Cultural Dissonance

That Paul imparted such a comprehensive system of thought to his converts should not be surprising since, as Regina Börschel aptly notes, "No one converts to no-man's-land, but rather the end-goal of the conversion is clear for the converts who have a general idea of the new interpretation of reality, the community, etc."<sup>15</sup> Nevertheless, both in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians Paul not only draws on his imparted teaching, he also reinforces it and elaborates on it. The latter two activities suggest the possibility of slippage between Paul's characterization of what his readers think and the facts on the ground.

In the case of the Thessalonians, this is to be expected for two primary reasons. First, given Paul's premature and forced departure from Thessalonica, it is highly probable that he felt the need to complement his teaching. Furthermore, in their conversion, the largely Gentile community attempted to appropriate a thought-complex that we have seen to be deeply Jewish and that was at variance with their previous *Sinnwelt*. This had a high probability of creating some cultural dissonance, bringing confusion and misunderstanding.

While this remains at the level of probability for the Thessalonians, for the Corinthians the problem of cultural dissonance is much clearer. As we have seen, Paul spent a good deal of time addressing issues of idolatry and sexual immorality and he is at pains to reframe the apocalyptic structure of the *parousia* and resurrection in a more philosophical way to address a position that some of the Corinthians evidently held (1 Cor 15). Thus, although he imparted this moral teaching and an apocalyptic cosmology

---

<sup>15</sup> "Niemand konvertiert in ein Niemandsland, vielmehr steht für den Konvertiten wenigstens der Zielpunkt der Konversion fest, er hat vage Vorstellungen von der neuen Wirklichkeitsdeutung, der neuen Gemeinschaft etc."; Börschel 2001, 138.

with angelic beings, the imminent eschaton and the future resurrection, these failed to "stick" with the Corinthians.<sup>16</sup> Similarly, the Lord's Supper was transmitted to the Corinthians by Paul, but he clearly felt that their own practice of it had gone wrong. In light of these points, then, it is questionable whether the community as a whole understood themselves as the people of God in the same deeply Jewish way that Paul evidently did. The fact that Paul felt the need to address these misunderstandings or misappropriations of his initial teaching points to the difficulties involved in the process of conversion.

Stephen Chester, in particular, has helpfully pointed to this feature of Paul's missionary efforts, discussing it in terms of indigenization (Chester 2003, 215–215). More so than appears to be the case with the Thessalonians, who simply may not have had time to indigenize Paul's teaching, the Corinthians appropriated Paul's teaching within conceptual frameworks that were already available from their previous way of life, what Chester refers to as the "practical consciousness." In terms of Regina Börschel's study, what we see in 1 Corinthians is Paul addressing the results of his failure to replace fully the Corinthian Gentiles' existing *Sinnwelt*.<sup>17</sup> Furthermore, given the diverse background of the community members and the internal divisions, it is not clear that the community understood anything *as a whole*. Instead it may be that different groups within the community had different conceptions of what it was to be a believer in Christ.

In this light, it is worth noting Christopher Stanley's variegated models for different audience types, which he applies specifically to facility with scripture (Stanley 2004). Such a model may well be applicable to many of Paul's direct and implicit appeals to knowledge, especially in 1 Corinthians, particularly where their place in Paul's initial

---

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Hanges 2012, 409–410 on the cultural distance between Paul and the Corinthians concerning πορνεία.

<sup>17</sup> For discussion of Börschel and Chester's works, see Excursus 2.

teaching is hard to imagine. This might apply, for instance, to Paul's language of "membership" in Christ (6:15) or to the presumed esoteric knowledge in 6:2–3. In such cases, those who had spent more time with Paul and/or were more closely affiliated with the synagogue before his arrival may have understood the statements differently than a Gentile neophyte converted after Paul had left Corinth or Thessalonica.

In light of these problems, Paul remains engaged in these letters, and especially in 1 Corinthians, in the continuing process of what Richard Hays (2005) referred to as the "conversion of the imagination";<sup>18</sup> Paul's is an ambitious attempt to replace their previous pagan *Sinnwelt* and social/moral praxis with a new, Christ-centered, monotheistic *Sinnwelt* and social/moral praxis that closely resembled a form of Judaism. It is understandable, then, why it is that his converts apparently failed to understand all of his theological, apocalyptic or moral arguments.

### 8.3 Moving Forward

The outline of Pauline formative preaching and teaching gathered above accomplishes two tasks. First, it concludes this study of Paul's reminders of and appeals to his teaching present in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. The picture acquired here allows us to appreciate the extent to which Paul's teaching was both fundamental and problematic for his congregations; he complemented, corrected, reinterpreted and reapplied it throughout these letters. In particular, Paul's apocalyptic eschatology was evidently difficult for his Gentile converts to grasp and he had to reframe his initial teaching both for the Thessalonians and the Corinthians. Similarly, in both letters Paul felt

---

<sup>18</sup> But see Bockmuehl 2008 who argues that the term "imagination" is problematic on historical and theological grounds and proposes the phrase "conversion of desire" in its place, which fits with the above discussion of the moral transformation of Paul's converts as well as issues surrounding eschatological expectations. Nevertheless, Hays' "conversion of the imagination" aptly captures the importance of the transformation of one's matrix of interpretation that happens in conversion; cf. Börschel 2001, 138, quoted above.

the need to revisit matters of sexual behavior, idolatry and greed (or public behavior more generally). Additionally, I have shown that the *Sinnwelt* which Paul imparted was profoundly Jewish, though it also stands in obvious tension with other examples of Judaism from the second temple period.

Second, the cumulative outline of Paul's teaching presented above lays the foundation for the next chapter in which I compare the elements of this outline with Paul's letter to the Romans. Although there are no explicit reminders of Paul's teaching in Romans, there are a number of things which he clearly takes for granted that his audience will affirm. However, certain elements of Paul's teaching seen in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians which receive cursory treatment, if any at all, are dealt with *in extenso* in Romans (e.g. "justification" and the place of Israel). These two aspects, respectively, may suggest materials which Paul expects his Roman audience to accept without dispute and those on which he feels the need to explain his position. In this way, a comparison between Paul's formative teaching and his letter to the Romans allows one to catch a glimpse, beyond Paul, of wider early Christian thought.

# Part III: Formative Instruction in Churches Paul did not Establish: Romans

Part III takes the study beyond the focus on Pauline churches to assess the way in which he expected his teaching, as outlined in chapter 8, to be accepted in Rome among communities he did not establish. To accomplish this task, I approach Romans topically, addressing the relevant passages on topics from Paul's initial teaching in Corinth and Thessalonica together. I conclude that there is both continuity and discontinuity between what Paul taught his communities and what he expected the Romans to know. Moreover, the tone of Paul's judgments on certain matters, such as Gentile observance of Jewish Law in Rom 14, differs markedly from his dealings with the same issues in other letters.



# Chapter 9

## Paul's Teaching and the Roman τύπος: A Comparison

### 9.1 Methodological Notes

In writing to the Christian communities in Rome, Paul undertook a very different task from that which he attempted in 1 Corinthians or 1 Thessalonians. Accordingly, my approach to Romans differs from my approach to these other letters. In the first place, Paul had never been among the believers in Rome and therefore he can give no explicit reminders of his teaching there. Instead, what we find are general references to "the teaching" to which the Roman readers had been entrusted. While these do not provide a similarly detailed framework to Paul's explicit reminders in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, they indicate an important rhetorical dynamic of the letter: Paul explains potentially controversial elements of his gospel by means of presumed commonalities.

It is precisely this dynamic that I seek to elucidate here through a comparison of Paul's teaching in Thessalonica and Corinth with the formative instruction Paul presumes for his Roman readers. This is not simply a matter of juxtaposing material in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians with Romans, which is in any case a difficult comparison given the possibility that Paul's own thinking developed between the writing of the letters. Rather, it is a matter of analyzing whether and how Paul's teaching (summarized in chapter 8 and in the previous chapter summaries) is presumed to be known already by his Roman audience. It will become evident that there is both continuity and discontinuity between what Paul calls "his gospel" (2:16) and what he

expects of his Roman readers. Due to the constraints of space, I cannot explore every resonance between Romans and Paul's teaching isolated in chapter 8. Instead I will focus on some main contours and highlight obvious areas of overlap or tension.

In this respect, it is noteworthy that, in comparison with 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, Paul does not often bring the presumed knowledge of his readers to the level of explicit discourse in Romans. Rather, he relies more commonly on implicit assumptions of knowledge as the ground of his communication. Therefore, my approach in this chapter is similar to my analysis of implicit appeals in Part II though, again, there are no explicit reminders to which they can be linked.

This chapter begins with a discussion of the rhetorical dynamic noted above, focusing on Paul's knowledge of his intended audience (§9.2). The bulk of the chapter explores the relationship of Paul's teaching to his presuppositions about his Roman readers (§9.3) before drawing some preliminary conclusions regarding the importance of this argument for the study of Romans (§9.4).

## 9.2 The Rhetorical Dynamic of Romans

### 9.2.1 Paul's purpose in writing

There is no space here for an extended treatment of why Paul wrote Romans, but a few comments are pertinent.<sup>1</sup> According to the letter frame (1:1–15; 15:14–16:23), Paul presents Romans as a letter of introduction to a community Paul hoped to visit soon and from whom he hoped to garner support for a Spanish mission (15:22–29).<sup>2</sup> If this is the case, a number of other elements can be accounted for without undue strain. Phoebe, as

---

<sup>1</sup> Along with the majority of contemporary scholarship on Romans, I am convinced that Romans was not written as the definitive presentation of Paul's gospel (*pace* Bornkamm 1991 [1963]; cf. Wilckens 1978–1982, 1:47; Haacker 1999, 9). Rather it should be understood as an *ad hoc* letter written with a particular audience and situation in mind; so Donfried 1991 [1974], 103–107 who is followed by the majority of scholars.

<sup>2</sup> Jewett 2007, 80–91 emphasizes the Spanish mission as Paul's motive.

benefactor, is commended to the Romans as Paul's liaison (16:1–2).<sup>3</sup> The extended letter body, with its occasionally apologetic tone, serves a ground-clearing function by presenting Paul's "gospel" (1:15; 2:16) in a way that allays potential (or actual) objections (3:8).<sup>4</sup> Further, the motive for the extended body is supplied partially (ἀπὸ μέρους) by his mention of a reminder (15:15).<sup>5</sup>

What is crucial for this study, on any understanding of the purpose of Romans, is that *Paul is here engaged in an act of persuasion*. Accordingly, his argument is constrained and directed by the ἔνδοξα he assumes his readers to have.<sup>6</sup> As a responsible communicator, he must build on that which he expects his audience to know already. This is where the element of continuity between Paul's teaching and the Roman ἔνδοξα is to be found. Those parts of his teaching that he expects to be (at least potentially) unknown or objectionable, he can not take for granted as objects of agreement, but instead must demonstrate them. To whom, then, was he writing?

## 9.2.2 Paul's audience in Romans

With few exceptions, there is widespread agreement that Christianity travelled to Rome along the trade-routes and arrived among the synagogues in the 40s CE.<sup>7</sup> The first

---

<sup>3</sup> See Jewett 2007, 89–91 for a full theory regarding Phoebe's role in Paul's Spanish preparations.

<sup>4</sup> The apologetic function of Romans is noted by Kettunen 1979 and Stuhlmacher 1991 [1986], among others, though both consider the apology a means to the end of preparing for the Spanish mission; cf. Morris 1988, 17; Wedderburn 1988, 141; Zeller 1985, 16. At the most general level, this fact points to Romans as an effort to persuade the Romans to accept Paul's gospel; cf. Gignac 2006, 406. Olson 1984 has also shown how Paul's statements of self-confidence (e.g. Rom 15:17) are related to typical use of apologetic self-commendation in Greco-Roman literature. This is loosely connected with Klein 1991 [1969] who argues that in Romans Paul tries to provide an apostolic foundation for the church. Klein's position has been taken up and modified by Reichert 2001 and Weima 2003.

<sup>5</sup> These passages will be discussed further in §9.2.3 below.

<sup>6</sup> This point is undervalued by scholars who deny any apologetic intent to Romans, such as Seifrid 1992, 207–210.

<sup>7</sup> E.g. Fitzmyer 1993, 29; Jewett 2007, 60; Lampe 2001; Leenhardt 1961, 11; Wilckens 1978–1982, 1:35. Other scholars, such as Dunn 1988, 1:xlvi, argue that the early Roman Christians were a result of Jewish missionaries, though he does not specify what he means by "missionaries."

converts, then, would have been Jews and Gentiles associated with the synagogues.<sup>8</sup>

From Rom 16<sup>9</sup> it is evident that by the time Paul wrote his letter the Roman believers were organized into various house churches which, taken together, comprised Gentiles and Jews.<sup>10</sup>

Nevertheless, Paul only explicitly addresses Gentiles in his letter, however the Roman communities may have developed.<sup>11</sup> Other direct addresses, as at Rom 7:1, do not *necessarily* move beyond that, though knowing the Jewish Law would certainly fit Jewish readers as well.<sup>12</sup> Accordingly, the majority of recent studies on Romans have concluded that Paul is speaking primarily to Gentiles in Romans.<sup>13</sup> It should be remembered, however, that whatever the dominant thrust of the letter, there *were* Jews in the nascent Roman communities who formed part of the audience.<sup>14</sup>

It seems, then, that it is best to understand the ethnic composition of Paul's Roman audience in very similar terms to his Corinthian audience. He envisions a predominantly

---

<sup>8</sup> On the existence of "God-fearers," cf. *I Aph* 11.55 (c. 200–500 CE, probably from the later end of the range); Lampe 2003, 69, 76; Levinskaya 1990; Segal 1990, 93–96; Das 2007, 70–82. The *editio princeps* of the Aphrodisias inscription is in Reynolds and Tannenbaum 1987, but see Chaniotis 2002 for criticisms, corrections and updated bibliography.

<sup>9</sup> While it was once debated whether Rom 16 belonged originally to the letter, scholars now are unanimous in its place in Romans, though the closing doxology (16:25–27) may be a later addition; see esp. Gamble 1977, 128–129; cf. Donfried 1991 [1970]; Metzger 1994, *ad loc.*

<sup>10</sup> So Lampe 2003, 359–360; Jewett 2007, 958–959; cf. note 165 below.

<sup>11</sup> E.g. 1:13; 11:13. The direct address to the Jewish interlocutor in Rom 3 is a feature of diatribe and one cannot draw a *straight* line between a diatribal interlocutor and the audience, though a connection can be made. See further below.

<sup>12</sup> That 7:1 refers to Torah is the majority position from Michel 1955, 141 to Jewett 2007, 431; *pace* Käsemann 1980, 187 and Haacker 1999, 137. On the issue of Roman law here, see Jeffers 1998, 133–143.

<sup>13</sup> Reichert 2001, 103 rightly identifies this as the current critical consensus; cf. Das 2007, 264; Wilckens 1978–1982, 1:34. I am unconvinced by the argument of Watson 2007b, 188, 215 that Paul is writing Romans partially to Christian Jews to call for a separation from the synagogue, cf. §9.3.7.1 below. Notably, misconstruing the Romans Christians as "mostly Jewish" (O'Neill 1975, 41) is one of several faulty presuppositions that led J. C. O'Neill to excise a majority of Romans as various interpolations.

<sup>14</sup> The deliberate marginalization of this historical context by Stowers 1994, 30–33; Thorsteinsson 2003, 87–122 and Das 2007 (cf. similarly Nanos 1996, 75–84) is problematic. Given that there *were* Jews in the Roman communities, to whom indeed Paul extends his greeting, would not Prisca, Aquila and the others mentioned want to read the letter? What does it mean for Paul, as an author who is trying to bring unity, to deliberately "encode" one part of his audience but not the other?

Gentile community, to whom he principally speaks, though there was also a Jewish contingent (cf. Reichert 2001, 146).<sup>15</sup> These Jews and Gentiles are not from the upper socio-economic classes, as Lampe has shown (Lampe 2003, 80) and as may be suggested by the fact that Paul wrote in Greek to a community in the heart of the Roman empire. Further, the majority of his recipients were probably immigrants rather than Roman citizens or long-term residents since he expects them to be liable for direct taxes (φόρος).<sup>16</sup>

### 9.2.3 The τύπος διδαχῆς in Rome: common categories of belief

The diversity of the Roman house churches could be seen to pose an acute problem for reconstructing their presumed knowledge. Naturally, the religious ἔνδοξα of one who has been a believer for a long time will have differed from a neophyte and the difference could be even more exaggerated if the established member was a Jew and the neophyte a pagan Gentile. I am interested here, however, in the readers whom Paul assumes to have been handed over to the τύπος διδαχῆς (Rom 6:17). Ambiguities remain and caution is warranted, but the fact that Paul presumes to speak to a group with a common body of knowledge, allowing for the fact that he may well overreach occasionally, encourages efforts to compare the presumed Roman τύπος with Paul's teaching.<sup>17</sup>

In studies of early Christian *kerygma* and catechesis, Rom 6:17b looms large.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> The most common explanation for Gentile-dominant house churches, which remains highly plausible, points to the expulsion of Jewish Christians from Rome by Claudius in 49 CE. For variations on this account, see e.g. Wiefel 1991 [1970]; Stuhlmacher 1991 [1986]; Wedderburn 1988, 54–59; Lampe 2003, 11–16, 69–76; Watson 2007b, 167–174; Das 2007, 149–202.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Omerzu 2002, 49–50; Jewett 2007, 798–799.

<sup>17</sup> It is, of course, not necessarily the case that the τύπος διδαχῆς encompassed all the theology and praxis that Paul presumed among the Roman believers, but it remains the only positively identified body of knowledge noted to be present among the Romans. Given the fact that the outline of this body of knowledge is not delimited by Paul, the use of the τύπος here stands as an umbrella term for Paul's presumed knowledge of the Romans Christians.

<sup>18</sup> For a thorough discussion of the various interpretive options, including minority positions not discussed here, see Gagnon 1993, 671–681. The view of Bultmann 1967 [1947], 283, followed recently by

Alfred Seeberg argued that the τύπος διδαχῆς in Rom 6:17b was equivalent to Paul's "ways" in 1 Cor 4:17 and that both refer to a recognizably fixed Christian halakah (Seeberg 1903, 1–5). Many other scholars have taken a similar approach,<sup>19</sup> arguing that τύπος διδαχῆς, as a pattern of teaching, is a reference to baptismal catechesis,<sup>20</sup> or less specifically to the gospel or Christian doctrine.<sup>21</sup>

However, such a formal understanding of the Rom 6:17b has long been criticized.<sup>22</sup> F. W. Beare argued that the verb παραδιδόναι did not refer to the passing on of tradition but to the handing over of slaves, noting the centrality of the slavery metaphor in Rom 6:15–22.<sup>23</sup> Further, Robert Gagnon has argued that τύπος ought to be understood not as a set pattern, but an impression made by the teaching, taking διδαχῆς as a genitive of source.<sup>24</sup> He concludes, "my analysis indicates that the phrase τύπος διδαχῆς says nothing one way or the other about the set 'pattern' of early Christian teaching, or the 'fixed form' of baptismal instruction" (Gagnon 1993, 687).

Nevertheless, even if one accepts Beare's and Gagnon's arguments, the phrase εἰς ὃν παρεδόθητε τύπον διδαχῆς indicates that Paul felt at liberty to presume a certain

---

Jewett 2007, 419, that v. 17b is an interpolation is unnecessary, as will be seen. On the rhetorical flow of 6:17–18, see Viard 2002, 356–357 who rightly understands v. 17b as designating "l'événement qui permit le passage de l'esclavage à la liberté."

<sup>19</sup> Though several scholars, from Bengel 1835, 41 to Dunn 1988, 1:344, argue that the τύπος ought to be understood as Christ. However, as Gagnon 1993, 676–677 rightly notes, this has to be read into a text which is read more naturally by relating the relative ὃν with τύπον and which otherwise focuses on slavery to God rather than Christ; cf. Jewett 2007, 418.

<sup>20</sup> So Byrne 1996, 206; Fitzmyer 1993, 449; Käsemann 1980, 181.

<sup>21</sup> So Kuss 1957–1959, 2:389–390; Black 1973, 98. Some argue that this pattern of Christian teaching stands in opposition to Jewish teaching; cf. Michel 1955, 136; Stowers 1994, 258; Moo 1996, 402.

<sup>22</sup> *Contra* Bultmann, Käsemann 1980, 67 considered the reference to judgment in v. 16 as "indispensable" to the passage.

<sup>23</sup> Beare 1959, 207. However, Beare fails to note that Paul never elsewhere uses the term with reference to slavery, but he does do so with reference to tradition (1 Cor 11:2, 23; 15:3). The slavery imagery has been picked up by others such as Schlier 1977, 207 and Wright 2002, 545.

<sup>24</sup> Gagnon 1993, 681–687, drawing material primarily from Philo. His view has been adopted by Jewett 2007, 418–419 as the most plausible interpretation, though he ultimately thinks v. 17b is an interpolation.

knowledge on the part of his Roman audience. If the τύπος is an imprint left by teaching, the shape of the imprint must reflect the shape of the object which formed it. Therefore, although τύπος διδαχῆς may not be evidence for a fixed pattern of Christian instruction, it does imply that Paul expected a certain "shape" for the impression.

Romans 16:17<sup>25</sup> corroborates the argument that Paul expected certain things to be known to the Romans.<sup>26</sup> There he interrupts the greetings for his final exhortation in which he tells his Roman readers to "watch out for those who cause divisions and offenses against the teaching that you learned [παρὰ τὴν διδαχὴν ἣν ὑμεῖς ἐμάθετε]." Here again, if Paul did not feel free to presume any knowledge of the "teaching" that the Romans had learned, such an appeal makes little rhetorical sense. Indeed, if the Roman teaching were sufficiently different from the material in Paul's letter, his exhortation could severely undermine his efforts to use Rome as a base for further European mission work.<sup>27</sup>

In line with Paul's appeals in 6:17 and 16:17, Paul's cryptic statement in 15:15 suggests that he had some notion of what his Roman readers knew. There he states that the letter was written "in part" (ἀπὸ μέρους) as a reminder since he is already confident in the Roman believers' sufficiency as a community (v. 14). Although it is not clear whether the partial reminder is restricted to a particular part of the letter (e.g. part or all of the

---

<sup>25</sup> Jewett 2007, 986–988 argued that this passage is an interpolation, following the course set by others such as J. C. O'Neill and Rudolf Bultmann. However, Jewett overstates the change in tone (cf. the earlier objections of Cranfield 1975-1979, 797) and Jewett's "contradictions" with the rest of Romans are far from persuasive. Further, unlike the doxology in 16:25–27, there is no manuscript evidence for such an interpolation. See also Lohse 2003, 104–106 who argues that the apparent difficulties can be accounted for by an appeal to developing early Christian tradition.

<sup>26</sup> Lohse 2003, 106–107 also recognizes the mutually reinforcing relationship of 6:17 and 16:17.

<sup>27</sup> Notably, scholars such as Dunn 1988, 2:902 who reject the interpretation of 6:17 as an appeal to teaching recognize that there is no such ambiguity in 16:17.

paraenetic section in 12:1–15:13)<sup>28</sup> or to an aspect of Paul's motivation in writing,<sup>29</sup> it is probably too optimistic to read this as another reference to baptismal catechesis.<sup>30</sup>

Nevertheless, the fact that Paul can consider some of the material in Romans as a reminder necessarily implies that he has some idea of what they know, even if it is only a general idea. Furthermore, the fact that he expects only *part* of his letter to be a reminder suggests that he expects some of his teaching in Romans to differ from what his readers already know.

Finally, there are two more verses which suggest that Paul viewed his gospel as potentially "other" for his Roman readers. In 2:16, Paul notes that God's eschatological judgment of "the hidden things of humans...through Christ Jesus" is "according to my gospel." It is difficult to say whether Paul is highlighting something distinctive about his gospel in contradistinction to that of others<sup>31</sup> or whether he is highlighting an expected point of continuity.<sup>32</sup> However, in both cases Paul acknowledges the *potential* that his gospel could be seen as "other" – in the former interpretation he highlights the fact while in the latter he tries to ameliorate it.

Similarly, in 3:8 Paul notes that some people accuse him of promoting a gospel that encourages slack morals. Whether or not Paul actually expected such a reputation to precede him to Rome, his rhetoric is an implicit affirmation that he thought his gospel *could* be misconstrued in that way and so *could* be viewed as other.

Therefore, while 6:17, 15:15 and 16:17 indicate that Paul has some knowledge of the teaching which the Roman believers had received, 15:15, 2:16 and 3:8 suggest that

---

<sup>28</sup> This is argued by Cranfield 1975-1979, 753 and Wilckens 1978-1982, 3:117. Dunn 1988, 2:859 thinks it could also be a reference to the letter as a whole.

<sup>29</sup> So Barrett 1991, 252.

<sup>30</sup> As do Fitzmyer 1993, 711; Käsemann 1980, 392 and Michel 1955, 327.

<sup>31</sup> E.g. Barrett 1991, 61; Black 1973, 59; Fitzmyer 1993, 753; Jewett 2007, 218.

<sup>32</sup> E.g. Cranfield 1975-1979, 163; Käsemann 1980, 68 and more cautiously Dunn 1988, 1:103.

Paul perceived *at least the potential* for a gap between his teaching and the Roman τύπος διδαχῆς.

#### 9.2.4 Paul's gospel and the Roman τύπος

As I noted above, Paul does not often bring presumed knowledge of his readers to the level of explicit discourse in Romans<sup>33</sup> and scholars are divided about whether or how much Paul knows about the Roman communities. The above discussion has shown, however, that he clearly *does* claim to know something of what the Roman Christians believe, even if specific contextual details are difficult to pin down.<sup>34</sup>

This lack of direct appeal is especially striking in light of the fact that Paul writes Romans partially as a "reminder" (15:15, see above); he certainly appears to presume a lot of his readers. Indeed, it is worth considering momentarily, and in general terms, the extraordinary degree of presumed consent in Romans.<sup>35</sup> Although Paul acknowledges that his "gospel" may differ from the Roman τύπος, he nevertheless takes for granted his readers' agreement that there is one God for Jews and Gentiles (3:28–30), that Jesus' death was "for us" (4:25; 5:6–8; 14:15), that he was exalted by God (1:3–4) and that God will (soon) judge the world (3:5–6, 13:11). Further, he expects his readers to *experience* the Holy Spirit (8:9, 15). Paul regularly refers to the Roman believers as "brothers" and clearly presumes his readers to have been baptized and to engage in communal worship including prophecy and perhaps liturgical elements. He even assumes that the question of Israel and the church will be intelligible and relevant to his readers. These items, among others, form the basis of arguments that Paul apparently assumes he can launch, with little

---

<sup>33</sup> Of course, Paul does occasionally directly appeal to his readers' knowledge and in some instances the presumed knowledge correlates with Paul's teaching. These appeals are not sufficient in number to warrant a section of their own and so they will be discussed under the relevant sections below.

<sup>34</sup> On the community structure implied in Rom 16, see §9.3.7 below.

<sup>35</sup> The material noted here is explored in more detail below.

explanation. Within this presupposed material, Paul explains aspects of "his gospel" that he does not take for granted, but the "big picture" consensus that Paul assumes is remarkable. Trying to ascertain the proportions of these two aspects of Romans will take up the bulk of this chapter.

### 9.3 Paul's Formative Instruction and the τύπος in Rome

As I noted earlier, unlike the approach in Part II, this section will consider Paul's explicit reminders and implicit appeals to his audience's knowledge within the framework of his formative instruction in Thessalonica and Corinth. Therefore, rather than dividing the discussion according to type of appeal and examining passages in rough order of occurrence, I will proceed topically, grouping different types of appeal from various parts of the letter together. Each section will outline the continuity and difference between Paul's teaching and the knowledge he expects from his Roman audience.

#### 9.3.1 One God, the father and judge

As we saw in Part II, in Thessalonica and Corinth Paul presented God as the one true God, in necessary opposition to idols, who is the father of Jesus Christ and of believers and is coming in judgment. Unsurprisingly, this is largely the picture Paul presents in Romans as well, though with some shifts in emphasis.

In 3:30, Paul uses the axiom that "God is one"<sup>36</sup> as the foundation for his argument that both Jews and Gentiles are justified by the same means:<sup>37</sup> God is the God of Jews and Gentiles "if, as is indeed the case, God is one..."<sup>38</sup> Further, as in Corinth and Thessalonica, Paul takes for granted that his readers will understand that this one God is

---

<sup>36</sup> Cf. Excursus 3 above. See also the discussion of Jewish apologetic appropriation of Deut 6:4 in Guerra 1995, 84–101; cf. Gräßer 1985 [1981], 237–239.

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Demke 1976, 475; Moxnes 1980, 40–41; Wilckens 1978-1982, 1:248; Fitzmyer 1993, 365; Haacker 1999, 95; Wright 2002, 482.

<sup>38</sup> Εἶπερ is best read as the protasis for v. 29c stated as a fact, the ground for Paul's argument rather than being contingent on it; cf. Cranfield 1975-1979, 1:222 and Jewett 2007, 299–300.

the father of believers as well as Jesus (Rom 1:7, 6:4; 8:15; 15:6). Indeed, it is precisely these two points, that God is the father of *believers* and of "our Lord Jesus Christ" (15:6), that distinguish this from generic Greco-Roman and Jewish use.<sup>39</sup>

Also in continuity with Paul's teaching about God in Corinth and Thessalonica, Paul presumes that his Roman readers will be familiar with God's role as judge. This is notably affirmed in the dialogical exchange in Rom 3:5–6. If our injustice highlights God's justice is God unjust to condemn us? "By no means! How then will<sup>40</sup> God judge the world?" The notion that the world needs to be judged is a crucial presupposition without which Paul's argument carries no weight. Again in 14:10, Paul grounds his argument with an appeal to God's eschatological judgment. "Why do you pass judgment on your brother or sister? Or you, why do you despise your brother or sister? For we will all stand before the judgment seat of God."<sup>41</sup>

Finally, this true God the judge also stands in opposition to idolatry. In Paul's description of the corruption of humanity in 1:18–32, he describes the apex of foolishness as exchanging "the glory of the incorruptible God for the likeness of a corruptible image...the truth of God for a lie" (vv. 23, 25; cf. Bengel 1835, 11). This transaction is the reverse of Paul's account of the Thessalonians' (1 Thess 1:9) and Corinthians' (1 Cor 6:9–11) conversion and reflects a common Jewish iconoclasm.<sup>42</sup> In the diatribal dialogue that follows in 2:1–16, Paul demonstrates that he expects his readers to agree with him. In 2:2 Paul, or perhaps his Gentile interlocutor,<sup>43</sup> states "we know that God's judgment upon

---

<sup>39</sup> Cf. the discussion in §7.2.2.

<sup>40</sup> The tense of the verb is not clear and depends on whether one reads κρίνει or κρίνῃ. I have opted to follow the NA<sup>27</sup> reading, along with most scholars (e.g. Wilckens 1978-1982, 1:166; Jewett 2007, 239), though it makes little difference to my overall argument.

<sup>41</sup> Cranfield 1975-1979, 12:709 perceptively refers to this verse as a "remembrance." Cf. Paul's assumptions about judgment in Rom 2:5, 3:19, *passim*.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Black 1973, 52; Cranfield 1975-1979, 1:124. See Excursus 3.

<sup>43</sup> I find the traditional view that this interlocutor is a Jew (still advocated by some such as Gathercole 2002, 197–200 and Dunson 2012, 112–114) unconvincing. Preferable is the view that this

those who do such things is in accordance with truth" (cf. also 2:22) It is important to note that diatribal and epistolary interlocutors are intended as objects of identification for the audience, which requires that the characters and their arguments are recognizable.<sup>44</sup> Therefore, even if the "we" reflects the interlocutor's self-condemning position rather than a statement by Paul, the irony of affirming one's own condemnation is not supposed to be lost on Paul's audience who hears this from the perspective of those already "full of goodness and filled with knowledge" (Rom 15:14).

### 9.3.1.1 Paul beyond the τύπος: Jesus the judge?

Alongside this continuity, however, there is one suggestive variation that may indicate a difference between Paul's "gospel" and what he felt he could presume of his Roman readers. Although Paul evidently did speak of God as eschatological judge in Thessalonica and Corinth,<sup>45</sup> Jesus is the focus of the Day of the Lord, a concept rarely employed in Romans. It is suggestive that 1 Cor 4:5, which specifies that the "Lord" (Jesus) will come and judge the hidden purposes of the heart, is closely echoed in Rom 2:16, "the day when, *according to my gospel*, God, *through Jesus Christ*, will judge the secret thoughts of all." I noted above (§9.2.3) that it is difficult to tell if Rom 2:16 highlights a point of distinction for Paul's gospel or a point of continuity. In light of the fact that elsewhere in Romans God is the only judge mentioned, it may be that Paul could not presume consent on God's judgment coming *through Jesus*. It is true that Jesus as

---

interlocutor is a Gentile (so Stowers 1994, 100; Thorsteinsson 2003, 190, *passim*; Keck 2005, 74), though it matters little for the argument at hand.

<sup>44</sup> On this quality of diatribe, see Bultmann 1910, 11–12, 65, *passim*; Schmeller 1987, 23–24; Stowers 1994, 101, 103; Wehner 2000, 55–65; on epistolary interlocutors, see Thorsteinsson 2003, 140–141. It is probably not the case here that Paul expects the Romans to consider themselves *presently* in the same situation as the condemned interlocutor, but perhaps to recognize their pre-conversion Gentile lives in the characterization.

<sup>45</sup> 1 Thess 1:9–10 where Jesus saves from the coming wrath (cf. Rom 2:5); 3:13 where one is blameless before "our God and father"; 1 Cor 3:17, God will destroy the one who destroys his church; 5:13, "God will judge those on the outside."

judge is extremely common in early Christianity, with close links to the Jesus tradition (e.g. Matt 25), and this fact led C. H. Dodd to assume that Paul originally composed this passage for a Jewish audience (Dodd 1932, 35).<sup>46</sup> However, it should be remembered that Paul is the earliest witness we have to early Christian views of eschatology and it is conceivable, if barely, that Paul was aware that some groups did not emphasize the role of Christ in judgment. This is, of course, speculative. But it is at least highly suggestive that the only place in Romans where Paul mentions Jesus' role in the judgment, and one of the few places he elicits the Day of the Lord imagery, he notes that it is God's judgment *through* Jesus and that this is "according to my Gospel," which correlates with what he taught in Corinth and Thessalonica.<sup>47</sup>

### 9.3.2 Jesus Christ our Lord, son of God, raised from the dead

As I demonstrated above, in Thessalonica and Corinth Paul presented Jesus as Lord, Christ and son of God who died "for us" (ὕπερ ἡμῶν 1 Thess 5:10), or for our sins (ὕπερ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν; 1 Cor 15:3) and was raised again. Furthermore, due to the variety of ways in which Paul applied this narrative, it is evident that he considered it fundamental to his teaching, as he states explicitly in 1 Cor 2:2.<sup>48</sup> So also, these elements recur regularly in Romans as items Paul expects his readers to know already. Notably, the only direct appeal to Roman knowledge regarding Jesus, his death, or resurrection is Paul's appeal to Christ's resurrection in 6:9, which naturally presupposes the fact of his death.<sup>49</sup> Further, throughout Romans Paul presumes, rather than explains, that Jesus is

---

<sup>46</sup> Black 1973, 59 noted that there was "nothing...particularly Pauline" about this point; cf. Cranfield 1975-1979, 1:163. Other scholars locate the "Pauline" aspect in the fact that Jesus is judging the "hidden things"; cf. Barrett 1991, 51; Byrne 1996, 90.

<sup>47</sup> This is not, of course, to suggest that judgment by the Messiah was not part of certain strands of Jewish tradition, cf. Wright 1992, 311-320 noting *Pss. Sol.* 17-18 and *4 Ezra* 12:10-23. It is only to say that as not all strands articulated this hope, it is conceivable that Paul could not presume agreement on this point in Rome.

<sup>48</sup> See summary and cross-references in ch. 8 above.

<sup>49</sup> Frankemölle 1970, 29, 85 argued that this reference to Christ's resurrection stemmed from "das

Christ and Lord.<sup>50</sup>

A striking similarity between the Roman τύπος and Paul's teaching is found in the acclamation κύριος Ἰησοῦς in Rom 10:9 and 1 Cor 12:3. As many scholars have noted, this appears to be a traditional formulation, linked with conversion in Romans, though not explicitly so in 1 Corinthians.<sup>51</sup> In Rom 10:9, Paul appeals to the confession of this formula and belief in Christ's resurrection as the grounds (ὅτι) for his complex, *peshet*-like exegetical arguments in vv. 5–8; that is, the experience of salvation through confession and belief is what justifies his re-writing of Deuteronomy 30:12–13.<sup>52</sup> "Calling upon the name of the Lord" Jesus, by which one is saved (Rom 10:13; citing Joel 3:5), also features as part of the Corinthian praxis (1:2).<sup>53</sup> Jesus as Lord is the object of honor in Rom 14:6–8 and 14:9 notes that the purpose of Christ's death and resurrection was so that he could rule over (κυριεύειν) the dead and the living.

As in, *inter alia*, his use of the Day of the Lord in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, Paul's application of Joel 3:5 to Jesus in Rom 10:13 demonstrates his willingness to appropriate passages about YHWH for Jesus.<sup>54</sup> While this may not have been a particularly significant move for the Gentile converts in Corinth and Thessalonica, it surely would have been for anyone who had been associated with a synagogue, whether

---

urchristliche Glaubensbekenntnis" also seen in 1 Cor 15; cf. Rom 4:24 where Paul refers to his readers as "those who believe on the one who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead."

<sup>50</sup> It is very difficult to ascertain any specific overtones to Χριστός in Romans, which is used 65 times, roughly half of which occur absolutely (35 times). Notably, in 8:11 Ἰησοῦς and Χριστός are used in complementary parallel position with no obvious difference in meaning and there is nowhere that Paul explicates the latter term.

<sup>51</sup> So Jewett 2007, 630; cf. Calhoun 2011, 96; Wright 2002, 664. Wilckens 1978-1982, 2:227 argues that κύριος Ἰησοῦς is a baptismal acclamation, noting the influence of Seeberg 1903 on this theory. Hurtado 2003, 111 emphasizes the continuity in this acclamation between the earliest Aramaic-speaking followers of Jesus and Paul's churches.

<sup>52</sup> Thus the logic is similar to Sanders' famous "solution to plight" construal of Paul's thought (Sanders 1977, 474, *passim*). On Paul's use of Deuteronomy here, see esp. Lincicum 2010, 153–158; cf. Capes 1992, 116–123.

<sup>53</sup> Cf. §7.3.2.1 above.

<sup>54</sup> Cf. the discussion in Hurtado 2003, 111–113 and the study of Capes 1992.

Jew or Gentile, *unless Paul expected his readers already to accept a very similar view of Jesus*. Otherwise, it is incredible that he would use such arguments without much greater defense.

This point also comes to bear on Paul's oft-discussed exposition of the gospel in Rom 1:3–4. It is commonly argued that these verses reflect an adoptionist theology divergent from Paul's own, "appointed son of God...from his resurrection."<sup>55</sup> On this theory, this apparently problematic statement can be accounted for as an (awkward) earlier element that Paul attempts to ameliorate while also establishing a common base with his readers (cf. Jewett 2007, 108).

However, the form-critical arguments that undergird this interpretation, have been criticized cogently in Robert Calhoun's recent work, *Paul's Definition of the Gospel in Romans 1*.<sup>56</sup> As an alternative, Calhoun proposes that the binary pairs of seed of David/son of God, birth/resurrection and flesh/spirit should be read as instances of *synecdoche* in which Paul delimits the temporal and anthropological extremes of his gospel "to function like tongs" in order to implicate all of it.<sup>57</sup>

What is particularly significant for our purposes is that even with Calhoun's understanding of Rom 1:3–4 (and other passages), it is crucial that Paul's epithets draw "extensively upon assumptions shared between himself and his Roman Christian addressees" (Calhoun 2011, 141).<sup>58</sup> These shared assumptions center around Jesus's status

---

<sup>55</sup> See recently, Jewett 2007, 103–108; cf. also Wilckens 1978–1982, 1:64 who argues that Paul's theology is to be distinguished from that of the appropriated traditional material. Wright 2002, 416–417 is more circumspect about the presence of pre-Pauline material.

<sup>56</sup> Calhoun 2011, 96–103; cf. the earlier criticism in Scott 1992, 229–236.

<sup>57</sup> Calhoun 2011, 140. In this way, Wilckens 1978–1982, 1:65 is correct to argue that Paul does not envision Jesus *becoming* the son of God at his resurrection, but being *transferred* in to that role (cf. Gathercole 2011, 173–174); however, his corollary argument that Paul's meaning should be distinguished from the original meaning of the passage is problematic. For a discussion of the possible religious background of this designation, see Hurtado 2003, 101–107.

<sup>58</sup> It is worth noting that the notion of Jesus as a descendent of David does not feature elsewhere in Paul's letters, but it is difficult to draw firm conclusions from this silence since he also nowhere denies it implicitly or explicitly. The gospel summary in 2 Tim 2:8 suggestively includes the phrase ἐκ σπέρματος

as Davidic Messiah (Christ), son of God and Lord who died and rose again. If Rom 1:3–4 were taken to imply a presumed adoptionist Christology, it would be remarkable for Paul to presume *simultaneously* a willingness on the part of his Roman readers to appropriate Old Testament YHWH texts for Jesus, insofar as the former is considered to reflect a "low" and the latter a "high" Christology. On the contrary, Calhoun's view fits the wider picture of presumed knowledge among the Romans better than the adoptionist position.

### 9.3.2.1 Jesus' death: interpreting his death "for us"

As indicated above, Paul presents Jesus' death as "for" (ὑπέρ) believers in the same way that he does in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians (Rom 4:25; 5:6–8; 14:15). Paul goes beyond this bare description in Romans to elucidate how it is that Christ's death is *pro nobis*. However, it is highly suggestive that Paul presumes very little of his audience in his discussions of Jesus' death, and the precise content of what he does presume is very difficult to isolate.

Paul addresses Jesus' death by means of a constellation of four images: reconciliation (καταλλαγή/καταλλάσσω), redemption (ἀπολύτρωσις), justification (δικαιοῦν) and sacrificial imagery (the ἱλαστήριον and sin offering). In many cases these various threads are wound together so closely that it is difficult to prize them apart and analyze their relation to Roman ἔνδοξα on their own terms.

Taking the last first, Paul states in 3:24b–26a that God set Jesus "as a ἱλαστήριον, [accessed] through faith,<sup>59</sup> by his blood in order to show his righteousness [cf. 1:17; 3:21] on account of the passing over of previously committed sins by the forbearance of God." The majority of scholars within the enormous bibliography on these verses<sup>60</sup> consider

---

Δαβίδ, which appears to have been understood as part of the Pauline gospel by subsequent Pauline interpreters in spite of its lack of attestation in his letters.

<sup>59</sup> Or perhaps, "through his [Christ's] faithfulness" as argued by Campbell 2009, 642 and others.

<sup>60</sup> For review of literature, see Kraus 1991 and the updated discussion in Kraus 2008 and Tiwald 2012.

Paul to be quoting a known tradition.<sup>61</sup> However, this is not as clear as is often assumed and even if Paul is drawing on a pre-existing tradition in 3:24–26, he does not mark it out as such (cf. 1 Cor 15:3–7) and it is not clear whether the Romans would have understood it as such.<sup>62</sup> What is probable is that Paul evokes an image limited to Judaism, namely the "mercy-seat" (ἰλαστήριον, כפרת).<sup>63</sup> The confluence of the mercy-seat, blood, righteousness, overlooking sins and forbearance evokes what Daniel Stökl Ben Ezra refers to as the *imaginaire* of Yom Kippur.<sup>64</sup> The logic of 3:24–26 is similar to 5:9 (discussed below) where believers are "justified by his blood," only here the transfer implied in justification is illuminated by the metaphor of the atonement of Yom Kippur.<sup>65</sup> In addition to 3:24–26 and 5:9, a sacrificial interpretation of Jesus' death is evoked in 8:3 with the reference to a sin offering, *περὶ ἁμαρτίας*.<sup>66</sup>

What these varying formulations indicate is that Paul expected the Romans to be familiar with Jesus' death in sacrificial terms, at least on the metaphorical level. This assumption on Paul's part allows him the freedom to employ three *different* sacrificial images to describe the same aspect of Jesus' death "for us" with no further explanation. It

---

<sup>61</sup> E.g. Kraus 1991, 10–20, who is followed by Jewett 2007, 285–290.

<sup>62</sup> So Stökl Ben Ezra 2003, 204–205 rightly notes that 3:25 *may* be a pre-Pauline tradition, but if so we do not know the extent or origin of it; *pace* the more elaborate theory of Tiwald 2012 who follows Stuhlmacher 1986, 104 in arguing that the tradition in v. 25 can be traced back to the "Stephen circle" in Jerusalem; on which see the criticism in Kraus 1991, 261.

<sup>63</sup> Some, such as Lohse 1955 and Seeley 1990, argue that the reference is to Hellenistic(-Jewish) martyr theology, principally seen in *4 Macc* 17:20–22. However, as Stökl Ben Ezra 2003, 115–117, 201 rightly notes, that reference itself is a reworking of Yom Kippur atonement imagery (cf. Wolter 1978, 21; Wright 2002, 474–475; Campbell 2009, 650). The majority of recent scholars rightly acknowledge that ἰλαστήριον is a reference to the mercy-seat; cf. Finlan 2004, 126–145; Vahrenhorst 2008, 270–271; Kraus 2008, 201–207; Do 2009; Tiwald 2012. Reading ἰλαστήριον as a pagan votive offering also fails to convince since they are relatively rare (Kraus 1991, 21–32 only notes 5 occurrences) and they do not involve blood. Further, such an analogy fails to account for the fact that it is *God* who is the subject of the action rather than the recipient; so rightly Tiwald 2012, 193.

<sup>64</sup> Stökl Ben Ezra 2003, 203 (cf. Finlan 2004, 144), balancing out the argument of Kraus 1991 (and similarly Vahrenhorst 2008, 272–274) that Jesus is *only* the place of atonement *rather than* the atonement itself.

<sup>65</sup> Notably, justification features as the leading image in 3:24–26 and 5:9 (see further below).

<sup>66</sup> The phrase is used 51 times in Leviticus and Numbers alone in reference to sin and guilt offerings; cf. Schweizer 1976, 292; Wright 1991, 220–225.

is suggestive that elsewhere in his letters Paul does not often describe Jesus' death in sacrificial terms.<sup>67</sup> This may mean that the sacrificial interpretation of Jesus' death did not feature (or at least did not feature centrally) in Paul's teaching, though he knew it to be current elsewhere in the early church. If so, this is an example of Paul speaking to the Roman τύπος, but outside of his own framework of teaching.

Just as the sacrificial imagery was linked with the concept of justification in 3:24–25 and 5:9, similar connections with justification are present for reconciliation and redemption. The former is limited entirely to the Pauline corpus (Rom 5:10–11; 11:15; 2 Cor 5:18–20),<sup>68</sup> and is not used extensively though it is never explained. However, there are two reasons to suspect that Paul did not need reconciliation to be a feature of the Roman τύπος. The first is the fact that καταλλάσσειν was typical language for political peace-making, as alluded to in Paul's reference to ἐχθροί in 5:10, and often connected with εἰρήνη.<sup>69</sup> Therefore it was a commonly available metaphor. The second reason is the close connection between "reconciliation" and justification in 5:9–10. Tying these two points together, Michael Wolter pertinently notes that 5:9, 10b imitate the syntax of 5:1.<sup>70</sup>

"Having been justified from faith, therefore, we have peace with God...how much more having been justified in his blood will be saved...how much more having been reconciled will we be saved..." (vv. 1, 9, 10b)

Here, justification in vv. 1, 9 is linked with the parallel in v. 10b which also relates "peace" in v. 1 with reconciliation in v. 10. From this it is entirely possible that Paul's use of reconciliation was intended simply as a readily available metaphor.

---

<sup>67</sup> *Pace*, e.g. Dunn 1998, 212–218 who argues strongly for a sacrificial interpretation of Jesus' death. However, his only clear examples are from Romans, Ephesians and Colossians. His appeal to 1 Cor 5:7 is interesting, but the thrust of the passage is on ethics rather than atonement. 2 Cor 5:21 can be interpreted in sacrificial terms, but even Dunn notes that this is a minority position.

<sup>68</sup> So, e.g. Dunn 1998, 228. Porter 2006, 132–133 notes that Paul's use of καταλλάσσω is even unique within wider Greek literature up to his letters.

<sup>69</sup> See especially Breytenbach 1989, 82–83, 104; cf. Porter 2006, 134–135.

<sup>70</sup> Wolter 1978, 35; cf. similarly Wright 2002, 520.

The image of "redemption" (ἀπολύτρωσις, 3:24) has a similarly wide attestation with deep roots in Jewish Exodus traditions in addition to being common language for ransoming prisoners and freeing slaves.<sup>71</sup> 1 Cor 1:30 also speaks of Christ as "redemption" (along with δικαιοσύνη and ἁγιασμός) and this is likely linked with the language of purchasing slaves in 6:20 and 7:23.<sup>72</sup> Indeed, these points along with the fact that Paul is not consistent in his use of the term in Romans, with 8:23 presenting redemption as a future hope and 3:24 as something already present "in Christ Jesus," suggests that Paul is not drawing on a coherently formed teaching or Roman τύπος so much as variously employing a suitable metaphor with fitting theological overtones rooted in scriptures. This could also account for the fact that Romans (or 1 Corinthians for that matter) never clearly presents the object, person, or state from which believers are redeemed; the language appears evocative rather than precise.<sup>73</sup>

Finally, justification/righteousness terminology, δικαιοῦν and cognates, proliferates in Romans far beyond the rest of Paul's letters.<sup>74</sup> Due to constraints of space, a

---

<sup>71</sup> As Büchsel and Procksch 1967, 340–341, 352 note, the term ἀπολύτρωσις is "sparsely attested" but its meaning nevertheless parallels the more common λύτρωσις. For ἀπολύτρωσις as a release from slavery in exile, cf. Josephus *Ant.* 12.27.

<sup>72</sup> A similar connection is found in Gal 4:1–7 (cf. 3:13) in which believers are "redeemed" (ἐξαγοράζειν) from slavery (or "the curse of the Law") into adoption as God's children. Note that Scott 1992, 121–186 emphasizes the "Exodus typology" of this passage, which constitutes a further link with the ἀπολύτρωσις in Rom 3:24; cf. Wright 2002, 598. Note also the direct link between slavery and adoption in Rom 8:15 and adoption and ἀπολύτρωσις in 8:23.

<sup>73</sup> However, note that Galatians 3:13 and 4:5 both uses a similar term, ἐξαγοράζειν, to speak about those in Christ being "ransomed" (or "redeemed") from the curse of the Law. Given the slavery overtones of ἀπολύτρωσις, Romans 7:6 may also indicate that Paul has in mind redemption from slavery to the Law, though Paul also emphasizes former slavery to sin (as indicated in Rom 6:17, 20 and perhaps in the "handing over" of the wicked in 1:26). Gal 4:8 speaks of slavery to false gods in addition to slavery to the Law.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Seifrid 1992, 182. There are sixty-one occurrences of the δικαι- root (excepting three uses of δικαίωμα in reference to ordinances in 1:32; 2:26; 8:4) in Romans, in contrast to the total of forty-nine across the rest of the Pauline letters including the deutero-Pauline and Pastoral epistles. According to Wolter 2011, 345–348, however, this discrepancy can be accounted for by the fact that Paul's concept of "justification by faith" was only fully developed in his interaction with the Galatian opponents (which he dates after the establishment of the Thessalonian and Corinthian communities), rather than the Antioch incident, as argued by Dunn 1983 among others, or his conversion as argued by Kim 2002b and Seifrid 1992.

few points regarding Roman ἔνδοξα will have to suffice. First, the fact that other interpretive metaphors for Christ's death are linked consistently with justification and/or righteousness indicates that it is the focal point of Paul's discussion of Jesus' death in Romans (cf. Haacker 2003, 53). While justification/righteousness language is linked with law courts,<sup>75</sup> it also has deep roots in Jewish reflection on covenant, exile and restoration.<sup>76</sup> As a judgment, justification is closely related to the coming judgment of God (see §9.3.1 above) with which Paul assumes the Romans to be familiar. Further, Paul regularly assumes that the Romans understand God to be righteous (1:17; 2:5; 3:21, 25; *passim*) and that those under sin lack this righteousness.<sup>77</sup> Taken together, these observations suggest that justification/righteousness language was already in use in Rome when Paul wrote.

Second, Paul does not take *his interpretation* of this concept for granted.<sup>78</sup> In spite of the presumed Roman knowledge noted above, Paul's exposition of justification by faith is carefully structured, beginning from the accepted axiom of God's righteousness and the corruption of humanity (1:18–32; 3:21–23), through his critique of the Law's inability to

---

<sup>75</sup> Cf. Williams 1999, 144–147; Haacker 2003, 53. Notably, Lyu 2011, 89–95 concludes her discussion of justification/righteousness language in the Old Testament saying, "Die Rechtfertigung ist kein kultischer, sondern ein forensischer Begriff" (p. 95).

<sup>76</sup> Note the discussion of IQS and *Pss. Sol.* in Seifrid 1992, 78–135 and the overview in Wright 2002, 397–406. This is, of course, a central part of the debate surrounding the "New Perspective" on Paul. The relevant bibliography is far too large to detail, but major contributors after Bultmann include Sanders 1977; Dunn 1998, 334–389; Campbell 2009; Wright 2009 with reactions by Westerholm 1988; Stuhlmacher 2001; Kim 2002c; Seifrid 2000; Lyu 2011. However, it should be noted that a *doctrine* of justification by faith is a construct used to synthesize a number of themes in Paul's letters and as such is intrinsically anachronistic (so rightly Wolter 2011, 342). In Paul's letters it is one among a number of ways that Paul explains the meaning or effect of Jesus' death.

<sup>77</sup> So Dunn 1998, 343; Lyu 2011, 89–91, cf. Rom 3:23–24 and §9.3.5.3 below.

<sup>78</sup> *Pace* Seifrid 1992, 256 who claims that the Romans were "to a large extent" in agreement with Paul already. But this is an extrapolation from his account of the letter's purpose rather than a conclusion based on his discussion of justification/righteousness in Romans. More starkly, Lyu 2011, 106–111 argues that the *Rechtfertigungslehre* in Romans goes back to Paul and does not presume a previous tradition of use in Rome. This is analogous to my position so long as one is careful to distinguish between *Rechtfertigung*-language and *die Rechtfertigungslehre* (as far as Paul can be said to have one, see note 76 above). Paul does not take *his* understanding of justification/righteousness for granted, while some use of the terminology is presumed to be already present in Rome; cf. also Wolter 2011, 344 who argues that the justification/faith nexus is "ein spezifisch paulinisches Konzept" that is not found elsewhere in the New Testament.

solve the problem of "sinful flesh" (3:1–20; 8:3), to the ability of Jesus to undo the previous corruption, thus once again making believers to be in right standing before God – atoned for, reconciled and redeemed.<sup>79</sup> This stands in stark contrast with 1 Cor 6:11 where Paul states in passing that the Corinthians have been "justified" with no suggestion that he is nervous about misunderstanding (cf. Lyu 2011, 99). Paul's careful explanation of his position is in keeping with the ground-clearing purpose of the letter identified above (§9.2.1).

Before moving on, it is worth reflecting on what these observations mean for this study. In the first place, it is evident that Paul felt it necessary to be much more careful in his arguments regarding Jesus, his death and resurrection than he did in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. In those letters, Paul *uses* references to his teaching on Jesus' death and resurrection to make points about *other* issues at hand. For instance, Paul refers repeatedly to his "word of the cross" (1 Cor 1:18, *passim*) in 1 Corinthians without ever explaining fully what that is, presumably because he did not think it was necessary. Similarly in 1 Thessalonians Paul only ever alludes to his teaching about Christ's death. In both letters he reminds his readers of the resurrection, but in each case to make different points. While the same might be said to be true with respect to Jesus' resurrection or titles in Romans, it is certainly *not* true in the case of his death. In this case it appears that Paul considers his theology to be at least potentially "outside" the Roman τύπος and, accordingly, he devotes most of Rom 1:18–8:39 to explaining his understanding of how Jesus' death "worked" in relation to God's righteousness, the Law and morality. Indeed, this suggestion is supported by the cryptic accusation preserved in 3:8, already discussed

---

<sup>79</sup> On similar grounds Calhoun 2011, 193–218 characterizes Paul's argument in Romans as definitional insofar as the material from the two definitions in 1:3–4, 16–17 is developed. "1:16–17 thus serves as a facilitator of subsidiary arguments (for example, that divine πίστις and δικαιοσύνη are not inconsistent; or, that the word of God has not failed), which in turn confirm the basic thesis, that the gospel is God's power resulting in salvation for everyone who believes" (p. 218); cf. the similar analysis in Seifrid 1992, 210, 222.

above (§9.2.3), that Paul's understanding of how Jesus' death "works" leads him into antinomianism. It appears, then, that while Paul could presume continuity between his teaching and the Roman τύπος with respect to christological titles and the basic narrative of Jesus' death, resurrection and exaltation, he felt the need to explain the *significance* of Jesus' death very carefully, a point that indicates he suspected potential (if not actual) conflict over that issue.

### 9.3.3 Holy Spirit, dwelling in Christians, given by God

Paul clearly assumed that the Holy Spirit, or "Spirit of God," featured among the Roman readers' ἔνδοξα, as indeed he did among the Corinthians and Thessalonians. There is no point in Romans at which Paul gives a theoretical account of τὸ πνεῦμα ἅγιον but rather he presumes not only cognitive familiarity with the Spirit but *experience* of the Spirit.<sup>80</sup> Paul states unequivocally in Rom 8:9 that his readers "are not in flesh, but in the Spirit, if, as is the case [εἴπερ], the Spirit of God dwells in you." The logic of Paul's statement in 8:9 resembles his argument in 3:29–30 insofar as he provides the warrant for his initial statement with a protasis, stated as fact, with which he expects his audience to agree.<sup>81</sup> Moreover, it is not simply a proposition that requires assent, but it is *the experience* of the Spirit in v. 9 that ultimately provides the ground for Paul's assertion. Therefore, he presumes that the Romans will agree that God's Spirit dwells in them and, further, that possession of the Spirit constitutes an important group boundary marker –

---

<sup>80</sup> Notably, he appeals to the Spirit as an authority to support his testimony (9:1), to support his argument about the essence of the "kingdom" (14:17) and give weight to his exhortation (15:30). He also appeals to the "power" of the Spirit in 15:13.

<sup>81</sup> Cf. Cranfield 1975-1979, 1:388; Käsemann 1980, 223; Wilckens 1978-1982, 2:131; Fee 1994, 545; Jewett 2007, 489; *pace* Dunn 1988, 1:428. Similarly in v. 23 Paul states simply "we have the first-fruits of the Spirit." Paulsen 1974, 50–51 argued that the Spirit dwelling among believers was a pre-Pauline tradition linked with the notion of the community-as-temple (cf. 1 Cor 3:16, etc.), which he suggested could be traced back to the Stephen circle. However, the fact that the link between the Spirit and the community-as-temple never occurs outside of Pauline material, *and does not occur here*, would seem to suggest that it was a peculiarly Pauline metaphor with which he could not expect his Roman audience to be familiar.

those who have the Spirit belong to Christ and those who do not, do not.<sup>82</sup> Notably, the genitive in the phrase πνεῦμα θεοῦ, among other things, indicates that the Spirit comes *from* God, as Paul also notes in 1 Thess 4:8, 1 Cor 2:12 and elsewhere.<sup>83</sup> Receiving the Spirit from God is a clear area of overlap between Paul's formative instruction among his communities and broader early Christian teaching and experience.

### 9.3.3.1 Possible discontinuity

On the other hand, several ideas about the Spirit present in Romans are absent from 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians. Of these, only one can be linked with presumed Roman ἔνδοξα with any amount of certainty, namely, the notion that the Spirit is the "Spirit of Christ" and accordingly that Christ is "in" believers (8:9–10).<sup>84</sup>

The apparent connection in Rom 8:9–10 between the Spirit as the "Spirit of Christ" and Christ being "in you" is nowhere else clarified in the New Testament. The phrase τὸ πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ is paralleled only in Phil 1:19 (τοῦ πνεύματος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) where it is not clarified as "dwelling" with believers but characterized as working on Paul's behalf.<sup>85</sup> However, Gal 4:6 does refer to the "Spirit of the son" being "sent into our hearts" and in 2 Cor 13:5 Paul exclaims, "Or do you not understand (ἢ οὐκ ἐπιγινώσκετε) that Jesus Christ is in you (ἐν ὑμῖν)" (cf. Wolter 2011, 169–172). In terms of the

---

<sup>82</sup> So rightly, Horn 1992, 237; Fee 1994, 553; Jewett 2007, 490.

<sup>83</sup> More could be said about the function of 8:9 and the possession of the Spirit within 8:1–17 and its combination with other previously introduced themes (such as death and life [Rom 5–6], righteousness [1:17, 3:21, 25; 4:25, *passim*] and God's resurrection of Jesus [1:3, 4:25, *passim*]). However, other aspects of 8:1–17 are much more difficult to tie to presumed Roman ἔνδοξα and space prohibits a longer exploration.

<sup>84</sup> Other examples with less obvious links to presumed ἔνδοξα are "the law of the Spirit of life" (8:2), the Spirit as "first-fruits" (v. 23) and the Spirit's intercession for believers (vv. 26–27). In the first case, the subsequent chain of explanatory statements in vv. 3–9 indicate that Paul did not presume his audience was already familiar with the concept. The second would have been an easily accessible metaphor for an audience familiar with Jewish (Exod 25:2), Greek (Herodotus *Hist.* 4:71), or Roman (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant.* 14.11.3) sacrificial offerings. The third is presented as an assertion on the basis of previous material (ὡσαύτως) and is not presumed of the Romans.

<sup>85</sup> There is a later, non-Pauline parallel in 1 Pet 1:11 where τὸ...πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ was "in" the prophets (ἐν αὐτοῖς) who inquired after Christ.

categories introduced earlier (§6.2.4), Paul is probably using this question to introduce context-specific information as this statement receives no further explanation. Further it is linked with the previous statement that Christ is "powerful in you" (2 Cor 13:3) where the focus of Paul's argument is the contrast between weak and strong and the the notion of Christ "in" the Corinthians occurs almost incidentally.<sup>86</sup> However, this still stands in some contrast with Rom 8:9–10 at least insofar as the element of the Spirit is absent from the 2 Corinthians passage. In Romans Paul makes no effort to defend the equation between the Spirit and Christ or Christ's dwelling in believers, which, when combined with other passages where he appears to assume the same knowledge, suggests that he expected this to be part of the Roman τύπος.<sup>87</sup>

In summary, then, this discussion illuminates Paul's ability to take the reception of the Spirit for granted among his Roman audience, though he does not explicitly link it with any other aspect of conversion or baptism. Further, in a slightly surprising move in comparison with 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians, Paul appears to presume that the Romans understood the Spirit as the Spirit of Christ, such that Christ also dwells in believers. While this lies outside Paul's teaching represented in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians, correlations between Rom 8, Phil 1:19 and 2 Cor 13:3, 5 may suggest that this understanding of the Spirit and Christ was in fact a part of Paul's teaching that he shared with wider early Christian teaching.

---

<sup>86</sup> Col 1:27 presents a similar view of Christ in believers while Gal 4:19 presents a slightly different view; Christ is still being "formed" in the Galatians.

<sup>87</sup> *Pace* Wright 2002, 583 who argues that Paul's vacillation between the Spirit of God and of Christ "is the result of Paul hammering out patters of thought where none had existed previously." It may be, as argued by Wolter 2011, 172, that the genitive Χριστοῦ in the phrase should be taken as a genitive denoting quality rather than origin, such that it refers as the Spirit of God as the same Spirit that Jesus had. It remains the case, however, that Paul does not bother explaining his potentially confusing phrase to his readers.

### 9.3.4 Apocalyptic and eschatology

Certain elements of apocalyptic eschatology present in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, such as the eschatological trumpet (1 Cor 15:52; 1 Thess 4:16), are absent from Romans.<sup>88</sup> On the other hand, many scholars have argued that "apocalyptic" is the root and unifying element of all of Paul's theology, including that seen in Romans.<sup>89</sup> If that is true, then it would be worth asking whether the apocalyptic structure of Paul's thought was widespread within nascent Christianity or whether he ever articulated the root of his theology while instructing his communities. Nevertheless, space prohibits an exploration of the presence or absence of an apocalyptic substructure to Paul's thought in Romans. Rather, I will focus here on whether or not Paul presumes an apocalyptic cosmology and eschatology in Romans of the same sort we found in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians.

It is notable that the cosmology presumed by Paul includes Satan, angels and "powers" (Rom 8:38; 16:20). As already noted (§7.2.5), the character of Satan is limited to the Jewish tradition. In the case of Rom 16:20, the links with Jewish tradition are strengthened by Paul's allusion to Ps 110 (and perhaps Gen 3:15) by which he encourages the Romans regarding their ultimate victory over Satan.<sup>90</sup> This victory fits within a

---

<sup>88</sup> This is not to suggest that apocalyptic literature is only focused on eschatology. Note the definition in Stone 1984, 394: "'apocalyptic' or 'apocalypticism' should be regarded as a pattern of thought, primarily eschatological in character, typifying some apocalypses and also a number of works belonging to other genres of literature of the Second Temple Period...It does not supply a key to the understanding of the particular literary forms of the apocalypses." See also the discussion in Collins 1998, 1–42, 264–268.

<sup>89</sup> So, famously, Käsemann 1969; Beker 1980; Martyn 1997, 111–156 and now Campbell 2009; but note the criticism of the former two construals in Matlock 1996, 186–250 who emphasizes the plasticity of the term "apocalyptic" within this discussion. Certain scholars such as Käsemann and Martyn play "apocalyptic" off against (salvation) history and covenant (cf. more recently Harink 2007), though this is not intrinsic to an apocalyptic eschatology. Of course, other scholars such as Räisänen 1987 have rejected any such unifying element in Paul's thought.

<sup>90</sup> On this see esp. Brown 2011, 112–124, who nevertheless decides against a direct allusion to Gen 3:15. Not incidentally, Brown also argues strongly, following Beker, that Satan's defeat is part of Paul's overall apocalyptic interpretation of Christ's death and resurrection (70–81).

common Jewish apocalyptic view of cosmic battle, reflected in human events, in which the wicked ruler (Mastema, Belial, Azzazel, etc.) is defeated with his minions.<sup>91</sup> Similarly, Paul's passing reference to ἄγγελοι and ἀρχαί in 8:38 falls squarely within the cosmological dualism typical of much apocalyptic thought.<sup>92</sup> The antithetical parallelism in v. 38 with life/death and things present/things to come suggests that angels and powers also ought to be taken as antithetical. This use of ἀρχή is in keeping with Paul's discussion of the eschatological defeat of such hostile powers in 1 Cor 15:24–25, which in turn is closely connected with the vision of Rom 16:20.<sup>93</sup> Similarly, the role of death in Rom 5–6, who holds dominion (5:17, 21; 6:9), fits this apocalyptic cosmology as also reflected in the defeat of death as the last enemy in 1 Cor 15:26.<sup>94</sup> This, then, means that ἀρχαί here is likely another term for what Paul otherwise refers to as demons (1 Cor 10:20–21),<sup>95</sup> which are only viewed negatively by Paul, in contrast with typical Greco-Roman use.<sup>96</sup> These passages indicate that Paul tacitly assumes a cosmology for the Romans that stands in direct continuity with what he passed on to the Corinthians and Thessalonians.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>91</sup> Classically present at Qumran (1QM 1:5; 13); cf. Brown 2011, 34–42 who also discusses Satan as "ruler" along with other demons in Jubilees, *1 Enoch* and *Testaments of the 12 Patriarchs*.

<sup>92</sup> Famously, 1QS 3:18; cf. 4:3–10; 1QM 13:4; and the discussion of the seven good and eight bad spirits in *T. Reub.* 2–3. On the distinction between "apocalyptic" and apocalypse, see note 88 above.

<sup>93</sup> It is also worth noting that Paul goes on to indicate in Rom 8:39 that the powers are within the category of created things, though they have become hostile, which is directly reflected in Col 1:16 and 2:15 respectively; cf. Eph 6:12.

<sup>94</sup> On this see esp. de Boer 1988.

<sup>95</sup> *Pace* Williams 2009, 122–123, 132–133.

<sup>96</sup> This is in line with Jewish tradition preceding him (e.g. Deut 32:17 [LXX]; Tob 3:8; Isa 13:21 [LXX]; Bar 4:35; Josephus *Ant.* 6.166–168; *1 En.* 19:1; *Sib. Or.* 1:355, etc.); cf. also Brown 2011, 77–79.

<sup>97</sup> The connection between the eschatological salvation and the renewal of a corrupted creation in Rom 8:22 (which may also be suggested in Gal 6:15 and 2 Cor 5:17) is not discussed here for reasons of space. However, it is worth noting that the corruption of the world and hope for renewal was common within Jewish (e.g. Isa 5:25–30; *4 Ezra* 3:7–22; 7:11–15; see esp. Hahne 2006, 153–159), Greco-Roman (e.g. Plato *Pol.* 296c–d; Hesiod *Op.* 109–201; see esp. the detailed survey of the "Golden Age" in Greek and Latin literature up to Ovid in Kubusch 1986) and early Christian (Matt 24:8 par. Mark 13:8; cf. Rev 2:12) traditions and so constitutes a broad consensual basis from which Paul could argue.

As we saw earlier (§9.3.1), Paul presumes that the Romans expect a future judgment, though perhaps not that Jesus was in the judgment seat. In one of the few positive appeals to knowledge in Romans, Paul also indicates that the Romans understood the eschatological hour in terms of "salvation" (Rom 13:11).<sup>98</sup> "And since [you] know this time – namely that it is already the hour for you to arise from sleep, for now our salvation is nearer than when we believed; the night has passed, the day has drawn near – let us put off, then, the works of darkness and let us put on the weapons of light" (vv. 11–12).<sup>99</sup> Here, the object of the readers' knowledge is explained with images of sleeping/waking, night/day and light/dark already noted especially in 1 Thess 5:1–11.<sup>100</sup> It is widely recognized that Paul expects this material to be known to the Romans and this is evident by the fact that he assumes its value as the base for his ethical exhortations.<sup>101</sup> Indeed, these were common contrasts in Jewish prophetic and eschatological traditions, linked in this way with Paul's earlier reference to "this age" (12:2).<sup>102</sup> In retrospect, looking back at the discussion of 1 Thess 5:1–11, it may be that presumed knowledge of day/night light/dark imagery here strengthens an argument for Paul's use of the same imagery in his own teaching, though this must remain speculative.

While the specific imagery of Rom 13:11–12 is not limited to Jewish apocalyptic eschatology, it is important to note the cumulative weight of Paul's language. Paul assumes that the Romans possess an apocalyptic cosmology, with angels, powers and Satan and an imminent eschatology that includes victory over Satan (and, implicitly, the

---

<sup>98</sup> Cf. Ortkemper 1980, 132–134 who emphasizes the eschatological aspect of ὁ καιρός.

<sup>99</sup> The theory that vv. 11–12 contain a baptismal hymn (proposed by Schlier 1977, 395–396 and maintained by Wilckens 1978–1982, 3:75; Dunn 1988, 2:784 and Jewett 2007, 817) is intriguing but must remain conjectural. Fitzmyer 1993, 682 rightly objects that one must omit portions of the prose to create the purportedly balanced strophes.

<sup>100</sup> See chapter §6.1.2.

<sup>101</sup> E.g. Käsemann 1980, 362; Ortkemper 1980, 157; Wright 2002, 728; Jewett 2007, 819.

<sup>102</sup> So Ortkemper 1980, 133–142; Jewett 2007, 819; cf. notably 1QS 1:9; 2:16; 1QM 1:1.

powers) and resurrection (6:5; cf. 1 Cor 15:26). In connection with this, the light/dark and day/night imagery can reasonably be identified as part of the Roman ἔνδοξα presumed by Paul. In any case, Paul expects the Romans to be on roughly the same eschatological timeframe as his communities in Thessalonica and Corinth.

### 9.3.5 Conversion: belief, baptism and moral transformation

The word "conversion" in the section title here is meant as a summary term under which potentially disparate elements in Romans can be organized. While there is no discussion of "turning" (ἐπιστρέφειν) in Romans as there is in 1 Thess 1:9 (cf. Gal 4:9), there are, to put it crudely, certain "criteria" for being "heirs" of the kingdom of God (8:17; 14:17; cf. 1 Cor 6:9–11). One of these, possession of the Spirit, was already discussed above (§9.3.3). The others include belief, baptism and moral transformation,<sup>103</sup> all of which are presupposed with varying degrees of specificity in Romans.

#### 9.3.5.1 *Belief*

It is clear from the letter-frame that Paul presumes his audience to have πίστις. In the first place, Paul states unambiguously that the faith of his readers "is proclaimed in the whole world" (Rom 1:8) and again that in coming to Rome he hopes "to be encouraged together among you through each other's faith, yours and mine" (v. 12). Further, in the closing frame Paul notes that what he has written is by way of partial reminder (15:15). Necessarily, then Paul expects his readers to already have an understanding of what "faith" is in relation to Jesus. What is not immediately clear from the letter-frame, however, is whether Paul expected the Romans to understand πίστις in the way that he did.

Unfortunately, clarity on that question is hard to come by. Robert Calhoun's recent

---

<sup>103</sup> Cf. Schrage 1961, 53 who also notes how moral transformation is one important difference between the pre-Christian and Christian life.

contribution intriguingly argues that Paul's language of πίστις in Rom 1:16–17 is part of a deliberately compressed definition of the Gospel, which Paul goes on to explicate through the rest of the letter, particularly in 3:21–31 and 10:9–15 (Calhoun 2011, 197–218). If this is the case, then the internal logic of Romans 1:16–15:13 does not require much of Paul's audience by way of previous understanding of πίστις. For Paul, it is clear that "believing" is constitutive for being "saved" (10:9; cf. 3:22) and presumably his audience would have accepted these points as uncontroversial. Nevertheless, regarding the relation of πίστις to "works of the law," Paul does not rely on unstated agreement, but carefully argues on the basis of the Abraham narrative (4:1–25) for his understanding that God's righteousness is found in Christ (and his faithfulness), through faith, apart from the Law (3:21–31). Only after Rom 4 does Paul use the concept of πίστις without further definition. In fact, his argument about πίστις is paralleled by his arguments about "justification," which I argued above (§9.3.2.1) were similarly condensed in Rom 4 and further linked with Paul's rebuttal of antinomian accusations, real or perceived.

### 9.3.5.2 *Baptism*

Paul's explicit discussion of baptism in Romans is limited to Rom 6:1–11. It needs to be noted at the outset that the fact of baptism forms the foundation for the whole passage. Without the baptism of Paul's readers, his efforts at moral exhortation trip immediately out of the gate.<sup>104</sup> In fact, v. 3 is the fulcrum for Paul's argument in 6:1–11;<sup>105</sup> the moral implications of dying with Christ are the running theme in these verses, which Paul develops in answer to the false objection in v. 1.<sup>106</sup> The question remains, what else, if anything, does Paul presume of his readers in Rom 6?

---

<sup>104</sup> This is generally recognized; cf. notes 110 and 111 below.

<sup>105</sup> Frid 1986, 190 refers to v. 3 as the premise for the rest of the argument.

<sup>106</sup> Cf. the analysis of Boers 2001.

In 6:3 Paul explains a preceding rhetorical question with yet another rhetorical question. In v. 2 he asks "how can we who have died to sin yet be alive in it?" which he follows in v. 3 with "or are you ignorant [ἢ ἄγνοεῖτε] that as many of you who were baptized, you were baptized into Christ's death?" The underlying assertion of v. 2, "we have died to sin," is introduced into the argument without precedent and is subsequently explained by Paul's development of the dying/rising imagery through the common connection with baptism in vv. 3–4. The logic runs as follows:

We have died to sin (v. 2) [because], in being baptized into Christ, we were baptized into Christ's death (v. 3) and therefore [as the logical correlative to being baptized into death] we were buried with Christ so that we should walk in a new life just as Christ did after his resurrection (v. 4).

This is a complete, if compressed, argument in defense of Paul's assertion about being dead to sin upon which he builds in vv. 5–11.<sup>107</sup> The phrase εἰς Χριστόν may be an abbreviation of the longer form εἰς τὸ ὄνομα Χριστοῦ (cf. 1 Cor 1:13),<sup>108</sup> though it is directly parallel to being baptized εἰς Χριστόν in Gal 3:27 and several scholars argue that the shorter formula has more locative or participational overtones here.<sup>109</sup> A participational understanding of baptism εἰς Χριστόν alone could serve as the foundation for Paul's argument in 6:1–11; if one somehow becomes a member of Christ in baptism (cf. 1 Cor 12:13), then one also participates in all aspects of the Christ event, including death, burial and new life.<sup>110</sup> On the other hand, Rom 12:4–5 presents believers as members of *one another* rather than Christ and, further, in this passage the concept of

---

<sup>107</sup> Cf. the different analyses of Frid 1986; Hellholm 1994 and Boers 2001, 677 which nevertheless all treat vv. 2–4 as the foundational argument.

<sup>108</sup> So Bengel 1835, 39; Beasley-Murray 1967, 129; Frankemölle 1970, 41–51; Barrett 1991, 114; Wilckens 1978-1982, 2:11; Fitzmyer 1993, 433.

<sup>109</sup> So Leenhardt 1961, 152–154; Kuss 1957-1959, 1:296; Dinkler 1974, 87; Käsemann 1980, 165; Betz 1994, 108; Hartman 1997, 70–71; Jewett 2007, 396–397.

<sup>110</sup> Wolter 2011, 143 refers to baptism "into Christ" as the starting point of Paul's argument. Cf. Schnackenburg 1964, 33; Leenhardt 1961, 152; Frankemölle 1970, 40; Wilckens 1978-1982, 2:11–12; Betz 1994, 110–111; Witherington 2004, 157; Jewett 2007, 396.

being baptized into Christ's death provides the *specific* foundation for what follows (NB the repetition of εἰς τὸν θάνατον in v. 4). Paul's very next statement is based on the assumption that his readers will not be lost by the introduction of the baptism/death connection.<sup>111</sup> It is the *implication* of this baptism event, namely that dying with Christ entails dying to sin, that Paul expounds here.<sup>112</sup>

The alternative view is that Paul simply risks losing his audience with a crucial step left unjustified (baptism as death) yet presented with the consensual rhetoric of "you/we know." Given that Paul is cognizant of some differences between his teaching and the Roman τύπος διδαχῆς (see §9.2.3 above) and that his argument in 6:1–11 is otherwise tightly constructed, there is no reason not to take the appeal to knowledge in 6:3 (and 6:6 as well) more or less at face value.<sup>113</sup>

It needs to be said, however, that all of the knowledge presumed in Paul's argument in Rom 6:1–11 is, at its most basic, presumed to be *acceptable* to his readers, even if they would not have articulated it in the same way prior to Paul's writing. Therefore, the underlying events and concepts – the death and resurrection of Christ, believers being baptized εἰς Χριστόν and the identification of baptism with Christ's death – provide the structure for Paul's argument while the specific formulations can be linked less securely with a presumed *active* Roman knowledge.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> So rightly Hellholm 1994, 154. This offers some limited support to the argument that v. 3 is "traditional baptismal" teaching (cf. Michel 1955, 130; Cranfield 1975-1979, 1:300; Kuss 1957-1959, 1:297; Dinkler 1974, 86; Käsemann 1980, 165) insofar as Paul does seem to expect the Romans to be familiar with dying with Christ in baptism, though it is not sufficient to establish wider early Christian tradition; cf. Haacker 1999, 127 and more optimistically, Wright 2002, 537.

<sup>112</sup> Note also the summary conclusion of vv. 2–5 in v. 6; cf. Frid 1986, 199–200; Boers 2001, 678–681.

<sup>113</sup> Pace Wolter 2011, 143. This conclusion is similar, though much more restrained, to the view that v. 6 constitutes part of an early Christian confession; cf. Michel 1955, 131; Frankemölle 1970, 28, 30.

<sup>114</sup> Cf. the comments of Beasley-Murray 1967, 127: "The 'Do you not know' of Rom. 6.3 could presume the currency of teaching *analogous* to that of Paul, without its possessing the precise features of Rom. 6" (my emphasis). However, the argumentative structure identified here suggests that the argument that Paul first formulated the idea of baptism into Christ's death here (e.g. by Betz 1994) is problematic.

With respect to 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians, it is notable that the theme of dying with Christ in baptism is entirely absent. Of course, Paul presumes that his congregations were baptized (cf. §8.1), but in 1 Corinthians baptism is linked with the reception of the Spirit (1 Cor 12:3). The only mention of death in relation to soteriology, apart from the death of Christ, is in 15:22 where "just as all die in Adam, so also in Christ all will be made alive." While this appears to reflect an Adam-Christ typology similar to that of Rom 5, there is no mention of baptism as death. The implications of this are difficult to account for precisely. It may well be that baptism into Christ's death was well known to the Corinthian and Thessalonian congregations and simply did not require mention in Paul's letters. Alternatively, Paul may have used this language here because he knew the Roman believers were familiar with it, but he did not introduce it to his own communities. In this way, baptism "into" Christ is the only parallel between the Roman τύπος and Paul's teaching that can be identified with any probability.

### 9.3.5.3 *Moral transformation*

It is notable that although moral transformation (for worse and better) is a major theme in Romans, Paul almost never appeals to his readers' knowledge or current practice regarding specific vices or virtues. In fact, most of Paul's discussion of moral transformation is rather abstract: his readers are to consider themselves "dead to sin" (6:11), they are to put to death the deeds of the body (8:13), but the practicalities involved in such actions are only discussed concretely in 12:9–13:14 and more obliquely in 1:18–2:2.

I argued above that Paul's use of the diatribal interlocutor in 2:1–16 indicates that his readers are expected to affirm God's righteous judgment on those identified in 1:18–32 (§9.3.1 and note 44). The vice-list in v. 29 summarizes most of the content in vv. 18–

32, with the exception of idolatry (vv. 23, 25):<sup>115</sup> "all wrongdoing, sexual immorality, greed, evil, full of envy, murder, strife, deceit, wicked actions, gossips." The sins listed here match up with several elements of Paul's teaching in Thessalonica and Corinth, the elements of sexual immorality and greed in particular.<sup>116</sup> Further, envy and strife are obviously connected to the issues that Paul faced in Corinth. In light of the presumed agreement regarding the necessity of judgment, this passage shows that Paul expected the Romans to hold a view of these vices similar, if not identical, to that imparted with his formative instruction.<sup>117</sup>

Paul's discussion of virtues in 12:9–13:14 is also very similar to the material presumed in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians. In particular, the emphasis on love (Rom 12:9–10; 13:8–10), including the concept of φιλαδελφία that Paul also imparted in Thessalonica, communal harmony (Rom 12:16–17) and respectable treatment of those "outside" the community (vv. 18–21) have obvious parallels in the materials surveyed in chapters 5–8 above.<sup>118</sup> Nevertheless, unlike the vices in 1:18–32, there is no direct appeal to knowledge in Rom 12:1–13:14. It is suggestive that in 15:14–15 Paul states that he is "convinced" that his Roman readers are "full of goodness, having been filled with all knowledge and able to admonish one another" and that he writes by way of partial reminder. As I noted above (§9.2.3), several scholars consider this to be related

---

<sup>115</sup> See the discussion of idolatry in §9.3.1 above.

<sup>116</sup> See the summary and references in chapter 8 above.

<sup>117</sup> Of course, disdain for many of these vices was widespread among ancient moralists; cf. Malherbe 1992. What is notable, however, is the stability Paul presumes between the vices highlighted in his own teaching, especially idolatry, sexual immorality and greed and those which he could highlight when writing to the Romans. Indeed, the stable elements bear close resemblance to Jewish paraenesis identified by *inter alios* Niebuhr 1987.

<sup>118</sup> E.g. 1 Thess 4:9–12; 5:15; 1 Cor 5:1–2; 10:31–33; 13:1–13. These parallels are so strong that several scholars have argued that Paul is reworking traditional Jewish material, which could also account for the imperatival use of the participles in Rom 12:9–19 (e.g. Talbert 1969). However, the vast majority of convincing parallels come from Paul's own letters, obviating the need for a pre-Pauline source beyond general Jewish paraenesis (cf. Edsall 2012, 420–422). Further, the use of participles is not so striking to *necessitate* recourse to a source theory. See the judicious discussion in Wilson 1991, 156–165.

specifically to the paraenesis in Rom 12:1–15:13. Although this is too limiting an understanding of 15:14–15, nevertheless it does *include* Paul's discussion in 12:9–13:14, so there is reason for thinking that Paul expected some of the exhortations to be known to his readers, though specificity beyond this is difficult.<sup>119</sup>

It is worth noting, finally, that Rom 8:4 articulates a point that has thus far remained largely implicit in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians, namely, the connection between the Spirit and moral transformation. In Rom 8:4, Paul states that Jesus' actions happened "in order that the decrees of the Law might be fulfilled in us, we who walk not according to the flesh, but according to the Spirit."<sup>120</sup> 1 Cor 6:11 closely parallels this thought when Paul contrasts the former life of some of the Corinthians – the sexually immoral, idolaters, adulterers, the greedy, etc. – with their current status as those "washed, sanctified and justified...in the Spirit of our God." Later in that same chapter Paul expresses astonishment that the Corinthians were not making the connection between the indwelling of the Spirit and sexual morality (6:19). More subtly, in 1 Thess 4:8, Paul concludes his exhortations regarding sexual morality (and greed) with the statement "Whoever rejects this does not reject a person, but God who gave his Holy Spirit to you." As Eckart Reinmuth has demonstrated, there was a widely accepted connection in second temple Judaism between possessing God's Spirit and keeping the Law.<sup>121</sup> This point does not necessitate that Paul included this as part of his formative instruction, or that he assumed it of the Romans, though it makes both conclusions

---

<sup>119</sup> The oft-positing link between Rom 12:14 ("bless those who persecute you") and Jesus tradition, while possible, is not explicitly indicated in the text and, indeed, the content is not limited to the Jesus tradition, *pace* Furnish 1972, 61–62; Piper 1979, 63; Wilckens 1978–1982, 3:22–23, with Wilson 1991, 165–171; cf. Jewett 2007, 766.

<sup>120</sup> On the notion of the Law here, see §9.3.6 below.

<sup>121</sup> Reinmuth 1985, 48–73 (Pauline materials), 74–93 (Jewish materials). He addresses *T. 12 Patr.*, *I En.*, *Sib. Or.*, *Jub.* and the Qumran materials (1QH, 1QS, CD). Cf. earlier Schrage 1961, 49–57 who argued that possession of the Spirit and the love command did not stand in contrast with *konkreten Einzelgebote* in Paul's thought, though his contrast with the Jewish Law is overdrawn (cf. 101–102).

possible.

### 9.3.6 Knowledge of scripture

Paul explicitly characterizes some of his readers as "those who know the Law" (7:1). And he does more than pay lip service to this characterization; he continually cites scripture by way of proof and adduces arguments from scriptural characters and narratives. As with the discussion of the use of scripture in 1 Corinthians, the task here is not to parse out all, or even the majority, of Paul's citations, allusions, or references to scripture in Romans.<sup>122</sup> Rather, the question for this section is more general. Did Paul expect the Romans to have a view of scripture that is analogous to that which Paul passed on to the Corinthians (and probably the Thessalonians)?<sup>123</sup>

The short answer to this question is, Yes. As I noted already (§9.3.2), Paul assumes that his readers will accept his application of texts about YHWH to Christ. Further, Paul presents his readers as those who consider the Jewish Scriptures to contain (or, perhaps better, be) a prophetic promise of Christ (1:2), to be normative for morality (13:8–10) and to be addressed in some way to them (4:24; 15:4).<sup>124</sup> Further, Paul presumes their familiarity with Adam (5:12–21), Abraham (4:1–24), Isaac (4:18–21, 9:7–9), Jacob and Esau (9:10–13), the "patriarchs" (9:5, 11:28, 15:8), Moses (5:13–14), David (1:3, 4:6, 11:9) and Elijah (11:2–4) with their narrative contexts and a certain construal of "salvation-history" (9:1–11:36).<sup>125</sup> This is a striking array of materials that Paul assumes his audience to know, regardless of whether any given listener had access to the original

---

<sup>122</sup> For a very detailed investigation that principally covers Isaiah, though in comparison with other texts, see Wagner 2002.

<sup>123</sup> Cf. §7.4 above for the argument that Paul passed on scripture to the Thessalonians, despite the silence of 1 Thessalonians on the matter.

<sup>124</sup> Cf. the account of Paul's use of Deuteronomy in Lincicum 2010, 117–168, who notes that Paul treats it as an ethical authority (e.g. for love, 123–127), a theological authority and a lens for Israel's history.

<sup>125</sup> See esp. Stanley 2004, 139–141 who concludes, "Clearly, Paul assumes a much broader knowledge of Scripture in his letter to the Romans, whom he did not know, than in his letters to his own churches" (140).

context of any given explicit citation.<sup>126</sup>

It needs to be emphasized, however, that Paul's assumed Roman familiarity with a given biblical figure *necessarily* implies a general narrative context. For instance, it is impossible to know who Adam is without knowing the general context of the Jewish creation narrative. In fact, in almost every case noted above, Paul draws on broader elements of the narrative: Adam's sin, Abraham's righteousness, Isaac as the promised child, Jacob and Esau's birthrights, Moses with the exodus and the giving of the Law (cf. Stanley 2004, 139–140). Of course, in a group as diverse and diffuse as Paul's audience, references to scripture undoubtedly struck people differently, according to their previous familiarity. But it remains the case that Paul's letter would be unintelligible to someone with no knowledge of these aspects of Scripture.

### 9.3.6.1 Paul's teaching outside the τύπος or new developments?

There are two aspects of Paul's use of scripture in Romans that fall decidedly beyond anything in 1 Corinthians or 1 Thessalonians: his designation of the Law as "spiritual" (7:14) and his various arguments regarding the church and Israel, or "salvation-history" (esp. 4:1–24; 9:6–11:32). I take these in order.

There seems to be an emerging consensus that Paul engages in a "speech-in-character" (προσωποποιία) in 7:7–25,<sup>127</sup> though scholars are divided about who precisely the character is.<sup>128</sup> What matters for our purposes is that, whoever the character might be,

---

<sup>126</sup> This is where Stanley's 2004 monograph focuses; he concludes that Paul requires little concrete scriptural knowledge and that most of his audience probably had none. Whether or not Stanley's entire argument is convincing, his point stands that "we should accept the fact that the letter [*sc.* Romans] gives us little more than his [*sc.* Paul's] best guess as to what they might of known" (141).

<sup>127</sup> See Stowers 1994, 264; Busch 2004, 14; Jewett 2007, 455; Krauter 2010, 146. Other scholars who argue that the "I" is someone other than Paul, such as Lambrecht 1992, 74–91, effectively hold this position as well, even if the terminology is not present.

<sup>128</sup> Adam (Käsemann 1980, 210; Lichtenberger 2004, 121–186); Eve (Busch 2004; Krauter 2008); pre-Christian Paul from the perspective of faith (Bultmann 1952, 1:266; Wright 2002, 552–553), or a stock tragic character (Stowers 1994, 269–272).

Paul explicitly includes the Roman readers in 7:14 (so Lichtenberger 2004, 137): "For *we know* that the law is spiritual."<sup>129</sup> Robert Jewett has recently emphasized the striking quality of this formulation, which is not found verbatim elsewhere before Paul (Jewett 2007, 460). Nevertheless there are parallels, however imperfect, in Jewish<sup>130</sup> and early Christian traditions<sup>131</sup> which could provide a context in which such a statement could be intelligible. Paul's designation of the Law as πνευματικός functions as a way to insulate the Law from implication in his fleshly sin.<sup>132</sup> As such, it provides the *grounds* for his argument that the Law can be holy (v. 12) while still occasioning sin and, notably, Paul does not go on to defend his statement. This indicates, as many commentators recognize, that Paul does in fact expect his audience to know, or at least be willing to accept, that the Law is spiritual.<sup>133</sup>

It is difficult to tell what relationship this description of the Law bears to Paul's more polemical comments in 1 Cor 15:56 where the Law is identified as "the power of sin" or 2 Cor 3:7–11 where Paul contrasts the "ministry of death, engraved with letters on stone" and "the ministry of the Spirit." *Prima facie*, Rom 7:14 stands in direct conflict with these passages, in which case Rom 7:14 may be an example of Paul tailoring his arguments to his audience among whom a more anti-Law stance would be unacceptable. However, on that reading, Rom 3:20 appears to stand in continuity with the Corinthian

---

<sup>129</sup> The minority reading of οἶδα μὲν for οἶδαμεν is argued by Haacker 1999, 145 and Wilckens 1978-1982, 2:85. However the textual witnesses are overwhelmingly in favor of the first-person plural and it also has the advantage of *lectio difficilior*.

<sup>130</sup> The parallel with *m. Sanh.* 10:1 (תורה מן השמים) is often drawn; cf. Barrett 1991, 137. See Lichtenberger 2004, 140 n. 21 for more examples of the divine origin of the Law, though he dismisses them as genuine parallels.

<sup>131</sup> Cf. Matt 22:43 (Δαυὶδ ἐν πνεύματι καλεῖ αὐτὸν κύριον) and parallels; 2 Pet 1:21 (οὐ γὰρ θελήματι ἀνθρώπου... ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ πνεύματος ἁγίου); 2 Tim 3:16 (πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος).

<sup>132</sup> So Wright 2002, 566 ("in order to exonerate Torah"). See already John Chrysostom *Hom. Rom.* 14 [557B-C].

<sup>133</sup> Witherington 2004, 198; Leenhardt 1961, 190 n.\*; Cranfield 1975-1979, 1:355; Seifrid 1992, 320–321; Jewett 2007, 461.

passages and therefore to be in tension with 7:14 and the supposed rhetorical context.<sup>134</sup>

Another possibility is that 7:14 is simply speaking about the Law *eo ipso* while 3:20 and the Corinthian passages are more interested in the function of the Law, thus removing Paul's apparent contradiction.<sup>135</sup> In both cases, however, there is no indication that Paul taught either the Corinthian or Thessalonian congregation that the Law was "spiritual." In this light, Rom 7:14 may indicate a difference between the Roman τύπος and Paul's teaching on the Law.

Turning now to Paul's treatment of "salvation-history," there is no discussion regarding the church and Israel in the rest of Paul's letters that approaches the length or depth of argument that is represented in Rom 4 and 9–11. I cannot solve here the fascinating and important problems of what precisely Paul's aim in Rom 9–11 is, what position he is arguing against, or his theology of Israel (with their Law and promises).<sup>136</sup> What is crucial to see here is the remarkable difference between Paul's careful arguments regarding Abraham as the father of *believers*, among other matters, and the fact that Paul appears to take similar positions for granted in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians. In 1 Cor 10:1 Paul refers to the Israelites in the desert as "our fathers" and later in 12:12 refers to the Corinthian Gentile status as in the past. Similarly, Paul represents the Thessalonians as the elect people of God, *distinct from the Gentiles* who do not know God (1 Thess 4:5, 9).<sup>137</sup> In contrast, these are precisely the topics that Paul is at pains to address in his

---

<sup>134</sup> Räisänen 1987, 150–154 argues a similar point regarding this conflict, though rather than attributing the difference to rhetorical savvy, he attributes it to a contradiction in Paul's thought.

<sup>135</sup> Cf. Hays 1989, 151: "In explaining this ministry of the Spirit [*sc.* in 2 Cor 3], however, Paul as we have seen, straightway begins to cite and interpret scripture. This shows that Paul's rejection of *gramma* is by no means a rejection of *Graphē*." Note also the solution in Reinmuth 1985 who draws on Jewish thought connecting the Spirit with Torah-observance.

<sup>136</sup> See the general debate in, *inter alia*, Sanders 1983; Hübner 1984; Jewett 1985; Theobald 2003 [1987]; Räisänen 1987; Wright 1991; Dunn 1998, 499–532; Yarbrough 2001.

<sup>137</sup> See §7.2.7 above. Recently Paula Fredricksen 2010 has argued perceptively that Paul's gospel was necessarily a Judaizing one, insofar as it required Gentiles to refuse worship to their local gods and so redefined their identity.

recasting of "salvation-history" in Romans, the connection between the patriarchs, Israel (with its Law) and the church.<sup>138</sup> It would appear, then, that the presentation of these topics is deeply Pauline and, at least potentially, *peculiarly* Pauline;<sup>139</sup> he does not presume that his Roman readers will already accept this account, for reasons not entirely clear from the letter itself.<sup>140</sup>

What we see in Romans, then, is a complex picture of the relationship between the presumed Roman ἔνδοξα and Paul's teaching. On one hand, the general view of scripture's authority and prophetic value presumed in Romans stands in continuity with what Paul passed on to the Corinthians (and probably the Thessalonians).<sup>141</sup> However, Paul does not take for granted his particular understanding of the relation between the church and Israel (Rom 9–11), or faith and the Law (Rom 4). Furthermore, the notion that the Law is spiritual stands in remarkable contrast with his presentation of the Law in his other letters, a point which led Hans Hübner (1984), for one, to argue that Paul's thought developed regarding the law between Galatians and Romans. While this is possible, another explanation could be found in differences in the presumed ἔνδοξα of Paul's readers in each case, to say nothing of the rhetorical situation in each letter.

---

<sup>138</sup> In addition to the commentaries, on the function of Abraham in Rom 4; see Sanders 1983, 32–36; Hays 2005a (followed to an extent by Campbell 2009, 715–725; Jipp 2009) and now Wright 2013; cf. the different account in Hübner 1984, 51–53 who nevertheless affirms Paul's use of Abraham as an argument to integrate Jews and Gentiles. On scripture and the argument of Rom 9–11, see Nicolet Anderson 2007 and note the recent extended treatment of Belli 2010 who argues that Paul draws on scripture for every part of his argument in Rom 9–11, cf. Wagner 2002, 353–359; Lincicum 2010, 164–166. Whether Paul had "salvation-history" in mind or treated historical episodes as more isolated examples (as argued by, *inter alios*, Luz 1968, 83, 134–135, *passim* and Barrett 1962, 4–5), it remains the case that Paul is concerned with explaining the relationship of the patriarchs, promises and Israel to the Church.

<sup>139</sup> The peculiarity of Paul's thought here is emphasized, perhaps over-emphasized, in Räisänen 1987, 201.

<sup>140</sup> On the relation of the church and Israel, see further §9.3.8.

<sup>141</sup> On the use of scripture in Corinth and Thessalonica, see §7.4.

### 9.3.7 Community praxis: worship and other

The material in Romans pertaining to community praxis stands somewhere between 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians with respect to its detail and breadth of topics. Certain topics in Romans and Paul's teaching appear to overlap entirely. For instance, his reference to the "holy kiss" in Rom 16:16 just as clearly assumes a preexisting practice among his readers and is just as ambiguous as to its significance.<sup>142</sup>

Paul addresses various "gifts" in Rom 12:6–8 which bear resemblance to elements of 1 Cor 12:29 and 1 Thess 5:12–21 (see Table 1 below). As when writing to the Corinthians and Thessalonians, Paul simply assumes that the Roman believers understand what he means by these terms and that the actions implied are already taking place. However, Rom 12:6–8 is more like 1 Thessalonians insofar as Paul's emphasis in both cases falls on the task itself rather than the person performing it.<sup>143</sup> This is not to drive an artificial wedge between "function" and "office"; it is merely to observe that Paul is suitably vague when writing to communities whose structure is still new (Thessalonica) or not fully known (Rome).

Table 1

Romans 12	1 Corinthians 12	1 Thessalonians 5
(ἀπόστολοι, 1:1; 16:7)	ἀπόστολοι (v. 28)	(ἀπόστολοι, 2:7)
προφητεία (v. 6)	προφήται (v. 28)	προφητεία (v. 20)
διακονία (v. 7)	ἀντιλήμψις? (v. 28)	
διδασκαλία (v. 7)	διδάσκαλοι (v. 28)	
παρακήσις (v. 8)		νουθετοῦντες (v. 12, 14) <sup>144</sup>

<sup>142</sup> Wilckens 1978-1982, 3:137, *inter alios*, notes that the practice had a firm place within early Christianity; cf. ch. 7 above.

<sup>143</sup> This is signified in Romans 12 with Paul's use of participles, ὁ διδάσκων, ὁ παρακαλῶν, ὁ μεταδιδούς, ὁ προϊστάμενος, ὁ ἐλεῶν; cf. Jewett 2007, 750–753.

<sup>144</sup> This is a synonym for παρακαλεῖν; cf. Ortkemper 1980, 78; Michel 1955, 267 and §7.2.6.1.

μεταδιδούς (v. 8)	ἀντιλήμψις? (v. 28)	
προϊστάμενος (v. 8)	κυβέρνησις? (v. 28)	προϊστάμενος (v. 12)
ἔλεος (v. 8)		ἀντέχεσθε ἀσθενῶν? (v. 14)
	"Powers" (v. 28)	
	Healing (v. 28)	
	Glossolalia (v. 28) <sup>145</sup>	

It is immediately clear from the comparison that these lists are not meant to be exhaustive (rightly Ortkemper 1980, 65–67) and that there was probably not fixed terminology for certain tasks across early Christian communities. For example, the only gift that occurs in each list is prophecy. Further, Paul presumes that there are people who are in caring authority (προϊστάμενος) over the churches and it is suggested that these are leaders of the house churches, though this remains speculative and the language is not the same in every case (κυβέρνησις in 1 Cor 12:28?).<sup>146</sup> Paul assumes that, whatever our difficulty may be in identifying its precise meaning, the Romans knew what he meant by διακονία and it is noteworthy that Paul refers to Phoebe in 16:1 as a διάκονος of the church in Cenchreae.<sup>147</sup> This means that the "function" of service remained attached to Phoebe even when she was away from her home community of Cenchreae, which is itself a sign that the function shaded into an "office." Paul presumes the Romans are familiar with this designation and its implications. The same applies to those who teach, exhort, share and show mercy, though in those cases there is no further evidence that these designations could be applied in the same way as διάκονος. Further, Paul's passing mention of "the apostles" in 16:7 and his self-designation as such in 1:1 and 11:13

<sup>145</sup> While most scholars argue that Rom 8:26 does not have glossolalia, Wilckens 1978-1982, 2:161–162 argues that Paul is interpreting all prayers as essentially glossolalia.

<sup>146</sup> So Käsemann 1980, 342; Wilckens 1978-1982, 3:15 and slightly differently Jewett 2007, 753. Leenhardt 1961, 312 and Ortkemper 1980, 82–83 prefer a more general sense of organization and administration; cf. the discussion of the term in §7.2.6.1 above.

<sup>147</sup> For a helpful discussion of the possible interpretations διάκονος, see Jewett 2007, 747–749, though his efforts to distance 12:7 from 16:1 are not convincing.

indicates that he expected the Romans to be aware of such a title as well.

Regarding communal worship in Rome, little is said and, indeed, Paul may have known little for sure. The repeated discussions of glossolalia in 1 Corinthians are evidently related to the over-valuation of that gift in Corinth and it does not appear explicitly when writing to any other community. However, alongside the mention of prophecy and teaching, which probably refer to functions during communal worship in addition to whatever else they may have meant, Paul may hint at a liturgical element in worship and to glossolalia. In Rom 8:15, Paul states that, by the Spirit of adoption "we cry 'Abba, father,'" clearly presuming his readers' knowledge of the formula (cf. Wright 2002, 593). The presence of Aramaic here indicates a link with, if not an origin among, the early believers in Palestine. It is quite possible that this "cry" is related to the Lord's prayer.<sup>148</sup> Along with this connection, Robert Jewett argues that the plural κράζομεν indicates a liturgical setting with the congregation "crying out" together (Jewett 2007, 499). If this is true, then we see here an aspect of communal worship that does not appear in 1 Thessalonians or 1 Corinthians. This may simply be due to the fact that Paul had no occasion to mention it in those letters, though it may also indicate that he never passed it on as part of his instruction. However, it is not clear whether 8:15 is in fact a reference to nascent Christian liturgy.<sup>149</sup>

The data regarding community praxis in Rome, then, reveals little by way of standards communal praxis or structure. Apart from the fact that there was some basic structure with various roles and the enigmatic "holy kiss," Paul's presumes very little of the Roman community that matches up with his initial teaching in Corinth or

---

<sup>148</sup> E.g. Michel 1955, 168; Dunn 1988, 1:461, but Käsemann 1980, 228 is skeptical.

<sup>149</sup> On the contrary, Wilckens 1978-1982, 2:137 and Keesmaat 1999, 74-75 argue that the background for this cry is found in Israel's crying out to God in the LXX and the former considers the verb to indicate ecstatic exclamation.

Thessalonica.

### 9.3.7.1 Paul's ecumenical turn in Rom 14–15

Before moving on, it is necessary to look briefly at Rom 14–15, what it presumes about Roman praxis and how it relates to Paul's teaching elsewhere. Paul brings up two specific issues in these chapters, dietary and calendrical matters, while also speaking more generally about the motivations behind his concerns. Contrary to many scholars, I am not convinced that these chapters show that Paul had detailed knowledge of the situation in the Roman churches regarding these matters, though it is possible (cf. §9.2 above). What they do show, however, is that Paul considered it *possible* that there would be a variety of positions on these issues, as indeed he had encountered such variety in his own churches; dietary/common meal matters arose in Corinth (1 Cor 8–10; 11:17–34) and calendrical issues arose in Galatia (Gal 4:8–11).<sup>150</sup> Compared with the relevant passages from these two letters, his tone and advice in Romans sounds decidedly soft. This shift can be easily accounted for in light of two considerations.

First, unlike in 1 Cor 8–10, idolatry is not the underlying issue in Rom 14–15. Rather, Paul explicitly identifies the matter as one of food-impurity (κοινός, 14:14).<sup>151</sup> Furthermore, Paul guards against possible pro-idolatry interpretations of his position regarding food purity in vv. 6, 22 by identifying the context of variant practices as "with respect to the Lord." Therefore, the urgent motivation for Paul's strong language in 1 Cor 8–10 is lacking in Romans; what he faces instead are mixed communities of believers who, inevitably, vary regarding Jewish food-purity praxis. Accordingly, Paul structures the parameters of his discussion broadly between those who eat "everything" and those

---

<sup>150</sup> It is widely recognized that the context for Paul's discussion of pure/impure food in Rom 14 is a communal meal; see esp. the illuminating discussion in Smit 2007; cf. Rudolph 2011, 35–44; Shogren 2000; Theobald 2003, 493.

<sup>151</sup> For further arguments regarding the issue at stake, see Barclay 1996, 289–293. On the category of κοινός, see Rudolph 2011, 36–37.

who eat only vegetables (so Jewett 2007, 71).<sup>152</sup>

The issue of judging "one day to be better than another" (14:5) is also most likely a reference to the Jewish calendar, perhaps Sabbath observance.<sup>153</sup> In stark contrast to Gal 4:8–11, Paul allows for the celebration of these "days" so long as they are celebrated with respect "to the Lord" (14:6). The rhetorical context for this statement is the same as that regarding food restrictions. Accordingly, Paul remains similarly vague, limiting his discussion to the topic of "days" rather than specific practices, enabling him to include his entire audience while not confronting anyone directly.

In both these instances, dietary and calendrical issues, what is so remarkable in relation to Paul's teaching elsewhere is that *he appears to allow for Gentiles to follow Jewish dietary restrictions and calendar*.<sup>154</sup> There is no indication that *only Jews* were among the weak who ate vegetables and celebrated Sabbath (or other days).<sup>155</sup> Further, Paul threads the needle regarding κοινός—food by adopting a Hillelite position (perhaps followed by Jesus, as Paul's language may suggest) that food purity is *imputed* rather than intrinsic: "I know and am persuaded in the Lord Jesus that nothing is κοινός *in itself*" (14:14).<sup>156</sup> Therefore, he allows for food purity-status among the "weak" to be determined

---

<sup>152</sup> Parallels from Dan 1:12; Jdt 10:5 and Josephus *Vit.* 14 are often adduced as historical analogies for Jewish dietary restrictions while dining with Gentiles; cf. Barclay 1996, 291; Shogren 2000; Toney 2008, 58–60; Rudolph 2011, 37; *pace* Reasoner 1999, 102, 136–138 who fails to address adequately Barclay's (probably correct) contention that *Paul* would not have condoned and accommodated pagan motivations for abstinence.

<sup>153</sup> So rightly, Wilckens 1978–1982, 3:83; Barclay 1996, 292; Lampe 2003, 73; Rudolph 2011, 36; *pace* Jewett 2007, 484–485. Contrary to Jewett's claim, it is impossible to imagine *Paul* condoning the veneration of Greco-Roman feast days, with their idolatrous intent and context. Further, the issue of "days" is linked in Rom 14 to that of Jewish dietary restrictions, which further weighs against the Greco-Roman feast interpretation. See above on 14:6, 22.

<sup>154</sup> Cf. Toney 2008, 71. Barclay 1996, 303–304 comes to a similar conclusion. Regarding his position, cf. note 160 below.

<sup>155</sup> So correctly Wright 2002, 731, who nevertheless fails to connect this observation with Paul's remarkable allowance for Gentiles following Jewish food purity and calendrical laws.

<sup>156</sup> See the discussion in Rudolph 2011, 35–44; cf. also Reasoner 1999, 99; Theobald 2003, 497–498, neither of whom note the Jewish legal context for v. 14. Thus Paul's statement falls short of being a "fundamental rejection of the Jewish law in one of its most sensitive dimensions," *pace* Barclay 1996, 300.

by the fact that some consider food impure (vv. 20–22),<sup>157</sup> while also allowing the "strong" their position, though the strong are apparently to cater to the weak (15:1). This again provides space for Gentiles to follow Jewish Law, a position that Paul strongly refutes in Galatians. This can be explained in one of two ways. On one hand, Paul's thought on the matter may have developed "beyond" his earlier view that Gentiles who follow the Law are cut off from Christ. On the other hand, Paul's argument in Rom 14–15 may reflect an "ecumenical" tendency in Romans reflecting his concern for unity and due to the fact that he is trying to garner support from a community that he does not know, which comprises Jews and Gentiles with their attendant variety in meal praxis.

### 9.3.8 Community self-understanding

Assessing the self-understanding of the Roman community is very difficult for several reasons, the foremost of which is the fact that one cannot properly speak of *the* Roman community, as I have noted throughout this chapter. Further, Paul's apparent reticence to appeal explicitly to Roman knowledge may cast doubt on how much he knew about these communities and what they thought of themselves. Despite this, or perhaps because of it, a comparison with the presupposed community self-understanding evident in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians is illuminating. Indeed, elements of the Roman self-understanding were already addressed including the significance of Jesus' death and resurrection *pro nobis*, baptism "into Christ," possession of the Holy Spirit and moral transformation.

It is worth recalling Deidun's insight already noted (§7.2.7) regarding direct address: "[w]e may assume that the epithets applied to a community, especially when unaccompanied by explanation or apology, correspond at least in some measure with the

---

<sup>157</sup> This does not necessary imply that the weak actually held a view of intrinsic purity, so Reasoner 1999, 100.

understanding which that community has of itself" (Deidun 1981, 3). In the case of Romans, we should perhaps emphasize that the correspondence is *expected* by Paul rather than necessarily true in reality, but to move beyond that may well be impossible. In this light, then, at first glance many of the elements from 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians are present in Romans as well.<sup>158</sup> Paul addresses the Romans as ἀδελφοί, notes that they are κλητοὶ ἅγιοι (Rom 1:7; cf. 1 Cor 1:2) and as such are the "elect" (Rom 8:33) and urged to be distinct from "the world" (12:2). This combination of sibling language with holiness terminology and its attendant separation from what is unholy is familiar by now. Further, Paul refers to the ἐκκλησία of the Gentiles and of Christ in 16:4, 16 respectively and repeatedly notes that the gospel is for Jews and Gentiles alike, likewise familiar elements, especially from Corinth.

However, of these five elements, only the first two are directly applied to the Roman community, sibling language and holiness. Unlike when writing to Corinth and Thessalonica, Paul never explicitly contrasts the present status of the Romans believers with being Gentiles and the separation in 12:2 is generically formulated. The contrast may be implied in the description of human corruption in 1:18–32, but any distinction from Gentiles *qua* Gentiles remains an undertone.<sup>159</sup> Similarly, Paul does not distance believers from any status as Ἰουδαῖοι, rather he repeatedly stresses that *both* Jews and Gentiles are the beneficiaries of the gospel (Rom 1:16; 2:9–10; 3:29; 9:24; 10:24).<sup>160</sup> It is possible that Paul has simply shifted his thinking here and no longer holds to the *tertium quid* implications of his stance in 1 Corinthians. On the other hand, a more cautious rhetorical

---

<sup>158</sup> See the discussions in chapter §§7.2.7, 7.3.7.

<sup>159</sup> That 1:18–32 is aimed at Gentiles is argued forcefully, *inter alios*, by Stowers 1994.

<sup>160</sup> I do not have the space to assess the arguments of scholars such as Boyarin 1994 who argue that Paul spiritualized the identity of Judaism or otherwise undermined the social and cultural integrity of the group (cf. similarly Barclay 1996 with respect to food-purity). That sort of reception history is well beyond the purview of this study. However, it remains the case that in Romans, at least, Paul does not suggest that a Jew who is a believer in any way ceases to be a Jew, only that they are saved on the same basis as Gentiles.

stance towards the social and cultural identity of his readers would certainly be in keeping with his efforts to secure support of the Roman community. Indeed, 9:24 might be read to suggest a *tertium quid* insofar as Christians are called *from* the Jew and Gentiles (ἐξ Ἰουδαίων ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐξ ἔθνῶν), but it would be a subtle hint, only really visible in the light of Paul's other letters.<sup>161</sup>

Perhaps more striking is Paul's well-known strange use of ἐκκλησία: Paul does not use the term at all for the first fifteen chapters Romans, including in the prescript. While the lack of ἐκκλησία in the prescript is not itself determinative as it is also lacking in Phil 1:1,<sup>162</sup> elsewhere in Philippians Paul does indicate that the community is a "church" (Phil 4:15; cf. Col 1:24). This is not the case in Romans. Of the five uses of ἐκκλησία in Romans, four patently refer to churches within Paul's sphere of influence. Phoebe is the διάκονος of the church in Cenchreae (16:1), a port near Corinth. Gaius hosts the "whole church" in Corinth (16:23). Prisca and Aquila have a church in their house in Rome (16:5), but of course they are Paul's co-workers and presumably he can expect to know much more about their house church than is the case with others. Paul Minear classically argued that "the mention of this one church [*sc.* in the house of Prisca and Aquila] implies that there were other churches in Rome" (Minear 1971, 24). However, this confuses the term "church" as a way to designate groups of early Christians and "church" as a *self*-designation of any given group. It is true that the mention of one specific group (amidst other greetings) implies other groups. Referring to one group as a "church," however,

---

<sup>161</sup> Wright 2002, 642 considers this verse a foreshadowing of the theme of "all Israel" into which Gentiles have been incorporated in 11:26. On the other hand, Fredricksen 2010 argues that while Paul distances the Romans from being Gentiles, he does not conflate them with Israel *per se*; cf. similarly Eastman 2010 and Gadenz 2009, 325 (though their analyses leave some questions). It is notable that the distinction drawn in 9:6 ("not all who are from Israel are Israel") does not necessarily indicate that those from outside Israel (Gentiles) can be Israel; it simply states that not all those *from within* Israel of the flesh are Israel of the promise. This reading can also account for the two different uses of "Israel" in 11:25–26 without conflating Gentiles with Israel and while keeping focus on the question of God's faithfulness to Israel, which is the guiding question of Rom 9–11.

<sup>162</sup> So Caragounis 1998, 253; Barentsen 2009, 603–604; cf. also Col 1:1.

makes no necessary statement about the terminology employed by other groups. The "churches of the Gentiles" (v. 4) who give thanks for Prisca and Aquila are most likely churches in which they have ministered, with "all" being added for rhetorical effect, which again is almost entirely limited to places of Pauline influence. It is also worth noting the connection between Gentile churches in 16:4 and "the rest of the Gentiles" in 1:13 among whom Paul has ministered. He cannot literally mean "among every other Gentile in the world" but rather it should be taken as a reference to the Gentiles from his previous sphere of missionary influence.

This leaves only the strange reference to "all the churches of Christ" (16:16). This phrase is not paralleled elsewhere within Paul's letters, with the closest phrase being "the churches of God" (1 Cor 11:16; 1 Thess 2:14; cf. 2 Thess 1:4). Whatever Paul's meaning here, it is clear that "all the churches" greeting the Romans are *distinct* from the Romans. Jewett argues that Paul's statement in v. 16

was not a euphemism because it reflects the situation of the initial rendezvous in Corinth with representatives of churches participating in the Jerusalem offering, which occurred at approximately the time of writing Romans.<sup>163</sup>

This is possible, but it may also simply reflect a generalizing, aspirational rhetoric as part of Paul's letter that urges unity.<sup>164</sup> While certainty eludes us, perhaps the easiest explanation for this phenomenon is that ἐκκλησία was not known to Paul as a *self-*designation among the Roman communities, but he could assume it for Prisca and Aquila from his previous time with them. On this view, Paul's omission of the term ἐκκλησία in Rom 1:7 is unrelated to whether there were multiple unrelated house churches or a unified "church" comprising these smaller communities within Rome.<sup>165</sup> Instead, it is

---

<sup>163</sup> Jewett 2007, 976–977; cf. Haacker 1999, 323.

<sup>164</sup> So Wilckens 1978–1982, 3:137–138, cf. the more general treatment of "all the churches" in Michel 1955, 345 and Barrett 1991, 260.

<sup>165</sup> This is the focus of the discussion in Caragounis 1998; Esler 2003, 120–125; Jewett 2007, 958–959. See further §9.2.2 above. On house churches in Rome (and early Christianity more broadly), Klauck

entirely a function of his expectations regarding the self-understanding of his readers.<sup>166</sup>

The picture that arises from this discussion can be stated briefly: Paul expects familiarity with concepts that are central to the self-understanding he imparted to his communities, but he does not presume that his Roman readers have appropriated all the terminology as their own. This picture fits with Paul's treatment of, especially, the relationship between Israel the Law and believers in Rom 4 and 9–11, but also justification by faith.<sup>167</sup> It is a matter of Paul explaining "his gospel" to those for whom he simply could not presume knowledge of it.

## 9.4 Summary and Conclusions

### 9.4.1 Summary

In this chapter I have brought the outline of Paul's teaching, as identified in Part II, into dialogue with Paul's letter to the Romans. I argued that Paul wrote to a Roman audience made up of various communities, comprising mostly Gentiles but also a contingent of Jews of unknown size, to pave the way for his visit and subsequent mission to Spain, as well as to lay out "his gospel" for the benefit of the Roman believers (§§9.2.1–2). I then showed that Paul knew something of what his Roman audience understood about nascent Christianity, which he refers to as the *τύπος διδαχῆς* (6:17), *and* that it was not synonymous with his teaching (§9.2.3).

With respect to each topic of Paul's formative instruction in Corinth and Thessalonica, Romans has demonstrated both continuity and difference. Paul presumed that his readers worshiped the one God, who is the father of Jesus and of believers and is

---

1981 is still very valuable, though he does not discuss the significance of *ἐκκλησία* terminology in Romans (cf. his comment on page 30).

<sup>166</sup> Cf. Trebilco 2012, 205–207 who concludes his discussion of *ἐκκλησία* by noting that it was not *the* technical term every Christian group, as seen in Hebrews and James; *pace* Caragounis 1998, 253.

<sup>167</sup> Cf. the discussions in §§9.3.2.1–9.3.6.1 above.

also going to judge the world (§9.3.1). However, Paul also refers to a (possibly liturgical) use of the Aramaic address *Abba* for God (8:15), which is not mentioned in 1 Corinthians or 1 Thessalonians, though it is difficult to draw any concrete conclusions from this. More suggestive is the fact that God is presumed as the eschatological judge in Romans, while Paul only refers to the judgment of *Christ* once and there it is specified as "my gospel" (2:16). This may indicate a point of perceived distance between Paul's teaching and the presumed τύπος in Rome.

Similarly, Paul's discussions of Jesus, his death and resurrection presume a good deal of his Roman readers, but there also are suggestions of discontinuity (§9.3.2). As at Corinth and Thessalonica, he assumes that they are familiar with the titles of Christ, Lord and Son and that they will accept Paul's re-application of YHWH texts to Jesus. Further, Paul expects that the Romans are familiar with the basic narrative of Jesus' life, death, resurrection and glorification (e.g. in the condensed form of 1:3–4). In line with his teaching in Corinth and Thessalonica, Paul assumes that the Romans understood Jesus' death as "for us" but, unlike in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians, Paul goes into much greater detail regarding its theological mechanics, so to speak. I argued that he approached the topic with a constellation of concepts: reconciliation, redemption, justification and sacrificial imagery. With each of these concepts, it was evident that Paul presumed that his readers would be familiar with them, but not that they already connected them with Jesus' death in the way that Paul wanted. The theme of justification/righteousness in particular receives extensive argumentation in Romans in notable contrast with 1 Corinthians. In the case of the mercy-seat and attendant Yom Kippur imagery (3:25), Paul may have been aware of such an interpretation of Jesus' death already present in Rome, though this is not certain. Nevertheless, when 3:25 is taken in conjunction with the two *other* sacrificial images (5:6, 8:3), they suggest that Paul

presumed that his Roman readers understood the significance of Jesus' death in sacrificial terms.

The relationship between Paul's explanations of Jesus' death in Romans and his teaching on it in Corinth and Thessalonica is not clear. On the one hand, the fact that Jesus' death is "for us" in both cases could indicate that the language employed in Romans is simply a manifestation of Paul's own theological language that has not had the opportunity to come to the level of explicit discourse in his other letters.<sup>168</sup> However, it is not that simple. In the case of reconciliation, redemption and justification, Paul employs these concepts regularly elsewhere in his letters. In the case of sacrificial imagery, though, Paul's varied sacrificial images in Romans are not matched elsewhere in his letters. It is notable that in these cases, James Dunn, for example, reads the sacrificial imagery from Romans into the more vague statements of Jesus' death "for our sins" or "for us" in Galatians, 1-2 Corinthians and Thessalonians (Dunn 1998, 217–218).<sup>169</sup> In this light, it is difficult to determine how representative Romans is for Paul's theology of the death of Christ, since he is writing with the Roman *τύπος* in mind and may well have tailored his language to it.

With respect to the Spirit (§9.3.3), Paul felt able to presume that the Romans had received the Spirit from God as with the Corinthians and Thessalonians. Further, Paul presumes that his readers understood the Spirit as the *πνεῦμα θεοῦ* and *πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ*, the latter standing out from the material in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians, but finding ready parallels in Paul's other letters. Similarly, the apocalyptic cosmology and eschatology that Paul imparted to the communities in Corinth and Thessalonica was

---

<sup>168</sup> This is the position reflected in, *inter alios*, Dunn 1998, 212–225.

<sup>169</sup> The possible exception to the lack of clear sacrificial imagery outside of Romans is 1 Cor 5:7 in which Christ is identified as "the paschal lamb." However, the passover sacrifice was not a sin sacrifice, so it is unclear how Christ as the passover lamb would qualify as a death "for our sins."

presupposed in Romans as well, including Satan, "powers," and the imminent judgment of God.

Paul assumes that as with the communities he established, believing (πίστις) was a defining feature of the Roman Christians and that, some time after believing, they were baptized "into Christ." In contrast with anything found in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians, Paul presumes that the Roman believers understood themselves to have "died with Christ" in baptism. It is unclear whether this was an idea present in Paul's teaching or not, but it is remarkable that the first letter that states this clearly is Romans *and* that Paul appears to presume knowledge of it among his readers.

Belief, baptism and the Spirit are also related to moral transformation, which we noted is presumed by Paul, but the details of which are not clear in Romans. Similarly, Paul clearly expects the Roman believers to be familiar with major biblical narratives and characters (Adam, Abraham, Moses, David, etc.) and to regard scripture as authoritative, but *precise* details are hard to establish. What is evident, however, is that Paul did not presume that the Romans already accepted his understanding of the relationship between the Law, Israel and the church, or "salvation history," and he went to great lengths (Rom 4, 9–11) to explain his position to the believers in Rome.

We also saw above that the worship and community structure reflected in Romans resembled what was seen in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians, but only in general outline, as might be expected from different groups with different origins in different geographical locations. Further, I argued that Paul approaches the matter of communal meals and "days" in a more open, even "ecumenical," way in Romans than he does elsewhere. While this might simply reflect development in his thought, such a rhetorical stance is also very fitting for a letter that is seeking the support of its diverse readership.

Finally, the community self-understanding evidenced the same ambiguity

reflected in the relationship between "Paul's gospel" and the Roman τύπος. Paul clearly expected the Romans to be familiar with a number of concepts and self-designations, since Paul never bothers to explain them, but he evidently does not presume that the various Roman communities have appropriated all of them. The most striking case was the omission of the term ἐκκλησία in reference to Roman communities aside from the Pauline-influenced house of Prisca and Aquila.

#### 9.4.2 Conclusions

Because broader conclusions and implications for this enquiry as a whole will be addressed shortly, I limit the discussion here to conclusions regarding Paul's letter to the Romans specifically.

By focusing on how Paul plays on the knowledge he already expected his Roman audience to possess, the preceding analysis repeatedly demonstrated that although certain central elements in Paul's theology and practice were taken for granted in a general way, Paul often did *not* presume that his readers would already understand (or accept) his particular views. This stands out most strikingly in Paul's careful explanations of Christ's death as "for us," the righteousness of God and believers, the role of the Law and the relationship between the church and Israel. These concerns appear to be related to Paul's explanation of "his gospel" (2:16), which he knew could be misconstrued as antinomian (3:8).

Furthermore, when one takes seriously the rhetorical situation of Romans, and Paul's common practice of arguing on the basis of his readers ἔνδοξα, one can account both for the similarities *and differences* between Romans and Paul's other letters. While scholars often debate whether and how much Paul's theology developed, for instance with respect to the role and status of the Law (e.g. Hübner 1984), what may be touted as development (e.g. Paul's provision for circumcision in Rom 4) can perhaps more easily be

explained as Paul's rhetorical awareness. He cannot presume that the Roman communities share his theology, nor does he write to defend communities he established from other teachers. In this case *Paul* is the "other teacher." This is not to say that development in Paul's thought is impossible, merely that it is not always a necessary hypothesis once Paul's attention to his readers' knowledge is fully appreciated.

Finally and significantly, the above analysis supports the argument that one cannot use Romans as a template for Pauline theology, as is still occasionally done. While Romans is an exceedingly valuable resource for understanding certain elements of Paul's thought, it is only so because those are the elements that he felt he most needed to explain to his Roman readers. Of course, there can be no serious debate about whether the death, resurrection and exaltation of Jesus Christ is at the heart of Paul's gospel; but justification by faith, for instance, as the way that Jesus' death is *pro nobis* is expounded at such length in Romans not necessarily because it is the center of Paul's theology, but because it was that element of Paul's theology that he thought most needed to be explained to his readers. The same is true for Paul's extended discussion of Israel in Rom 9–11.<sup>170</sup>

In Romans, then, we see Paul walking a tightrope, to borrow an image from Angelika Reichert (2001). The tightrope identified in this analysis is Paul's attempt to present "his gospel" to the Roman readers, while basing his presentation on presuppositions that he could expect his audience to have, which were not necessarily what Paul himself would have imparted to them had he established the Roman communities himself.

---

<sup>170</sup> The issue of the shape of Paul's theology will be addressed again in ch. 10.

# Chapter 10

## Conclusions and Implications

### 10.1 Summary

Rather than a detailed summary of the argument thus far, I will focus here on the general contours of the preceding material.<sup>1</sup> After introducing the question "what is the content of early Christian formative instruction," I argued in chapter 1 that such a question is too broad and difficult to be approached directly, concluding that the way forward is to focus on *Paul's witness* to this formative instruction.

In Part I (chapters 2–3) I laid out an appropriate method for identifying Paul's initial teaching through rhetorical cues in his letters that indicate what he expected his readers to know. I also argued that ancient epistolary practice did not sufficiently disrupt this structure of communication. Specifically, I identified three types of appeal to prior knowledge: (1) explicit reminders of his teaching, (2) direct appeals to his readers' knowledge and (3) implicit appeals to knowledge (cf. §2.2.4).

I argued that when these criteria are applied to 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians they illuminate a broad base of Pauline formative instruction across the two communities represented. Furthermore, when the structure of communication noted above is applied to Romans, a letter written to communities Paul did not establish, I argued that one can identify material that Paul presumes to have currency outside the ambit of his own influence. Given Paul's concern to base his communication on a basis of common

---

<sup>1</sup> See chapter summaries for a more detailed picture of each stage in my argument.

agreement, points of convergence between presumed formative instruction in Romans and Paul's own formative instruction suggest aspects of continuity. On the other hand, topics that Paul defends or explains in details suggest perceived potential for discontinuity between Paul's teaching and early Christian instruction in Rome.

In Part II I reconstructed Paul's formative instruction evident in 1 Thessalonians and 1 Corinthians and compared the results from each letter to highlight elements of continuity and discontinuity in Paul's teaching in each locale. After introducing each letter and community in chapter 4, I examined Paul's explicit reminders in chapter 5, his direct appeals to knowledge in chapter 6 and his implicit appeals to knowledge in chapter 7 before outlining the contours of his teaching in chapter 8. I argued that, although there are some differences in the formative instruction at Thessalonica and Corinth, the similarities are abundant and include similar teaching on God, Jesus (especially his death and resurrection), the Holy Spirit and its gifts, moral/ethical injunctions (particularly *ειδωλολατρία*, *πορνεία* and *πλεονηξία*), an apocalyptic eschatology, and a particular community self-understanding as God's holy people (including designations such as *ἀδελφός* and *ἐκκλησία*).<sup>2</sup>

More than simply a series of propositions, I argued that these elements taken together imply a more comprehensive symbolic universe, or to borrow the more succinct German term, a *Sinnwelt* that Paul attempted to pass on to his communities. Further, this *Sinnwelt* was one deeply rooted within Judaism and this fact posed some problems for his predominantly Gentile congregations, a cultural dissonance between Paul's teaching and their previous polytheistic Gentile symbolic universe. Such dissonance is particularly evident in 1 Corinthians where Paul was at pains to set the Corinthians back on the right track, pulling them back from their misapplications of his initial teaching (cf. §8.2).

---

<sup>2</sup> See esp. the summary in §8.1.

In Part III (chapter 9) I compared Paul's initial teaching, summarized in chapter 8, with the material he expected his Roman readers to know. Paul's approach in Romans is considerably more politic than in his other letters to communities he established. This results in careful explanations of elements of his gospel that he did not feel he could presume – such as his discussion of how Jesus' death is "for us" – and a decidedly more open discussion of Torah observance on food purity and "days" in Rom 14–15, especially when compared with Galatians. Even with these differences, however, there is remarkable continuity on what some might consider "core" matters between Paul's teaching in Thessalonica and Corinth and the presumed Roman *τύπος διδαχῆς*. Paul expects the Romans to agree that God is the creator and father, that Jesus is Christ and Lord, that he died and rose "for us," that the Spirit was given by God to believers, and that turning to God and Christ involves baptism and moral transformation. Further Paul presumes familiarity with scripture (at least in broad outline) and an apocalyptic cosmology and eschatology. One notable difference, worth mentioning here again, is the fact that Paul does not appear to assume that the Roman recipients understand Jesus as the eschatological judge, a point that he designates as "my gospel" in 2:16. In fact, with this point and Paul's apparently "ecumenical" approach to Torah observance, the traditional Jewish roots of the presumed Roman *τύπος* may be even more pronounced than with Paul's teaching in Thessalonica and Corinth. While Paul hints that he viewed nascent Christianity as a *tertium quid*, distinct from but comprising both Jews and Gentiles, this understanding is not pronounced in Romans.

## 10.2 Open Questions and Limitations

This account of early Christian formative instruction, as wide-ranging as it has been, still has not covered all bases even within Paul's letters. There remain open questions for further study. In the first place, this study has left open the question

regarding the representative nature, or lack thereof, of Paul's teaching and the Roman τύπος. The method employed here for Paul's letters has distinct limitations when applied to letters whose authorship is unknown or to literary texts without a specified audience. In these cases analyzing what the "author" expected the "readers" to know is an exercise in reconstructing the ideal reader whose relation to any historical readers is even more fraught than relating Paul's "intended readers" to his actual readers (cf. §2.2.4). Moving beyond Paul's witness would therefore entail a methodological shift, from looking for common formative instruction underlying different communities to looking at broader recurrent themes presumed in various texts. Further, a comprehensive study of these themes would need to take extra-canonical and so-called "gnostic" materials into consideration.

Moreover, the results of my study of 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians and Romans could be filled out by similar work on Paul's other letters, in particular 2 Corinthians and Galatians. These two letters preserve a portrait of Paul in conflict with opponents in a way not present in the letters studied here. An analysis of what Paul expects his readers to know in these letters, and whether or not these points of agreement are shared by his opponents, in addition to filling out the picture of Paul's initial teaching would illuminate the debate on Paul's opponents that has a long tradition in scholarship all its own.<sup>3</sup> Where do Paul's opponents fall with respect to the presumed agreement between Paul and the Roman communities? Do Paul's disagreements with these opponents touch on elements of belief or praxis and, if so, how? Answering these questions is a *desideratum* for further study of early Christian formative instruction.

Another important avenue of discussion pertains to ancient models with which to construe Paul's activities and his communities. Did Paul work on the model of the

---

<sup>3</sup> Note the survey of scholarship and issues in Sumney 2005.

synagogue, the voluntary association (so Ascough 2003), or a local cult and its "founder" (so Hanges 2012)? Put briefly, these are not mutually exclusive options as the cultic association advocated by Hanges is a subset of the voluntary associations proposed by Ascough (and others) and, from the position of an observer, the synagogue in the Diaspora would be difficult to distinguish from other associations. Theologically, Paul's teaching and the Roman τύπος likely share much more in common with the symbolic universe presumed within a synagogue than with the Bacchic association down the street. However, Hanges has demonstrated several significant parallels between Paul's work and the activities of Greco-Roman cult "founders" (or agents of transfer) such as installing basic leadership structure, supplying the cultic stipulations, and providing a foundational narrative within which members were to situate themselves (cf. Excursus 1 above). There is more work to be done on this matter and it seems likely that no one model explains every aspect of Paul's work. This study contributes to the debate by providing a detailed view of Paul's initial teaching against which to assess various proposals.

### 10.3 Conclusion: Paul and Early Christian Formative Instruction

I close now by returning now to the question that began this study. What does this investigation of Paul's witness to early Christian formative instruction tell us about early Christian preaching and teaching generally? Can we discern a stable musical theme of formative instruction between Paul's communities and those in Rome?

This study simultaneously confirms and challenges previous reconstructions of early Christian formative instruction. With the scholars discussed in §1.3.2, such as James Dunn, the comparison between Paul's teaching and the Roman τύπος has shown that in the middle of the first century CE there was no formalized, unified "pattern of instruction" or catechesis. Indeed, Paul's vehement disagreements with other early Christian teachers,

such as Peter in Gal 2 or the "super apostles" in 2 Corinthians, could be seen to point in this direction; one fights hardest with family.

Yet, and this is the thrust of my argument, Paul himself appears to have provided consistent teaching at Thessalonica and Corinth despite his different experiences, audiences and timeframe in each location. It would seem, then, that at least in this limited fashion Paul can legitimately speak of his "ways" that he teaches "in all the churches" (1 Cor 4:17). Although form-critical reconstructions tended toward unwarranted formality with set pieces of *kerygma* and catechesis (or Seeberg's *Glaubensformel* and *Sittenlehre*), it is nevertheless true that Paul imparted a markedly detailed set of teachings, which included belief and praxis and which cohered within a larger (Jewish) symbolic universe.

Furthermore, despite the elements of possible discontinuity between Paul's own formative teaching and the τύπος διδαχῆς he presumes in Rome, both share a great deal of agreement. Paul's approach in Romans is comparatively gentle, explanatory, even ecumenical. He praises God for the Roman adherence to the τύπος διδαχῆς not only for rhetorical expediency, but because it is a foundation he can work with, building on their previous knowledge to advance his gospel among the Gentiles. Far beyond James Dunn's simple unifying belief in Jesus of Nazareth as risen Lord,<sup>4</sup> Paul also assumed continuity regarding God, the Spirit, the coming judgment, and the church as God's people, elements that would recur commonly in later credal and confessional distillations. With the accompanying apocalyptic cosmology and the emphasis on moral transformation (including the staples of abstaining from idolatry, sexual immorality and greed), the compatibility between the two sets of presumed formative instruction becomes even more striking. In fact, when the symbolic universe that these elements imply is taken seriously, the presumed agreement between Paul and the Romans proves rather more extensive than

---

<sup>4</sup> This was the argument of Dunn 1977, 369 noted earlier (§1.3.2.3).

the materials identified by Seeberg, Dibelius, Dodd, and Selwyn. However, the scope of this study is intentionally more limited than the expansive form-critical attempts of those scholars. Nevertheless, my study leads me to conclude that the convictions Paul believed himself to share with his Roman readers do resemble a musical theme of surprising fullness and complexity.



## Bibliography

### Primary Literature

- Abegg, Jr., M. G. 1999–2007. *Qumran Sectarian Manuscripts*. Version 2.9. Accessed via Accordance Bible Software 9.1.1.
- Aland, B., K. Aland, J. Karavidopoulos, C. M. Martini, and B. M. Metzger, eds. 1995. *Novum Testamentum Graece post Eberhard et Erwin Nestle*. 27th Revised ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Allen, T.W. 1931. *Homeri Ilias*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Austin, R. G. 1960. *M. Tulli Ciceronis pro M. Caelio oratio*. 3rd ed. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Babbitt, Frank Cole. 1927–1976. *Plutarch's Moralia*. 15 vols. LCL 197, 222, 245, 305, 306, 321, 337, 405, 406, 424–429, 470, 499. London: Heinemann.
- Barigazzi, A. 1966. *Favorino di Arelate: Opere*. Florence: Monnier.
- Basore, John William. *Seneca: Moral Essays*. 3 vols. LCL 214, 254, 310. London: Heinemann.
- Beer, Georg *et al.* eds. 1912–. *Die Mischna: Text, Übersetzung und ausführliche Erklärung*. 61 vols. Gießen: Alfred Töpelmann.
- Becker, Carl, ed. 1952. *Tertullian: Apologeticum – Verteidigung des Christentums*. München: Kösel.
- Black, Matthew and Albert-Marie Denis, ed. 1970. *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece; Fragmenta Pseudepigraphorum quae supersunt Graeca*. PVTG 3. Leiden: Brill.
- Borret, M. 1967–1969. *Origène: Contre Celse*. 4 vols. SC 132, 136, 147, 150. Paris: Cerf.
- Box, G. H., ed. 1912. *The Ezra-Apocalypse (II Esdras iii.-xiv.)*. London: Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons.
- Brémond, É. and G. Mathieu. 1929–1962. *Isocrate: Discours*. 4 vols. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.
- Brock, S. P. and J.-C Picard. 1967. *Testamentum Iobi; Apocalypsis Baruchi Graece*. PVTG 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Burchard, Christoph, Carsten Burfeind and Uta Barbara Fink. 2003. *Joseph und Aseneth*. PVTG 5. Leiden: Brill.
- Burguière, Paul, Danielle Gourevitch and Yves Malinas. 1988. *Soranos d'éphèse: Maladies des femmes*. Vol. 1. Paris: Belles Lettres.
- Burnet, John, ed. 1900–1907. *Platonis opera*. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprint: 1967–1968.
- Butcher, S. H. 1903–1931. *Demosthenis orationes*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon. Reprint: 1960–1966.

- Bywater, I. 1894. *Aristotelis ethica Nicomachea*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprint: 1962.
- Caplan, Harry. 1954. [*Cicero*]: *Ad C. Herennium: De Ratione Dicendi*. LCL 403. London: Heinemann.
- Charlesworth, James H., ed. *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. London: Darton, Longman and Todd.
- Clarke, E. G. with W. E. Aufrecht, J. C. Hurd and F. Spitzer. 1984. *Targum Pseudo-Jonathan of the Pentateuch: Text and Concordance*. Hoboken: Ktav.
- Hubbell, H. M. 1949. *Cicero: De Inventione; De optimo genere oratorum; Topica*. LCL 386. London: Heinemann.
- Cohon, J. W. and H. Lamar Crosby. 1932–1951. *Dio Chrysostom*. 5 vols. LCL 257, 339, 358, 376, 385. London: Heinemann.
- Colson, F. H. and G. H. Whitaker. 1929–1962. *Philo*. 12 vols. LCL 226, 227, 247, 261, 275, 289, 320, 341, 363, 379, 380, 401. London: Heinemann.
- Copenhaver, Brian P. 1992. *Hermetica: the Greek Corpus Hermeticum and the Latin Asclepius*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cowley, A. E. with K. C. Hanson. 2005. *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* Eugene: Wipf and Stock. Original publication date, 1923.
- Danby, Herbert. 1933. *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- De Jonge, Marinus. 1978. *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*. PVTG 1.2. Leiden: Brill.
- Ehrman, Bart D. 2003. *The Apostolic Fathers*. LCL 24–25. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Elliger, K. and W. Rudolph, ed. 1997. *Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia*. 5th ed. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Epstein, Isidore, ed. 1935. *The Babylonian Talmud*. 35 vols. London: Soncino Press.
- Evans, Ernest. 1972. *Tertullian: Adversus Marcionem*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Fairclough, H. Rushton. 1929. *Horace: Satires, Epistles and Ars Poetica*. LCL 194. London: Heinemann.
- Fischer, K. T. and F. Vogel. 1906. *Diodori bibliotheca historica*. 5 vols. 3rd edn. Leipzig: Teubner. Reprint: Stuttgart, 1964.
- Fowler, Harold North. 1913. *Plato: Euthyphro; Apology; Crito; Phaedo; Phaedrus*. LCL 36. London: Heinemann.
- Freese, John Henry. 1926. *Aristotle: The 'Art' of Rhetoric*. Trans. John Henry Freese. LCL 193. London: Heinemann.
- Früchtel, L., O. Stählin and U. Treu. 1960–1970. *Clemens Alexandrinus*. 3 vols. Vol 2, 3rd ed. Vol. 3, 2nd ed. GCS 52. Berlin: Akademie.
- Gaselee, Stephen. 1977. *The Golden Ass: Being the Metamorphoses of Lucius Apuleius*. LCL 44. London: Heinemann.
- Geffcken, J. 1902. *Die Oracula Sibyllina*. GCS 8. Leipzig: Hinrichs. Accessed via

- Accordance Bible Software 9.1.1.
- Godley, A. D. 1981–1982. *Herodotus*. 4 vols. LCL 117-120. London: Heinemann.
- Grant, Robert McQueen. 1997. *Irenaeus of Lyons*. The Early Church Fathers. London/New York: Routledge.
- Grenfell, Bernard P. *et al.*, ed. 1898–. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. 77 vols. Egypt Exploration Society.
- Gummere, Richard M. 1953. *Seneca: Ad Lucilium epistulae morales*. 3 vols. LCL 75–77. London: Heinemann.
- Halliwell, Stephen, Donald Russell, and Doreen C. Innes. 1995. *Aristotle, Longinus, and Demetrius: Poetics; On the Sublime; On Style*. LCL 199. London: Heinemann.
- Harl, M., H.-I. Marrou, C. Matray and C. Mondésert. 1960.–1970. *Clément d'Alexandrie: Le pédagogue*. 3 vols. SC 70, 108, 158. Paris: Cerf.
- Hayward, Robert. 1987. *The Targum of Jeremiah: Translated, with a Critical Introduction, Apparatus and Notes*. The Aramaic Bible 12. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Herzer, Jens. 2005. *4 Baruch (Paraleipomena Jeremiou)*. Writings from the Greco-Roman World 22. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Jacoby, K., L. Radermacher and H. Usener. 1885–1905. *Dionysii Halicarnasei antiquitatum Romanarum quae supersunt*. 5 vols. Leipzig: Teubner. Reprint: Stuttgart, 1965, 1967.
- Jenkins, C. 1908. "Documents: Origen on I Corinthians," *JTS* 9–10 (1908): 9:232-247, 353-372, 500-514; 10:29-51.
- Jones, H. S. and J. E. Powell. 1942. *Thucydidis historiae*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprint: 1967–1970.
- Kassel, R, ed. 1965. *Aristotelis de arte poetica liber*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Accessed via TLG.
- Kennedy, George A. 2007. *Aristotle On Rhetoric: A Theory of Civic Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klein, G. 1909. *Der älteste christliche Katechismus und die jüdische Propaganda-Literature*. Berlin: G. Reimer.
- Kock, T. 1884. *Comicorum Atticorum fragmenta*. Vol. 2. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Koetschau, Paul, Erich Klostermann, Erwin Preuschen and W. A. Baehrens. 1899-1955. *Origenes Werke*. 12 vols. GCS 2, 3, 6, 10, 22, 29, 30, 33, 35, 38, 40, 41. Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Kovacs, David. 1995. *Euripides: Children of Heracles; Hippolytus; Andromache; Hecuba*. LCL 484. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- . 2002. *Euripides: Bacchae; Iphigenia at Aulis; Rhesus*. LCL 495. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Lake, Kirsopp and J. E. L. Oulton. 1926–1932. *Eusebius Ecclesiastical History*. 2 vols. LCL 153, 265. London: Heinemann.
- Littré, É. 1839–1861. *Oeuvres complètes d'Hippocrate*. 9 vols. Paris: Baillière. Reprint:

- Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1961–1973.
- Lulofs, H. J. Drossaart. 1965. *Aristotelis de generatione animalium*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprint: 1972.
- Lutz, C.E. 1947. *Musonius Rufus: The Roman Socrates*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- MacDonald, C. 1977. *Cicero: In Catilinam I-IV; Pro Murena; Pro Sulla; Pro Flacco*. LCL 324. London: Heinemann.
- Malingrey, A. M. 1980. *Jean Chrysostome: Sur le sacerdoce*. SC 272. Paris: Cerf.
- Marchant, E. C. 1900–1920. *Xenophontis opera omnia*. 5 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprint: 1961–1971.
- Mayhoff, Karl Friedrich Theodor. 1807–1869. *C. Plini Secundi Naturalis historiae libri XXXVI*. Teubner. Stuttgart: Teubner.
- McNamara, Martin, Robert Hayward and Michael Maher. 1994. *Tergum Neofiti I: Exodus; Targum Pseudo-Jonathan: Exodus*. The Aramaic Bible 2. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.
- Meineke, A. *Strabonis geographica*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Migne, J.-P. 1857-1886. *Patrologiae cursus completus (series Graeca)*. 162 vols. Paris: Migne.
- Miller, Walter, Carleton L. Brownson, O. J. Todd and E. C. Marchant. 1914–1956. *Xenophon*. 7 vols. LCL 51–52, 88–90, 168, 183. London: Heinemann.
- Most, Glenn. 2006–2007. *Hesiod*. 2 vols. LCL 57, 503. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Neusner, Jacob. 1977–1986. *The Tosefta*. 6 vols. New York: Ktav.
- . 1985. *Genesis Rabbah: The Judaic Commentary to the Book of Genesis*. 3 vols. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- . 1988. *The Mishnah: A New Translation*. London: Yale University Press.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. 2001–2012. *1 Enoch*. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Norlin, George. 1928–1945. *Isocrates*. 3 vols. LCL 209, 229, 273. London: Heinemann.
- Norman, A. F. 1969–1977. *Libanius: Selected Orations*. LCL 451, 452. London: Heinemann.
- Noy, David, Hanswulf Bloedhorn, and Alexander Panayotov, ed. 2004. *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis*. 3 vols. TSAJ 99, 101, 102. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Oldfather, W. A. 1925-1928. *Epictetus: The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, the Manual, and Fragments*. 2 vols. LCL 131, 218. London: Heinemann.
- O'Neil, Edward N. 1977. *Teles the Cynic Teacher*. Missoula: Scholars Press.
- Paton, W. R. et al. 1925-1978. *Plutarchi moralia*. Teubner. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Perry, Ben Edwin. 1952. *Aesopica: a Series of Texts Relating to Aesop or Ascribed to him or Closely Connected with the Literary Tradition that Bears his Name*. Vol. 1: *Greek and Latin Texts*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Qimron, Elisha and John Strugnell. 1994. *Qumran Cave 4 V: Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*. DJD 10. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rahlfs, Alfred and Robert Hanhart. 2006. *Septuaginta: id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft. Original publication date, 1935.
- Reynolds, Joyce and Robert Tannenbaum. 1987. *Jews and God-fearers at Aphrodisias: Greek inscriptions with Commentary*. CPS Sup 12. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Ribera Florit, Josep. 1992. *Targum Jonatán des los Profetas Posteriores en Tradición Babilónica: Jeremías*. CSIC. Madrid: Instituto de Filología des CSIC.
- Roberts, Alexander and James Donaldson, ed. 1885–1887. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*. 10 vols. Reprint, Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Rolfe, J. C. 1913–1914. Suetonius. 2 vols. LCL 31, 38. London: Heinemann.
- Ross, W. D. 1957. *Aristotelis politica*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. Reprint: 1964.
- . 1959. *Aristotelis ars rhetorica*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1964. *Aristotelis analytica priora et posteriora*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rousseau, Adelin and Louis Doutreleau. 1979. *Irénée de Lyon: Contre les hérésies, livre I*. SC 263. Paris: Cerf.
- Russell, Donald A. 2001. *Quintilian: The Orator's Education*. 5 vols. LCL 124–127, 494. London: Heinemann.
- Sandbach, F. H. 1972. *Menandri reliquiae selectae*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Schenkl, H. 1916. *Epicteti dissertationes ab Arriano digestae*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Schmidt, Francis. 1986. *Le Testament grec d'Abraham: introduction, édition critique des deux recensions grecques, traduction*. TSAJ 11. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Spiro, F. 1903. *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*. 3 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Stone, Michael Edward. 1990. *Fourth Ezra*. Ed. Frank Moore Cross. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Storr, Francis and Hugh Lloyd-Jones. 1912–1996. *Sophocles*. 3 vols. LCL 20, 21, 483. London: Heinemann.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. 1914. Appendix: The Letter of Aristeas. Pages 531–606 in *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Ed. H. B. Swete. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thackeray, H. St. J. et al. 1926–1965. *Josephus*. 10 vols. LCL 186, 203, 210, 242, 281, 326, 365, 410, 433, 456. London: Heinemann.
- Theodor, J. and Ch. Albeck. 1996. *Bereschit Rabba*. 3 vols. VAWJ. Jerusalem: Shalem.
- Tredennick, Hugh and E. S. Forster. 1960. *Aristotle: Posterior Analytics; Topica*. LCL 391. London: Heinemann.
- Willis, William H. et al., ed. 1982–. "Duke Databank of Documentary Papyri." Accessed online via <http://www.papyri.info/>.
- Wise, Michael O., Martin G. Abegg, Jr. and Edward M. Cook, ed. 1996. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: A New Translation*. San Francisco: Harper. Accessed via Accordance

Bible Software 9.1.1.

- von Arnim, J. 1893–1896. *Dionis Prusaensis quem vocant Chrysostomum quae exstant omnia*. 2 vols. 2nd edn. Berlin: Weidmann. Reprint: 1962.
- . 1903. *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta*. Vol. 3. Leipzig: Teubner.
- von der Mühl, P. 1962. *Homeri Odyssea*. Basel: Helbing & Lichtenhahn.
- von Tischendorf, C. 1866. *Apocalypses Apocryphae*. Leipzig: Mendelssohn.
- Wahl, Otto, ed. 1977. *Apocalypsis Esdrae, Apocalypsis Sedrach; Visio Beati Esdrae*. PVTG 4. Leiden: Brill.
- Zangemeister, Karl Friedrich Wilhelm. 1882. *Pauli Orosii Historiarum adversum Paganos libri VII*. CSEL 5. Vindobonae: C. Geroldi Filium.
- Ziegler, K. 1964–1971. *Plutarchi vitae parallelae*. 3 vols. Vol 1.1, 4th ed. Vol 1.2, 3rd ed. Vol 2–3, 2nd ed. Leipzig: Teubner.

## Secondary Literature

- Aasgaard, Reidar. 1997. Brotherhood in Plutarch and Paul: its Role and Character. In *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as a Social Reality and Metaphor*. Pages 166–182. Ed. Halvor Moxnes. London: Routledge.
- . 2004. *My Beloved Brothers and Sisters!: Christian Siblingship in Paul*. JSNTSup 265. London: T & T Clark.
- Adams, Edward. 2006. The "Coming of God" Tradition and its Influence on New Testament Parousia Texts. In *Biblical Traditions in Transmission: Essays in Honour of Michael A. Knibb*. Pages 1–19. Ed. Charlotte Hempel and Judith M. Lieu. SJSJ 111. Leiden: Brill.
- Aejmelaes, Lars. 1985. *Wachen vor dem Ende: die traditionsgeschichtlichen Wurzeln von I Thess 5: 1-11 und Luk 21: 34-36*. SESJ 44. Helsinki: Kirjapaino Raamattutalo.
- Aitken, Ellen Bradshaw. 1997. τὰ δρώμενα καὶ τὰ λεγόμενα: The Eucharistic Memory of Jesus' Words in First Corinthians. *HTR* 90 (4): 359-370.
- Albl, Martin C. 1999. *And Scripture Cannot be Broken: the Form and Function of the Early Christian Testimonia Collections*. NovTSup 96. Leiden: Brill.
- Alexander, P. S. 1998. 'Homer the Prophet of All' and 'Moses our Teacher': Late Antique Exegesis of the Homeric Epics and of the Torah of Moses. In *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*. Pages 127–142. Ed. L. V. Rutgers, P. W. van der Horst, H. W. Haverlaar, and L. Teugels. CBET 22. Leuven: Peeters.
- Alexandre, Monique. 1967. La Culture Profane chez Philon. In *Philon D'Alesandrie: Lyon 11-15 Septembre 1966*. Pages 105–129. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Alexandre Jr., Manuel. 1998. *Rhetorical Argumentation in Philo of Alexandria*. BJS 322; SPhilo Monographs 2. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Anderson Jr., R. Dean. 1996. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. CBET 17. Kampen: Kok Pharos.
- Ascough, Richard S. 2003. *Paul's Macedonian Associations: The Social Context of*

- Philippians and 1 Thessalonians*. WUNT 2:161. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2004. A Question of Death: Paul's Community-building Language in 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18. *JBL* 123 (3): 509-530.
- Asher, Jeffrey R. 2000. *Polarity and Change in 1 Corinthians 15: A Study of Metaphysics, Rhetoric, and Resurrection*. HUT 42. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Ashton, John. 2000. *The Religion of Paul the Apostle*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Aune, David Edward. 1983. *Prophecy in Early Christianity and the Ancient Mediterranean World*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Baltensweiler, Heinrich. 1963. Erwägungen zu I Thess 4:3-8. *TZ* 19 (1): 1-13.
- Barclay, John M. G. 1993. Conflict in Thessalonica. *CBQ* 55 (3): 512-530.
- . 1996. 'Do we undermine the Law?': A Study of Romans 14.1–15.6. In *Paul and the Mosaic Law*. Pages 287–308. Ed. James D. G. Dunn. WUNT 89. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 1997. The Family as the Bearer of Religion in Judaism and Early Christianity. In *Constructing Early Christian Families: Family as a Social Reality and Metaphor*. Pages 66–80. Ed. Halvor Moxnes. London: Routledge.
- . 2003. 'That You May Not Grieve like the Rest who Have no Hope' (1 Thess 4:13): Death and Early Christian Identity. In *Not in the Word Alone: The First Epistle to the Thessalonians*. Pages 131–153. Ed. Morna D. Hooker. *SMBen: Biblical-Ecumenical Section* 15. Rome: Benedictina.
- . 2005. The Empire Writes Back: Josephan Rhetoric in Flavian Rome. In *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Pages 315–332. Ed. Johnathan Edmondson, Steve Mason, and James Rives. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2007a. *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*. Vol. 10: Against Apion, Translation and Commentary. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2007b. Snarling Sweetly: Josephus on Images and Idolatry. In *Idolatry: False Worship in the Bible, Early Judaism and Christianity*. Pages 73–87. Ed. Stephen C. Barton. London: T & T Clark.
- Barclay, William. 1959. *Educational Ideals in the Ancient World*. London: Collins.
- Barentsen, Jack. 2009. Pre-Pauline Leadership and Pauline Constitution in the Roman Church: An Alternative Interpretation of Romans 12 and 16. In *The Letter to the Romans*. Pages 595–616. Ed. Udo Schnelle. *BETL* 266. Leuven: Peeters.
- Barker, Larry L. and Deborah Roach Gaut. 2002. *Communication*. 8th ed. London: Allyn and Bacon.
- Barrett, C. K. 1962. *From First Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology*. London: Adam & Charles Black.
- . 1968. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. BNTC. London: Adam & Charles Black.
- . 1978. Shaliah and Apostle. In *Donum Gentilicium: New Testament Studies in Honor of David Daube*. Pages 88–102. Ed. Ernst Bammel and C. K. Barrett. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- . 1991. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2nd ed. BNTC. London: A &

- C Black.
- Barth, Gerhard. 1982. Pistis in hellenistischer Religiosität. *ZNW* 73 (1-2): 110–126.
- Barton, John. 1980. *Amos's Oracles against the Nations: A study of Amos 1.3-2.5*. SOTSMS 6. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baslez, Marie-Françoise. 2010. La Conversion al Cristianismo en los Tres Primeros Siglos. *ScrTh* 42:695-718.
- Bauer, Thomas Johann. 2011. *Paulus und die kaiserzeitliche Epistolographie: Kontextualisierung und Analyse der Briefe an Philemon und an die Galater*. WUNT 276. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Baur, Ferdinand Christian. 1875. *Paul the Apostle of Jesus Christ: his Life and Work, his Epistles and his Doctrine*. Vol. 2. 2nd ed. Trans. Eduard Zeller. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Beare, F. W. 1959. On the Interpretation of Romans VI. 17. *NTS* 5 (3): 206-210.
- Beasley-Murray, George Raymond. 1967. *Baptism in the New Testament*. Biblical and Theological Classics Library. Carlisle: Paternoster.
- Becker, Jürgen. 1993. *Paul: Apostle to the Gentiles*. Trans. O. C. Dean. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Beker, Johan Christiaan. 1980. *Paul the Apostle: The Triumph of God in Life and Thought*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Belli, Filippo. 2010. *Argumentation and Use of Scripture in Romans 9-11*. AnBib 183. Roma: Gregorian & Biblical Press.
- Bengel, Johan Albrecht. 1835. *Gnomon Novi Testamenti*. Vol. 2. 3rd ed. Ed. Ernst Bengel and Johann Christian F. Steudel. 2 vols. Tübingen: Ludov. Frid. Fues.
- Berger, Klaus. 1972. *Die Gesetzesauslegung Jesu: Ihr historischer Hintergrund im Judentum und im Alten Testament*. Vol. 1: *Markus und Parallelen*. WMANT 40. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- . 1977. Almosen für Israel: Zum historischen Kontext der paulinischen Kollekte. *NTS* 23 (2): 180-204.
- Best, Ernest. 1972. *A Commentary on the First and Second Epistles to the Thessalonians*. BNTC. London: Adam & Charles Black.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. 1975. The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians. *NTS* 21 (3): 353-379.
- . 1978. De Fraternali Amore (Moralia 478A-492D). In *Plutarch's Ethical Writings and Early Christian Literature*. Pages 231-263. Ed. Hans Dieter Betz. SCHNT 4. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1985. *2 Corinthians 8 and 9*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- . 1994. Transferring a Ritual: Paul's Interpretation of Baptism in Romans 6. In *Paul in his Hellenistic Context*. Pages 84–118. Ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen. Studies of the New Testament and its World. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- . 1995. *The Sermon on the Mount*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Betz, Otto. 1990. Das Mahl des Herrn bei Paulus. In *Jesus, der Herr der Kirche: Aufsätze*

- zur biblischen Theologie II. Pages 217–251. Ed. Otto Betz. WUNT 52. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Bjerkelund, Carl J. 1967. *Parakalô: Form, Funktion und Sinn der parakalô-Sätze in den paulinischen Briefen*. Bibliotheca theologica Norvegica 1. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Black, Matthew. 1973. *Romans*. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants.
- Bloedhorn, Hanswulf and Gil Hüttenmeister. 1999. The Synagogue. In *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Vol. 3. Pages 267–297. Ed. William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Blumenthal, Christian. 2005. Was sagt 1 Thess 1.9b-10 über die Adressaten des 1 Thess? Literarische und historische Erwägungen. *NTS* 51 (1): 96-105.
- Bockmuehl, Markus N. A. 1990. *Revelation and mystery in ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT 2:36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 1991. "The Trumpet Shall Sound": Shofar Symbolism and its Reception in Early Christianity. In *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple Presented to Ernst Bammel*. Pages 199–225. Ed. W. Horbury. JSNTSup 48. Sheffield Academic Press.
- . 2000. *Jewish Law in Gentile Churches: Halakhah and the Beginning of Christian Public Ethics*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- . 2001. 1 Thessalonians 2:14-16 and the Church in Jerusalem. *TynBul* 52 (1): 1-31.
- . 2008. The Conversion of Desire in St. Paul's Hermeneutics. In *The Word Leaps the Gap: Essays on Scripture and Theology in Honor of Richard B. Hays*. Pages 498–513. Ed. J. Ross Wagner, C. Kavin Rowe, and A. Katherine Grieb. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 2009. The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of Biblical Commentary. In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literatur*. Pages 3–29. Ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2010. *The Remembered Peter: in Ancient Reception and Modern Debate*. WUNT 262. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- de Boer, Martinus C. 1988. *The Defeat of Death: Apocalyptic Eschatology in 1 Corinthians 15 and Romans 5*. JSNTSup 22. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Boers, Hendrikus. 2001. The Structure and Meaning of Romans 6:1-14. *CBQ* 63 (4): 664-682.
- Bohlen, Maren. 2011. *Sanctorum communio: die Christen als "Heilige" bei Paulus*. BZNW 183. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Bonhöffer, Alfred. 1911. *Epiktet und das Neue Testament*. RVV 10. Gießen: Töpelman.
- Bonner, Stanley F. 1977. *Education in Ancient Rome: From the elder Cato to the younger Pliny*. London: Methuen & Co.
- Bonsirven, Joseph. 1939. *Exégèse Rabbiniqne et Exégèse Paulinienne*. BTH. Paris: Beauchesne.

- Bookidis, Nancy. 2005. Religion in Corinth: 146 B.C.E. to 1000 C.E. In *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth*. Pages 141–164. Ed. Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen. HTS 53. Cambridge: Harvard Divinity School.
- Bornkamm, Günther. 1952. Zum Verständnis des Gottesdienstes. In *Das Ende des Gesetzes: Paulusstudien*. Pages 113–132. BEvT 16. München: Kaizer.
- . 1991. The Letter to the Romans as Paul's Last Will and Testament. In *The Romans Debate*. Revised and expanded ed. Pages 16–28. Ed. Karl P. Donfried. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. Original publication date, 1963.
- Bosman, Philip. 2003. *Conscience in Philo and Paul: A Conceptual History of the Synoida Word Group*. WUNT 2:166. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Botermann, Helga. 1996. *Das Judenedikt des Kaisers Claudius: Römischer Staat und Christiani im 1. Jahrhundert*. HE 71. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Botha, Pieter J. J. 2004. Cognition, Orality-Literacy, and Approaches to First-Century Writings. In *Orality, Literacy, and Colonialism in Antiquity*. Pages 37–63. Ed. Jonathan A. Draper. SemeiaSt 47. Leiden: Brill.
- Boyarin, Daniel. 1994. *A Radical Jew: Paul and the Politics of Identity*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Börschel, Regina. 2001. *Die Konstruktion einer christlichen Identität: Paulus und die Gemeinde von Thessalonich in ihrer hellenistisch-römischen Umwelt*. BBB 128. Berlin: Philo.
- Böttrich, Christfried. 1999. 'Ihr seid der Tempel Gottes': Tempelmetaphorik und Gemeinde bei Paulus. In *Gemeinde ohne Tempel = Community Without Temple: zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im Alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum*. Pages 411–425. Ed. Beate Ego, Armin Lange, and Peter Pilhofer. WUNT 118. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Breytenbach, Cilliers. 1989. *Versöhnung: eine Studie zur paulinischen Soteriologie*. WMANT 60. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- . 2003. 'Christus starb für uns'. Zur Tradition und paulinischen Rezeption der sogenannten 'Sterbeformeln'. *NTS* 49 (4): 447–475.
- Brockhaus, Ulrich. 1975. *Charisma und Amt: die paulinische Charismenlehre auf dem Hintergrund der frühchristlichen Gemeindefunktionen*. 2nd ed. Wuppertal: R. Brockhaus.
- Brookins, Tim. 2011. The Wise Corinthians: Their Stoic Education and Outlook. *JTS* 62 (1): 50–76.
- Brown, Derek R. 2011. The God of this Age: Satan in the Churches and Letters of the Apostle Paul. PhD dissertation, University of Edinburgh.
- Bruce, F. F. 1982. *1 & 2 Thessalonians*. WBC. Waco, TX: Word Books.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. 1910. *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*. FRLANT 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1952. *Theology of the New Testament*. 2 vols. London: SCM.
- . 1953. New Testament and Mythology. In *Kerygma and Myth*. Pages 1–44. Trans.

- Reginald H. Fuller. London: SPCK.
- . 1967. Glossen im Römerbrief. In *Exegetica: Aufsätze zur Erforschung des Neuen Testaments*. Pages 278–284. Ed. Erich Dinkler. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. Original publication date, 1947.
- Bultmann, Rudolf and Artur Weiser. 1968. πιστεύω κτλ. *TDNT* 5:174–228.
- Burgoon, Michael, Frank G. Hunsaker, and Edwin J. Dawson. 1994. *Human Communication*. 3rd ed. London: Sage.
- Burke, Trevor J. 2003. *Family Matters: A Socio-Historical Study of Kinship Metaphors in 1 Thessalonians*. JSNTSup 247. London: T & T Clark International.
- . 2011. The Holy Spirit as the Controlling Dynamic in Paul's Role as Missionary to the Thessalonians. In *Paul as Missionary: Identity, Activity, Theology, and Practice*. Pages 142-157. Ed. Trevor J. Burke and Brian S. Rosner. LNTS 420. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Burkert, Walter. 1987. *Greek Religion: Archaic and Classical*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Burnyeat, M. F. 1994. Enthymeme: Aristotle on the Logic of Persuasion. In *Aristotle's Rhetoric: Philosophical Essays*. Pages 3–55. Ed. David J. Furley and Alexander Nehamas. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1996. Enthymeme: Aristotle on the Rationality of Rhetoric. In *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Pages 88–115. Ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. Philosophical Traditions 4. London: University of California Press.
- Busch, Austin. 2004. The Figure of Eve in Romans 7:5-25. *BibInt* 12 (1): 1-36.
- Bussmann, Claus. 1971. *Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionsliteratur*. Europäische Hochschulschriften. Bern: Lang.
- Büchsel, F. and O. Procksch. 1967. λύω κτλ. *TDNT* 4:328–356.
- Byrne, Brendan. 1996. *Romans*. SP 6. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Calhoun, Robert Matthew. 2011. *Paul's Definitions of the Gospel in Romans 1*. WUNT 2:316. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Calvin, John. 1996. *Calvin's Commentaries (Complete)*. Trans. John King. Grand Rapids: Baker Books. Original publication date, 1548.
- Camp, Claudia. 2004. Oralities, Literacies, and Colonialisms in Antiquity and Contemporary Scholarship. In *Orality, Literacy, and Colonialism in Antiquity*. Pages 193–217. Ed. Jonathan A. Draper. SemeiaSt 47. Leiden: Brill.
- Campbell, Douglas A. 2009. *The Deliverance of God: An Apocalyptic Rereading of Justification in Paul*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Campbell, J. Y. 1948. The Origin and Meaning of the Christian use of the word ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑ. *JTS* 49 (2): 130-142.
- Capes, David B. 1992. *Old Testament Yahweh Texts in Paul's Christology*. WUNT 2:47. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Caragounis, Chrys C. 1996. "Fornication" and "Concession"? Interpreting 1 Cor 7,1-7. In *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Pages 543–559. Ed. Reimund Bieringer. BETL

125. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 1998. From Obscurity to Prominence: The Development of the Roman Church between Romans and *1 Clement*. In *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*. Pages 245–279. Ed. Karl P. Donfried and Peter Richardson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Carras, George P. 1990. Jewish Ethics and Gentile Converts: Remarks on 1 Thess 4, 3-8. In *The Thessalonian Correspondence*. Pages 306–315. Ed. Raymond F. Collins. BETL 87. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Carrington, Philip. 1940. *The Primitive Christian Catechism: A Study in the Epistles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Castelli, Elizabeth A. 1991. *Imitating Paul: a Discourse of Power*. Literary Currents in Biblical Interpretation. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Chanotis, Angelos. 2002. The Jews of Aphrodisias: New Evidence and Old Problems. *Scripta Classica Israelica* 21:209-242.
- Chapa, Juan. 1990. Conciliatory Patterns? 1 Thess 4,13.18; 5,11. In *The Thessalonian Correspondence*. Pages 220–228. Ed. Raymond F. Collins. BETL 87. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Chapple, Allan Leslie. 1984. Local Leadership in the Pauline Churches: Theological and Social Factors in its Development, a Study Based on 1 Thessalonians, Corinthians and Philippians. PhD dissertation; Durham University
- Chester, Andrew. 2007. The Christ of Paul. In *Redemption and Resistance: the Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity*. Pages 109–121. Ed. Markus N A Bockmuehl and James Carleton Paget. London: T & T Clark.
- Chester, Stephen J. 2003. *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church*. London: T & T Clark.
- Cheung, Alex T. 1999. *Idol Food in Corinth: Jewish Background and Pauline Legacy*. JSNTSup 176. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Chow, John K. 1992. *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth*. JSNTSup 75. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Classen, Carl Joachim. 1991. Paulus und die antike Rhetorik. *ZNW* 81 (1-2): 1-33.
- Collins, John J. 1998. *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Collins, Raymond F., ed. 1984a. *Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians*. BETL 66. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 1984b. Tradition, Redaction, and Exhortation in 1 Thess 4,13-5,11. In *Studies on the First Letter to the Thessalonians*. Pages 154–172. Ed. Raymond F. Collins. BETL 66. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 1998. The Function of Paraenesis in 1 Thess 4,1-12; 5,12-22. *ETL* 74 (4): 398-414.
- Collins, Raymond F. and Daniel J. Harrington. 1999. *First Corinthians*. SP 7. Collegeville, Minn.: Liturgical Press.
- Conzelmann, Hans. 1975. *1 Corinthians: a Commentary on the First Epistle to the*

- Corinthians*. Ed. James Waterson Leitch, George W. MacRae, and James W. Dunkly. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Cook, John Granger. 2006. Pagan Philosophers and 1 Thessalonians. *NTS* 52 (4): 514-532.
- Coppins, Wayne. 2010. Doing Justice to the Two Perspectives of 1 Corinthians 15:1-11. *Neot* 44 (2): 282-291.
- Corbeill, Anthony. 2002. Rhetorical Education in Cicero's Youth. In *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. Pages 23–48. Ed. James M. May. Leiden: Brill.
- Cotter, Wendy J. 1993. *Our Politeuma is in Heaven: The Meaning of Phil 3.17-21*. In *Origins and Method: Towards a New Understanding of Judaism and Christianity. Essays in Honour of John C. Hurd*. Pages 92–104. Ed. Bradley H. McLean. JSNTSup 86. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Coulot, Claude. 2006a. À la Venue du Seigneur (1 Th 4,13-18). *RevScRel* 80 (4): 499-509.
- . 2006b. Paul à Thessalonique (1Th 2.1-12). *NTS* 52 (3): 377-393.
- Cozijnsen, Bert. 1998. A Critical Contribution to the *Corpus Hellenisticum Novi Testamenti*: Jude and Hesiod. In *The Use of Sacred Books in the Ancient World*. Pages 79–109. Ed. L. V. Rutgers, P. W. van der Horst, H. W. Haverlaar, and L. Teugels. CBET 22. Leuven: Peeters.
- Cranfield, C. E. B. 1975-1979. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans*. 2 vols. London: T & T Clark.
- Crook, Zeba A. 2004. *Reconceptualising Conversion: Patronage, Loyalty and Conversion in the Religions of the Ancient Mediterranean*. BZNTW 130. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Crouch, James E. 1972. *The Origin and Intention of the Colossian Haustafel*. FRLANT 109. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Cullmann, Oscar. 1943. *Les Premières Confessions de Roi Chrétiennes*. Pages 84. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Dahl, Nils Alstrup. 1977. The One God of Jews and Gentiles. In *Studies in Paul: Theology for the Early Christian Mission*. Pages 178–191. Minneapolis: Augsburg.
- Danby, Herbert. 1933. *The Mishnah: Translated from the Hebrew with Introduction and Brief Explanatory Notes*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Das, A. Andrew. 2007. *Solving the Romans Debate*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Daube, David. 1949. Rabbinic Methods of Interpretation and Hellenistic Rhetoric. *HUCA* 22:239-264.
- Dautzenberg, Gerhard. 1975. *Urchristliche Prophetie: ihre Erforschung, ihre Voraussetzungen im Judentum und ihre Struktur im ersten Korintherbrief*. BWANT 104. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- Day, Peggy L. 1988. *An Adversary in Heaven: sātān in the Hebrew Bible*. Harvard Semitic Monographs 43. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Debanné, Marc J. 2006. *Enthymemes in the Letters of Paul*. LNTS 303. London: T & T Clark International.

- Deidun, T. J. 1981. *New Covenant Morality in Paul*. AnBib 89. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.
- Deissmann, Adolf. 1926. *Paul: A Study in Social and Religious History*. 2nd revised and enlarged ed. Trans. William E. Wilson. London: Hodder and Stoughton. Original publication date, 1911.
- DeMaris, Richard E. 1995. Corinthian Religion and Baptism for the Dead (1 Corinthians 12:29): Insights from Archaeology and Anthropology. *JBL* 144 (4): 661-682.
- Deming, Will. 1995. *Paul on Marriage and Celibacy: the Hellenistic Background of 1 Corinthians 7*. SNTSMS 83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Demke, Christoph. 1976. "Ein Gott und viele Herren": Die Verkündigung des einen Gottes in den Briefen des Paulus. *EvT* 36:473-484.
- Denny, James. 1892. *The Epistle to the Thessalonians*. The Expositor's Bible. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Dibelius, Martin. 1919. *Die Formgeschichte des Evangeliums*. Pages 172. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1934. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Trans. Bertram Lee Woolf. London: Ivor Nicholson and Watson.
- . 1937. *An die Thessalonicher I, II, An die Philipper*. 3rd revised ed. HNT 11. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Dinkler, Erich. 1974. Römer 6,1-14 und das Verhältnis von Taufe und Rechtfertigung bei Paulus. In *Battesimo e giustizia in Rom. 6 e 8*. Pages 83-103. Ed. Michel Bouttier and Lorenzo De Lorenzi. SMBen: Biblical-Ecumenical section 2. Rome: Abbazia di S. Paolo.
- Do, Toan Joseph. 2009. The LXX Background of ἰλαστήριον in Rom 3,25. In *The Letter to the Romans*. Pages 641-658. Ed. Udo Schnelle. BETL 266. Leuven: Peeters.
- Dodd, Brian J. 1999. *Paul's Paradigmatic "I": Personal Example as Literary Strategy*. JSNTSup 177. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Dodd, C. H. 1932. *The Epistle of Paul to the Romans*. MNTS. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- . 1936. *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments: Three Lectures with an Appendix on Eschatology and History*. Pages 240. London: Hodder and Stoughton.
- Doering, Lutz. 2009. First Peter as an Early Christian Diaspora Letter. In *The Catholic Epistles and Apostolic Tradition*. Pages 441-457. Ed. Karl-Wilhelm Niebuhr and Robert W Wall. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- . 2012. *Ancient Jewish Letters and the Beginnings of Christian Epistolography*. WUNT 298. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Donfried, Karl Paul. 1991. False Presuppositions in the Study of Romans. In *The Romans Debate*. Revised and expanded. Pages 102-125. Ed. Karl Paul Donfried. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. Original publication date, 1974.
- . 1991. A Short Note on Romans 16. In *The Romans Debate*. Revised and expanded. Pages 44-52. Ed. Karl Paul Donfried. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.

Original publication date, 1970.

- Downing, F. Gerald. 2010. Ambiguity, Ancient Semantics, and Faith. *NTS* 56 (1): 136-162.
- Draper, Jonathan A. 2008. Vice Catalogues as Oral-Mnemonic Cues: A Comparative Study of the Two Ways Tradition in the Didache and Parallels from the Perspective of Oral Tradition. In *Jesus, the Voice, and the Text: Beyond The Oral and the Written Gospel*. Pages 111–133. Ed. Tom Thatcher. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Dungan, David L. 1971. *The Sayings of Jesus in the Churches of Paul: The Use of the Synoptic Tradition in the Regulation of Early Church Life*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Dunn, James D. G. 1970. *Baptism in the Holy Spirit: A Re-Examination of the New Testament Teaching on the Gift of the Spirit*. SBT 15. London: SCM.
- . 1977. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*. London: SCM.
- . 1983. The Incident at Antioch (Gal. 2:11-18). *JSNT* 18:3-57.
- . 1988. *Romans*. 2 vols. WBC 38ab. Waco: Word Books.
- . 1995. *I Corinthians*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- . 1998. *The Theology of Paul the Apostle*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Dunson, Ben C. 2012. *Individual and Community in Paul's Letter to the Romans*. WUNT 2:332. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Dupont, Jacques. 1952. "Avec le Christ" dans la vie future. Vol. 1: *ΣΥΝ ΧΡΙΣΤΩΙ: L'union avec le Christ suivant saint Paul*. Bruges: Éditions de l'Abbaye de Saint-André.
- Eastman, Susan Grove. 2010. Israel and the Mercy of God: A Rereading of Galatians 6.16 and Romans 9–11. *NTS* 56 (3): 367–395.
- Eckert, Jost. 1981. Die Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem. In *Kontinuität und Einheit: für Franz Mussner*. Pages 65–80. Ed. Paul-Gerhard Müller and Werner Stenger. Freiburg; Basel; Wien: Herder.
- Eckstein, Hans-Joachim. 1983. *Der Begriff Syneidesis bei Paulus: eine neutestamentlich-exegetische Untersuchung zum "Gewissensbegriff"*. WUNT 2:10. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Edsall, Benjamin A. 2012. *Kerygma, Catechesis and Other Things We Used to Find: Twentieth-Century Research on Early Christian Teaching since Alfred Seeberg (1903)*. *CBR* 10 (3): 410-441.
- . 2013a. Greco-Roman Costume and Paul's Fraught Argument in 1 Cor 11.2–16. *JGRChJ* 9:forthcoming.
- . 2013b. Paul's Rhetoric of Knowledge: The OYK OIΔATE Question in 1 Corinthians. *NovT* 55 (2): forthcoming.
- Edson, Charles. 1948. Cults of Thessalonica (Macedonia III). *HTR* 41 (3): 153-204.
- Elgvin, Torleif. 1997. "To Master His Own Vessel": 1 Thess 4:4 in Light of New Qumran Evidence. *NTS* 43 (4): 604-619.
- Elliger, Winfried. 1978. *Paulus in Griechenland: Philippi, Thessaloniki, Athen, Korinth*.

- SBS 92/93. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.
- Ellis, E. Earle. 1999. *The Making of the New Testament Documents*. BIS 39. Leiden: Brill.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. 1991. Proclaiming the Lord's Death: 1 Corinthians 11:17-34 and the Forms of Paul's Theological Argument. *SBLSP* 30:592-617.
- . 1996. Is There an Ethical Dimension to Aristotelian Rhetoric? In *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Pages 116–141. Ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. Philosophical Traditions 4. London: University of California Press.
- . 2010. *Cosmology and Self in the Apostle Paul: The Material Spirit*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Eriksson, Anders. 1998. *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians*. ConBNT 29. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Esler, Philip F. 2003. *Conflict and Identity in Romans: the Social Setting of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Evans, C. A. 1993. Ascending and descending with a Shout: Psalm 47:6 and 1 Thessalonians 4:16. In *Paul and the Scriptures of Israel*. Pages 238–253. Ed. C. A. Evans and J. A. Sanders. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Fee, Gordon D. 1987. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1994. *God's Empowering Presence: The Holy Spirit in the Letters of Paul*. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers.
- . 2007. *Pauline Christology: an Exegetical-Theological Study*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- . 2009. *The First and Second Letters to the Thessalonians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Finlan, Stephen. 2004. *The Background and Content of Paul's Cultic Atonement Metaphors*. SBLAB 19. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Finsterbusch, Karin. 1996. *Die Thora als Lebensweisung für Heidenchristen: Studien zur Bedeutung der Thora für die paulinische Ethik*. SUNT 20. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1971. A Feature of Qumran Angelology and the Angles of 1 Cor 11:10. In *Essays on the Semitic Background of the New Testament*. Pages 187–204. London: Geoffrey Chapman.
- . 1981. The New Testament Kyrios and Maranatha and their Aramaic Background. In *To Advance the Gospel: New Testament Studies*. Pages 218–235. New York: Crossroad.
- . 1993. *Romans: a New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 33. New York: Doubleday.
- . 2008. *First Corinthians: a New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 32. London: Yale University Press.
- Forbes, Christopher. 1995. *Prophecy and Inspired Speech in Early Christianity and its Hellenistic environment*. WUNT 2:75. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Foster, Paul. 2007. Review: *Enthymemes in the Letters of Paul* by Marc J. Debanné. *JTS* 50 (2): 660-663.
- Fotopoulos, John. 2003. *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth: a Social-Rhetorical Reconsideration of 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*. *WUNT* 2:151. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2005. Arguments Concerning Food Offered to Idols: Corinthian Quotations and Pauline Refutations in a Rhetorical Partitio (1 Corinthians 8:1-9). *CBQ* 67 (4): 611-631.
- Fraade, Steven D. 2000. To Whom it may Concern: 4QMMT and its Addressee(s). *RevQ* 19 (4): 507-526.
- . 2003. Rhetoric and Hermeneutics in Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah (4QMMT): The Case of the Blessings and Curses. *DSD* 10 (1): 150-161.
- Frame, James Everett. 1912. *Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians*. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- France, R. T. 2007. *The Gospel of Matthew*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Frankemölle, Hubert. 1970. *Das Taufverständnis des Paulus: Taufe, Tod, und Auferstehung nach Röm 6*. Stuttgarter Bibelstudien. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.
- Fredricksen, Paula. 2010. Judaizing the Nations: The Ritual Demands of Paul's Gospel. *NTS* 56 (2): 232-252.
- Fredrickson, David E. 2003. Passionless Sex in 1 Thessalonians 4:4-5. *Word & World* 23 (1): 23-30.
- Frey, Jörg. 2007. Paul's Jewish Identity. In *Jewish Identity in the Greco-Roman World = Jüdische Identität in der griechisch-römischen Welt*. Pages 285-312. Ed. Jörg Frey, Daniel R. Schwartz, and Stephanie Gripentrog. AGJU 71. Leiden: Brill.
- Frid, Bo. 1986. Römer 6:4-5 eis ton thanaton und tō ēomoiōmati tou thanatou autou als Schlüssel zu Röm 6:1-11. *BZ* 30 (2): 188-203.
- Friesen, Stephen J. 2005. Prospects for a Demography of the Pauline Mission: Corinth among the Churches. In *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth*. Pages 351-370. Ed. Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen. HTS 53. Cambridge: Harvard Divinity School.
- . 2010. The Wrong Erastus. In *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. Pages 231-256. Ed. Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters. NovTSup 134. Leiden: Brill.
- Friesen, Steven J., Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters, eds. 2010. *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. NovTSup 134. Leiden: Brill.
- Furnish, Victor Paul. 1968. *Theology and Ethics in Paul*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- . 1972. *The Love Command in the New Testament*. Nashville.
- . 2007. *1 Thessalonians, 2 Thessalonians*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Gadenz, Pablo T. 2009. *Called from the Jews and from the Gentiles: Pauline Ecclesiology in Romans 9-11*. *WUNT* 2:267. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

- Gagnon, Robert A. J. 1993. Heart of Wax and a Teaching that Stamps: ΤΥΠΙΟΣ ΔΙΔΑΧΗΣ (Rom 6:17B) Once More. *JBL* 112 (4): 667-687.
- Gamble, Harry Y. 1977. *The Textual History of the Letter to the Romans: a Study in Textual and Literary Criticism*. SD 42. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 1995. *Books and Readers in the Early Church: A History of Early Christian Texts*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Garland, David E. 2003. *1 Corinthians*. BECNT. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Gathercole, Simon J. 2002. *Where is Boasting?: Early Jewish Soteriology and Paul's Response in Romans 1-5*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 2011. Paul's Christology. In *The Blackwell Companion to Paul*. Pages 172–187. Ed. Stephen Westerholm. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. 1986. Galatians 1 and 2: Autobiography as Paradigm. *Novum testamentum* 28 (4): 309-326.
- Gärtner, Bertil. 1965. *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and in the New Testament: a Comparative Study in the Temple Symbolism of the Qumran Texts and the New Testament*. SNTSMS 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Georgi, Dieter. 1994. *Der Armen zu gedenken: die Geschichte der Kollekte des Paulus für Jerusalem*. 2nd ed. Neukirchen: Neukirchener.
- Gerber, Christine. 2005. *Paulus und seine 'Kinder': Studien zur Beziehungsmetaphorik der paulinischen Briefe*. BZNW 136. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Gignac, Alain. 2006. Espaces géographiques et théologiques en Rm 1:1-15 et 15:14-33: Regard narratologique sur la «Topologie» Paulinienne. *BibInt* 14 (4): 385-409.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. 1999. *History, Rhetoric, and Proof: The Menahem Stern Jerusalem Lectures*. London: University Press of New England.
- Glad, Clarence E. 1995. *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy*. NovTSup 81. Leiden: Brill.
- Gooch, Peter D. 1993. *Dangerous Food: 1 Corinthians 8-10 in its Context*. SCJ 5. Waterloo, Ontario: Laurier Univ. Pr..
- Goppelt, Leonhard. 1982. *Typos: The Typological interpretation of the Old Testament in the New*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Graf, Fritz. 2011. Baptism and Graeco–Roman Mystery Cults. In *Abloution, Initiation, and Baptism: Late Antiquity, Early Judaism, and Early Christianity*. Vol. 1. Pages 101–118. Ed. David Hellholm, Tor Vegge, Øyvind Norderval, and Christer Hellholm. 3 vols. BZNW 176. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Grant, Robert M. 1961. Hellenistic Elements in 1 Corinthians. In *Early Christian Origins*. Pages 60–66. Ed. Allen Wikgren. Chicago: Quadrangle Books.
- Gräßer, Erich. 1985. "Ein einziger ist Gott" (Röm 3,30): Zum christologischen Gottesverständnis bei Paulus. In *Der Alte Bund im Neuen: Exegetische Studien zur Israelfrage im Neuen Testament*. Pages 231–258. WUNT 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. Original publication date, 1981.
- Green, Gene L. 2007. La Muerte y el Poder del Imperio: 1 Tesalonicenses 4:13-18. *Kairós* 40:9-26.

- Greeven, Heinrich. 1977. Propheten, Lehrer, Vorsteher bei Paulus. In *Das kirchliche Amt im Neuen Testament*. Pages 305–361. Ed. Karl Kertelge. Wege der Forschung 439. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. Original publication date, 1953.
- Guerra, Anthony J. 1995. *Romans and the Apologetic Tradition: The Purpose, Genre, and Audience of Paul's Letter*. SNTSMS 81. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gundry, Robert H. 1996. A Brief Note on "Hellenistic Formal Receptions and Paul's use of *apantēsis* in 1 Thessalonians 4:17". *Bulletin for Biblical Research* 6:39-41.
- Güttgemanns, Erhardt. 1979. *Candid Questions Concerning Gospel Form Criticism: A Methodological Sketch of the Fundamental Problematics of Form and Redaction Criticism*. Trans. William G. Doty. PTMS 26. Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press.
- Haacker, Klaus. 1999. *Der Brief des Paulus an die Römer*. THKNT 6. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- . 2003. *The Theology of Paul's Letter to the Romans*. New Testament Theology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hagner, Donald A. 1993-1995. *Matthew*. 2 vols. WBC 33. Waco: Word Books.
- Hahne, Harry Alan. 2006. *The Corruption and Redemption of Creation: Nature in Romans 8:19-22 and Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. LNTS 336. London: T & T Clark.
- Hainz, Joseph. 1972. *Ekklesia: Strukturen paulinischer Gemeinde-Theologie und Gemeinde-Ordnung*. Biblische Untersuchungen 9. Regensburg: F. Pustet.
- Halperin, David J. 1988. *The Faces of the Chariot: early Jewish Responses to Ezekiel's Vision*. TSAJ 16. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hanges, James Constantine. 2012. *Paul, Founder of Churches: A Study in Light of the Evidence for the Role of "Founder-Figures" in the Hellenistic-Roman Period*. WUNT 292. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hardin, Justin K. 2006. Decrees and drachmas at Thessalonica: Illegal Assembly in Jason's House (Acts 17.1-10a). *NTS* 52 (1): 29-49.
- Harink, Douglas. 2007. Paul and Israel: An Apocalyptic Reading. *ProEccl* 16 (4): 359-380.
- Harland, Philip A. 2005. Familial Dimensions of Group Identity: "Brothers" (ΑΔΕΛΦΟΙ) in Associations of the Greek East. *JBL* 124 (3): 491-513.
- Harnack, Adolf. 1904. *The Mission and Expansion of Christianity in the First Three Centuries*. Trans. James Moffatt. 2 vols. Theological Translation Library 19-20. New York: Harper.
- . 1995. The Use of Scripture in Paul's Communities. In *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches*. Ed. Brian Rosner. Trans. Brian Rosner. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans. Original publication date, 1928.
- Harnisch, Wolfgang. 1973. *Eschatologische Existenz: ein exegetischer Beitrag zum Sachanliegen von 1. Thessalonicher 4, 13-5, 11*. FRLANT 110. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Harrington, Hannah K. 2001. *Holiness: Rabbinic Judaism and the Graeco-Roman World*. London: Routledge.

- Harris, J. Rendel. 1920. *Tesminonies*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Harrison, J. R. 2002. Paul and the Imperial Gospel at Thessaloniki. *JSNT* 25 (1): 71-96.
- Harrison, James R. 2011. *Paul and the Imperial Authorities at Thessalonica and Rome: a Study in the Conflict of Ideology*. WUNT 273. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Harrisville, Roy A. 2006. Before ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: The Objective Genitive as Good Greek. *NovT* 48 (4): 353-358.
- Hartman, Lars. 1997. *'Into the Name of the Lord Jesus': Baptism in the Early Church*. Studies of the New Testament and its World. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Haufe, Günter. 1999. *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Thessalonicher*. THKNT 12/1. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Hay, David M. 1979. What is Proof? Rhetorical Verification in Philo, Josephus, and Quintilian. *SBLSP* 17 (2): 87-100.
- Hays, Richard B. 1983. *The Faith of Jesus Christ: An Investigation of the Narrative Substructure of Galatians 3:1-4:11*. Chico: Scholars Press.
- . 1989. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. Pages 240. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 2005a. Abraham as Father of Jews and Gentiles. In *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Pages 1-24. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans.
- . 2005b. *The Conversion of the Imagination: Paul as Interpreter of Israel's Scripture*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Häusser, Detlef. 2006. *Christusbekennntnis und Jesusüberlieferung bei Paulus*. WUNT 2:210. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Head, Peter M. 2009a. Letter Carriers in the Ancient Jewish Epistolary Materials. In *Jewish and Christian Scripture as Artifact and Canon*. Pages 203-219. Ed. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias. LSTS 70. London: T&t Clark.
- . 2009b. Named Letter-Carriers among the Oxyrhynchus Papyri. *JSNT* 31 (3): 279-300.
- Hellerman, Joseph H. 2001. *The Ancient Church as Family*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- . 2005. *Reconstructing Honor in Roman Philippi: Carmen Christi as Cursus Pudorum*. SNTSMS 132. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hellholm, David. 1994. Enthymemic Argumentation in Paul: The Case of Romans 6. In *Paul in his Hellenistic Context*. Pages 119-179. Ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen. Studies of the New Testament and its World. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Hendrix, Holland Lee. 1991a. Archaeology and Eschatology at Thessalonica. In *Future of Early Christianity: Essays in Honor of Helmut Koester*. Pages 107-118. Ed. Birger A. Perason, A. Thomas Kraabel, and George W. E. Nickelsburg. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- . 1991b. Benefactor/Patron Networks in the Urban Environment: Evidence from Thessalonica. *Semeia* 56:39-58.
- Hengel, Martin. 1974. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. Trans. John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress

- Press.
- . 1995. *Studies in Early Christology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd.
- Héring, Jean. 1962. *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*. Trans. A. W. Heathcote and P. J. Allcock. London: Epworth.
- Hickling, C. J. A. 1996. Paul's use of Exodus in the Corinthian Correspondence. In *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Pages 367–376. Ed. Reimund Bieringer. BETL 125. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Himmelfarb, Martha. 1993. *Ascent to Heaven in Jewish and Christian Apocalypses*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hock, Ronald F. 1980. *The Social Context of Paul's Ministry: Tentmaking and Apostleship*. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- . 1999. God's will at Thessalonica and Greco-Roman Asceticism. In *Asceticism and the New Testament*. Pages 159–170. Ed. L. E. Vaage and V. L. Wimbush. Routledge.
- Hoffmann, Paul. 1966. *Die Toten in Christus: eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung zur paulinischen Eschatologie*. Münster: Aschendorff.
- Hoffmann, Yair. 1981. The Day of the Lord as a Concept and a Term in the Prophetic Literature. *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 93 (1): 37-50.
- Hofius, Otfried. 1989. *Paulusstudien*. WUNT 51. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1997. "Einer ist Gott – Einer ist Herr": Erwägungen zur Struktur und Aussage des Bekenntnisses 1.Kor 8,6. In *Eschatologie und Schöpfung: Festschrift für Erich Gräßer zum siebzigsten Geburtstag*. Pages 95–108. Ed. Martin Evang, Helmut Merklein, and Michael Wolter. BZNW 89. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2000. *Neutestamentliche Studien*. WUNT 132. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2002. *Paulusstudien II*. WUNT 143. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 2008. *Exegetische Studien*. WUNT 223. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Hogeterp, Albert L. A. 2006. *Paul and God's Temple: a Historical Interpretation of Cultic Imagery in the Corinthian Correspondence*. BTS 2. Leuven: Peeters.
- Holleman, Joost. 1996. *Resurrection and Parousia: A Traditio-historical Study of Paul's Eschatology in I Corinthians 15*. NovTSup 84. Leiden: Brill.
- Holmberg, Bengt. 1978. *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles*. Lund: CWK Gleerup.
- Holtz, Traugott. 1986. *Der erste Brief an die Thessalonicher*. EKK 13. Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn.
- . 1991. Paul and the Oral Gospel Tradition. In *Jesus and the Oral Gospel Tradition*. Pages 380–393. Ed. Henry Wansbrough. JSNTSup 64. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- . 1995. The Question of the Content of Paul's Instructions. In *Understanding Paul's Ethics: Twentieth Century Approaches*. Pages 51–74. Ed. Brian Rosner. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Hooker, Morna D. 1964. "Beyond the Things that are Written": An Examination of 1 Cor

- iv. 6. *NTS* 10:127-132.
- . 1996. 1 Thessalonians 1:9-10 : a nutshell - but what kind of nut? In *Geschichte–Tradition–Reflexion: Festschrift für Martin Hengel zum 70. Geburtstag*. Vol. 3. Pages 435–448. Ed. Hubert Cancik, Hermann Lichtenberger, and Peter Schäfer. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Horbury, William. 1997. Septuagintal and New Testament Conceptions of the Church. In *A Vision for the Church: Studies in Early Christian Ecclesiology in Honour of J. P. M. Sweet*. Pages 1-17. Ed. Markus N. A. Bockmuehl and Michael B. Thompson. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Horn, Friedrich Wilhelm. 1992. *Das Angeld des Geistes: Studien zur paulinischen Pneumatologie*. FRLANT 154. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Horrell, David G. 1996. *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- . 2005. *Solidarity and Difference: a Contemporary Reading of Paul's Ethics*. London; New York: T & T Clark International.
- Horsley, Richard A. 1998. *1 Corinthians*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Horst, Pieter W. van der. 1985. Hellenistic Parallels to the Acts of the Apostles (2.1-47). *JSNT* 25:49-60.
- Hurd, John Coolidge, Jr. 1965. *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*. London: SPCK.
- Hurtado, Larry W. 2003. Review: *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World*, by Dennis E. Smith. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2003. Pp. xi + 411. \$25.00 (paper). *JBL* 122 (4): 781–785.
- Hübner, Hans. 1984. *Law in Paul's Thought: A Contribution to the Development of Pauline Theology*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Høgenhaven, Jesper. 2003. Rhetorical Devices in 4QMMT. *DSD* 10 (2): 187-204.
- Ishai-Rosenboim, Daniella. 2006. Is YOM H' (The Day of the Lord) a Term in Biblical Language. *Biblica* 87 (3): 395-401.
- Jeffers, James S. 1998. Jewish and Christian Families in First-Century Rome. In *Judaism and Christianity in First-Century Rome*. Ed. Karl P. Donfried and Peter Richardson. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Jervis, L. Ann. 1993. "But I Want You to Know...": Paul's Midrashic Intertextual Response to the Corinthian Worshipers (1 Cor 11:2-16). *JBL* 112 (2): 231-246.
- Jewett, Robert. 1985. The Law and the Coexistence of Jews and Gentiles in Romans. *Int* 39 (4): 341–356.
- . 1986. *The Thessalonian Correspondence: Pauline Rhetoric and Millenarian Piety*. Foundations and Facets. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- . 2007. *Romans: A Commentary*. Ed. Eldon Jay Epp. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Jipp, Joshua W. 2009. Rereading the Story of Abraham, Isaac, and 'Us' in Romans 4. *JSNT* 32 (2): 217–242.
- Johanson, Bruce C. 1987. *To all the Brethren: A Text-Linguistic and Rhetorical Approach to 1 Thessalonians*. Coniectanea biblica: New Testament series 16. Almqvist &

Wiksell.

- de Jonge, Marinus. 1986. The Earliest Christian use of *Christos*: Some Suggestions. *NTS* 32 (3): 321-343.
- . 1988. *Christology in Context: the Earliest Christian Response to Jesus*. Philadelphia: Westminster Press.
- Joubert, Stephan. 2000. *Paul as Benefactor: Reciprocity, Strategy and Theological Reflection in Paul's Collection*. WUNT 2:124. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Kamlah, Ehrhard. 1964. *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*. WUNT 7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Käsemann, Ernst. 1963. Unity and Diversity in New Testament Ecclesiology. *NovT* 6 (4): 290-297.
- . 1969. The Beginning of Christian Theology. In *New Testament Questions of Today*. Pages 82–107. Trans. W. J. Montague. London: SCM Press.
- . 1973. The Problem of a New Testament Theology. *NTS* 19 (3): 235-245.
- . 1980. *Commentary on Romans*. Trans. Geoffrey W. Bromiley. London: SCM.
- . 1988. What I have Unlearned in 50 Years as a German Theologian. *CurTM* 15 (4): 325-335.
- Keck, Leander E. 2005. *Romans*. ANTC. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- Keener, Craig S. 2005. *1–2 Corinthians*. NCBC. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Keesmaat, Sylvia C. 1999. *Paul and his Story: (Re)interpreting the Exodus Tradition*. JSNTSup. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.
- Kennedy, George A. 1963. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- . 1972. *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World: 300 B.C.–A.D.300*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1980. *Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times*. London: Croom Helm.
- . 1996. The Composition and Influence of Aristotle's *Rhetoric*. In *Essays on Aristotle's Rhetoric*. Pages 416–424. Ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty. Philosophical Traditions 4. London: University of California Press.
- Kent, John Harvey, ed. 1966. *The Inscriptions, 1926-1950*. Corinth: Results of Excavations Conducted by The American School of Classical Studies at Athens VII:III. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Kertelge, Karl, ed. 1977. *Das kirchliche Amt im Neuen Testament*. Wege der Forschung 439. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- Kettunen, Markku. 1979. *Der Abfassungszweck des Römerbriefes*. AASF 18. Helsinki: Suomalainen Tiedekatemia.
- Kim, Byung-Mo. 2002a. *Die paulinische Kollekte*. TANZ 38. Tübingen: Francke.
- Kim, Seyoon. 2002b. The Jesus Tradition in 1 Thess 4.13-5.11. *New Testament Studies* 48 (2): 225-242.

- . 2002c. *Paul and the New Perspective: Second Thoughts on the Origin of Paul's Gospel*. WUNT 140. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Kirschner, Robert. 1986. *Imitatio rabbini*. *JSJ* 17 (1): 70-79.
- Klassen, William. 1993. The Sacred Kiss in the New Testament: An Example of Social Boundary Lines. *NTS* 39 (1): 122-135.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. 1981. *Hausgemeinde und Hauskirche im frühen Christentum*. Stuttgart: Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.
- . 1982. *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult: eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief*. NTAbh 15. Münster: Aschendorff.
- . 1990. Brotherly Love in Plutarch and in 4 Maccabees. In *Greeks, Romans, and Christians: Essays in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Pages 284–288. Ed. D. L. Balch, Everett Ferguson, and Wayne A. Meeks. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- . 2000. *The Religious Context of Early Christianity: a Guide to Graeco-Roman Religions*. Trans. Brian McNeil. Studies of the New Testament and its World. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.
- . 2006. *Ancient Letters and the New Testament*. Trans. Daniel P. Bailey. Waco: Baylor University Press.
- Klawans, Jonathan. 2000. *Impurity and Sin in Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2006. *Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Klein, Günter. 1991. Paul's Purpose in Writing the Epistle to the Romans. In *The Romans Debate*. Revised and expanded ed. Pages 29–43. Ed. Karl P. Donfried. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. Original publication date, 1969.
- Klinghardt, Matthias. 1996. *Gemeinschaftsmahl und Mahlgemeinschaft: Soziologie und Liturgie frühchristlicher Mahlfeiern*. TANZ 13. Tübingen: Francke Verlag.
- Kloppenborg, John. 1993. ΦΙΛΑΔΕΛΦΙΑ, ΘΕΟΔΙΔΑΚΤΟΣ and the Dioscuri: Rhetorical Engagement in 1 Thessalonians 4:9-12. *NTS* 39 (2): 265-289.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. 1986. *Die Schrift als Zeuge des Evangeliums: Untersuchungen zur Verwendung und zum Verständnis der Schrift bei Paulus*. BHT 69. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Koester, Helmut. 1979. 1 Thessalonians—Experiment in Christian Writing. In *Continuity and Discontinuity in Church History: Essays Presented to George Huntston Williams on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*. Pages 33–44. Ed. F. Forrester Church and Timothy George. Studies in the History of Christian Thought 19. Leiden: Brill.
- Konradt, Matthias. 2001. Eidenai ekaston hymōn to eautou skeuos ktasthai...: zu Paulus' sexualethischer Weisung in 1 Thess 4,4 f. *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde der älteren Kirche* 92:128-135.
- Konstan, David. 2007. The Syntax of en Christō in 1 Thessalonians 4:16. *Journal of Biblical Literature* 126 (3): 579-593.
- Kraus, Wolfgang. 1991. *Der Tod Jesu als Heiligtumsweihe: eine Untersuchung zum Umfeld der Sühnevorstellung in Römer 3,25-26a*. WMANT 66. Neukirchen-

- Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- . 2008. Der Erweis des Gerechtigkeits Gottes im Tod Jesu nach Röm 3,21–26. In *Judaistik und neutestamentliche Wissenschaft: Standorte, Grenzen, Beziehungen*. Pages 192–216. Ed. Lutz Doering, Hans-Günther Waubke, and Florian Wilk. FRLANT 226. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Krauss, Samuel. 1905. Die jüdischen Apostel. *JQR* 17 (2): 370-383.
- Krauter, Stefan. 2008. Eva in Röm 7. *ZNW* 99 (1): 1-17.
- . 2010. Röm 7: Adam oder Eva? *ZNW* 101 (1): 125-147.
- Kubusch, Klaus. 1986. *Aurea Saecula: Mythos und Geschichte: Untersuchung eines Motivs in der antiken Literatur bis Ovid*. Studien zur klassischen Philologie 28. Frankfurt: P. Lang.
- Kuck, David W. 1992. *Judgment and Community Conflict: Paul's use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5*. NovTSup 66. Leiden: Brill.
- Kugel, James. 1987. On Hidden Hatred and Open Reproach: Early Exegesis of Leviticus 19:17. *HTR* 80:43-61.
- Kuss, Otto. 1957-1959. *Der Römerbrief*. RNT. Regensburg: Friedrich Pustet.
- Kümmel, Werner Georg. 1973. *The New Testament: The History of the Investigation of its Problems*. 2nd ed. Trans. S. McLean Gilmour and Howard Clark Kee. New Testament Library. London: SCM Press.
- de Lacey, D. R. 1982. 'One Lord' in Pauline Christology. In *Christ the Lord: Studies in Christology presented to Donald Guthrie*. Pages 191–203. Ed. Harold H. Rowdon. Downers Grove: Inter-Varsity Press.
- . 1991. οἰτινὲς ἐστε ὑμεῖς: The Function of a Metaphor in St Paul. In *Templum Amicitiae: Essays on the Second Temple presented to Ernst Bammel*. Pages 391–409. Ed. William Horbury. JSNTSup 48. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Lake, Kirsopp. 1910. 2 Thessalonians and Professor Harnack. *Expository Times* 22:131-133.
- Lambrecht, Jan. 1990. Thanksgivings in 1 Thessalonians 1-3. In *The Thessalonian Correspondence*. Pages 183–205. Ed. Raymond F. Collins. BETL 87. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 1992. *The Wretched "I" and its Liberation: Paul in Romans 7 and 8*. Louvain Theological & Pastoral Monographs 14. Louvain: Peeters.
- Lampe, Peter. 1991. Das korinthische Herrenmahl im Schnittpunkt hellenistisch-römischer Mahlpraxis und paulinischer Theologia Crucis (1Kor 11,17-34). *ZNW* 82:118-213.
- . 2001. Urchristliche Missionswege nach Rom: Haushalte paganer Herrschaft als jüdisch-christliche Keimzellen. *ZNW* 92 (1-2): 123-127.
- . 2003. *Christians at Rome in the First Two Centuries: From Paul to Valentinus*. Ed. Marshall D. Johnson. Trans. Michael Steinhauser. London: Continuum.
- Lanci, John R. 2005. The Stones Don't Speak and the Texts Tell Lies: Sacred Sex at Corinth. In *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth*. Pages 205–220. Ed. Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen. HTS 53. Cambridge: Harvard Divinity School.

- Landau, Tamar. 2006. *Out-Heroding Herod: Josephus, Rhetoric, and the Herod Narratives*. AGJU 63. Leiden: Brill.
- Laub, Franz. 1973. *Eschatologische Verkündigung und Lebensgestaltung nach Paulus: eine Untersuchung zum Wirken des Apostels beim Aufbau der Gemeinde in Thessalonike*. Biblische Untersuchungen 10. Regensburg: F. Pustet.
- Lee, Michelle V. 2006. *Paul, the Stoics, and the Body of Christ*. SNTSMS 137. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Leenhardt, Franz J. 1961. *The Epistle to the Romans: A Commentary*. London: Luterworth.
- Lemcio, Eugene E. 1988. The Unifying Kerygma of the New Testament. *JSNT* 33:3-17.
- . 1990. The Unifying Kerygma of the New Testament (II). *JSNT* 38:3-11.
- . 1991. *The Past of Jesus in the Gospels*. SNTSMS 68. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Levinskaya, Irina A. 1990. The Inscription from Aphrodisias and the Problem of the God-Fearers. *TynBul* 54 (2): 312-318.
- Lewis, C. S. 1960. *Studies in Words*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Légasse, Simon. 1999. *Les Épîtres des Paul aux Thessaloniens*. LD 7. Paris: Cerf.
- Lichtenberger, Hermann. 2004. *Das Ich Adams und das Ich der Menschheit: Studien zum Menschenbild in Römer 7*. WUNT 164. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Lieberman, Saul. 1962. *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine: Studies in the Literary Transmission of Beliefs and Manners of Palestine in the I Century B.C.E.—IV Century C.E.* 2nd improved ed. New York: Jewish Theological Seminary of America.
- Lietzmann, Hans. 1931. *An die Korinther I, II*. HNT 9. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Lim, Timothy H. 1987. "Not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in the demonstration of the spirit and power". *NovT* 29 (2): 137-149.
- Lincicum, David. 2008. Paul and the Testimonia: Quo Vademus. *JETS* 51 (2): 297-308.
- . 2010. *Paul and the Early Jewish Encounter with Deuteronomy*. WUNT 2:284. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Lindemann, Andreas. 2000. *Der erste Korintherbrief*. HNT 9:1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Litfin, A Duane. 1994. *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric*. SNTSMS 79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lohfink, Gerhard. 1971. *Die Himmelfahrt Jesu: Untersuchungen zu den Himmelfahrts- und Erhöhungstexten bei Lukas*. SANT 26. München: Kösel.
- Lohse, Eduard. 1955. *Märtyrer und Gottesknecht: Untersuchungen zur urchristlichen Verkündigung vom Sühntod Jesu Christi*. FRLANT 64. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1977. Emuna und Pistis: jüdisches und urchristliches Verständnis des Glaubens. *ZNW* 68 (3-4): 147-163.
- . 2003. Apostolische Ermahnung in Röm 16,17-20. In *Die bleibende Gegenwart des Evangeliums: Festschrift für Otto Merk zum 70. Geburtstag*. Pages 101-108.

- Ed. Roland Gebauer and Martin Meiser. MThSt 76. Marburg: N. G. Elwert.
- Long, Fredrick J. 2004. *Ancient Rhetoric and Paul's Apology: the Compositional Unity of 2 Corinthians*. SNTSMS 131. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Longenecker, Bruce W. 2009. Exposing the Economic Middle: A Revised Economy Scale for the Study of Early Urban Christianity. *JSNT* 31 (3): 243-278.
- . 2010. *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World*. Cambridge: Eerdmans.
- Luckensmeyer, David. 2009. *The Eschatology of First Thessalonians*. SUNT 71. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Luz, Ulrich. 1968. *Das Geschichtsverständnis des Paulus*. BEvT 49. Munich: Kaiser.
- . 2001-2007. *Matthew: A Commentary*. Trans. James E. Crouch. 3 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- . 2010. Stages of Early Christian Prophetism. In *Prophets and Prophecy in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. Pages 57–75. Ed. Jozef Verheyden, Korinna Zamfir, and Tobias Nicklas. WUNT 2:286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Lüdemann, Gerd. 1984. *Paul, Apostle to the Gentiles: Studies in Chronology*. Trans. F. Stanley Jones. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- . 2003. *Primitive Christianity: A Survey of Recent Studies and Some New Proposals*. Trans. John Bowden. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Lyons, George. 1985. *Pauline Autobiography: Toward a New Understanding*. SBLDS 73. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Lyu, Eun-Geol. 2011. *Sünde und Rechtfertigung bei Paulus: eine exegetische Untersuchung zum paulinischen Sündenverständnis aus soteriologischer Sicht*. WUNT 2:318. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- MacDonald, Margaret Y. 1988. *The Pauline Churches: a Socio-Historical Study of Institutionalization in the Pauline and Deutero-Pauline Writings*. SNTSMS 60. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MacGregor, Kirk R. 2009. Is 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 a Prohibition of Homosexuality? *BibSac* 166 (662): 201–216.
- Mach, Michael. 1992. *Entwicklungsstadien des jüdischen Engelglaubens in vorrabbinischer Zeit*. TSAJ 34. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Mack, Burton L. 1984. Decoding the Scripture: Philo and the Rules of Rhetoric. In *Nourished with Peace: Studies in Hellenistic Judaism in Memory of Samuel Sandmel*. Pages 81–115. Ed. F. E. Greenspahn, E. Hilgert, and B. L. Mack. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Mader, Gottfried. 2000. *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum*. Mnemosyne 205. Leiden: Brill.
- Maier, Friedrich Wilhelm. 1961. *Paulus als Kirchengründer und kirchlicher Organisator*. Pages 101. Würzburg: Echter.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. 1987. *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

- . 1988. *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- . 1992. Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament. *ANRW* II 26.1:267-333.
- . 2000. *The Letters to the Thessalonians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 32B. New York: Doubleday.
- Marrou, Henri-Irénée. 1965. *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*. 6th revised and expanded ed. Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Martin, Dale B. 1995. *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Martyn, J. Louis. 1997. *Theological Issues in the Letters of Paul*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Mason, Steve. 1998. 'Should any wish to enquire further' (*Ant.* 1.25): The Aim and Audience of Josephus' *Judean Antiquities/Life*. In *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives*. Pages 64–103. Ed. Steve Mason. JSPSup 32. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- . 2003. Flavius Josephus in Flavian Rome: Reading On and Between the Lines. In *Flavian Rome: Culture, Image, Text*. Pages 559–589. Ed. A. J. Boyle and W. J. Dominik. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2005a. Figured Speech and Irony in T. Flavius Josephus. In *Flavius Josephus and Flavian Rome*. Pages 243–288. Ed. Johnathan Edmondson, Steve Mason, and James Rives. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2005b. Of Audience and Meaning: Reading Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* in the Context of a Flavian Audience. In *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. Pages 71–100. Ed. Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi. SJSJ 104. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2007. Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History. *JSJ* 38 (4–5): 457–512.
- Masson, Charles. 1957. *Les deux Épitres de Saint Paul aux Thessaloniens*. CNT 11a. Paris: Delachaux & Niestlé.
- Matlock, R. Barry. 1996. *Unveiling the Apocalyptic Paul: Paul's Interpreters and the Rhetoric of Criticism*. JSNTSup 127. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- . 2007. The Rhetoric of πίστις in Paul: Galatians 2.16, 3.22, Romans 3.22, and Philippians 3.9. *JSNT* 30 (2): 173-203.
- Maxwell, Kathy Reiko. 2010. *Hearing Between the Lines: the Audience as Fellow-Worker in Luke-Acts and its Literary Milieu*. LSNT 425. London: T. & T. Clark.
- McCant, Jerry W. 2004. Paul's Periodic Apology. In *Rhetorics and Hermeneutics: Wilhelm Wuellner and his Influence*. Pages 175–192. Ed. James D. Hester and J. David Hester. Emory Studies in Early Christianity 9. London: T & T Clark.
- McDonald, James I. H. 1980. *Kerygma and Didache: The Articulation and Structure of the Earliest Christian Message*. SNTSMS 37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGehee, Michael. 1989. A Rejoinder to Two Recent Studies Dealing with 1 Thess 4:4. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 51 (1): 82-89.
- McKelvey, R. J. 1969. *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*. Oxford

- Theological Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McKnight, Scot. 2009. Was Paul a Convert? *ExAud* 25:110-132.
- McRae, Rachel M. 2011. Eating with Honor: The Corinthian Lord's Supper in Light of Voluntary Association Meal Practices. *JBL* 130 (1): 165-181.
- Meeks, Wayne A. 2003. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Mendelson, Alan. 1982. *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria*. HUCM 7. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press.
- Merklein, Helmut. 1992. Der Theologe als Prophet: zur Funktion prophetischen Redens im theologischen Diskurs des Paulus. *NTS* 38 (3): 402-429.
- Metzger, Bruce Manning. 1994. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Pages 366. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.
- Meyer, Eduard. 1923. *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums*. Vol. 3: *Die Apostelgeschichte und die Anfänge des Christentums*. Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta'sche Buchhandlung.
- Michel, Alain. 1967. Quelques Aspects de la Rhétorique chez Philon. In *Philon D'Alesandrie: Lyon 11-15 Septembre 1966*. Pages 81–103. Paris: Éditions du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique.
- Michel, Otto. 1929. *Paulus und seine Bibel*. BFCT 2:18. Gütersloh: Bertelsmann.
- . 1955. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 10th ed. KEK. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Milligan, George. 1908. *St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians: the Greek Text with Introduction and Notes*. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Minear, Paul S. 1971. *The Obedience of Faith: The Purposes of Paul in the Epistle to the Romans*. SBT 19. London: SCM.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. 1989. Concerning ΠΕΠΙ ΔΕ in 1 Corinthians. *NovT* 31 (1): 229-256.
- . 1991. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- . 1994. Rhetorical Shorthand in Pauline Argumentation: The Functions of 'the Gospel' in the Corinthian Correspondence. In *Gospel in Paul: Studies on Corinthians, Galatians and Romans for Richard N. Longenecker*. Pages 63–88. Ed. L. Ann Jervis and Peter Richardson. JSNTSup 108. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- . 2005. Paul's Letters to Corinth: The Interpretive Intertwining of Literary and Historical Reconstruction. In *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth*. Pages 307–338. Ed. Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen. HTS 53. Cambridge: Harvard Divinity School.
- . 2010. *Paul, the Corinthians, and the Birth of Christian Hermeneutics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1977. Review: Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer

- Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2. Jh.s v. Chr. By Martin Hengel. In *Essays in Greco-Roman and related Talmudic Literature*. Pages 495–499. Ed. Henry A. Fischel. The Library of Biblical Studies. New York: Ktav Pub House. Original publication date, 1970.
- Moo, Douglas J. 1996. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Pages 1012. NICNT. Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Moo, Douglas J. 2005. The Christology of the Early Pauline Letters. In *Contours of Christology in the New Testament*. Pages 169–192. Ed. Richard N. Longenecker. McMaster New Testament Studies. Cambridge: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Morlan, David S. 2012. *Conversion in Luke and Paul: An Exegetical and Theological Exploration*. LNTS 464. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Morris, Leon. 1988. *The Epistle to the Romans*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans; Inter-Varsity Press.
- Moss, Candida R. and Joel S. Baden. 2012. 1 Thessalonians 4.13–18 in Rabbinic Perspective. *NTS* 58 (2): 199–212.
- Most, Glenn W. 1994. The Uses of *Endoxa*: Philosophy and Rhetoric in the *Rhetoric*. In *Aristotle's Rhetoric: Philosophical Essays*. Pages 167–190. Ed. David J. Furley and Alexander Nehamas. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Moxnes, Halvor. 1980. *Theology in Conflict: Studies in Paul's Understanding of God in Romans*. NovTSup 53. Leiden: Brill.
- Munck, Johannes. 1963. 1 Thess 1:9-10 and the Missionary Preaching of Paul: Textual Exegesis and Hermeneutic Reflections. *NTS* 9 (2): 95-110.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. 1988. 1 Corinthians 11:2–16 Once Again. *CBQ* 50 (2): 265–274.
- . 2002. *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*. 3rd revised ed. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- . 2009a. Co-authorship in the Corinthian Correspondence. In *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues*. Ed. Jerome Murphy-O'Connor. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- . 2009b. *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mussies, G. 1972. *Dio Chrysostom and the New Testament*. SCHNT 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Müller, Karlheinz. 1966. 1 Kor 1:18-25: die eschatologisch-kritische Funktion der Verkündigung des Kreuzes. *BZ* 10 (2): 246-272.
- Nanos, Mark D. 1996. *The Mystery of Romans: The Jewish Context of Paul's Letter*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Nebe, Gottfried. 2006. Die Kritik am eidōla-Kult in 1 Thessalonicher 1,9-10 im Rahmen der paulinischen Missionstätigkeit und Soteriologie: Zugleich ein Beitrag zum Verständnis von "Tora-Gesetz" und "Natur-Gesetz". In *Das Gesetz im frühen Judentum und im Neuen Testament: Festschrift für Christoph Burchard zum 75. Geburtstag*. Pages 191–221. Ed. D Sängler and M Konrad. NTOA 57. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Neirynek, F. 1996. The Sayings of Jesus in 1 Corinthians. In *The Corinthian*

- Correspondence*. Pages 141–176. Ed. Reimund Bieringer. BETL 125. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Nesbit, R. G. M. 1992. The Orator and the Reader: Manipulation and Response in Cicero's Fifth Verrine. In *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*. Pages 1-17. Ed. Tony Woodman and Jonathan Powell. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neuenzeit, Paul. 1960. *Das Herrenmahl: Studien zur paulinischen Eucharistieauffassung*. SANT 1. München: Kösel.
- Newton, Derek. 1998. *Deity and Diet: the Dilemma of Sacrificial Food at Corinth*. JSNTSup 169. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Nicholl, Colin R. 2004. *From Hope to Despair in Thessalonica: Situating 1 and 2 Thessalonians*. Pages 315. SNTSMS 126. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. 2001–2012. *1 Enoch*. 2 vols. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Nicklas, Tobias. 2010. Paulus – der Apostel als Prophet. In *Prophets and Prophecy in Jewish and Early Christian Literature*. Pages 77–104. Ed. Jozef Verheyden, Korinna Zamfir, and Tobias Nicklas. WUNT 2:286. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Nicolet Anderson, Valérie. 2007. Une relecture paulinienne de l'histoire d'Israël (Rm 9–11). In *Ancient and modern Scriptural Historiography = L'historiographie biblique, ancienne et moderne*. Ed. George J. Brooke and Thomas Römer. BETL 207. Leuven: Leuven University Press; Peeters.
- Niebuhr, Karl-Wilhelm. 1987. *Gesetz und Paränese: katechismusartige Weisungsreihen in der frühjüdischen Literatur*. WUNT 2:28. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1998. Der Jakobusbrief im Licht frühjüdischer Diasporabriefe. *NTS* 44 (4): 420-443.
- Niederwimmer, Kurt. 1989. *Die Didache*. KAV 1. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Nigdelis, Pantelis M. 1994. Synagoge(n) und Gemeinde der Juden in Thessaloniki: Fragen aufgrund einer neuen jüdischen Grabinschrift der Kaiserzeit. *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 102:297-306.
- Norden, Eduard. 1898. *Die antike Kunstprosa: vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. 2 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.
- . 1913. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rege*. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Nordgaard, Stefan. 2011. Paul's Appropriation of Philo's Theory of 'Two Men' in 1 Corinthians 15.45–49. *NTS* 57 (3): 348-365.
- Noy, David, Hanswulf Bloedhorn, and Alexander Panayotov, ed. 2004. *Inscriptiones Judaicae Orientis*. 3 vols. TSAJ 99, 101, 102. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Oakes, Peter. 2005. Re-mapping the Universe: Paul and the Emperor in 1 Thessalonians and Philippians. *JSNT* 27 (3): 301-322.
- Oepke, A. 1964. βάπτω, βαπτίζω, Βαπτισμός, Βάπτισμα, Βαπτιστής. *TDNT* 1:529-546.
- Oliver, Robert T. 1971. *Communication and Culture in Ancient India and China*.

- Syracuse, NY: Syracuse University Press.
- Olmstead, Wendy. 2006. *Rhetoric: An Historical Introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Olson, Stanley N. 1984. Epistolary Uses of Expressions of Self-Confidence. *JBL* 103 (4): 585-597.
- Omerzu, Heike. 2002. *Der Prozess des Paulus: eine exegetische und rechtshistorische Untersuchung der Apostelgeschichte*. Pages 615. BZNW 115. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- O'Neill, J. C. 1975. *Paul's Letter to the Romans*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Ortkemper, Franz-Josef. 1980. *Leben aus dem Glauben: christliche Grundhaltungen nach Römer 12-13*. NTAbh 14. Münster: Aschendorff.
- Osiek, Carolyn and David L. Balch. 1997. *Families in the New Testament World: Household and House Churches*. Family Religion and Culture. Louisville: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Oster, Richard E. 1992. Use, Misuse and Neglect of Archaeological Evidence in Some Modern Works on 1 Corinthians (1 Cor 7,1-5, 8,10, 11,2-16, 12,14-26). *ZNW* 83 (1): 52-73.
- Pak, James Yeong-Sik. 1991. *Paul as Missionary: A Comparative Study of Missionary Discourse in Paul's Epistles and Selected Contemporary Jewish Texts*. European University Studies XXIII:410. Bern: Peter Lang.
- Papazoglou, F. 1979. Quelques aspects de l'histoire de la province de Macédoine. *ANRW* II 7.1:302-369.
- Patrick, Dale and Gary S. Shogren. 1992. Election. *ABD* 2:434-444.
- Paulsen, Henning. 1974. *Überlieferung und Auslegung in Römer 8*. WMANT 43. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Payne, Philip B. 1995. Fuldensis, Sigla for Variants in Vaticanus, and 1 Cor 14.34-5. *NTS* 41 (2): 240-262.
- . 1998. Ms. 88 as Evidence for a Text without 1 Cor 14.34-5. *NTS* 44 (1): 152-158.
- Penn, Michael Philip. 2005. *Kissing Christians: Ritual and Community in the Late Ancient Church*. DRLAR. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Perelman, Ch. 1979. *The New Rhetoric and the Humanities*. Trans. W. Kluback. Synthese Library: Studies in Epistemology, Logic, Methodology, and Philosophy of Science 140. Dordrecht, Holland: D. Reidel.
- Perelman, Ch. and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca. 1958. *La Nouvelle Rhétorique: Traité de L'Argumentation*. 2 vols. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
- Pesch, Rudolf. 1984. *Die Entdeckung des ältesten Paulus-Briefes: Paulus, neu gesehen: die Briefe an die Gemeinde der Thessalonicher*. Herderbücherei 1167. Herder.
- Peterman, G. W. 2010. Δικαιωθῆναι διὰ τῆς ἐκ Χριστοῦ πίστεως: Notes on a Neglected Greek Construction. *NTS* 56 (1): 163–168.
- Peterson, Erik. 1926. *EΙΣ ΘΕΟΣ: Epigraphische, formgeschichtliche und religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen*. FRLANT 24. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Phua, Richard Liong-Seng. 2005. *Idolatry and Authority: a Study of 1 Corinthians 8.1-11.1 in the Light of the Jewish Diaspora*. LNTS 299. London: T&T Clark.
- Pickett, Raymond. 1997. *The Cross in Corinth: the Social Significance of the Death of Jesus*. JSNTSup 143. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Pierce, C. A. 1955. *Conscience in the New Testament: A Study of Syneidesis in the New Testament in the Light of its Sources, and with Particular Reference to St. Paul*. SBT. London: SCM.
- Pilhofer, Peter. 1995. *Philippi*. Vol. 1: *Die erste christliche Gemeinde Europas*. WUNT 87. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Piper, John. 1979. 'Love your enemies': *Jesus' Love Command in the Synoptic Gospels and in the Early Christian Paraenesis*. SNTSMS 38. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Plevnik, Joseph. 1984. The Taking up of the Faithful and the Resurrection of the Dead in 1 Thessalonians 4:13-18. *CBQ* 46 (2): 274-283.
- . 1990. Pauline Presuppositions. In *The Thessalonian Correspondence*. Pages 50–61. Ed. Raymond F. Collins. BETL 88. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 1997. *Paul and the Parousia: an Exegetical and Theological Investigation*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Pogoloff, Stephen M. 1992. *Logos and Sophia: the Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians*. SBLDS 134. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Porter, Stanley E. 2006. Paul's Concept of Reconciliation, Twice More. In *Paul and His Theology*. Pages 131–152. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. Pauline Studies 3. Leiden: Brill.
- Porter, Stanley E. and D. A. Carson, ed. 1993. *Biblical Greek Language and Linguistics: Open Questions in Current Research*. JSNTSup 80. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press.
- Qimron, Elisha and John Strugnell. 1994. *Qumran Cave 4 V: Miqṣat Ma'ase Ha-Torah*. DJD 10. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Rambo, Lewis R. 1993. *Understanding Religious Conversion*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- . 2009. Conversion Studies, Pastoral Counseling, and Cultural Studies: Engaging and Embracing a New Paradigm. *ExAud* 25:1-16.
- Räisänen, Heikki. 1987. *Paul and the Law*. 2nd ed. WUNT 29. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Reasoner, Mark. 1999. *The Strong and the Weak : Romans 14.1-15.13 in Context*. SNTSMS 103. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Reaume, John D. 1995. Another Look at 1 Corinthians 15:29, "Baptized for the Dead". *BibSac* 152 (Oct-Dec): 457-475.
- Reichert, Angelika. 2001. *Der Römerbrief als Gratwanderung: eine Untersuchung zur Abfassungsproblematik*. FRLANT 194. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Reinbold, Wolfgang. 2000. *Propaganda und Mission im ältesten Christentum: eine Untersuchung zu den Modalitäten der Ausbreitung der frühen Kirche*. FRLANT 188. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Reinhartz, Adele. 2009. We, You, They: Boundary language in 4QMMT and the New

- Testament Epistles. In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature*. Pages 89–105. Ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill.
- Reinmuth, Eckart. 1985. *Geist und Gesetz: Studien zu Voraussetzungen und Inhalt der paulinischen Paränese*. Theologische Arbeiten 44. Berlin: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Rengstorff, Karl Heinrich. 1964. ἀποστέλλω (πέμπω), ἐξαποστέλλω, ἀπόστολος, ψευδαπόστολος, ἀποστολή. *TDNT* 1:397-447.
- Reynolds, Joyce and Robert Tannenbaum. 1987. *Jews and God-fearers at Aphrodisias: Greek inscriptions with Commentary*. CPS Sup 12. Cambridge: Cambridge Philological Society.
- Richard, Earl. 1995. *First and Second Thessalonians*. SP 11. Collegeville: Liturgical Press.
- Richards, E. Randolph. 1991. *The Secretary in the Letters of Paul*. WUNT 2:42. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2004. *Paul and First-Century Letter Writing: Secretaries, Composition, and Collection*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- Riesner, Rainer. 1981. *Jesus als Lehrer: eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelien-Überlieferung*. WUNT 2:7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 1998. *Paul's Early Period: Chronology, Mission Strategy, Theology*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Rigaux, B. 1956. *Saint Paul, les Épitres aux Thessaloniens*. Etudes Bibliques. Paris: Lecoffre.
- . 1975. Tradition et Rédaction dans I Th. V. 1-10. *New Testament Studies* 21:318-340.
- Robertson, Archibald and Alfred Plummer. 1914. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*. 2nd ed. ICC. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Rosenmeyer, Patricia A. 2001. *Ancient Epistolary Fictions: the Letter in Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosner, Brian S. 1994. *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5-7*. AGAJU 22. Leiden: Brill.
- . 1996. The Function of Scripture in 1 Cor 5,13b and 6,16. In *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Pages 513-518. Ed. Reimund Bieringer. BETL 125:.. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 2007. *Greed as Idolatry: The Origin and Meaning of a Pauline Metaphor*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Rowland, Christopher. 1982. *The Open Heaven: a Study of the Apocalyptic in Judaism and Early Christianity*. London: SPCK.
- Rowland, Christopher and Christopher R. A. Morray-Jones. 2009. *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament*. CRINT 3:12. Leiden: Brill.

- Rudolph, David J. 2011. *A Jew to the Jews: Jewish Contours of Pauline flexibility in 1 Corinthians 9:19-23*. WUNT 2:304. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Sacchi, Paolo. 1990. *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*. Trans. William J. Short. JSPSup 20. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Safrai, Shmuel. 1987. Education and the Study of the Torah. In *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Pages 945–970. Ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern. CRINT 1:2. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Sanders, E. P. 1977. *Paul and Palestinian Judaism: A Comparison of Patterns of Religion*. Pages 627. Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Sanders, E. P. 1983. *Paul, the Law, and the Jewish People*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Sandnes, Karl Olav. 1991. *Paul – One of the Prophets?: A Contribution to the Apostle's Self-Understanding*. Pages 291. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Satlow, Michael L. 1998. Rhetoric and Assumptions: Romans and Rabbis on Sex. In *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*. Pages 135–144. Ed. M. Goodman. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Schanz, Martin and Carl Hosius. 1966. *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur bis zum Gesetzgebungswerk des Kaisers Justinian*. 4th reworked ed. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft 8.1: *Die Römische Literatur in der Zeit der Republik*. München: Beck.
- Schlatter, Adolf. 1934. *Paulus der Bote Jesu: eine Deutung seiner Briefe and die Korinther*. Stuttgart: Calwer.
- Schlier, Heinrich. 1977. *Der Römerbrief: Kommentar*. HTKNT 6. Freiburg: Herder.
- Schmeller, Thomas. 1987. *Paulus und die "Diatriben": eine vergleichende Stilinterpretation*. NTAbh 19. Münster: Aschendorff.
- . 2010. *Der Zweite Brief an die Korinther (2Kor 1,1–7,4)*. EKK 8:1. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Theologie; Ostfildern: Patmos-Verlag.
- Schmidt, Ulrich. 2009. 1Thess2.7b, c: 'Kleinkinder, die wie eine Amme Kinder versorgen'. *NTS* 55 (1): 116-120.
- Schmithals, Walter. 1971. *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letter to the Corinthians*. Trans. John E. Steely. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- . 1972. *Paul and the Gnostics*. Nashville: Abingdon.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. 2004. *Early Christian Mission*. 2 vols. Leicester: InterVarsity Press.
- Schnackenburg, Rudolf. 1964. *Baptism in the Thought of St Paul: A Study in Pauline Theology*. Trans. G. R. Beasley-Murray. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Schnelle, Udo. 2005. *Apostle Paul: His Life and Theology*. Trans. M. Eugene Boring. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic.
- Schoon-Janßen, Johannes. 1991. *Umstrittene 'Apologien' in den Paulusbrieffen: Studien zur rhetorischen Situation des 1. Thessalonicherbriefes, des Galaterbriefes und des Philipperbriefes*. GTA 45. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Schowalter, Daniel N. and Steven J. Friesen, eds. 2005. *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth: Interdisciplinary Approaches*. HTS 53. Cambridge: Harvard Divinity

School.

- Schrage, Wolfgang. 1961. *Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese: ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Ethik*. Gütersloh: Mohn.
- . 1991-2001. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. 4 vols. EKK 7. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Schreiber, Stefan. 1996. *Paulus als Wundertäter: redaktionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen zur Apostelgeschichte und den authentischen Paulusbriefen*. BZNW 79. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2007. Eine neue Jenseitshoffnung in Thessaloniki und ihre Probleme (1 Thess 4,13-18). *Biblica* 88 (3): 326-350.
- Schrenk, Gottlob and Gottfried Quell. 1967. ἐκλέγομαι, ἐκλογή, ἐκλεκτός. *TDNT* 4:144-192.
- Schröter, Jens. 2009. Die Funktion der Herrenmahlsüberlieferungen im 1. Korintherbrief: Zugleich ein Beitrag zur Rolle der »Einsetzungsworte« in frühchristlichen Mahltexten. *ZNW* 100 (1): 78-100.
- Schubert, Paul. 1939. *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings*. BZNW 20. Berlin: Alfred Töpelmann.
- Schütz, John Howard. 1975. *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority*. SNTSMS 26. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Schweizer, Eduard. 1976. Ecumenism in the New Testament: The Belief in the Son of God. In *The Law of the Spirit in Rom 7 and 8*. Pages 279–300. Ed. Lorenzo De Lorenzi. SMBen: Biblical-Ecumenical Section 1. Rome: St. Paul's Abbey.
- Scott, James M. 1992. *Adoption as Sons of God: An Exegetical Investigation into the Background of ΥΙΟΘΕΣΙΑ in the Pauline Corpus*. WUNT 2:48. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr.
- Seeberg, Alfred. 1903. *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*. Leipzig: Deichert.
- . 1905. *Das Evangelium Christi*. Leipzig: Deichert.
- . 1906. *Die beiden Wege und das Aposteldekret*. Leipzig: Deichert.
- . 1908. *Die Didache des Judentums und der Urchristenheit*. Leipzig: Deichert.
- Seeley, David. 1990. *The Noble Death: Graeco-Roman Martyrology and Paul's Concept of Salvation*. JSNTSup 28. Sheffield: JSOT Press.
- Segal, Alan F. 1990. *Paul the Convert: the Apostolate and Apostasy of Saul the Pharisee*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Seifrid, Mark A. 1992. *Justification by Faith: The Origin and Development of a Central Pauline Theme*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2000. *Christ, Our Righteousness: Paul's Theology of Justification*. NSBT 9. Downers Grove: Apollos/Intervarsity Press.
- Sellin, Gerhard. 1982. Das "Geheimnis" der Weisheit und das Rätsel der "Christuspartei" (zu 1 Kor 1-4). *ZNW* 73 (1/2): 69-96.
- . 1986. *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten: eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung von 1 Korinther 15*. FRLANT 138. Göttingen:

- Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1987. Hauptprobleme des Ersten Korintherbriefes. *ANRW* II 25.4:2940-3044.
- Selwyn, Edward Gordon. 1958. *The First Epistle of St. Peter: The Greek Text with Introduction, Notes and Essays*. 2nd ed. London: Macmillan and Co.
- Senft, Christophe. 1979. *La première épître de Saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*. CNT 2:7. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé.
- Sharp, Douglas Simmons. 1914. *Epictetus and the New Testament: a comparative study of Arrian's text of Epictetus and the New Testament*. London.
- Shen, Michael Li-Tak. 2010. *Canaan to Corinth: Paul's Doctrine of God and the Issue of Food Offered to Idols in 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*. StBL. Berlin: Lang.
- Shogren, Gary Steven. 2000. "Is the Kingdom of God about Eating and Drinking or Isn't it?" (Romans 14:17). *NovT* 42 (3): 238–256.
- Smallwood, E. Mary. 1999. The Diaspora in the Roman period before CE 70. In *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Vol. 3. Pages 168–191. Ed. William Horbury, W. D. Davies, and John Sturdy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smit, Joop F. M. 2000. *About the Idol Offerings: Rhetoric, Social Context and Theology of Paul's Discourse in First Corinthians 8:1-11:1*. CBET 27. Leuven: Peeters.
- Smit, Peter-Ben. 2007. A Symposium in Rom. 14:17? A Note on Paul's Terminology. *NovT* 49 (1): 40–53.
- Smith, Barry D. 2010. The Problem with the Observance of the Lord's Supper in the Corinthian Church. *BBR* 20 (4): 517-544.
- Smith, Claire S. 2012. *Pauline Communities as 'Scholastic Communities': A Study of the Vocabulary of 'Teaching' in 1 Corinthians, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*. WUNT 2:335. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Smith, Dennis Edwin. 2003. *From Symposium to Eucharist: The Banquet in the Early Christian World*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Smith, Jay E. 2001. Another look at 4Q416 2 ii.21, a critical parallel to First Thessalonians 4:4. *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 63 (3): 499-504.
- Spawforth, Antony. 1995. The Achaean Federal Cult Part 1: Pseudo-Julian, Letters 198. *TynBul* 46 (1): 151-168.
- Sperling, S. David. 1982. Fragments of Tannaitic Letters Preserved in Rabbinic Literature. In *Handbook of Ancient Hebrew Letters: a Study Edition*. Pages 183–211. Ed. Dennis Pardee. SBL S 15. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Spicq, Celsus. 1956. La Charité fraternelle selon 1 Th. 4,9. In *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert*. Pages 507–511. Travaux de l'Institut Catholique de Paris 4. Paris: Bloud & Gay.
- Stamps, Dennis L. 2002. The Christological Premise in Pauline Theological Rhetoric: 1 Corinthians 1.4-2.5 as an Example. In *Rhetorical Criticism and the Bible*. Pages 441–457. London: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Stamps, Dennis L. 2007. Review: *Enthymemes in the Letters of Paul* by Marc J. Debanné. *JSNT* 29 (5): 82.
- Stanley, Christopher D. 1992. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in*

- the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTSMS 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2004. *Arguing with Scripture: The Rhetoric of Quotations in the Letters of Paul*. New York: T&T Clark.
- Stanton, Graham. 1974. *Jesus of Nazareth in New Testament Preaching*. SNTSMS 27. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Stemberger, Günter. 1972. *Der Leib der Auferstehung: Studien zur Anthropologie und Eschatologie des palästinischen Judentums im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter (ca. 170 v. Chr.-100 n. Chr.)*. AnBib 56. Rome: Biblical Institute.
- Stern, Menahem. 1974. The Jewish Diaspora. In *The Jewish People in the First Century: Historical Geography, Political History, Social, Cultural and Religious Life and Institutions*. Pages 117–183. Ed. S. Safrai and M. Stern. CRINT 1:1. Assen: Van Gorcum.
- Steyn, Gert J. 1996. Reflections on TO ONOMA TOY KYPIOY in 1 Corinthians. In *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Pages 479–490. Ed. Reimund Bieringer. BETL 125. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Still, E. Coye. 2004. Divisions over Leaders and Food Offered to Idols: The Parallel Thematic Structures of 1 Corinthians 4:6-21 and 8:1-11:1. *TynBul* 55 (1): 17-41.
- Still, Todd D. 2007. Interpretive Ambiguities and Scholarly Proclivities in Pauline Studies: A Treatment of Three Texts from 1 Thessalonians 4 as a Test Case. *CBR* 5 (2): 207-219.
- . 2012. “Since we Believe That Jesus Died and Rose Again”: The Gospel Paul Preached in Thessalonica as Evidenced by 1 Thessalonians. *ResQ* 54 (1): 7–18.
- Still, Todd D., ed. 2007. *Jesus and Paul Reconnected: Fresh Pathways into an Old Debate*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Stirewalt, M. Luther. 2003. *Paul, the Letter Writer*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Stone, Michael E. 1984. Apocalyptic Literature. In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*. Pages 383–441. Ed. Michael E. Stone. CRINT 2:2. Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress.
- Stowers, Stanley Kent. 1994. *A Rereading of Romans: Justice, Jews, and Gentiles*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Stökl Ben Ezra, Daniel. 2003. *The Impact of Yom Kippur on early Christianity: The Day of Atonement from Second Temple Judaism to the Fifth Century*. WUNT 163. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Stuhlmacher, Peter. 1986. *Reconciliation, Law, & Righteousness: Essays in Biblical Theology*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- . 1991. The Purpose of Romans. In *The Romans Debate*. Revised and expanded ed. Pages 231–242. Ed. Karl P. Donfried. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. Original publication date, 1986.
- . 2001. *Revisiting Paul's doctrine of Justification: A Challenge to the New Perspective*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.
- Sumney, Jerry L. 2005. Studying Paul's Opponents: Advances and Challenges. In *Paul*

- and His Opponents*. Pages 7–56. Ed. Stanley E. Porter. Pauline Studies 2. Leiden: Brill.
- Taatz, Irene. 1991. *Frühjüdische Briefe: die paulinischen Briefe im Rahmen der offiziellen religiösen Briefe des Frühjudentums*. NTOA 16. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Talbert, Charles H. 1969. Tradition and Redaction in Romans XII. 9–21. *NTS* 16 (1): 83–94.
- Tellbe, Mikael. 2001. *Paul between Synagogue and State*. ConBNT 34. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International.
- Theissen, Gerd. 1982. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Trans. John H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- Theobald, Michael. 2003. Erkenntnis und Liebe: Kriterien glaubenskonformen Handelns nach Röm 14,13–23. In *Studien zum Römerbrief*. Pages 481–510. WUNT 136. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2003. Kirche und Israel nach Röm 9–11. In *Studien zum Römerbrief*. Pages 324–349. WUNT 136. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck. Original publication date, 1987.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. 2000. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: a Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Thomas, Johannes. 1992. *Der jüdische Phokylides: formgeschichtliche Zugänge zu Pseudo-Phokylides und Vergleich mit der neutestamentlichen Paränese*. NTOA 23. Freiburg: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Thorsteinsson, Runar M. 2003. *Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Thurén, Lauri. 2000. *Derhetorizing Paul: A Dynamic Perspective on Pauline Theology and the Law*. WUNT 124. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Tilling, Chris. 2012. *Paul's Divine Christology*. WUNT 2:323. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Tiwald, Markus. 2012. Christ as Hilasterion (Rom 3:25): Pauline Theology on the Day of Atonement in the Mirror of Early Jewish Thought. In *The Day of Atonement: its Interpretations in Early Jewish and Christian Traditions*. Pages 189–209. Ed. Thomas Hieke and Tobias Nicklas. TBN 15. Leiden: Brill.
- Tomson, Peter J. 1990. *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*. CRINT 3:1. Assen; Minneapolis: Van Gorcum ; Fortress Press.
- Toney, Carl N. 2008. *Paul's Inclusive Ethic: Resolving Community Conflicts and Promoting Mission in Romans 14–15*. WUNT 2:252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Trapp, Michael. 2003. *Greek and Latin Letters: An Anthology with Translation*. Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Trebilco, Paul R. 2012. *Self-Designations and Group Identity in the New Testament*. Cambridge, UK ; New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Tuckett, Christopher M. 1990. Synoptic Tradition in 1 Thessalonians. In *The Thessalonian Correspondence*. Pages 160–182. Ed. Raymond F. Collins. BETL 88. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 1996. The Corinthians who say "There is no resurrection of the dead" (1 Cor

- 15,12). In *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Pages 247–275. Ed. Reimund Bieringer. BETL 125. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 2001. *Christology and the New Testament*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Ulonska, Herbert. 1987. Christen und Heiden: die paulinische Paränese in I Thess 4:3-8. *TZ* 43 (1-2): 210-218.
- Vahrenhorst, Martin. 2008. *Kultische Sprache in den Paulusbriefen*. WUNT 230. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Van Cangh, Jean Marie. 1996. Peut-on reconstituer le texte primitif de la Cène? (1 Cor 11,23-26 par Mc 14,22-26). In *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Pages 623–637. Ed. Reimund Bieringer. BETL 125. Louvain: Peeters.
- van der Horst, P. W. 1980. *Aelius Aristides and the New Testament*. SCHNT 6. Leiden: Brill.
- van de Sandt, Huub and David Flusser. 2002. *The Didache: Its Jewish Sources and its Place in Early Judaism and Christianity*. CRINT 3:5. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- van Henten, Jan Willem. 2005. Commonplaces in Herod's Commander Speech in Josephus' *A.J.* 15.127-146. In *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*. Pages 183–206. Ed. Joseph Sievers and Gaia Lembi. JSJSup 104. Leiden: Brill.
- van Houwelingen, P. H. R. 2007. The Great Reunion: the Meaning and Significance of the "Word of the Lord" in 1 Thessalonians 4:13-28. *CTJ* 42 (2): 308-324.
- Van Kooten, George H. 2012. Ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ: The 'Church of God' and the Civic Assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι) of the Greek Cities in the Roman Empire: A Response to Paul Trebilco and Richard A. Horsley. *NTS* 58 (4): 522–548.
- van Unnik, W. C. 1968. Den Geist löscht nicht aus. *NovT* 10 (4): 255-269.
- Verhoef, Eduard. 1996. The Senders of the Letters to the Corinthians and the Use of "I" and "We". In *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Pages 417–425. Ed. Reimund Bieringer. BETL 125. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- Viard, Jean-Sébastien. 2002. Obéissance ou liberté? Redécouverte structurelle de Rm 6,15-23. *ScEs* 54 (3): 351-366.
- Vom Brocke, Christoph. 2001. *Thessaloniki, Stadt des Kassander und Gemeinde des Paulus: eine frühe christliche Gemeinde in ihrer heidnischen Umwelt*. WUNT 125. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- von Campenhausen, Hans. 1997. *Ecclesiastical Authority and Spiritual Power in the Church of the First Three Centuries*. Trans. J. A. Baker. Peabody: Hendrickson. Original publication date, 1969.
- von Dobschütz, Ernst. 1909. *Die Thessalonicher-Briefe*. 7th ed. KEK 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- von Rad, Gerhard. 1965. *Old Testament Theology*. Vol. 2: *The Theology of Israel's Prophetic Traditions*. Trans. D. M. G. Stalker. London: Oliver and Boyd.
- von Roller, Otto. 1933. *Das Formular der paulinischen Briefe: ein Beitrag zur Lehre vom*

- antike Briefe*. BWANT 58. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- von Weizsäcker, Carl. 1899-1907. *The Apostolic Age of the Christian Church*. Trans. James Millar. 2 vols. Theological Translation Library 5-6. London: Williams and Norgate.
- Vos, Johan S. 1993. Das Rätsel von I Kor 12:1-3. *NovT* 35 (3): 251-269.
- . 1996. Die Argumentation des Paulus in 1 Kor 1,10-3,4. In *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Pages 87–119. Ed. Reimund Bieringer. BETL 125. Leuven: Leuven University Press.
- . 2002. *Die Kunst der Argumentation bei Paulus: Studien zur antiken Rhetorik*. WUNT 149. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Vögtle, Anton. 1936. *Die Tugend- und Lasterkatologe im Neuen Testament: exegetisch, religions- und formgeschichtlich Untersucht*. NTAbh 16. Münster: Verlag Aschendorff.
- Wagner, J. Ross. 1998. "Not Beyond the Things which are Written": A Call to Boast only in the Lord (1 Cor 4.6). *NTS* 44 (2): 279-287.
- . 2002. *Heralds of the Good News: Isaiah and Paul "In Concert" in the Letter to the Romans*. NovTSup 101. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2011a. Baptism "Into Christ Jesus" and the Question of Universalism in Paul. *HBT* 33 (1): 45-61.
- . 2011b. Paul and Scripture. In *The Blackwell Companion to Paul*. Pages 154–171. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Walbank, Mary E. Hoskins. 2003. Aspects of Corinthian Coinage in the Late 1st and Early 2nd Centuries A.C. In *Corinth, the Centenary: 1896-1996*. Pages 337–349. Ed. Charles K. Williams and Nancy Bookidis. Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Walters, James. 2005. Civic Identity in Roman Corinth and Its Impact on Early Christians. In *Urban Religion in Roman Corinth*. Pages 397–417. Ed. Daniel N. Schowalter and Steven J. Friesen. HTS 53. Cambridge: Harvard Divinity School.
- Walters, James C. 2010. Paul and the Politics of Meals in Roman Corinth. In *Corinth in Context: Comparative Studies on Religion and Society*. Pages 343–364. Ed. Steven J. Friesen, Daniel N. Schowalter, and James C. Walters. NovTSup 134. Leiden: Brill.
- Wanamaker, Charles A. 1990. *The Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Ward, Richard F. 1994. Pauline Voice and Presence as Strategic Communication. *Semeia* 65:95–107.
- Watson, Francis. 2007a. "I Received from the Lord...": Paul, Jesus, and the Last Supper. In *Jesus and Paul Reconnected: Fresh Pathways into and Old Debate*. Pages 103–124. Ed. Todd D. Still. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 2007b. *Paul, Judaism, and the Gentiles: Beyond the New Perspective*. Revised and Expanded ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Wedderburn, A. J. M. 1987. *Baptism and Resurrection: Studies in Pauline Theology*

- against its *Graeco-Roman Background*. WUNT 44. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 1988. *The Reasons for Romans*. SNTW. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- . 2002. Paul's Collection: Chronology and History. *NTS* 48 (1): 95-110.
- Wehner, Barbara. 2000. *Die Funktion der Dialogstruktur in Epiktets Diatriben*. PhilAnt 13. Stuttgart: Steiner.
- Weima, Jeffrey A. D. 1996. "How you must walk to please God": Holiness and Discipleship in 1 Thessalonians. In *Patterns of Discipleship in the New Testament*. Pages 98–119. Ed. R. N. Longenecker. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans.
- . 1997. An Apology for the Apologetic Function of I Thessalonians 2:1-12. *JSNT* 68:73-99.
- . 2003. The Reason for Romans: The Evidence of Its Epistolary Framework (1:1-15; 15:14-16:27). *RevExp* 100:17-33.
- Weiss, Alexander. 2010. Keine Quästoren in Korinth: Zu Goodrichs (und Theißens) These über das Amt des Erastos (Röm 16.23). *NTS* 56 (4): 576-581.
- Weiss, Johannes. 1910. *Der erste Korintherbrief*. 9th revised ed. KEK 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- . 1959. *Earliest Christianity: A History of the Period A.D. 30-150*. Ed. F. C. Grant. 2 vols. Harper Torchbooks. New York: Harper.
- Welborn, L. L. 1987. A Conciliatory Principle in 1 Cor. 4.6. *NovT* 29 (4): 320-346.
- . 2011. *An End to Enmity: Paul and the "Wrongdoer" of Second Corinthians*. BZNW 185. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Wenham, David. 1995. *Paul: Follower of Jesus or Founder of Christianity?* Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- West, Angela. 1987. Sex and Salvation: a Christian Feminist Study of 1 Corinthians 6:12-7:39. *ModChm* 29 (3): 17-24.
- Westerholm, Stephen. 1988. *Israel's Law and the Church's Faith: Paul and his Recent Interpreters*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- White, Joel R. 1997. "Baptized on account of the Dead": The Meaning of 1 Corinthians 15:29 in its Context. *JBL* 116 (3): 487-499.
- . 2012. Recent Challenges to the *communis opinio* on 1 Corinthians 15.29. *CBR* 10 (3): 379-395.
- Whitenton, Michael R. 2010. After ΠΙΣΤΙΣ ΧΡΙΣΤΟΥ: Neglected Evidence from the Apostolic Fathers. *JTS* 61 (1): 82–109.
- Whitters, Mark F. 2001. Some New Observations about Jewish Festal Letters. *JSJ* 32 (3): 272-288.
- Wiefel, Wolfgang. 1991. The Jewish Community in Ancient Rome and the Origins of Roman Christianity. In *The Romans Debate*. Revised and expanded. Pages 85–101. Ed. Karl Paul Donfried. Edinburgh: T & T Clark. Original publication date, 1970.
- . 1998. *Das Evangelium nach Matthäus*. THKNT 1. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.

- Wilckens, Ulrich. 1959. *Weisheit und Torheit: eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu 1. Kor. 1 und 2*. BHT 26. Tübingen: Mohr.
- . 1974. *Die Missionsreden der Apostelgeschichte: form- und traditions geschichtliche Untersuchungen*. 3rd ed. WMANT 5. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- . 1978-1982. *Der Brief an die Römer*. 3 vols. EKK 6. Zürich: Benzinger.
- Wilk, Florian. 1998. *Die Bedeutung des Jesajabuches für Paulus*. FRLANT 179. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Williams, Charles K. and Nancy Bookidis, eds. 2003. *The Centenary: 1896-1996. Corinth: Results of Excavations Conducted by The American School of Classical Studies at Athens X:X*. Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Williams, David J. 1999. *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character*. Peabody: Hendrickson.
- Williams, Guy J. 2009. *The Spirit World in the Letters of Paul the Apostle: A Critical Examination of the Role of Spiritual Beings in the Authentic Pauline Epistles*. FRLANT 231. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Willis, Wendell Lee. 1985. *Idol Meat in Corinth: the Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*. SBLDS 68. Chico: Scholars Press.
- Wilson, Walter T. 1991. *Love without Pretense: Romans 12.9-21 and Hellenistic-Jewish Wisdom Literature*. WUNT 2:46. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Winter, Bruce W. 1993. The Entries and Ethics of Orators and Paul (1 Thessalonians 2:1-12). *TynBul* 44 (1): 55-74.
- . 1997. *Philo and Paul among the Sophists*. SNTSMS 96. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2001. *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Wire, Antoinette Clark. 1990. *The Corinthian Women Prophets: a Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Wiseman, James. 1979. Corinth and Rome I: 228 B.C. – A.D. 267. *ANRW* II 7.1:438-548.
- Wisse, Jakob. 2002. The Intellectual Background of Cicero's Rhetorical Works. In *Brill's Companion to Cicero: Oratory and Rhetoric*. Pages 331–374. Ed. James M. May. Leiden: Brill.
- Witherington, Ben. 1995. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: a Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 2004. *Paul's Letter to the Romans: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- . 2006. *1 and 2 Thessalonians: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary*. Grand Rapids: W. B. Eerdmans.
- Witmer, Stephen E. 2006. θεοδίδακτοι: 1 Thessalonians 4.9: A Pauline Neologism. *NTS* 52:239-250.
- . 2008. *Divine Instruction in Early Christianity*. WUNT 2:237. Tübingen: Mohr

- Siebeck.
- Wolff, Christian. 1996. *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. THNT 7. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Wolter, Michael. 1978. *Rechtfertigung und zukünftiges Heil: Untersuchungen zu Röm 5,1-11*. BZNW 43. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2010. Böser Sex. Presented at the Oxford/Bonn Theology Seminar, University of Oxford.
- . 2011. *Paulus: Ein Grundriss seiner Theologie*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener.
- Woodman, Tony and Jonathan Powell, eds. 1992. *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wright, N. T. 1991. *The Climax of the Covenant: Christ and the Law in Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- . 1992. *The New Testament and the People of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 1. London: SPCK.
- . 2002. The Letter to the Romans. In *The New Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. 10. Pages 395–770. Nashville: Abingdon Press.
- . 2003. *The Resurrection of the Son of God*. Christian Origins and the Question of God 3. London: SPCK.
- . 2009. *Justification: God's Plan and Paul's Vision*. London: SPCK.
- . 2013. Paul and the Patriarch: The Role of Abraham in Romans 4. *JSNT* 35 (3): 207–241.
- Yadin, Azzan. 2003. 4QMMT, Rabbi Ishmael, and the Origins of Legal Midrash. *DSD* 10 (1): 130-149.
- Yarbrough, O. Larry. 1985. *Not Like the Gentiles: Marriage Rules in the Letters of Paul*. SBLDS 80. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Yarbrough, Robert. 2001. Paul and Salvation History. In *Justification and Variegated Nomism*. Vol. II: *The Paradoxes of Paul*. Pages 297–342. Ed. D. A. Carson, Peter T. O'Brien, and Mark A. Seifrid. WUNT 181. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Yinger, Kent L. 1999. *Paul, Judaism, and Judgment According to Deeds*. SNTSMS 105. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Zeller, Dieter. 1985. *Der Brief an die Römer*. RNT. Regensburg: F. Pustet.
- . 2009. Offene Fragen zum urchristlichen 'Reden im Geist'. In *Beiträge zur urchristlichen Theologiegeschichte*. Pages 231–246. Ed. Wolfgang Kraus and Ulrich B Müller. BZNW 163. Berlin: de Gruyter.