

STUDIEN ZUM NEUEN TESTAMENT UND SEINER UMWELT (SNTU)

Serie A, Band 20

Herausgegeben von DDr. Albert Fuchs
o. Professor an der Theologischen Fakultät Linz

Die "Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt" (Serie A = Aufsätze) erscheinen seit 1976, mit Originalaufsätzen oder bearbeiteten Übersetzungen sonst schwer zugänglicher Artikel. Inhaltlich werden wissenschaftlich-exegetische Arbeiten bevorzugt, gelegentlich auch historische und philologische Fragen behandelt.

Alle Manuskripte, Korrekturen, Mitteilungen usw., die die Serie betreffen, werden an den Herausgeber, Prof. DDr. Albert Fuchs, Blütenstr. 17, A-4040 Linz, erbeten. Es wird darum ersucht, die Manuskripte in Maschinschrift einseitig beschrieben, spationiert (auch und besonders die Fußnoten) und in druckreifem Zustand einzusenden. Hilfreich ist es auch, wenn die Beiträge zusätzlich auf PC-Diskette geliefert werden können (auf DOS-Basis und in unformatiertem Zustand).

Abkürzungen, Zitate und Schreibweise (Angabe von Untertiteln, Reihe usw.) sollten den bisher erschienenen Bänden entsprechen bzw. sich nach LThK² und TRE richten. Hebräische Texte werden bevorzugt in Transkription gedruckt.

Der reprofertige Satz wurde von Dr. Christoph Niemand angefertigt. Griechische und hebräische Texttypen sind im Programm "LOGOS" (Softwarevertrieb Sven Brands, Hebelstr. 2, D-68535 Edingen-Neckarhausen) erstellt.

Anschriften der Mitarbeiter:

Prof. Dr. Raymond F. Collins, School of Religious Studies,
The Catholic University of America, Washington DC 20064, U.S.A.
Prof. Dr. Bernhard Mayer, Guttenbergstr. 34, D-85101 Lenting
Prof. Dr. Franz Weißengruber, Lustenauer Straße 37, A-4020 Linz

Die von den Mitarbeitern und Rezensenten vertretenen Positionen und Meinungen decken sich nicht notwendigerweise mit denen des Herausgebers.

Copyright: Prof. DDr. A. Fuchs, Linz 1994. Alle Rechte vorbehalten.

Bestelladresse: Studien zum Neuen Testament und seiner Umwelt
Bethlehemstraße 20, A-4020 Linz

INHALTSVERZEICHNIS

BERNHARD MAYER

Beobachtungen zur Zeitangabe ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ in Mk 2,20 5

ALBERT FUCHS

Exegese im elfenbeinernen Turm.

Das quellenkritische Problem von Mk 1,2-8 par Mt 3,1-12 par Lk 3,1-17
in der Sicht der Zweiquellentheorie und von Deuteromarkus 23

RAYMOND F. COLLINS

"It was indeed written for our sake" (1 Cor 9,10).

Paul's Use of Scripture in the First Letter to the Corinthians 151

FRANZ WEISSENGRUBER

Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: II, 27.1

Apostolische Väter und Apologeten 171

REZENSIONEN 191

Bauckham R. (Hg), The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting (Fuchs)	228
Van Belle G., The Signs Source in the Fourth Gospel (Fuchs)	226
Bendemann R.v., Heinrich Schlier (Fuchs)	251
Berger K., Synopse des Vierten Buches Esra (Fuchs)	248
Betz O. - Riesner R., Jesus, Qumran und der Vatikan (Fuchs)	244
Biblich-historisches Handwörterbuch (Fuchs)	191
Bieringer R. - Lambrecht J., Studies on 2 Corinthians (Fuchs)	234
Bindemann W., Theologie im Dialog (Fuchs)	231
Bock D.L., Luke, I (Fuchs)	216
Bultmann R., Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition (Fuchs)	199
Charlesworth J.H. (Hg), The Dead Sea Scrolls (Fuchs)	242
Crump D.M., Jesus the Intercessor (Fuchs)	221
Elliott J.K., Essays and Studies (Fuchs)	201
Feldmeier R. (Hg), Die Heiden (Fuchs)	203
Fitzmyer J.A., Romans (Fuchs)	230
Focant C. (Hg), The Synoptic Gospels (Fuchs)	205
Frankemölle H., Evangelium. Begriff und Gattung (Fuchs)	204
Gnilka J., Theologie des Neuen Testaments (Fuchs)	193
Häfner G., Der verheißene Vorläufer (Fuchs)	210
Hengel M., Die johanneische Frage (Fuchs)	222

Hengel M. - Löhr H. (Hgg), Schriftauslegung (Fuchs)	201
Herzer J., Die Paralipomena Jeremiae (Fuchs)	245
Hoffmann P., Frühgeschichte der Jesus-Bewegung (Fuchs)	200
Hoppe R., Der Triumph des Kreuzes (Giesen)	238
Van Iersel B., Markus. Kommentar (Fuchs)	211
Jeffrey D.L., A Dictionary of Biblical Tradition (Fuchs)	253
Kettenbach G., Schiffahrtmetaphorik der Bibel (Fuchs)	252
Klauck H.-J., Der erste Johannesbrief (Fuchs)	240
Klauck H.-J., Der zweite und dritte Johannesbrief (Fuchs)	241
Kümmel W.G., Vierzig Jahre Jesusforschung (Fuchs)	198
Lambrecht J., Pauline Studies (Fuchs)	230
Lambrecht J., The Truth of the Gospel (Becker)	235
Lindars B., Essays on John (Fuchs)	225
Lohfink G., Studien zum Neuen Testament (Fuchs)	200
Lüdemann G., Die Auferstehung Jesu (Hasitschka)	194
Mateos J. - Camacho F., El evangelio de Marcos (Fuchs)	211
Mayer B. (Hg), Christen und Christliches in Qumran (Fuchs)	243
Meiser M., Paul Althaus als Neutestamentler (Fuchs)	250
Mell U., Die "anderen" Winzer (Fuchs)	212
Merklein H. (Hg), Bibel in jüdischer und christlicher Tradition (Fuchs)	202
Metzger B.M., Der Kanon des Neuen Testaments (Fuchs)	192
Morgenthaler R., Lukas und Quintilian (Fuchs)	217
Neirynek F. (Hg), Colloquium Biblicum Lovaniense (Fuchs)	254
Neirynek F., Q-Synopsis (Fuchs)	208
Neusner J., Die Gestaltwerdung des Judentums (Giesen)	246
Paget J.C., Epistle of Barnabas (Fuchs)	248
Pokorny P., Der Brief des Paulus an die Epheser (Fuchs)	237
Rapske B., Paul in Roman Custody (Fuchs)	228
Reimarus H.S., Kleine gelehrte Schriften (Weißengruber)	249
Reinmuth E., Pseudo-Philo und Lukas (Fuchs)	220
Schmithals W., Johannesevangelium und Johannesbriefe (Fuchs)	223
Schrage W., Der erste Brief an die Korinther, II (Fuchs)	232
Schreiber J., Die Markuspasion (Fuchs)	215
Stegemann W., Zwischen Synagoge und Obrigkeit (Fuchs)	219
Strecker G., Literaturgeschichte (Fuchs)	192
Tilly M., Johannes der Täufer (Fuchs)	209
Vögtle A., Judasbrief. 2. Petrusbrief (Fuchs)	242
Wenham D., Paul. Follower of Jesus (Fuchs)	229
Winter M., Das Vermächtnis Jesu (Fuchs)	226
Witherington B., Conflict and Community in Corinth (Fuchs)	233
Eingesandte Schriften	255

problem, nonetheless, remains with regard to the issue of the extent to which verses 33b-36 reflect Paul's own thought. Do they constitute some sort of community rule²⁴ and, if so what is its import? Or is the pair of rhetorical questions found in verse 36 Paul's rejoinder to a "Corinthian slogan" emanating from conservative patriarchal circles in Corinth. There is some likelihood that this latter interpretation is the correct one.²⁵ If this be the case it would have been Paul's Corinthian protagonists who referred to the law without reference to any particular scripture within the law. Paul's shift of vocabulary, from what "the law says" to "the word of God", constitutes, of itself, a theological critique of the reactionary position.²⁶ The law may say, but it is God who speaks. Obedience is expected as the proper response to the God who speaks (14,21).

2.5 While it may be argued that the expression, "the law says", in 14,34, is not originally from Paul, Paul often uses νόμος to designate the scriptures, especially the Pentateuch. In 1 Corinthians νόμος is once used of a Pentateuchal verse (Deut 25,4 in 9,9) and once of a prophetic text (Isa 28,11-12 in 14,21). In the former case the introductory lemma is ἐν τῷ Μωϋσέως νόμῳ γέγραπται, whereas in the latter it is ἐν τῷ νόμῳ γέγραπται. The language of 9,9 is without parallel in the extant Pauline writings.²⁷ It appears that Paul has made a distinction bet-

from the era which gave rise to 1 Tim 2,9-15, but some few (Ellis, Barton) consider the addition to have come from Paul himself. In her analysis, Schüssler Fiorenza states, "Since these verses cannot be excluded on theological grounds, it is exegetically more sound to accept that as original Pauline statements and then explain them within their present context". She considers them to be a "community rule". See *E. Schüssler Fiorenza, In Memory of Her: A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins*, London 1983, 230, 232. See also *B. M. Metzger, A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, Stuttgart 1994, 499-500.

²⁴ See *Schüssler Fiorenza, In Memory of Her*, 232; *W. A. Maier, An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 14:33b-38*, in: *CTQ* 55 (1991) 81-104.

²⁵ See *D. W. Odell-Scott, Let the Women Speak in Church. An Egalitarian Interpretation of 1 Cor 14:33b-36*, in: *BTB* 13 (1983) 90-93; *In Defense of an Egalitarian Interpretation of 1 Cor 14:34-36. A Reply to Murphy-O'Connor's Critique*, in: *BTB* 17 (1987) 100-103; *R. W. Allison, Let Women be Silent in the Churches (1 Cor. 14.33b-36): What did Paul Really Say, and What did it Mean?*, in: *JSNT* 32 (1988) 27-60; *e contrario, J. Murphy-O'Connor, Interpolations in 1 Corinthians*, in: *CBO* 48 (1986) 81-94; *D. J. Nadeau, Le problème des femmes en 1 Co 14/33b-35*, in: *ETR* 69 (1994) 63-65. Murphy-O'Connor considers the passage to be an interpolation, while Nadeau holds that the two verses represent Paul's own position.

²⁶ Cf. 12,1 (πνευματικῶν). 4 (χαρισμάτων).

²⁷ Cf. Gal 3,10 which is, however, a reprise of Deut 27,26.

ween "the law" and "the law of Moses", which would then be a reference to what is today termed the Pentateuch.

2.6 In his comprehensive study of the use of scripture by Paul, Koch has described Ps 8,7, in 15,27, as a scripture identified as such by its subsequent interpretation,²⁸ Ps 24,1 in 10,26 and Isa 22,13 in 15,32 as scriptures cited in a stylistically different fashion,²⁹ Isa 40,3 in 2,16 as a citation which is only loosely identified,³⁰ and Deut 17,7 in 5,13 as a citation which is totally unidentified.³¹ Koch does not include Sir 6,19 in 9,9, Isa 45,14 in 14,25, and Ps 110,1 in 15,25 among the passages cited by Paul in 1 Corinthians.

2.7 A classic consideration in any examination of Paul's use of Scripture is that of the provenance of his Greek text. In this regard it is frequently asserted that Paul generally quotes the scriptures according to the LXX,³² often from memory³³ or according to an oral tradition.³⁴ This position, which has been almost a given in the discussion on Paul's use of Scripture since the seminal work of Roepe and Kautzsch³⁵ in the nineteenth century, needs to be revisited in the

²⁸ Koch lists the 89 biblical citations which he identifies in Paul's letters within seven categories. His first category consists of 66 citations which have been formally introduced by Paul, all of which occur in the so-called *Hauptbriefe*. Koch's third category, "scripture identified as such by subsequent interpretation", includes only Ps 8,7 in 15,27 and the use of Exod 34,34 in 2 Cor 3,16. Cf. Koch, *Die Schrift*, 22. Presumably it is the expression ὅταν δὲ εἴπῃ in 15,27b which serves as the interpretative key in this regard.

²⁹ Koch's fifth category. Cf. Rom 11,34-35; 12,20; 2 Cor 9,10. Koch also includes the citation, apparently from Menander's *Thais* (Fragment 187), in this category. See Koch, *Die Schrift*, 23. This is the only passage in the authentic Pauline corpus where Paul uses a pagan author in this fashion, but see Tit 1,12; Acts 17,28 (2x).

³⁰ Along with Rom 10,13; 2 Cor 8,21; 9,7; 10,17 and Gal 3,11, 1 Cor 2,16 thus belongs to Koch's sixth category. See *Die Schrift*, 23.

³¹ This is Koch's seventh category. See also Ps 61,13 in Rom 2,6 and Isa 29,16 in Rom 9,20; Deut 19,15 in 2 Cor 13,1. See *Die Schrift*, 23.

³² For example, D. Moody Smith writes, "In Paul's quotation of the OT there are remarkable affinities with the LXX". See D. M. Smith, *The Pauline Literature: in D. A. Carson and H. G. M. Williamson, It is Written: Scripture Citing Scripture. Essays in Honour of Barnabas Lindars*, Cambridge 1988, 265-291, 272.

³³ Thus Ellis, *Paul's Use of the Old Testament*, 4.

³⁴ Thus Koch, 40, 42, particularly with regard to the scriptures cited at 1 Cor 1,31; 2,9; 9,10.

³⁵ G. Roepe, *De Veteris Testamenti locorum in apostolorum libris allegatione* (1827); A.F. Kautzsch, *De Veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo Apostolo allegatis*, Leipzig

light of contemporary Septuagintal studies.³⁶ Stanley, for example, has recently and judiciously observed:

Though his [=Paul's] primary text is clearly that Greek translation known today as the "Septuagint" (LXX), a number of Paul's quotations agree with readings preserved in only a minority tradition within the text-history of the LXX. In other places, Paul agrees with the majority tradition against a significant minority reading, or follows one strand of a strongly divided LXX tradition. Most interesting are those places where Paul's quotations appear to have come from a biblical text that is only weakly attested (if at all) in the extant LXX manuscripts.³⁷

As interesting and as important as this textual issue is, it need not further detain us here since our primary concern is to try to understand what Paul meant when he wrote, as he did in 9,10, that the scriptures were written for our sake (δι' ἡμᾶς ἐγράφη). How do the scriptures, written for our sake, function in Paul's rhetorical argument?

3. *Written For Our Sake*

3.1 A ready point of departure for a consideration of this issue must certainly be those two passages in 1 Corinthians, wherein Paul respectively tells his correspondents that the scriptures "were written for our sake" (δι' ἡμᾶς ἐγράφη, 9,10) and that they "were written down to instruct us" (ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νοουθεσίαν ἡμῶν, 10,11).³⁸ These passages are contained in the long section of the letter, which professedly contains Paul's paraenesis on the issue of food which has been offered to idols (1 Cor 8-10, cf. 8,1.4). The unit is structured according to the well-known concentric pattern, A-B-A', in which the central element constitutes a kind of digression which, in fact, undergirds and supports the entire argument.

1869. See also the later studies of H. Monnet (1874), H. Vollmer (1895), and W. Dittmar (1899, 1903).

³⁶ See Koch, *Die Schrift*, 2; J. Barr, Paul and the LXX: A Note on Some Recent Work, in: *JTS* 45 (1994) 593-601; Stanley, Paul and the Language of Scripture.

³⁷ Stanley, Paul and the Language of Scripture, 254-255.

³⁸ Cf. Rom 15,4.

3.2 The digression of chapter 9 constitutes, for the most part, a kind of an apology (9,3) in which freedom (9,1.19) and power/rights (ἐξουσία, 9,4.6.12) form the dominant themes. Although the digression is ostensibly an *apologia pro vita Pauli*, it is a fictive apology in which the use of examples is integral to the deliberative style of Paul's rhetoric. In 1 Corinthians, the example introduced by Paul is, more often than not, Paul himself (4,16; 11,1). Thus, while the digression talks about Paul's use of the freedom which is his and his use of the rights which are his, the entire piece is an object lesson for the Corinthians who are to learn from Paul's example how they should use their freedom with regard to the issue at hand, namely, food that has been offered to idols.

3.2.1 After a series of six rhetorical questions (vv. 4-7), Paul offers introduces a disjunctive rhetorical question to buttress his remarks. The rhetorical question is actually a double question whose first part expects a negative response, while the second part awaits a positive response: "Do I say this on human authority? Does not the law also say the same?" (Μὴ κατὰ ἄνθρωπον ταῦτα λαλῶ ἢ καὶ ὁ νόμος ταῦτα οὐ λέγει, 9,8). Having argued from reason (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον)³⁹ for the legitimacy of the exercise of one's rights in verses 4-7, Paul claims that the scriptures themselves provide a warrant for the legitimate exercise of rights. Then, for the first time in his interrogatory appeal, Paul chooses to answer his own question. Yes,⁴⁰ the law does imply that one has a right to exercise one's rights, "for it is written in the law of Moses, 'you shall not muzzle an ox while it is treading out the grain'" (9,9). The scripture pertinent to Paul's argumentation is Deut 25,4.⁴¹ Paul's introductory lemma, "it is written in the law of Moses", is

³⁹ Paul employs this formula with a similar connotation in Rom 3,5 and Gal 1,11. Cf. 1 Cor 3,3; 15,32; Gal 3,15. Paul's ἄνθρωπος is contrasted with his ὁ νόμος, thereby implying that Paul considers ὁ νόμος to be the word of God. Notwithstanding the contrast between the type of arguments adduced, Paul has incorporated the scriptural citation in v. 9 into a logical argument. In his quasi-syllogistic reasoning, v. 9a serves as the major premise of his argument, while the rhetorical questions of vv. 9b-10 serve as the minor premise. See *W. Wuellner*, Paul as Pastor: The Function of Rhetorical Questions in First Corinthians, in *A. Vanhoye*, ed., *L'Apôtre Paul. Personnalité, style et conception du ministère* (BETL, 73), Leuven 1986, 49-77, 68.

⁴⁰ Note the use of γάρ; cf. BDF, 452.

⁴¹ Deut 25,4 is cited with similar purpose in 1 Tim 5,18. Dewey observes that this may represent an exception the general rule that the pastoral epistles do not refer to the text of Paul's letters, but adds that, "the passage in 1 Tim hardly seems a reference to the Corinthians letter". See *Dewey*, *Textuality*, 55, n. 18.

hapax in his extant correspondence; it is, nonetheless, a textual equivalent of a rabbinic formula.⁴²

3.2.2 Having quoted from Deut 25,4 a fragment of agricultural law, Paul again uses a disjunctive rhetorical question in order to ponder the significance of the scripture. As in 8a-b, the rhetorical question of 9c-10a is actually a double question whose first part expects a negative response, while the second part awaits a positive response: "Is it for oxen that God is concerned? Or does he not speak entirely for our sake?" Once again Paul answers his own question, using the particle γάρ to suggest the positive response: "it was indeed (γάρ) written for our sake that (ὅτι) whoever plows should plow in hope and whoever threshes should thresh in hope of a share in the crop" (10b-d).⁴³

A number of commentators, Weiss and Conzelmann among them, hold that Paul's ὅτι is recitative. The parallelism between 8a-9b and 9c-10d suggests that there is merit to their case. In both instances there is a disjunctive rhetorical question (μη ... ἢ ... λέγει), a response introduced by a rhetorical γάρ, featuring a formulaic use of γράφω, and consisting of what is apparently a quotation, focusing on the use of ἀλοάω, which functions as a catchword linking the two "scriptures" with one another.⁴⁴ That verse 9b is a citation of Deut 25,4 is clear. The source of 10cd is less clear. Its balanced structure and non-Pauline language (ἀροτριάω, ἀλοάω) suggest that it is an element of traditional lore. Recognition of the virtually contrived character of Paul's second scripture underscores the importance which he attaches to his "scriptural" argumentation.

3.2.3 Weiss and Conzelmann opine that the "scripture" may be an otherwise unknown agraphon. Brewer⁴⁵ suggests that Paul may well be referring to a well-known *halakah*,⁴⁶ later incorporated into the Mishnah:

⁴² See *b. Yoma* 35b, 66a.

⁴³ Adapted from the NRSV in consideration of ὅτι being construed as a recitative ὅτι.

⁴⁴ See *C. Plag*, Paulus und die *Gezera schawa*: Zur Übernahme rabbinischer Auslegungskunst, in *Judaica* 50 (1994) 135-140.

⁴⁵ See *D. I. Brewer*, 1 Corinthians 9.9-11: A Literal Interpretation of "Do not Muzzle the Ox", in: *NTS* 38 (1992) 554-565, 558.

⁴⁶ Without further specification, Tomson suggests that the halakhic midrash on wages is an element of apostolic halakah, derived from the Jewish church. See *P. J. Tomson*, Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles (CRINT, III, 1), Assen-Minneapolis 1990, 144-145.

These may eat [of the fruits among which they labor] by virtue of what is enjoined in the Law: he that labors on what is still growing after the work is finished, and he that labors on what is already gathered before the work is finished; [this applies only] to what grows from the soil (*b. B. Mes.* 7,2).

Paul's ability to offer such a parallel to Deut 25,4 was facilitated by the customary practice of comparing domestic animals, farmhands⁴⁷ and other servants in halakah pertaining to agriculture and tort.⁴⁸

3.2.4 In 9,8-10, Paul has, in effect, employed a kind of a kind of *kal va-homer* argumentation,⁴⁹ whose focal point is the disjunctive rhetorical question in 9c-10a. By eliciting an implicit negative response to the first part of his question, Paul does not so much intend to deny God's providential care of animals,⁵⁰ but to argue according to a line of thought that is similar to the modern legal principle, *de minimis non curat lex*, the law is not concerned with trivia.⁵¹ His rhetoric implies that it is not so much animals who benefit from Deut 25,4 as it is humans who profit from the legal prescription. On a somewhat superficial level it can be argued that humans benefit from the law insofar as they obey it. The thrust of Paul's argument goes beyond this, however. Using the *gezerah shavah* principle to link traditional halakah with the biblical precept, and exploiting the full rhetorical force of his *kal va-homer* argumentation, Paul claims that if animals are to receive a just reward for their labors, a fortiori humans are entitled to a just recompense for their labors.

3.3 Paul's use of Deut 25,4 in 9,8-10 is clearly subordinated to his hortatory purpose. His argument, in fact, functions on two levels. On a first level he wishes to establish that apostolic labors merit due recompense. That goal is, however,

⁴⁷ With regard to apostolic work, Paul employs a different agricultural image in 3,5-9.

⁴⁸ Cf. *b. B. Mes.* 87a-91b; *m. Yad.* 4,7; Philo, *Virt.*, 145 (27).

⁴⁹ The argument from the minor premise to the major, from the lesser to the greater - essentially an a fortiori appeal - is the first of R. Ishmael's hermeneutical principles.

⁵⁰ Much depends on how the πάντως of v. 10 is to be translated. If the word is to be rendered "entirely" (NRSV, RSV, NJB; cf. REB), Paul is virtually rejecting the literal sense of the text. If the word is to be rendered "really", "surely", or "certainly" (RNAB, *The New Translation*; NIV; JB), Paul has retained the literal sense of the biblical passage but has subordinated the agricultural norm to its hortatory value. This is certainly the case in this instance.

⁵¹ Cf. Philo, *Somm.*, 1, 93; *Aristeas*, 144.

subordinated to Paul's ultimate purpose which is to exhort the Corinthians to forgo, as he did, the exercise of ἐξουσία and an otherwise legitimate use of their ἐλευθερία for the benefit of others within the community. Paul's paraenetic intention⁵² is similarly in evidence when he uses the scriptures in 10,1-13. He explicitly states that these things have been written for our admonition (ταῦτα ... ἐγράφη δὲ πρὸς νουθεσίαν ἡμῶν, 10,11).⁵³

Paul's discussion of the Exodus events in 10,1-13 is meshed with the discussion of food offered to idols, not only by the theme of idolatry, which Paul uses to characterize the behavior of the Israelites at the time of the Exodus (10,7), but also by the double exhortation which he addresses to the Corinthians to flee from idolatry, not only in verse 7, but also in the pointed remark elicited from his scriptural meditation (v. 14). For the Corinthians the issue at hand is food offered to idols (εἰδωλοθύτων, 8,1,4). As such it is a matter of eating and drinking. Eating and drinking provide the common thread for the three arguments which Paul introduces into the discussion: his own example, the example of the Israelites in the wilderness, and the Corinthians' experience of the eucharist. The first rhetorical question in Paul's apology is, "Do we not have the right to our food and drink? (μὴ οὐκ ἔχομεν ἐξουσίαν φαγεῖν καὶ πεῖν, 9,4). During the Exodus the Israelites "all ate (ἔφαγον) the same spiritual food and all drank (ἔπιον) the same spiritual drink" (10,3-4). Again, "the people sat down to eat and drink (φαγεῖν καὶ πεῖν)" (10,7). In the eucharist, the Corinthians share the cup and share the bread (ποτήριον ... ἄρτον, 10,16).

3.3.1 The citation of Exod 32,6 in 10,1-13 is, as has been noted, the only explicit citation of scripture in the entire passage. It forms the hinge of Paul's homiletic exposition insofar as what precedes the citation describes the wilderness events whereas what follows the citation is the paraenetic exhortation which Paul addresses to the Corinthians. The citation of Exod 32,6 is singular in Paul's exposition not only by reason of its form and function, but also because Paul's nar-

⁵² "Paul most often appeals to the authority of scripture to reinforce ethical precepts or to adjudicate specific questions of personal conduct and church policy (Rom 13,9f; 14,11; 1 Cor 5,13; 9,9; 2 Cor 8,15; 9,9; and elsewhere)", says *H. Marks*, *Pauline Typology and Revisionary Criticism*, in: *JAAR* 52 (1984) 71-92, 76.

⁵³ According to von Harnack, this is but an incidental claim, and not truly indicative of Paul's own practice. The present essay is offered as a demurer. See *A. von Harnack*, *Das Alte Testament in den paulinischen Briefen und in den paulinischen Gemeinden*, in: *Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Berlin 1928, 124-141, 138.

rative rehearsal seems otherwise to allude to the book of Numbers narrative account of the wilderness events.⁵⁴ Exod 32,6 is introduced with no little irony on Paul's part.⁵⁵ In the Book of Exodus, its "eating and drinking" refer to the feasting that accompanied the idolatrous worship of the golden calf. As Paul used the verse, it hearkens back to the people's eating the food (the manna) and drinking the water (from the rock) which God had provided for them during the wilderness experience. After the experience of such graciousness of God in their regard, the idolatry of the people was all the more remarkable.

3.3.2 Paul expected the Christians at Corinth to learn from this example. They are exhorted to consider the people of Israel (10,18). The Israelites had eaten spiritual food and had drunk spiritual drink. In somewhat analogous fashion, the Corinthians had shared the cup and the bread provided at the table of the Lord. Despite their having been nourished by the Lord, the Israelites had become idolatrous. The Corinthians must take this example to heart. Lest a similar fate overtake them, they must flee from idolatry. The present imperative (φεύγετε, 10,14) suggests that idolatry is a real rather than merely a potential danger for the Corinthians.

3.3.3 In two passages of his disquisition on the matter of food offered to idols, that is, in 10,1-15 and 9,8-10, Paul has used the scriptures in the service of his paraenesis, albeit in different fashions. 1 Cor 9,8-10 is one of the two passages in 1 Corinthians where Paul explicitly cites the book of Deuteronomy, one of his most commonly used biblical sources. Deuteronomy is also cited in 5,13, where Paul uses a Deuteronomic exclusionary formula (Deut 17,7)⁵⁶ with good rhetorical effect. It is, however, not only in the service of his ethical exhortation that Paul uses the scriptures in 1 Corinthians. He also does so when he addresses his remarks to those Corinthians who would deny the resurrection of the dead.

⁵⁴ N-A²⁷ offers Num 20,7-11 (v. 4); 14,16 (v. 5); 11,4 (v. 6). 34 (v. 6); 25,1 (v. 8). 9 (v. 8); 21,5-6 (v. 9); 14,2 (v. 10). 36 (v. 10); 16,11-35 (v. 10), while Hays refers to Num 14,26-35; 25,1-9; 26,62; 21,5-9; 16,41-50. See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 92. Collier, "That we Might not Crave Evil", considers that the entire piece is a midrash on Numbers 11's ἐπιθυμία motif, in the tradition of Pss 78 and 106.

⁵⁵ See Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 92.

⁵⁶ Cf. Deut 13,5; 19,19; 21,21; 22,21; 24,7. On the significance of Paul's use of the Deuteronomic exclusionary formula, see B. S. Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics: A Study of 1 Corinthians 5-7* (AGJU, 22), Leiden 1994, 61-68.

4. Some Say there is No Resurrection of the Dead

4.1 Paul's use of *kal va-homer* and *gezerah shavah* techniques⁵⁷ in 1 Cor 10,1-13 has led Pitta to designate this pericope as one of three in 1 Corinthians in which Paul has employed a kind of midrashic argumentation.⁵⁸ The others are 1 Cor 1,18-2,16 and 1 Cor 15,20-28.45-49. In 1 Cor 15,1 Paul reiterates the proclamation which he had earlier made to the Corinthians (γνωρίζω δὲ ὑμῖν, ἀδελφοί, τὸ εὐαγγέλιον ὃ εὐηγγελισάμην ὑμῖν). His disclosure formula serves to underscore the need to repeat the gospel, which is epitomized - and highlighted as being of first importance (ἐν πρώτοις)! - in the credal formula of 15,3. The problem at hand, to which Paul responds with so much emphasis, is the Corinthians' denial of resurrection from the dead (v. 9). In Paul's analysis the resurrection of the dead is intrinsically connected with the resurrection of Christ, which is the focal point of his gospel. The nub of Paul's argument is to be found in vv. 20-28, where he explains the implications of his kerygma. Key to his explanation is the affirmation that the risen Christ is the first fruits of those who have died (vv. 20,23). Apocalyptic language is the kind of discourse appropriate to a discussion of the resurrection. It is noteworthy that apocalyptic language is characterized by allusion to and citation of the scriptures. As Paul writes about the resurrection he introduces the notion of the kingdom (βασιλεία, v. 24), a key theme in Jewish apocalyptic and the preaching of Jesus, yet a notion which Paul but rarely introduces into his correspondence.⁵⁹ By way of explanation (note the introductory γὰρ in v. 25), Paul makes use of a scriptural midrash featuring Pss 110,1 and 8,7.⁶⁰

4.2 The first of the rabbinic *middot* for the interpretation of the scripture is the *gezerah shavah* principle. According to this principle, the appearance of a scriptural expression in another passage of scripture warrants the interpretation

⁵⁷ Rabbinic tradition attributed both of these *middot* to Hillel, but it is likely that the rules were developed prior to the great Rabbinic hero.

⁵⁸ See Pitta, Sinossi paolina, 99-117.

⁵⁹ Cf. Rom 14,17; 1 Cor 4,20; 6,9.10; 15,24.50; Gal 5,21; 1 Thess 2,12.

⁶⁰ The combination apparently pre-dated Paul, but Paul offers the oldest documentary evidence of the christological use of these psalm verses. The pair was frequently used in early Christian apologetic (see Eph 1,20-23 [clearly dependent upon 1 Cor 15, 23-28]; cf. O. Michel, Paulus und seine Bibel, Gütersloh 1929, 193; 1 Pet 3,22; Heb 1,13; 2,6-9; cf. Mark 12,36; Matt 22,44). Like Paul, later authors used the brace of scriptural verses for their own purposes.

of the one in the light of the other. Paul has fully exploited the implications of this principle as he brings Ps 110,1 and 8,7 together in a forceful rhetorical unit (vv. 25-27a),⁶¹ on which he offers an explanatory comment in verses 27b-28. The expressions which link the two verses together are the universal "all" (πάντας, πάντα) and the regal "under his feet" (ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ). In order to bring the two texts together in mutually clarifying elucidation, Paul has amended the text of Ps 110,1 in such a radical fashion that many commentators prefer not to identify his use of the psalm as a direct quotation. To the biblical text Paul has added an interpretive πάντας. With this addition, Paul has not only set the stage for the correlation with Ps 8,7, he has also transformed the text so as to include death, and not merely the political enemies to which the text originally referred, among the enemies to be destroyed. Paul has also changed the psalm's ὑποπόδιον τῶν ποδῶν σου to ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ. These are precisely the two elements which establish the link with Ps 8,7, to be introduced in verse 27, and they are both Pauline creations, at least in their present form.⁶² Paul has, moreover, also tailored Ps 8,7 so as to make the link with his revised text of Ps 110,1. In Ps 8,7 he has substituted a ὑπὸ τοὺς πόδας for the LXX's ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν. The change does not alter the meaning of the psalm verse but it does link Paul's two scriptures with one another. In sum, not only has Paul made use of the *gezerah shavah* principle in his argument, he has modified the wording of the biblical texts in order to be able to do so.

To be sure, Paul's modification of Ps 110,1 is more radical than is his modification of Ps 8,7. Psalm 110 is a royal psalm, in which Yahweh addresses the enthroned king, "Sit at my right hand until I make your enemies your footstool". Paul introduces this biblical verse into his discussion on the eschatological kingdom by means of the verb βασιλεύειν (cf. βασιλεία, v. 24), a verbal allusion to the king's sitting at the right hand of God (Ps 110,1). To this is appended as a descriptive element the psalm's "until he has put all his enemies under his feet",⁶³ whose pronominal references have been changed by Paul to adapt the scripture to his epistolary context and thus serve his christological argument. It is patently

⁶¹ A linkage between these two scriptures is also exploited in Eph 1,20-23. See also Heb 1,13-2,8.

⁶² See *Stanley*, *Paul and the Language of Scripture*, 206-207.

⁶³ This citation of Ps 110,1 constitutes the oldest evidence of the christological use of Psalm 110, whose first verse is the biblical verse most often quoted in the New Testament (Matt 22,44; Mark 12,36; Luke 20,42-43; Acts 2,34-35; Heb 1,3.13, with not a few additional allusions in these and other books of the New Testament).

clear that Paul intends his readers to understand that all enemies will be under Christ's feet, but who is the actor in the drama, God or his Christ? In the biblical text, with its first person singular, it is God who is the actor; in Paul's use of the adapted text, with its third person singular, it appears that Christ is the actor whom Paul has in mind.⁶⁴ Christ is God's eschatological agent. Christ will vanquish death, the ultimate enemy.

4.3 The argument from scripture utilized by Paul in 15,25-27 is hardly incidental in his treatment of the denial of the resurrection of the dead. Granted that he has recourse to apocalyptic language, of which scriptural allusions are a characteristic feature, but Paul's use of the scriptures in 15,25-27 functions as much more than as an embellishment from imagination. His argument from scripture functions as a kind of enthymeme, or rhetorical syllogism, in which the case is established that death will ultimately be vanquished, through the agency of the Christ, whose enthronement is alluded to, and whose own resurrection has been affirmed. In this instance the use of $\gamma\alpha\rho$ to introduce each of the scriptures cited by Paul provides textual evidence of Paul's use of the scriptures in a quasi-syllogistic fashion. In this fashion, Paul not only implicitly affirms the authority of the scriptures, he also points to their abiding relevance and their eschatological horizon. The emphatic $\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}$ (v. 25) with which Paul begins his scriptural argument serves as a textual marker of this perspective.

5. *Written to Instruct Us*

5.1 This altogether brief essay has not been able to consider in detail all of the passages in which Paul employs the scriptures in 1 Corinthians. Nor has it been able to examine all of the ways in which Paul uses the scriptures in his rhetorical argument. It has, however, attempted to show that the use of the biblical scriptures is not indifferent to Paul's rhetorical argument. A legitimate claim can be made that Paul's first letter to the Corinthians is characterized by its deliberative mode of rhetoric.⁶⁵ In classical rhetoric the point to be established was demonstrated by a proof ($\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$) or series of proofs ($\pi\acute{\iota}\sigma\tau\epsilon\iota\varsigma$).

⁶⁴ See the substantive arguments advanced by *J. Lambrecht*, Paul's Christological Use of Scripture in 1 Cor. 15,20-28, in: NTS 28 (1982) 502-527; rep. in: *Pauline Studies* (BETL, 115), Leuven 1994, 125-149, 134-140.

⁶⁵ See, among others, but especially, *M. M. Mitchell*, Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians, Louisville 1991.

The πρόθεσις of Paul's letter is a plea for unity within the community (1,10). Two issues which divided the community of Christians at Corinth and which Paul to resolve in order that his plea for unity be effective were the matter of food offered to idols, on which the members of the community were divided, and belief in the resurrection of the dead, for which there were naysayers. The former was a behavioral matter, the latter a credal matter, insofar as it was a consequence of the credal belief that Jesus had been raised from the dead. In addressing both kinds of divisive issues, Paul employed a scriptural argument.

According to the classical rhetoricians, Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintillian being among the most noteworthy, there were three modes of proof, the proof from one's own authority, ἔθις,⁶⁶ the appeal to the audience, πάθος, and a kind of logical proof, λόγος. In the appeal from λόγος, it was customary to distinguish a kind of deductive proof and a kind of inductive proof. The use of a syllogistic reasoning known as ἐνθυμήσις was characteristic of deductive reasoning. In 9,9-10 and again in 15,25-27 Paul uses the biblical scriptures in precisely this fashion. In a fashion similar to the way Hellenists used proverbs and the dicta of gnomic wisdom in their reasoning, Paul used the Jewish scriptures. In 10,1-5, Paul used the scriptures in a different fashion. In rhetorical induction, the example (παράδειγμα) was all-important. Aristotle considered that there were two kinds of examples, the historical example and the invented example.⁶⁷ The story of God's people were written in the scriptures. It is to their example that Paul appeals in 10,1-5. He labels the story of the Exodus events as a τύπος rather than a παράδειγμα. Nonetheless, the wilderness story summed up in 10,1-5 functioned very effectively as a rhetorical παράδειγμα in Paul's appeal to the Corinthians. In his rhetorical argument, Paul used the scriptures both as authoritative λόγος and as historical example.

The rhetoricians cited the importance of the inventio or εὑρεσις is the development of a rhetorical argument. The fashion in which Paul used the scriptures, at times carefully editing the text for his own purposes, and deftly introducing them into a tightly structured argument shows that the crafting of biblical mate-

⁶⁶ Insa Saw suggests that Paul has cited Gen 2,7 in 15,45 and Isa 25,8-Hos 13,18 in 15, 54-55 in order to enhance his authority (cf. 15, 27, 32, 33). To the extent that this case can be made, Paul has used scripture for purposes of his ἔθις as well as in his logical proof. See *I. Saw, Paul's Rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 15: An Analysis Utilizing the Theories of Classical Rhetoric*, Lewiston etc. 1995, 213.

⁶⁷ See *Aristotle, Rhetorica*, Rh 2.20.2.1393b.

rial was very much a part of Paul's εὑρεσις. His use of the scriptures was more than the employ of literary embellishment.

5.2 The scriptures which Paul so carefully wove into his first letter to the Corinthians were the Hebrew scriptures, albeit rendered in Greek translation in his letter. Paul's view of these scriptures and the way in which he used them was consistent with the way that they were used among his people. He referred to them as did the rabbis. His introductory *lemmata* indicate that, for Paul, the scriptures were the word of God, but also that they were significant insofar as they had been written down. The frequency of Paul's use of γράφω to identify the scriptures which he used in his rhetorical appeal should suffice to make it clear that the *scriptural* character of his argument was not a matter of indifference to him. Use of the scriptures was integral to Paul's εὑρεσις.

As time moved forward, rabbinic usage virtually canonized its principles of hermeneutics. Perhaps the most important of all issues was that the scriptures, particularly the Torah, continue to be relevant for God's people. The relevancy of the scriptures was not only something that Paul affirmed, it was also necessary for his rhetorical argument. As Paul used the scriptures in his argument, he interpreted the scriptures according to a pattern of hermeneutics which would be categorized in the first and second principles of the rabbinic *middot*, *gezerah shavah* and *kal va-homer*.

Paul's application of the like with like comparison was indeed a studied one. In 15,25-27 he changed the wording of the biblical text so as to be able to use a comparison in his interpretation of the texts; he would do so later in the chapter when he uses Isa 25,8 and Hos 13,14 as a hermeneutical pair. Earlier, Paul had performed a similar exercise in 3,19-20, where he associated Job 5,13 and Ps 93,11.⁶⁸ That association was truly disingenuous. "Wise" (σοφοί) was the catchword which allowed Paul to link the passages together, thus providing a path to their communal interpretation. In order to bring the passages together, Paul cited only phrases from Job 5,13 and rendered the "our thoughts" of Ps 93,11 as "the thoughts of the wise" on the basis of the immediately preceding verse in the psalm (Ps 93,10).

If Paul's own hermeneutical principles were similar to some of those that would become standard in rabbinic hermeneutics, it might also be observed that Paul's use of the scriptures shows some similarities with halakic and haggadic

⁶⁸ See C. Plag, Paulus und die *Gezera schawa*, 138-139.

readings of the biblical texts. There is a marked resemblance between the logion cited by Paul in 9,10cd and a well-known *halakah*. Paul's use of the Exodus story in 10,1-5 shows affinity with rabbinic *haggadah*. While Paul is concerned with the text of scripture, which he nonetheless modifies for his own purposes, his use of the scripture is immersed in the on-going hermeneutical process of the Jewish oral tradition. Thus, despite Paul's studied use of selected scriptural texts,⁶⁹ there is more than a little truth to Dewey's assertion that, "Paul and his churches were fundamentally dependent on the oral medium and oral authority".⁷⁰ Indeed, both Tomson and Rosner have convincingly articulated the claim that, to a large extent, Paul's use of the Jewish scriptures in his paraenesis has largely been mediated to him through Jewish tradition.⁷¹ One ought to expect no less since Paul has characterized the community at Corinth to which he was writing as "the church of God", clearly a biblical characterization of those Christians.⁷²

5.3 In his discussion of Paul's use of scripture, Richard Hays has written about Paul's "typological reading strategy".⁷³ That strategy included not only a christological component, as is seen in Paul's use of a brace of scriptural verses in 15,25-27, but also an ecclesial component. On the basis of his reading of the scriptures and his conviction of their abiding relevance, Paul is also able to make an ecclesial statement. That statement includes not only a reflection about what the church is, but also a variety of paraenetic exhortations which spell out in various ways, and with the people of Israel as an example, what it means for the church of God at Corinth to be called as God's holy people (1,2).

⁶⁹ The formulaic expression of 5,13 (cf. Deut 17,7), with its striking use of *ἐξάίρω*, hapax not only in Paul, but also in the entire in the New Testament, provides one indication of Paul's selectivity.

⁷⁰ Dewey, *Textuality*, 56.

⁷¹ See Tomson, *Paul and the Jewish Law*; Rosner, *Paul, Scripture and Ethics*.

⁷² See, for example, Deut 23,1; Jud 20,2.

⁷³ Hays, *Echoes of Scripture*, 164.