Pauline Eucharistic Theology in 1 Corinthians, with special reference to Chapters 10 and 11

Wilson, Franklin Arthur

Franklin Arthur Wilson

Pauline Eucharistic Theology in 1 Corinthians, with special reference to Chapters 10 and 11

The purpose of this thesis is to examine Paul's theology of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians. In so doing, the thesis takes issue with the proposition that Paul's eucharistic theology is largely dependent upon themes derived from the Passover meal.

The first chapter examines the relationship between the Last Supper and the Passover meal. In recognition of the liturgical nature of the eucharistic texts, the thesis follows J. Jeremias in seeing the paschal character of the Last Supper supported by narrative details in the Gospels. In addition, the thematic character of the Passover meal is investigated with a view toward understanding the first century meal as a celebration of freedom and joy.

The second chapter assesses the place of the Lord's Supper and Passover in 1 Corinthians. Following a survey of the Letter, texts exhibiting possible paschal references are examined, as well as texts bearing possible references to the Lord's Supper.

Having concluded that the Pauline eucharistic tradition does bear paschal images, chapter three seeks to examine exegetically the relationship between the tradition and Paul's interpretation of it. The conclusion is drawn that Paul interprets the eucharistic tradition in terms of participation and unity in the body of Christ.

In chapter four additional examples of Paul's theme of participation and unity in the body of Christ are examined and viewed in relation to his use of the theme in his eucharistic teaching.

The thesis concludes in chapter five by exploring the link between the language of participation and unity in the body of Christ and Paul's ethical teaching of building up the church through love as it is expressed in 1 Corinthians. Thus, a view is gained of the Apostle's eucharistic theology as a part of his larger ethical teaching in 1 Corinthians.

Pauline Eucharistic Theology in 1 Corinthians, with special reference to Chapters 10 and 11

Franklin Arthur Wilson

Degree of Master of Arts in Theology

University of Durham

Department of Theology

1984

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The completion of this project provides much needed opportunity to express my appreciation to those individuals whose wise council and long-suffering patience have both prospered the enterprise and endured its formation.

I have to record a singular debt of gratitude to my supervisor, Dr. John F. McHugh, Senior Lecturer in the University of Durham, Department of Theology; his careful supervision has provided immense insight into the task of theological research in general and Pauline studies in particular. In addition, I would thank Professor C.K. Barrett and the members of his 1982 Departmental and Post-Graduate Seminar for the experience of sharing in and learning from their patient scholarship, and in particular Dr. Bruce N. Kaye, then Senior Tutor in St. John's College, Durham, for his kind encouragement.

It remains only for me to express my thanks to those persons for whom no amount of gratitude will suffice; my wife, Marcia Kathleen, and our children Katharine, Andrew, and John are they who have borne well the sacrifice in order that my goal might be accomplished.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

ABBREVIATIONS

A. Periodicals

CTJ	Calvin Theological Journal.
CBQ	Catholic Biblical Quarterly.
ET	Evangelishche Theologie.
ExT	Expository Times.
HTR	Harvard Theological Review.
JBL	Journal of Biblical Literature
JTS	Journal of Theological Studies.
NT	Novum Testamentum.
NTS	New Testament Studies.
RTR	Reformed Theological Review.
SJT	Scottish Journal of Theology.
ZNW	Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft und die Kunde des Urchristentums.

B. Books and Articles

Barrett, Romans	C.K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 1957.
Barrett, 1 Corinthians	C.K. Barrett, A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians, 1968.
Barrett, Paul	C.K. Barrett, Essays on Paul, 1982.
Barrett, "Things"	C.K. Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols," in NTS 11 (1965), 138-153.
Barrett, Background	C.K. Barrett (ed.), The New Testament Background: Selected Documents, 1956.
Bauer	W. Bauer, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature, translated from the 4th revised and augmented edition by W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich, 1957.
Benoit	P. Benoit, "The Accounts of the Institution and What they Imply," in The Eucharist in the New Testament, J. Delorme (ed.), translated by M. Stewart, 1964.
Best	E. Best, One Body in Christ, 1955.

B. Books and Articles (Continued)

Bornkamm, Experience	G. Bornkamm, Early Christian Experience, translated by P. Hammer, 1969.
Bornkamm, Paul	G. Bornkamm, Paul, translated by D. Stalker, 1971.
Bultmann	R. Bultmann, Theology of the New Testament I, translated by K. Grobel, 1952.
Moulton and Geden	W. Moulton and A. Geden, A Concordance to the Greek Testament, 4th edition, 1963.
Conzelmann	H. Conzelmann, 1 Corinthians, translated by J. Leitch, 1975.
Cranfield, Romans 12-13	C.E.B. Cranfield, A Commentary on Romans 12-13, 1965.
Cranfield, Romans	C.E.B. Cranfield, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, 1975.
Danby	H. Danby, The Mishnah, 1933. Abbreviation of mishnaic tractate titles follows Danby, p. 806.
Davies	W.D. Davies, Paul and Rabbinic Judaism, 3rd edition, 1964.
Delorme	J. Delorme, "The Last Supper and the Pasch in the New Testament," in The Eucharist in the New Testament, J. Delorme (ed.), translated by M. Stewart, 1964.
EJ	Encyclopeadia Judaica, 1971-72.
Gregg	D. Gregg, Anamnesis in the Eucharist, 1976.
Gundry	R. Gundry, 'SŌMA' in Biblical Theology with Emphasis upon Pauline Anthropology (Soc. N.T.S. Monograph Series, 29), 1976.
Gunther	J. Gunther, St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background (Novum Testamentum Supplement, 35), 1973.
Hauck	F. Hauck, "κοινός- κοινόω," in TDNT III, 789-809.
Héring	J. Héring, The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, translated from the 2nd French edition by A. Heathcote and P. Allcock, 1962.
Horsley, "Consciousness"	R. Horsley, "Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8-10," in CBQ 40 (1978), 574-589.

B. Books and Articles (Continued)

Horsley, "Pneumatikos"	R. Horsley, "Pneumatikos and Psychikos: Distinctions of the Spiritual Status among the Corinthians," in HTR 69 (1976), 269-288.
Horsley, "Wisdom"	R. Horsley, "Wisdom of Word and Words of Wisdom in Corinth," in CBQ 39 (1977), 224-239.
Hurd	J. Hurd, The Origins of First Corinthians, 1965.
Jeremias, Jerusalem	J. Jeremias, Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus, translated by F.H. Cave and C.H. Cave, 1969.
Jeremias, Words	J. Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, translated from the 3rd German edition by N. Perrin, 1966.
Jones	D. Jones, "Ἀνάμνησις in the LXX and Interpretation of 1 Cor. xi. 25," in JTS 6 (1955), 183-191.
Käsemann, Essays	E. Käsemann, Essays on New Testament Themes (Studies in Biblical Theology 41), translated by W. Montague, 1964.
Käsemann, Perspectives	E. Käsemann, Perspectives on Paul, translated by M. Kohl, 1969.
Kuhn	K.G. Kuhn, "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran," in The Scrolls and the New Testament, K. Stendahl (ed.), 1958, 65-93.
Kümmel	W.G. Kümmel, Introduction to the New Testament, translated by A. Mattill Jr., 1966.
Lietzmann	H. Lietzmann, Mass and Lord's Supper, translated by D. Reeve, 1979.
Michel	O. Michel, "οἶκος -οἰκουμένη" in TDNT V, 119-159.
Moule	C.F.D. Moule, "The Judgment Theme in the Sacraments," in The Background of the New Testament: Studies in Honour of C.H. Dodd, W.D. Davies and D. Daube (editors), 1956, 464-461.
Nygren	A. Nygren, Commentary on Romans, translated by C. Rasmussen, 1952.
Orr and Walther	W. Orr and J. Walther, 1 Corinthians, 1974.

B. Books and Articles (Continued)

Robinson	J.A.T. Robinson, The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology Studies in Biblical Theology 5), 1952.
Sanders	E.P. Sanders, Paul and Palestinian Judaism, 1977.
Schweitzer	A. Schweitzer, The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle, translated by W. Montgomery, 1956.
Schweizer I	E. Schweizer, "πνεῦμα - πνευματικός " in TDNT VI, 332-451.
Schweizer II	E. Schweizer, "σῶμα - σωματικός " in TDNT VII, 1024-1094.
Segal	J. Segal, The Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times to AD 70, 1963.
Smith	D. Smith, "Meals and Morality in Paul and His World," in Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers, K.H. Richards (ed.), 1981, 319-339.
Stauffer	E. Stauffer, "ἀγαπάω - ἀγαπητός " in TDNT I, 21-55.
Theissen	G. Theissen, Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums, 1979.
TDNT	Theological Dictionary of the New Testament, G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (editors), translated and edited by G. Bromiley, 1964-1974.
de Vaux	R. de Vaux, Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions, translated by J.F. McHugh, 1961.
Winter	B. Winter, "The Lord's Supper at Corinth: An Alternative Reconstruction," RTR 37/3 (1978), 73-82.
Wedderburn	A. Wedderburn, "The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in 1 Cor.," SJT 24/1 (1971), 74-96.

Chapter 1

THE LAST SUPPER AND THE PASSOVER MEAL

The primary purpose of this study is to explore the eucharistic theology of St. Paul, as he employs it in chapters 10 and 11 of the First Letter to the Corinthians. Yet, in any exegetical treatment of texts relating to the Lord's Supper, it has proven to be a matter of some necessity and more than a little debate to raise the question of the relationship, if any, between the last supper of Jesus and the Passover meal.

This is of particular importance in the study of Paul's eucharistic theology for at least two reasons. In the first place, Paul's references to the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians 10 and 11 are probably the earliest written eucharistic texts.[1] St. Mark's tradition (Mk. 14.22-24) may indeed be as old or even older in form than Paul's,[2] but the Apostle's teaching is almost certainly the earliest written record we possess. It is, therefore, of interest that in 1 Corinthians we have neither a reference to the Eucharist as an example of what may have been the earliest eucharistic practice of the Palestinian Church, the "breaking of bread"[3] as a continuation of "meal fellowship with the historical Jesus"[4] or as a celebration of the resurrection appearance meals,[5] or to a Last Supper-type Passover meal in which the Eucharist actually divided a meal.[6]

In the second place, it has not been uncommon in the study of Pauline theology for scholars to assert that "...Paschal ideas dominate his [Paul's] view of the Eucharist."[7] If indeed this is the case, we must ask whether Paul's tradition (1 Cor. 11.23-25) is founded upon the account of the Last Supper as a Passover meal. Moreover, it does not necessarily follow that a connection between Paul's eucharistic tradition and a paschal Last Supper requires a Pauline paschal interpretation of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians.

Either way, in order to understand rightly Paul's interpretation of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians, we must ask whether it is first necessary to appreciate the "...heilsgeschichtliche connection in which the Eucharist stands."[8]

In order to address these and other questions, it will be first necessary to consider briefly the issue of the Last Supper as a Passover meal. We will begin by discussing the significance of the literary type in which the texts have come to us. Secondly, and on the basis of the initial discussion, we will survey the debate surrounding the Last Supper as a Passover meal in the Gospels and in Paul. Finally, an attempt will be made to assess the main themes of the Passover meal as it was celebrated in Jerusalem prior to the destruction of the Temple; this will be done in order to determine what might have been the chief paschal ideas connected with the Passover meal in the time of Paul.

A. Eucharistic Texts: The Interpretation of Liturgical Tradition

The texts of the New Testament which bear witness to the Last Supper words of Jesus as eucharistic words are fourfold: Mark 14.22-24, Matthew 26.26-27, Luke 22.19-20,[9] and 1 Corinthians 11.23-25.[10] While each of these texts varies from the others, it is widely held that they are uniform in at least one respect: their literary type. They are liturgical texts.[11]

What this designation means, on the face of the matter, is quite clear: as liturgical texts, they reflect the worship life of the ancient congregations in which they were used and, to a large extent, in which they were developed.[12] Beyond this, however, it has also been suggested that, with the exception of Matthew's account, the liturgical character of the texts reflects not literary dependence,

but the development of independent liturgical traditions.[13] Thus, in Mark (and in Matthew beyond Mark), Luke, and 1 Corinthians, is reflected the process of evolution of individual traditions as the results of a variety of liturgical pressures being exerted upon a common tradition in particular worship settings.[14]

In spite of these commonly held views, however, a more pressing set of questions generally derives from the liturgical texts a more diverse set of answers. These questions pertain to the relationship between liturgical tradition and historical event, or, at least, the account of an historical event. Do the liturgical traditions concerning the Last Supper words of Jesus have their roots in an historical event? Or are such traditions to be treated as aetiological cult legends which testify only to the worship life of the congregation in which they had their genesis? On the other hand, if it can be held that these traditions have their foundation in an historical account, can the testimony of the traditions be garnered to prove or disprove the character of the historical event upon which the account rests?

Does an historical account and, hence, an historical event lie behind the tradition of the liturgical texts? This is a far-reaching question to which the limits of this study cannot do justice. Let it suffice to recognize the two most obvious and most common responses.

There are, on the one hand, scholars who contend that the liturgical texts are based upon aetiological cult legends which grew up in the ancient communities in an effort to account for cultic practice, i.e., to legitimate worship practice according to the content of faith.[15] Obviously, according to this point of view, there is no historical account or event behind the liturgical tradition.

On the other hand, there are those for whom the comparison of the liturgical texts leads to the conclusion that there lies behind the independent traditions a common tradition based upon an historical

event.[16] Here, however, it must be emphasized that the character of the historical event is a matter of much debate. The suggestions include a Passover meal, a communal Essene-type meal, a haburah meal, a symbolic meal.[17] Most scholars, however, would agree that an analysis of the Marcan, Lucan, and Pauline traditions shows forth a common tradition which, in turn, is based upon an historical account.

But what was the nature of the historical event upon which the account was based? In this regard, it is necessary in our investigation to ask whether the liturgical texts can prove or disprove the historical character of the Last Supper.

The liturgical texts have been characterized as "solemn, stylized language,"[18] "bare concise texts,"[19] containing "festive language and parallelism,"[20] "discreet to the point of baldness,"[21] "with no attempt at description."[22] What all of this descriptive language means has been summed up by Kuhn; he writes of the liturgical formulas, "...nothing in the formulas of institution speak for or refuses such a [paschal] setting."[23] While Kuhn's view is, perhaps, extreme, it serves well to demonstrate the point of view that the liturgical texts transmit, in large part, traditional material that has been de-historicised by means of its process of development.[24] This means that possible evidence of the historical event upon which the liturgical texts are based is probably absent from the texts themselves. Hence, the historical character of the Last Supper probably cannot be determined on the basis of the liturgical texts alone.

This is a significant step in the discussion, as it has great bearing upon many of the traditional arguments leveled against the account of the Last Supper as a Passover meal. These arguments are typified by Bornkamm, when he writes, "...in the Lord's Supper there are no words of explanation for the lamb, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs; and the Lord's Supper is constituted through a

completely different kind of bread-word and cup-word that has no analogy at all in the Jewish celebration."[25] If, however, the liturgical character of the texts is seriously considered, then it must be recognized that the process of their evolution has, of necessity, "obliterated"[26] most, if not all, of the details of the historical event upon which they are founded. Thus, assertions that the Last Supper could not have been a Passover meal because of the lack of certain characteristic details may be overruled on the basis of the history-obscuring tendency of the liturgical traditions. Any historical details surviving would have done so more by accident than by design, and might well not correspond to the primary characteristics of the historical event, i.e., lamb, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs. Hence, we conclude with Delorme that, "...it certainly cannot be proved in the name of liturgical tradition, that the last supper was not a paschal meal."[27]

If then, the historical character of the Last Supper cannot be determined on the basis of the liturgical texts, what are the texts by which such a determination might be made? Following Jeremias, we suggest the narrative framework of the Gospels themselves. If a consistent description of the historical character of the Last Supper can be established on these grounds, then any remnant details in the liturgical texts might be used to affirm that description. This is the method adopted by Jeremias in his classic investigation, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. It is largely upon his work that the following observations are based.

B. The Last Supper and the Passover Meal in the Gospels and in Paul

The recognition of the liturgical character of the eucharistic texts has necessitated our examination of the narrative framework of

the Gospels and by this we mean the place of the Last Supper in the Passion narratives of the Gospels.[28] Of the four cannonical Gospels, only the Synoptics bear explicit witness to the Last Supper of Jesus as a Passover meal.[29] In the Fourth Gospel, a eucharistic tradition is extant, but not in the context of the Last Supper.

1. The Synoptics

The Synoptic Gospels are unequivocal in their presentation of the Last Supper as a Passover meal. In Mark 14.12 (ἵνα φάγῃς τὸ πάσχα), Matthew 26.17 (φαγεῖν τὸ πάσχα), and Luke 22.8 (τὸ πάσχα, ἵνα φάγωμεν), the references are likely to "eating the Passover lamb."[30]

But beyond the obvious references to τὸ πάσχα in all three accounts, there are other elements in the narratives which, taken individually, are of little consequence; yet, when considered collectively, these elements weigh heavily in favour of the Last Supper as a Passover meal. Jeremias designates fourteen such elements, not all of which are found in the Synoptic narratives.[31] Of those features found in the Synoptics, we will note those which seem most weighty:

a. The meal took place in Jerusalem (Mk.14.13 par.; 14.36 par.). Since, most likely, the reform of Josiah (621 B.C.), it had been necessary (for the proper celebration of the Passover festival) to eat the Passover meal in Jerusalem.[32]

b. Jesus celebrated the meal with the Twelve (Mk. 14.17; Matt. 26.20).[33] This number corresponds roughly to Passover practice.[34] Some scholars, however, contend that Jesus' celebration with his disciples militates against the family character of the Passover meal.[35] In fact, the opposite may be the case; if we consider Mk. 3.31-35, it is clear that either Jesus, or the tradition stemming from him, spoke of his family in other than traditional terms.

c. Jesus and his disciples reclined at table (Mk. 14.18, Matt. 26.20, ἀνάκειμαι ; Lk. 22.24, ἀναπίπτω). Both terms indicate a posture uncommon at ordinary meals; yet it was ritual duty at the Passover meal to recline at table as a symbol of the participants' freedom.[36]

d. The breaking of bread took place during the course of the meal (Mk. 14.22; Matt. 26.26). Contrary to the normal custom of breaking bread at the beginning of the Jewish meal,[37] the breaking of bread during the Passover meal took place following the eating of the preliminary course.[38] Jeremias points out that even though the phrase, "And as they were eating..." (καὶ ἐσθιόντων αὐτῶν), is the transitional work of the editor, it still reflects an uncommon meal practice, the practice common to the Passover meal.[39]

e. Wine was drunk at the meal (Mk. 14.23-25; par.). "Wine was drunk only at festive occasions,"[40] of which the Passover meal was certainly one. There were not fewer than four cups of wine drunk at the paschal meal.[41]

f. The meal concluded with the singing of hymns, (Mk. 14.26; Matt. 26.30), most likely the "singing of hymns of praise."[42] It is striking that the Passover meal is ended with the singing of the second part of the Passover Hallel, the Psalms of praise.[43]

g. Following the meal, Jesus did not leave Jerusalem and return to Bethany, but went instead to the Mount of Olives (Mk. 14.32 par.). Jeremias has demonstrated that it was required of Passover pilgrims that they spend the night of 14/15 Nisan within the district of Jerusalem.[44]

h. During the meal, Jesus spoke words of interpretation over bread and wine (Mk. 14.22f; Matt. 26.26f; Lk. 22.19f). As is well known, the interpretation of ritual foods was (and still is) a standard part of the Passover meal.[45] It is true, however, that the

interpretation of such food during the paschal meal takes place during the haggadah and not during the blessings over bread and wine which frame the meal's main course.[46] This matter is complicated by the dissimilarity between Jesus' interpretive words over the bread and cup and the traditional interpretation given the lamb, unleavened bread, and bitter herbs in the haggadah.[47] Yet, there were a variety of interpretive methods available[48] and, assuming that a paschal Last Supper would have had a haggadah, it would have been possible for Jesus, at that point in the meal, to prepare his disciples for the rather unorthodox blessings of bread and wine that were to follow.[49] Furthermore, the argument that the interpretive words over the bread and cup are non-paschal because they are out of keeping with standard Passover practice, loses force when we consider the degree to which the Gospel narratives portray Jesus' unorthodox postures vis-à-vis standard traditions.[50]

Neither the possibility of an original development over and against the traditional practice nor the probability of a variety of acceptable practices existing simultaneously, the sort of which Jeremias has indicated,[51] ought be lightly dismissed.

The above eight features have been pared from Jeremias' fourteen because (with the exceptions of "d" and "f") they are common to all three of the Synoptic narratives and, as such, lend considerable collective weight to the character of the Last Supper as a Passover meal.

2. The Gospel of John

The waters surrounding the Fourth Gospel are much less clear. St. John's passion chronology stands in direct contradiction to that of the Synoptics. The crux of the contradiction is the Passover meal. If John 18.28 ("Then they led Jesus from the house of Caiaphas

to the praetorium. It was early. They themselves did not enter the praetorium, so that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover.") is allowed to function as the key chronological reference in the Johannine timetable, then it is clear that in the Fourth Gospel the trial and the crucifixion of Jesus take place before the Passover meal. As is well known, in John's Gospel (19.14) Jesus is crucified on the Day of Preparation (14 Nisan) while the Passover lambs are slaughtered in the Temple.[52] This, of course, means that John's Passion chronology is one day ahead (according to the Passover calendar) of the Synoptics'.

On the other hand, St. John agrees with the Synoptics that Jesus was crucified on a Friday,[54] and the betrayal was announced during the Last Supper.[55] Also, in spite of his chronology, John is in agreement with the Synoptic narratives on at least four of the above mentioned paschal details: the meal was held in Jerusalem (18.1), with the closest circle of disciples (13.5), who reclined at table (13.12, 23, 25, 28), and afterwards remained with Jesus in the environs of Jerusalem (18.2).[56]

Finally, the Fourth Gospel's account of the Last Supper (13.2ff) has preserved at least three additional paschal details either less clearly stated or unmentioned in the Synoptic narratives.

a. According to John 13.30, the meal took place at night. The use by John of νύξ in comparison with the Marcan and Matthean ὀψία (Mk. 14.17; Mt. 26.20) is more clearly in keeping with the Passover tradition,[57] as ὀψία may refer either to the time either prior to or after sundown.[58]

b. The Passover offering (lamb) belonged to the category of "Lesser Holy Things."[59] It was necessary, therefore, to celebrate the Passover meal in a state of "levitical purity."[60] That is, those who participated in the meal had to be ritually clean by means of a

purifying bath (cf. Numbers 19.19). Thus, the reference during the washing of feet (John 13.5-11) to "He who has bathed...." (ὁ λελουμένος), could be an indication of levitical purity in preparation for consuming the Lesser Holy Things, which may well have been the Passover offering.

c. In John 13.29 the disciples assume that Judas has been sent out to buy something necessary for the festival or to make a gift to the poor. According to Jeremias, both misconceptions could easily have been made in the context of a Passover meal.[61]

In addition to the above details, it may be argued that the early Christian identification of Jesus with the Passover lamb[62] could have functioned as a liturgical-theological force sufficient to enable the Evangelist in the Fourth Gospel to relocate in time the crucifixion, so that it would literarily coincide with the sacrifice of the paschal lambs in the Temple.[63] Thus, Jeremias quotes the thinking of J. Betz when he writes, "The typology became the chronology."[64]

Hence, it can be seen that the Fourth Gospel, by the repeated identification of Jesus with the Passover lambs, ultimately serves to "emphasize the connection"[65] between the Passion and the Passover. It follows then that the Last Supper, as a primary event in all four Passion narratives, takes on fresh paschal overtones.

Thus, while the explicit structure of the Johannine account, epitomized by John 18.28, is in obvious conflict with the Synoptic chronology, there is considerable implicit evidence in the Fourth Gospel which is in agreement with the Synoptic narrative detail and in support of the paschal character of the Last Supper.

3. St. Paul: 1 Corinthians 11.23-25

As we have already seen, the Apostle Paul made use of the tradition which identified Jesus with the Passover lamb.[66] Yet this does

not necessarily mean that Paul's use of the tradition ought to weigh against the Last Supper as a Passover meal. It is quite possible that the identification of Jesus with the paschal lamb could have arisen "...out of the sayings of Jesus at the Last Supper..."[67] and not from the time at which he was actually crucified.

Regarding the Last Supper itself, St. Paul provides us with no narrative account. His information regarding the setting in which the eucharistic words were spoken is contained in the context of and in the introduction to the liturgical text, 1 Cor. 11.23-25. Yet, the introductory words of this text ("...the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed...") provide us with two striking supportive details. If an historical event (i.e., the Last Supper) does indeed lie behind the tradition transmitted by the Apostle, then we may accept these details as surviving remnants of that event.

a. In support of the Johannine witness (John 13.30), the Pauline tradition speaks of a meal at night (ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ). Kuhn, however, argues that this phrase, as part of the introduction to the liturgical formula, has "...more significance for the literary history of the tradition than for the actual history of the event."[68] Yet, this argument does not ring true. If it be granted that an event lies behind the tradition (as Kuhn admits one does), then it must be asked why the tradition would be introduced by a time reference, if not to anchor it in "a definite history, one ordained by God."[69] Of course, the definite history of the event remains less than clear without further description; but this we have in the balance of the phrase.

b. The meal took place on the night "...in which he was betrayed." It is significant that the word (παραδίδωμι) Paul's tradition uses to speak of Jesus' betrayal is the same word used in various forms by each of the four Gospels (Matt. 26.21; Mk. 14.18;

Lk 2.21-22; John 13.21) to announce the Betrayal during the course of the Last Supper. At the very least, it seems clear that the Pauline tradition is rooted in the same meal of which the Gospels speak.[70]

At the very heart of the Pauline eucharistic tradition (1 Cor. 11.25a) there are two features which may, more than any others, be summoned in support of the collective paschal image derived from the details in the Gospel narratives. The first clause of verse 25 reads, "In the same way also the cup, after supper..."(ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι).

a. The ὡσαύτως καὶ , with reference to the cup, may be taken to refer back to the way in which Jesus had earlier in the formula taken bread, blessed and broken it.[71] As we have seen, the blessing of bread and wine are standard elements of the structure of the Passover meal. That the meal was not an ordinary meal is evidenced again by the presence of wine[72] and by the prepositional phrase that follows.

b. The phrase μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι is an indication, in the first place, that the Pauline tradition is not reflecting a symbolic meal, but a real one: a supper separates the interpretive words over bread and cup. It is significant that Luke's tradition is in agreement with Paul's on this point, while at the same time, preserving the likely ancient order of the "eschatological prospect" (Lk. 22.15-18) over an earlier cup.[73] Thus, the antiquity of the Pauline tradition's meal order is supported. This is invaluable, since, as we know, the order of the Passover meal was such that the meal's main course came between the blessing of the unleavened bread and the third cup.[74]

It was common at the Passover meal for a guest or participant other than the head of the family to pronounce the benediction over the third cup.[75] It is not, however, too difficult to imagine that Jesus, in the context of his last Passover meal,[76] would set aside a

given rubric, especially if it were his desire to give the disciples "...a share in the atoning power of his death..." by means of the bread and cup.[77]

Thus, in the liturgical tradition transmitted by Paul, there can be seen the remnant of a meal held at night, a night connected by the Betrayal with the Passion of Jesus, and a meal which knew the blessing of bread and wine separated by a supper. The remnant details of the Pauline tradition are all the more significant in that the Church's earliest celebrations were evidently not based upon the Last Supper tradition.[78] Therefore, the surviving paschal details of the Last Supper cannot be derived from liturgical practice, but from "historical reminiscence."[79]

In summary, we have seen that the framework of the Passion narratives in all four Gospels maintain details strongly in favour of the Last Supper as a Passover meal. We have also seen that the Johannine chronology, if it is derived from the typology of Christ as the Passover lamb, implicitly emphasizes the paschal character of the Passion of which the Last Supper was a part. Finally, from the Pauline liturgical tradition alone, we have discerned remnant details which confirm the implicit and explicit witness of the Gospels that the Last Supper was a Passover meal.

C. The Thematic Character of the Passover Meal

Our purpose here is to gain insight into the thematic character of the Passover meal as it was celebrated in Jerusalem in the time of St. Paul, i.e., during the first sixty years of the first century A.D.[80] Whether Paul ever went to Jerusalem as a Passover pilgrim is not known; but it is thought that Paul was raised in Jerusalem,[81] and, as Acts 22.3 indicates, that he was a student there. Thus, it

seems reasonable to conclude that Paul, at least during his years as a student and later as a Pharisee, knew first hand the Passover meal as it was observed in Jerusalem before the destruction of the Temple.

Our inquiry will proceed on the basis of a brief historical survey of the Passover festival, a discussion of the themes inherent in the Passover meal, and a brief analysis of two elements of the Passover liturgy.

1. Historical Survey

In the first century A.D., the Passover meal was the inaugural event of the larger festival of Passover-Unleavened Bread and, at that time, this festival was the "...principal feast of the Jewish year."[82] As such, Passover was one of the three great pilgrimage feasts held each year at the central shrine, Jerusalem;[83] it was of immense popularity, with Jewish families traveling as pilgrims from throughout Palestine and from all over the known world in order to properly celebrate Passover in Jerusalem.[84] On the eve of Passover (14 Nisan), during the meal itself, the participants reclined at table, ate sumptuously, drank wine, and sang hymns of praise all in commemoration of the deliverance from Egypt.[85]

Although in the first century the Passover festival was the chief feast of the year, it had not always been so.[86] While there is much debate concerning the history of the festival, most scholars hold that the seven day feast of New Testament times had its origins in two separate celebrations: Passover and Unleavened Bread.[87] That this is probable can be seen even from evidence in the Gospels where the feast is called by both names.[88] It is also well attested that a study of the Old Testament evidence reveals references to Passover celebrations without Unleavened Bread and observances of the feast of Unleavened Bread without a Passover lamb.[89] Even in the Mishnah,

there are indications of Rabbinic awareness of Passover's evolution as the rabbis discuss the distinction between the "Passover of Egypt" and the "Passover of the Generations."[90]

It does seem likely, then, that the festivals of Passover and Unleavened Bread had separate origins. But whether the Passover originated from the nomadic practice of sacrificing a first-born lamb for the welfare of the flock,[91] and the festival of Unleavened Bread stemmed from the agricultural celebration of the beginning of the barley harvest,[92] or even if the two feasts had a common origin in the New Year celebration,[93] is not crucial for our purposes. The significant point for our study is the recognition that, whatever their origins, the feasts underwent an evolution of meaning and importance from one or two feasts among many to the principal feast of the year.

What was the catalyst that enabled this transformation to occur? More than likely it was at least twofold. Of first importance must have been the association of the feasts with the Exodus tradition; in the Pentateuch, all of the traditions associate both Passover and Unleavened Bread with the story of the Exodus from Egypt;[94] no doubt, the feasts' popularity owed much to this ancient and beloved tradition. Of secondary, and perhaps equal, importance must have been the establishment of the feasts as a combined festival in Jerusalem, under the jurisdiction of the Temple, and, therefore, a pilgrimage.[95] Thus, in the time of St. Paul (and for centuries prior) the festival of Passover-Unleavened Bread was held in Jerusalem as a pilgrimage feast in commemoration of the Exodus event.[96] In this context, the Passover meal had become a "joyous family celebration."[97]

2. Themes Inherent in the Passover Meal

Of the Passover meal, Jeremias has written, it is "...the table celebration of the whole people of God, the high point of the year.

The solemn setting, the reclining on couches, the festal wine, the paschal lamb, the liturgy of the feast, mark it as a meal of rejoicing...."[98] M. Barth is in agreement with this. In his explanation of the Lord's Supper as "ein Freudenmahl," he says of the Passover meal that because of the action (Wirkung) of the lamb's blood which was thrown at the foot of the altar, "Man dürfte fröhlich feiern."[99]

If the Passover meal was a "night of rejoicing,"[100] it was this because it was also a night in celebration of freedom; "...the Passover meal was a feast of freedom."[101] This freedom which the meal celebrated was, of course, based upon the "salvation wrought by God,"[102] as recorded in the books of Exodus and Deuteronomy.[103] It was in light of the traditions of deliverance that the meal was celebrated as a feast of freedom and joy.

Doubtless other themes were prominent in the paschal celebration as well: purity,[104] sacrifice,[105] commemoration,[106] thanksgiving.[107] However, it is here contended that these features took on their full meaning only in relationship to the central themes of freedom and joy. The preparatory rites of purification and sacrifice anticipated the culminating celebration of the meal. The acts of commemoration and thanksgiving served to call to mind and express the freedom and joy at the heart of the meal.

3. Haggadah and Hallel: Two Elements of the Passover Liturgy

In order to demonstrate the fundamental centrality of the twin themes of freedom and joy, we will briefly examine two constituent elements of the Passover meal liturgy: the haggadah and the hallel. As the Mishnah indicates, both were standard features of the liturgical structure which surrounded the main course of the Passover meal.[108]

a. The Passover haggadah took place after the preliminary course and the mixing of the second ritual cup of wine.[109] It evolved out of the exegesis of Exodus 12.26f, 13.8[110] and involved the interpretation of the meal's ritual foods. During this interpretive meditation, the paterfamilias, in response to formal questions raised generally by a son,[111] "...never failed to recall the meaning of the feast and the symbolism of the various dishes."[112] He could "...prolong at will..."[113] the duration of the interpretation, probably according to the maturity of the person posing the questions.[114]

As to the meaning the head of the family might give the feast and the ritual dishes, this was anchored in the scriptural tradition.[115] In the Mishnah, we read, "...he begins with the disgrace and ends with the glory."[116] Furthermore, in the same tractate, Rabban Gamaliel[117] comments on the haggadah saying, "In every generation a man must so regard himself as if he came out of Egypt...He [God] brought us out from bondage to freedom, from sorrow to gladness, and from mourning to a Festival day...."[118]

Through the scriptural injunction to both personalize and make contemporary the Exodus deliverance, the haggadah became a primary means by which the themes of freedom and joy were both announced and interpreted for the meal participants. It is true that the haggadah itself was the responsibility of the person functioning as the paterfamilias and that there were different means of interpretation acceptable.[119] It can be said as well that the mere existence of the Mishnaic injunctions concerning the fulfilling of ones "obligation"[120] at Passover is an indication that this may not always have been done. Yet, at the chief feast of the year, surrounded by his family, with the heavy weight of the tradition bearing down upon him, it is doubtful that many a father missed his opportunity to tell the story, least of all in the pious household from which a "Hebrew born of Hebrews,"[121] such as Paul, would have sprung.

b. If the haggadah allowed for a certain amount of improvisation, this must not have been the case with the hallel. As a standard element of the paschal liturgy, the only question about its place in the meal seems to have been where the first section ended and the second began.[122] Even a cursory reading through Psalms 113-118 confirms the centrality of the dual themes of freedom and joy.

Following the haggadah before the main course and coming after the third cup following the main course, the singing of the hallel formed part of the frame which enclosed the central portion of the meal.[123] If, as Jeremias suggests, the teaching of Shammai represents the older practice, then we should think of the first part as consisting of Psalm 113 and the second half made up by Psalms 114-118.[124] We will take a brief look at Psalms 113 and 118, since, no matter where the hallel might have been divided, Psalm 113 would have begun the singing and Psalm 118 would have ended it.

i. Psalm 113 begins and ends with the exclamation "Praise the Lord!" God's praise is sung because he is "high above all nations" (v. 4); he demonstrates his glory by "raising the poor from the dust" and by lifting "the needy from the ash heap to make them sit with the princes..." (vv. 7-8a). Further, "He gives the barren woman a home making her the joyous mother of children." (v. 9). Here we see expressed a joy that is grounded in the God who rescues the poor, the humble, and the powerless, fulfilling the hopes of his people by his freeing power.

ii. Psalm 118, which ended the meal's singing, sounds a note of confident triumph; both at the beginning and ending, the Psalm proclaims that the Lord "...is good; his steadfast love endures forever." In verses 2-4, members of the community, in their turn, affirm God's steadfast love. Then, in verse 5, the reason for this

affirmation is given: "Out of my distress I called on the Lord; the Lord answered me and set me free." Later, following the famous passage concerning the rejected stone that "...has become the head of the corner" (v. 22), the Psalm announces, "This is the day which the Lord has made: let us rejoice and be glad in it." (v. 24).

Clearly, Psalm 118 is a hymn of joyful deliverance; it is a song in celebration of surprising freedom, the sort of freedom Israel first knew in its deliverance from slavery in Egypt. But it was, no doubt, the sort of freedom and joy of which the Jewish people longed to sing in the first century under Roman occupation. The Passover hallel provided an opportunity to sing of such freedom and joy.

We have seen that the twin themes of freedom and joy are fundamental to the central story and song which framed the heart of the Passover meal. The themes are founded upon the wonderous tale of God's delivery of his people; he had brought them from "...bondage to freedom....from mourning to a Festival day...."[125] The participants in the meal are themselves those who have been set free; they rejoice and sing because the story and song of deliverance belong to them.

As we turn our attention to Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians, we must bear in mind the festive character of the Passover meal. We need to ask if it is this meal of freedom and joy that is Paul's means of interpreting the Lord's Supper, which likely had its origin in just such a meal. We need to ask if it is the case that "...Paschal ideas dominate his [Paul's] view of the Eucharist."[126]

Notes, Chapter 1

1. Kümmel, p. 205, dates the composition of 1 Corinthians "...in the spring of 54 or 55."

2. Jeremias, Words, pp. 186-193.

3. Delorme, p. 22. However, Bultmann, p. 144 doubts that "the breaking of bread" was ever a technical term for the Eucharist.

4. Kuhn, p. 86.

5. O. Cullmann (ed.), Essays on the Lord's Supper (1958), p. 8.

6. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 137f.

7. Davies, p. 250.

8. Jeremias, Words, pp. 16; 88.

9. Concerning the integrity of the "long" Lucan text, see Jeremias, Words, pp. 139-159.

10. As will be seen below (p. 11), it is the contention of this study that the Pauline eucharistic tradition is rooted in the historical Last Supper.

11. Benoit, p. 72f; Bultmann, p. 144; Delorme, p. 29f; Jeremias, Words, p. 137; Lietzmann, p. 178f.

12. Delorme, p. 29; Kuhn, p. 79.

13. Kuhn p. 79; Jeremias, Words, p. 104f.

14. Delorme, p. 30.

15. See for example, Bultmann, History of the Synoptic Tradition (1963), p. 265f; also, the comments of Kuhn, p. 79f.

16. See for example, Jeremias, Words, p. 137.

17. A Passover meal, Jeremias, Words, p. 62; a communal Essene-type meal, Kuhn, p. 86f; a haburah meal, Lietzmann, p. 185; a symbolic meal, Segal, p. 246.

18. Jeremias, Words, p. 97.

19. Benoit, p. 73.

20. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 134.

21. Delorme, p. 29.

22. Delorme, p. 29.

23. Kuhn, p. 263, note 4.

24. Delorme, p. 30.

Notes, Chapter 1 (continued)

25. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 132f.

26. Delorme, p. 30.

27. Delorme, p. 34.

28. Jeremias, Words, p. 16, speaks of the Passion in the "narrow sense": Mk. 14.17-18.47; Matt. 26.20-27.61; Lk. 22.14-23.56a; John 13.2-19.42.

29. Jeremias, Words, p. 17f, concerning the apparently ambiguous time reference of Mk. 14.12.

30. C. K. Barrett, "Luke XXII.15: To Eat the Passover," JTS 9 (1958), 305-7.

31. Jeremias, Words, pp. 46-62.

32. Jeremias, Jerusalem, p. 76.

33. K. H. Rengstorff, "ἀπόστολος," TDNT I, p. 428.

34. Jeremias, Words, p. 48f.

35. See for example Kuhn, p. 83f. However, Segal, p. 241 and note 7 on the same page, raises the possibility of a Passover haburah constituted by participants other than members of a family.

36. Jeremias, Words, p. 48f.

37. Delorme, p. 22.

38. Danby, Pes. 10.3, p. 150, "...he eats it seasoned with lettuce, until he is come to the breaking of bread...."

39. Jeremias, Words, p. 49.

40. Jeremias, Words, p. 50.

41. Danby, Pes. 10.1, p. 151.

42. Bauer, p. 884.

43. Danby, Pes. 10.7, p. 151.

44. Jeremias, Jerusalem, p. 61.

45. Danby, Pes. 10.5, p. 150f; see also Jeremias, Words, p. 56f.

46. Kuhn, p. 83.

47. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 133; see also Danby, Pes. 10.5, p. 150f.

48. Jeremias, Words, pp. 57f.

49. Jeremias, Words, pp. 231.

Notes, Chapter 1 (continued)

50. See for example, Mk. 2. 23-28 and parallels, also Lk. 4.21.

51. Jeremias, Words, p. 58.

52. Delorme, p. 52f.

53. Jeremias, Words, p. 19.

54. According to the Johannine narrative, the day following the crucifixion is a sabbath (John 19.31).

55. John 13.21; see also Mk. 14. 18-21 and parallels.

56. Jeremias, Words, pp. 55 and 81.

57. Danby, Zeb. 5.8, p. 475.

58. Bauer, p. 614.

59. Danby, Zeb. 5.8, p. 475.

60. Jeremias, Words, p. 49.

61. Jeremias, Words, p. 53f.

62. The texts in the New Testament in evidence of this tradition are as follows: 1 Cor. 5.7; 1 Peter 1.19; Revelation 5.6, 9, 12; 12.4; John 1. 26, 36; 19.14, 36. For further discussion see Jeremias, "πάσχα," TDNT V, p. 900.

63. Delorme, p. 54f.

64. Jeremias, Words, p. 83.

65. Jeremias, Words, p. 82f.

66. In 1 Cor. 5.7 Paul writes, "Cleanse out the old leaven that you may be a new lump, as you really are unleavened. For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed."

67. Jeremias, Words, p. 74.

68. Kuhn, p. 82.

69. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 132.

70. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 266.

71. Jeremias, Words, p. 122.

72. Concerning the use of wine in Jewish meal practice, see the above discussion on page 7.

73. Jeremias, Words, p. 160f. See, however, p. 122 in the same work where the author suggests the change in the Lucan word order represents a joining together of the bread and cup words, as in Mark and Matthew. Yet this argument lacks force in view of the independence of the Lucan tradition.

Notes, Chapter 1 (continued)

74. Benoit, p. 74.

75. Kuhn, p. 84.

76. This is according to Luke 22.15f. See Jeremias, Words, p. 207f for a discussion of Jesus' "avowal of abstinence."

77. Jeremias, Words, p. 233.

78. Jeremias, Words, p. 79.

79. Jeremias, Words, p. 62.

80. Bornkamm, Paul, p. xi-xii.

81. J. Jeremias, "The Key to Pauline Theology," ExT 76 (1964), 27-30.

82. de Vaux, p. 484.

83. Jeremias, Jerusalem, p. 58f and p. 76.

84. Jeremias, Jerusalem, p. 76.

85. Danby, Pes. 10.5, p. 150f.

86. de Vaux, p. 484.

87. Segal, pp. 79-95.

88. Segal, p. 39, notes 10 and 11.

89. de Vaux, p. 486.

90. Danby, Pes. 9.5, p. 148.

91. de Vaux, p. 489.

92. de Vaux, p. 490f.

93. Segal, p. 155.

94. de Vaux, p. 492; Segal, p. 46.

95. de Vaux, p. 491.

96. de Vaux, p. 492.

97. Segal, p. 241.

98. Jeremias, Words, p. 205.

99. M. Barth, Das Abendmahl, Passamahl, Bundesmahl und Messiasmahl (Theologishche Studien 18), Zürich, 1945, p. 7.

100. Jeremias, Words, p. 205, note 5.

Notes, Chapter 1 (continued)

101. Barrett, Background, p. 156; concerning the Passover meal as a demonstration of freedom, see L. Jacobs, "Passover" in EJ Volume XIII, 167.

102. Barrett, Background, p. 157.

103. Exodus 12; Deuteronomy 26. 5-9.

104. Danby, Pes. 8.1, p. 148.

105. Danby, Pes. 5.1-10, pp. 141-143.

106. Danby, Pes. 10.5, p. 150f; Exodus 13.3-10.

107. Danby, Pes. 10.5-6, p. 150f.

108. Danby, Pes. 10.4-6, p. 150f; see also Benoit, p. 74 and Jeremias, Words, p. 85f.

109. Jeremias, Words, p. 56.

110. Jeremias, Words, p. 56.

111. Jeremias, Words, p. 56, note 1.

112. Benoit, p. 74.

113. Benoit, p. 74.

114. Danby, Pes. 10.4, p. 150.

115. See for example Exodus 13.8.

116. Danby, Pes. 10.4, p. 150, "...and he expounds from A wandering Aramean was my father...until he finishes the whole section." Here the term "section" refers to Deuteronomy 26.5f.

117. Jeremias, Words, p. 56, note 2, indicates that this is almost certainly the Gamaliel who was Paul's teacher according to Acts 22.3.

118. Danby, Pes. 10.5, p. 150f.

119. Jeremias, Words, p. 57f.

120. Danby, Pes. 10.5, p. 150f.

121. Philippians 3.5, Ἑβραῖος ἐξ Ἑβραίων.

122. Danby, Pes. 10.6, p. 151.

123. Jeremias, Words, p. 85f.

124. Jeremias, Words, p. 55, note 1.

125. Danby, Pes. 10.5, p. 150.

126. Davies, p. 250.

Chapter 2

THE PASSOVER AND THE LORD'S SUPPER IN 1 CORINTHIANS

In this portion of our study, the purpose is threefold. In the first place, we will attempt to gain a broad overview of 1 Corinthians. This we will do by means of a brief discussion of the following issues as they relate to the Epistle: authorship, literary integrity, date of composition, the Letter's form, structure, and contents, and the congregation at the time of writing, and Paul's overall purposes in the Epistle. It is intended that such a broad overview should enable us to gain insight into the literary, historical, and theological contexts in which St. Paul makes reference to the Lord's Supper.

In the second place, and in connection with chapter one of this study, we will undertake an examination of those passages in the Letter in which it has been suggested Paul makes use of paschal language, thought, and imagery. These passages are 5.7f, 10.16, 11.23-25, and 15.20 (23). Here the purpose will be to determine if the presence of paschal ideas supports the possibility of 1 Corinthians being written in close proximity to the season of Passover;[1] this we will do by asking what it was that motivated Paul to employ terminology and ideas related to Passover. Lastly, we will observe any connections between Paul's use of these ideas and the Lord's Supper.

In the third section, we will discuss those portions of the Epistle in which Paul makes reference to the Lord's Supper. In two of the four texts to be discussed, the references are quite clear (10.16-17; 11.23-26); with respect to these passages, we will simply look more closely at the literary and historical settings involved, attempting to lay the groundwork for a more thorough exegetical investigation in chapter three. Of the remaining two texts, 5.7f presents

a debated connection with the Eucharist; the purpose here will be to determine if, under scrutiny, the text warrants eucharistic interpretation. The fourth text to be discussed (10.3-4) contains what Conzelmann has called a "prefiguration"[2] of the Lord's Supper; we will briefly investigate its value for the exegesis of the eucharistic texts.

A. An Overview of the Epistle

1. Authorship

Among modern scholars, the Pauline authorship of 1 Corinthians is "universally recognized."[3] Not only are there early references to the Letter among Christian writers of antiquity,[4] the Epistle's language and style also exhibit definite Pauline characteristics.[5] It is also true, however, that the authorship of various sections of 1 Corinthians has been called into question; but these efforts have largely rested upon the more debated issue of literary integrity.[6] Nonetheless, along with 2 Corinthians, Romans, 1 Thessalonians, Galatians, Philippians, and Philemon, 1 Corinthians enjoys virtually unquestioned status as having been written by the Apostle Paul.[7]

2. Literary Integrity

If the Pauline authorship of 1 Corinthians is regarded as unassailable, the case for the Epistle's literary integrity is not.[8] On the basis of passages in both 1 and 2 Corinthians (1 Cor. 5.9; 2 Cor. 2.3-9; 7.8), it is commonly agreed that Paul wrote at least four letters to Corinth.[9] This fact, combined with the recognition of apparent internal inconsistences in both of the canonical Letters,[10] and the "observation of breaks and joins"[11] in 1 Corinthians has resulted in numerous efforts to reconstruct Paul's Corinthian correspondence through various combinations of 1 and 2

Corinthians.[12] Such efforts, while creative and intriguing, have produced no thoroughly convincing conclusions. Hence, it will be the point of view in this study that 1 Corinthians makes sufficient sense in its present form to warrant treating it as a literary unity. We may assume this point of view not only because of the lack of conclusive evidence in support of the attempts at reconstruction, but also because it is doubtful that any of the reconstructions up to the present time would substantially alter the evaluation of the eucharistic theology in 1 Corinthians.[13]

3. Date of Composition

The dating of 1 Corinthians or, for that matter, all of Paul's letters, is an enterprise flawed with uncertainty. Paul himself provides little historical linkage by which we might attach specific dates to his letters. There is, on the other hand, considerable information to be gained from the Corinthian correspondence regarding the Apostle's movements and events in his ministry. The general scholarly practice has been to rely first upon the evidence provided by Paul and secondly upon that provided by Acts in order to date the Epistles and reconstruct the events surrounding their composition.[14]

In 1 Corinthians, Paul says that he is at Ephesus and will remain there until Pentecost (16.8). In 4.19f and 16.5f, there is indication that he plans to visit Corinth, but that before doing so he hopes to "pass through Macedonia" (16.5). Paul also confirms that, prior to writing, he had visited Corinth and preached there (2.1f), founding a church of which he considered himself the "father" (4.15) and "skilled master builder" (3.10). To the Corinthian church, Paul had previously written a letter (5.9) and sent Timothy (4.17). It is apparent also that Paul had received a letter from the Corinthians (7.1) and several visitors as well (1.11; 16.17).

From 2 Corinthians, we learn that Paul did visit Corinth again, but that the visit was "painful" (2.1). He indicates also that he has written another letter, the letter with "many tears" (2.4). In 7.5f, Paul mentions the "coming of Titus," who had apparently arrived from Corinth with welcome news of the Corinthians' "zeal" for Paul.

The account of Paul in Acts 18 and 19 is compatible with what we learn of his movements and plans in the Corinthian letters.[15] In Acts 18. 1-17, the author describes Paul's work in Corinth, where he preached to both Jews and gentiles for "a year and six months" (18.11). Following his stay in Corinth, Paul's travels took him through Ephesus (18.19), to Caesarea and Antioch (18.22), through Galatia and Phrygia (18.23), and then back to Ephesus (19.1f), where 1 Corinthians was written.

The crucial point in Acts for the dating of 1 Corinthians is the account of Paul's appearance before the proconsul, Gallio (18.12ff). According to the Dephi inscription, it is probable that Gallio was proconsul in Achaia beginning in either A.D. 51 or 52.[16] Thus, if Paul was before Gallio during this time and, following his travels, back in Ephesus sometime the next year, where he remained between two and three years (Acts 19.8, 10; 20.31), it is reasonable to infer that 1 Corinthians was written sometime in the middle fifties.[17]

It may be noted that Hurd has, with some justification, called into question the chronology in Acts 18.1-17, suggesting that the account of Paul before Gallio may have been part of a later visit.[18] Were this the case, Paul (contrary to Galatians 1.11-2.1) could have been in Corinth earlier than is commonly thought.[19] This hypothesis, however, cannot be proven and rests upon the presupposition that the "previous letter" (5.9) had to do with the Apostolic Decree (Acts 15.23-29; 21.25).[20] But, to build upon the Apostolic Decree "...means almost inevitably to erect one hypothesis upon another."[21]

Moreover, for our purposes, even if 1 Corinthians were written as late as A.D. 56, its eucharistic references would still predate by a decade or more the Markan literary account of the Lord's Supper.[22] Hence, for the present study, little is gained by an earlier dating of any or all of the Corinthian correspondence.

4. Form, Structure, and Contents

In terms of its form, 1 Corinthians manifests the "formalities of epistolary style;"[23] it possesses the opening (1.1-3), the proemium (1.4-9), the concluding greeting (16.15-24). Yet the Epistle is far from an example of artificial letter writing. In the body of the Letter, Paul addresses real concerns and practical issues. Hence, 1 Corinthians is a "striking example"[24] of a genuine letter.

Regarding the structure of 1 Corinthians, it has been noted that the Letter lacks "a connecting train of thought."[25] It has also been observed that the structure of the body of the Letter is free.[26] However, the unsystematic structure of 1 Corinthians can probably be explained by its practical nature, and its being "...addressed to a single, though complex, situation..."[27] about which St. Paul was informed by, perhaps, three different means.[28] As previously mentioned, Paul alludes to visits by two groups (1.1; 16.17) and relates that one of these groups (Chloe's people) has informed him of "quarreling" (ἔριδες) in the congregation. Héring considers the possibility that information might also have come to Paul by way of "Sosthenes" (1.1).[29] In addition to information received orally, περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε (7.1) seems to indicate that Paul had also received a letter from the congregation in Corinth.

Thus, the loose structure of the Epistle may, at least in part, be attributed to the several sources from which Paul received information and the complex issues with which that information dealt.

Apart, however, from the clear connection between "Chloe's people" and the ἔρις in 1.11, there can be little certainty which group or person brought what information or the Corinthian letter to Paul.[30]

Due to the written and oral nature of the news Paul received, there is some possibility of viewing the contents of the Epistle from two perspectives: (a) Paul's responses to the problems about which he has heard by word of mouth and (b) his responses to the questions addressed to him in the Corinthian letter. If this method of observation is employed, then we may, with some probability, view the sections and issues of 1 Corinthians as follows:

(a) Responses to information received by word of mouth:

chapter(s) 1-4: divisive quarreling between groups and the Apostles' role

5-6: immorality and lawsuits

11.17-34: abuses in the context of the Lord's Supper[31]

15: denial of the resurrection of the dead

(b) Responses to questions in the Corinthian letter:

7: marriage and sexual relations

8-11.1: Christian freedom with respect to sacrificial foods

11.1-16: women being veiled at worship

12-14: spiritual gifts in the context of worship

16.1-12: the contribution, Paul's visit, Timothy and Apollos

This is, of course, an extremely general overview of the contents of 1 Corinthians. But for the purposes of this study, it allows us to see that the portions of the Letter in which Paul makes direct reference to the Lord's Supper (10.16-17; 11.17-34) occur in the larger contexts of Christian freedom in relation to sacrifical foods (8-11.1) and issues pertaining to the public worship of the congregation (11.2-14.40). Also, if our arrangement of the contents is correct, the references to the Supper are divided between Paul's

responses to written questions (10.16-17) and his responses to information received orally (11.17-34).

5. The Congregation at the Time of Writing

In the time of Paul, Corinth was a relatively new city, having been re-established by Julius Caesar following the destruction of the old city a century earlier.[32] While ancient Corinth had been infamous for its immorality, it is doubtful that the Corinth known by Paul was any more or less immoral than other seaports in the ancient world.[33]

Barrett describes Corinth as follows: "...it was a commercial centre in which men of many races, and many faiths, met, and were in constant contact...Roman colonists, more or less local Greeks, and levantine traders, among them a community of Jews large enough to have their own synagogue building, probably made up the greater part of the population. It is probable that, before the Christian Gospel reached Corinth, Isis from Egypt, the great Mother from Phrygia, Dionysus from Thrace and elsewhere, and the strange nameless deity from Judaea, had already met there...."[34]

Thus, Corinth in Paul's day was probably a city of considerable cultural, ethnic, and religious pluralism. Evidence in 1 Corinthians of such pluralism may be seen, for example, by Paul's references to "Jews and Greeks" (1.22, 24; 10.32; 12.13); he also speaks of "slave and free" (12.13). Paul points to the gentile heritage of what must have been a considerable portion of the congregation when he reminds the Corinthians of "when you were heathen" (12.2). Evidence of a Jewish population in Corinth has been discovered in the form of a synagogue inscription,[35] and may be seen in 1 Corinthians by the very fact that dietary questions are raised.[36] A striking indication of the congregation's pluralistic character is that when these dietary

issues are discussed (8.1ff), it is in relation to pagan meals, but Paul illustrates his point with reference to Israel (10.18).

Thus, it may be possible to interpret, at least in part, the Corinthian disputes and problems in terms of conflicts between Jew and gentile. The irregularities in the Corinthian celebration of the Lord's Supper have, to a limited extent, been interpreted along these lines.[37] Yet, the congregation addressed by Paul in 1 Corinthians seems to exhibit a greater complexity than the stark contrast between legalistic Judaism and liberal Hellenism will allow.

Part of this complexity is due to the existence of divisive quarreling between groups in the congregation (1.12; 3.4-5, 21f), with each group showing "an untoward preference for one or the other of the Apostles."[38] The difficulties, however, in determining the character of these groups and their possible role in each of the Corinthian disputes, are legion.[39] Numerous efforts have been made to identify the groups with particular theological perspectives; but this has proven a highly precarious enterprise, especially given the fact that scholars cannot even agree on the number of groups in question.[40] Thus, to identify the Apollos group with Hellenistic Judaism,[41] the Cephas group with Palestinian Judaism,[42] and the Christ group with gnostic spiritualism,[43] seems to overstep the limitations of the text; at no point does Paul link a specific group with a particular theological point of view. This is also the case in 11.18ff where Paul again refers to "divisions" (σχίσματα). Here the conflict seems to run along both socio-economic and theological lines; it may be due to a speculative theological position that the poor are abused by their more materially secure brethren.[44] Even so, there is no identification of the divisions in 11.18ff with the groups in chapters 1-3.[45]

Thus, the Corinthian congregation presents us with a complex picture not least because of its ethnic diversity and factional tendency, a tendency perhaps magnified by the number and variety of teachers who had taught there.[46] As a result, the Corinthians seem to have demonstrated at least two extreme theological points of view, neither of which do we intend to identify with one of the supposed groups within the Corinthian congregation. Our intention here is to point out theological tendencies which, according to the text, seem to have been current in the congregation.

On the one hand, a certain element manifested what have been termed "the first tentative beginnings"[47] of a sort of gnosticism, the language of which may well have had its origins in Hellenistic Judaism of the type of Philo.[48] This facet of the congregation produced a Spirit-based enthusiasm that was enamoured of wisdom (3.18), knowledge (8.1), freedom (6.12), and things spiritual (12.1; 14.12). As such, some members could tolerate immorality (5.6ff), engage in civil lawsuits against fellow church members (6.1ff), and participate in sexual immorality (6.13ff). Others could eat sacrificial foods (8.1ff; 10.23ff), and some even denied the resurrection of the dead (15.12). There are indications that these more enthusiastic members may have challenged Paul's rights as an apostle (9.1ff)[49] and developed a sort of "crude sacramentalism"[50] which may have contributed toward the abuse of the Lord's Supper (11.17ff).

On the other hand, there seems to have existed in tension with this enthusiasm a tendency towards asceticism and legalism.[51] It was apparently this tendency that gave rise to questions concerning marriage and sexual relations (7) and sacrificial foods (8 and 10). It is possible also to see these more legalistic members of the community at odds with their "strong" brethren (4.10) over such issues as sexual immorality (5-6) and the place of women in worship

(11 and 14). It is also not unlikely that the legalistic, "weaker" (8.11) members were made to feel inferior in matters of spiritual gifts (12 and 14).

It has been said of Paul in Corinth that he "...had to walk the tightrope between the legalism of Jewish Christianity and the false liberalism of gnostic rationalism."[52] Certainly, it is true that Paul faced at least two extreme fronts in Corinth: one libertine and another legalistic. However, as Horsley has suggested, we may not easily limit the Jewish influence to legalism.[53] It may well be that the enthusiasts owed much of their thinking to Hellenistic Judaism.[54] If this is the case, then the picture of the Corinthian congregation is scarcely clarified, as the traditional distinctions between Jewish legalism and Hellenistic-gnostic rationalism become less clearly defined. Perhaps Gunther's comment regarding the first century is instructive on this point: "Hellenism and Palestinian sectarian Judaism had more in common than was once recognized...."[55] In the Corinthian congregation we likely meet with both sectarian Judaism and Hellenism, but it is often difficult in the study of 1 Corinthians to draw a distinct line between the two.

6. Overall Purposes

"In first Corinthians the apostle Paul is attempting to straighten out some people in his newly founded community who, by virtue of their possession of wisdom, were claiming special spiritual status."[56] This observation, in its straightforward way, does seem to capture a good deal of Paul's purpose in 1 Corinthians. But as Barrett has cautioned, the whole of the Epistle ought not be seen in light of Paul's correction of the spiritualists; he may even be seen to correct those who follow in his original teachings and call upon his name.[57]

It is true, nonetheless, that in 1 Corinthians we see Paul at work attempting to curb abuses and correct misunderstandings that are based upon the "wisdom of this world" (1.21). This wisdom Paul counters with the wisdom and power of God" (1.24): the word of the cross, which is "Christ crucified" (1.23). In related fashion, Paul also challenges those members of the Corinthian community who, on the basis of their knowledge, believe they are completely free (6.12; 10.23). This knowledge Paul does not deny (8.1); nor does he deny Christian freedom (6.12; 9.1; 10.23ff). Rather, he demonstrates the limitation of knowledge in the church and makes it subordinate to love (8.1; 13). At the same time, he places Christian freedom within the context of membership in Christ (6.15; 10.17; 12.4) and the commonality of all Christians with one another in Christ (12.12ff). Hence, the Christian is called to limit his freedom according to the example of Christ (11.1) and out of love for his fellow brethren for whom Christ died (8.11). Paul warns the Corinthians who flaunt their freedom on the basis of their knowledge that, "Knowledge puffs up, but love builds up" (8.2).

We would be quite mistaken if, in all of this, we were to conclude that Paul in 1 Corinthians has simply retreated to a new legalism and merely intends the Christian to "...be like his fellow Christians, something that was achieved by observing the rules and regulations laid down by the apostle for 'all the churches'...."[58]

It is true that in 1 Corinthians Paul draws heavily upon the traditions and practices of the church (5.7, 11.2, 16, 23; 15.3); but he also draws upon other forms and examples of authority in order to make his case. At times, he bases his arguments on such things as the scriptures (1.19; 3.19; 9.9; 10.1ff; 14.21), a word of Jesus (7.10), the example of Jesus (11.1), a proverbial maxim (5.6), and common experience (9.24f; 11.13).[59] We need not, however, view this

as a new legalism. Rather it is an effort on Paul's part to give a clear expression of "Christian priorities"[60] in the responsible exercise of freedom.

In this expression of priorities, Paul does not do away with Christian freedom. Instead, in a situation where "freedom of conscience was the real problem,"[62] Paul redefines Christian freedom, not on the basis of conscience, but on the basis of membership in the body of Christ, the church.[63] As a father teaches his children, so Paul instructs the Corinthians that the purpose of Christian freedom is not to experience all things possible, but to build up the church of Christ through love.

7. Summary

It is within the larger complex of issues and questions revolving around freedom, the proper function of wisdom, knowledge, and spirituality that we will view the discussion of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians. It is in terms of the crucified Christ and membership in his body that Paul addresses the Corinthians who turned the Lord's Supper into their own meal and, out of freedom, entered into partnership with other gods. Far from encumbering our interpretation of Paul's eucharistic theology, the multi-faceted context of 1 Corinthians provides us with a perspective beneficial to the understanding of the Apostle Paul's thought, as he puts it to work wrestling with the questions and problems of the Corinthians.

B. The Passover in 1 Corinthians

Since, in our examination of the eucharistic theology in 1 Corinthians, the principal question is whether or not Paul interprets the Lord's Supper in terms of Passover, it behoves us to determine which

portions of the Letter actually demonstrate evidence of the Passover, i.e., the presence of language, images, and ideas common to the celebration of Passover in the time of Paul. If such evidence can be demonstrated, then it becomes necessary to determine, as far as possible, Paul's reason for utilizing it. In this fashion, we intend to determine what role the Passover might have played, both thematically and chronologically, in the composition of 1 Corinthians and the extent to which connections may be seen between the Passover and the Eucharist.

1. 1 Corinthians 5.7f

The passage occurs in the context of Paul's instruction of the Corinthians to rid themselves of a member who has involved himself in a case of intolerable sexual immorality (πορνεία ; 5.1ff); to make matters worse, inspite of the incident, the community is arrogant (5.2) and boastful (5.6). As part of his instruction, Paul employs a proverb about the infecting quality of leaven (ζύμη): "Do you not know that a little leaven leavens the whole lump?" (5.6). The proverb was evidently common in the ancient world;[64] Paul also uses it in Galatians 5.9.

The verses read as follows: "Cleanse out the old leaven that you may be a new lump, as you really are unleavened. For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed. Let us, therefore, celebrate the festival, not with the old leaven, the leaven of malice and evil, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth."

Commenting on v.8, Bishop Lightfoot remarked, "...it has often been suggested with great probability that we have in this verse a hint of the season of the year when the Epistle was written. This was, we know, towards the end of the Apostle's stay at Ephesus, which place he hoped to leave about Pentecost (1 Cor. 16.8). It is thus probable that the Jewish Passover Feast was actually impending."[65]

In our own time, this suggestion has met with a mixed response. Barrett holds that the possibility is not "unreasonable;"[66] while Conzelmann, more or less, dismisses the possibility out of hand: "Naturally, despite 1 Cor. 16.8, the statement cannot be used for the dating of the epistle."[67] However, at least one thing is clear: apart from the issue of date, there is little question about the presence of paschal language and imagery in 5.7f. Paul interprets the leaven proverb (5.6) in three different ways, each time drawing upon the traditions of Passover.

In the first instance, Paul exhorts the Corinthians to "Cleanse out the old leaven...." Here he draws upon the paschal tradition of preparing a house for the festival by ridding it of even the slightest bit of old dough.[68]

In the second place, Paul declares the Corinthians themselves to be "unleavened" (καθώς ἐστε ἄζυμοι). Again, Paul's interpretation is in keeping with the injunction of Exodus 12.19: "...no leaven shall be found in your houses." But now Paul has shifted the metaphor to the Corinthians who in 6.19 he will call "God's temple;" here they are like a clean house, ready for the festival. This declaration may be seen to rest on yet another paschal motif, the sacrifice of the Passover lamb.[69] Jeremias sees in the reference to Christ, as the paschal lamb who has been sacrified, a "pre-pauline Christian Passover haggadah."[70] This means that the tradition of Christ as the true Passover lamb was probably already well known to the Corinthians.[71] But the question remains as to whether the tradition was known to the Corinthians as part of their liturgical rite (as a Passover haggadah) or, perhaps, simply as a part of the larger Christological tradition (cf. 1 Pt. 1.19; Jn. 1.29, 36; 19.36; Rev. 5.6, 9, 12; 12.11).[72]

In the third instance, and on the basis of the identification of Christ as the true Passover lamb who has been sacrificed, Paul gives the metaphor a moral thrust. He exhorts the Corinthians to "celebrate the festival...with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." It may be argued that Paul here interprets the Christian life in light of the Passover as "thanksgiving to God for his mighty act of love and deliverence."[73] But in this life the Corinthians must "also observe suitable paschal purity."[74]

Clearly, 5.7f is a text that demonstrates manifold evidence of paschal influence. Apart from the question of possible eucharistic interpretation, to which we shall later return, remains the question of Paul's motive. Does Paul's amplification of the leaven proverb arise out of the proverb itself?[75] In Galatians 5.9, Paul makes no connection between the proverb and Passover, even though he might well have done so. Lightfoot argues that in both passages Paul is addressing situations in which the congregation is endangered by undesirable elements.[76] But even if the situations addressed in Gal. 5.9 and 1 Cor. 5.6ff were entirely different, Paul's use of the proverb in Galatians without paschal allusion, suggests that in his mind it did not require interpretation along the lines of Passover. Moreover, if, as Lightfoot suggests, the two situations were at all parallel, then it seems doubtful that the Corinthian situation itself gave rise to Paul's paschal amplification of the proverb. Could it have been the immediacy of Passover that motivated Paul to give the leaven proverb a paschal interpretation? This, of course, cannot be proven in any conclusive way. Perhaps the most that can be said is that the possibility of seasonal influence upon Paul's use of the proverb ought not be denied.

2. 1 Corinthians 10.16

In this verse, Paul employs traditional eucharistic terminology that was probably already known to the Corinthians.[77] The use of the tradition occurs in the context of the Apostle's exhortation concerning "the worship of idols" (φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας ; 10.14). In this section, he is particularly concerned with the Corinthian participation in pagan meals at which food that has been sacrificed to demons is consumed (10.20). Hence, Paul's reference to the cup and bread of the Lord's Supper, as a "participation" (κοινωνία) in the blood and body of Christ, is constitutative for his argument against participation in the "table of demons" (10.21).

The verse reads: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ?." The portion of the verse with which we are immediately concerned is the "cup of blessing" (τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας). As we have seen earlier, this is the technical terminology for the third cup of the Passover meal. It is also true, however, that the "cup of blessing" designated the cup of thanksgiving at any Jewish meal at which wine was consumed.[78] It has also been suggested that the terminology may simply indicate "the cup Jesus blessed."[79] Thus, the technical term τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας cannot, of itself, be taken with any certainty to refer to the third cup of the Passover meal.

It has, however, been noted that 10.16 is a tradition related to the eucharistic tradition which Paul quotes in 11.23-25.[80] In view of what has been earlier stated regarding the paschal evidence implicit in 11.23-25, it does not seem unlikely, if 10.16 is a related tradition, that the "cup of blessing" to which Paul refers is rooted in the third cup of the Passover meal-Last Supper of Jesus. If, then, for the purpose of our investigation, we assume that the

"cup of blessing" in 10.16 does have reference to the third cup of the Passover meal, we must determine why, in this context, Paul uses this tradition.

In view of the fact that Paul is here laying the cornerstone for his argument against Corinthian participation in pagan meals,[81] it seems understandable that he should choose to do so on the basis of the familiar Christian meal tradition. As in 6.12 where Paul tells the Corinthians that their membership in Christ prohibits their becoming "members of a prostitute," so here, Paul argues that participation in Christ through the bread and cup of the Lord's Supper prohibits their becoming "partners with demons" by participating in pagan meals.

Thus, it seems probable that the meal-related problem provided Paul the opportunity to employ the tradition which already had within it the Passover terminology, "cup of blessing." As such, the Passover language was part of the familiar tradition and its use was, probably, less dependent upon the time of year than it was upon the Corinthian situation. If this was the case, then the connection between what we have assumed to be a link between the Passover meal's third cup and the Eucharist was a connection which preceded Paul's use of the tradition in 1 Corinthians 10.16.

3. 1 Corinthians 11.23-25

The general context of 11.23-25 is Paul's discussion of questions and problems relating to worship gatherings (11.2-14.40); the immediate context is his argument against certain Corinthian abuses of the Lord's Supper (11.17-34). It has been earlier argued that this passage demonstrates implicit paschal evidence in support of the Passover meal-Last Supper of Jesus. To those features already mentioned (the meal at night, the night of Jesus' betrayal, the

blessing of bread and cup separated by a meal), may be added the twice repeated command for remembrance. The commands read as follows:

11.24b "Do this in remembrance of me"

(τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν).

11.25b "Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me"

(τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν).

The first command follows the words over the bread; the second command comes immediately after the words over the cup. Of the accounts of the Last Supper in the Gospels, only the Lucan includes the command, and there only once, following the words over the bread (Luke 22.19b).[82]

The origin and meaning of this command has been much debated. Some scholars follow Lietzmann[83] and argue that the command is of Hellenistic origin, with parallels in the cult meals for the dead.[84] Others, however, vigorously defend the command's Semitic origin and parallel in the paschal liturgy.[85] At this point in the discussion, we need not pursue the complex exegetical questions at stake in the debate over the meaning of the command. We may, for the moment, agree that the phrase is "...entirely consonant with, if not suggested by all that we know of the more general meaning of the Passover."[86]

If this is the case, the question again becomes one of motivation. What prompted Paul to employ the eucharistic tradition which included within it the command with its paschal suggestions? As in 10.16, it seems most probable that it was the Corinthian situation which stimulated Paul to draw upon the eucharistic tradition of which the paschal motifs are an implicit part. As in the prior instance in 10.16, here in 11.24-25 the association between paschal language (in this case, the commands for remembrance) and the

On the basis of Philo's use of the term to designate the day during the Passover festival on which the first sheaf of the barley harvest was waved, Barrett notes the possibility that Paul may in 15.20 (23) use ἀπαρχή with reference to Passover;[88] but he recognizes that "...this cannot be positively affirmed."[89]

In support of Barrett's conclusion and against the reading of ἀπαρχή in purely paschal terms, would seem to be the close association between "first fruits" and Pentecost, the Feast of Weeks which was also known as "first fruits."[90] This was also a pilgrimage feast, closely associated with the bringing of the first fruits of the wheat harvest.[91] Thus, when Paul describes Christ as the "first fruits" in 15.20 (23), it seems doubtful that we should see here a strictly paschal description of Christ; it seems clear from 5.8 that Paul knows another, more graphic, way of speaking of Christ in paschal terms.

Perhaps the argument might be turned to suggest that since Paul was possibly writing near the feast of Pentecost (16.8), it is this feast, more than Passover, that ought provide the context for our understanding of ἀπαρχή in 15.20(23). If, however, as Delling suggests, we may read 15.20(23) in light of Romans 8.23, then it seems possible that Paul is here stressing the temporal sense of ἀπαρχή in antithesis to τέλος (15.24).[92] Thus, the Corinthian enthusiasts may presently deny the resurrection from the dead, but only because they have, as yet, received "...the gift of a part as a pledge of the fuller gift yet to come."[93] Paul thus opposes the Corinthian "fanatical anticipation of the resurrection"[94] by maintaining that the resurrection of the end time is yet to be delivered. Hence, as in Romans 8.23, the entire direction of the cultus is reversed: Christ, the offering of first fruits, is the gift brought through the resurrection by God to humankind.[95] It is difficult,

therefore, to see in Paul's use of ἀπαρχή in 15.20 (23) a reference to either the traditional cultic practice of bringing first fruits at Pentecost or waving the barley sheaf at Passover.

5. Summary

Of the four texts discussed, three demonstrate probable evidence of paschal language, imagery, and thought: 5.7f; 10.16; 11.23-25. It was our conclusion that 15.20 (23) probably ought not be read in terms of Passover.

All three of the texts that demonstrate evidence of Passover make use of pre-Pauline traditional material. Of the three, only 5.7f can possibly be said to have been used as a result of the season in which Paul may have been writing.

Both 10.16 and 11.23-25 are clearly eucharistic texts. Yet, the paschal connections evidenced in these texts are implicit in the traditional material of which the texts are composed; hence, the connections between the Lord's Supper and the Passover are probably pre-Pauline. Whether or not Paul relies upon these traditional paschal connections in his interpretation of the Eucharist in 1 Corinthians remains to be seen. At this juncture, all that may be said is that if it is suggested that Paul interprets the Eucharist in terms of Passover, it is probable that he would not have done so simply as a result of the season in which he was writing.

C. The Eucharist in 1 Corinthians

Before proceeding to an exegetical treatment of the eucharistic texts in 1 Corinthians, it will be necessary for us to determine which texts are to be examined. There are two clear references in 1 Corinthians to the Lord's Supper: 10.16-17 and 11.23-26.[96] In

addition to these texts there is the debated possibility of a reference to the Eucharist in 5.7f.[97] Paul also describes the wilderness food and drink of the Israelites in terms that are apparently eucharistic: πνευματικὸν βρῶμα and πνευματικὸν πόμα (10.3-4). Finally, it should be noted that in 16.21,23 Paul utilizes two elements of an ancient eucharistic liturgy: the "kiss of peace" (ἐν φιλήματι ἁγίῳ)[98] and the "maranatha-call" (μαράνα θά').[99] However, insofar as these are not references to the Supper itself, they require no discussion at this point.

1. 1 Corinthians 10.16-17

As we have already seen in our earlier discussion of 10.16, this passage occurs in the context of Paul's argument against participation in pagan cult meals (10.14-22) and in his larger discussion of Christian freedom and the eating of sacrificial foods (8-10). As has been previously indicated, 10.16 is part of the pre-Pauline eucharistic tradition and, as such, Bornkamm holds that it is "...the only authentic commentary in the New Testament itself on the words of institution."[100] However, 10.17 is thought to be Paul's own interpretation of the tradition in 10.16;[101] if this is the case, then this text is of the utmost importance for our understanding of Paul's eucharistic theology in 1 Corinthians. Käsemann underlines this point by saying, in regard to 10.17, "...it is precisely this theologoumenon which is constitutive for his [Paul's] own conception of the Lord's Supper."[102]

Thus, our task in the next chapter will be, in part, to examine the eucharistic tradition in 10.16 and Paul's own interpretation of the tradition in 10.17. Of particular interest in our study of 10.17 will be whether or not Paul's interpretation is in any way connected with the Passover imagery implicit in the tradition. In our exegesis

of the text, we will keep in mind the historical situation addressed by Paul. Here we may think again of the libertine element within the Corinthian congregation, which, on the basis of its knowledge (8.1) considered itself free (6.12; 10.23). Conzelmann holds that the Corinthian knowledge is derived from "...experience of the Spirit (12.4ff)...their freedom is accordingly not moral indifference, but represents a speculative position."[103] Thus, a primary question in the exegesis of the passage will be how Paul's interpretation of the tradition may be shaped by his immediate concern about participation in pagan cult meals and the larger issue of Christian freedom within the congregation.

2. 1 Corinthians 11.23-26

The immediate context of this passage is Paul's attempt to correct the Corinthian abuses of the Lord's Supper (11.17-34).[104] This discussion is, as we have seen, part of the Apostle's larger agenda concerning public worship (11.2-14.40). In 11.2-16, Paul contends with the question of whether or not women should be veiled in church. Chapters 12 and 14 involve the place, allotment, and use of spiritual gifts in the congregation's worship. Chapter 13, perhaps an independent unit inserted by Paul, is a hymn to love, which "...provides the scale by which other gifts may be tested and measured."[105]

We have previously seen that 11.23-25 constitutes part of the church's eucharistic tradition, with v.26 being Paul's eschatological interpretation of the "command for remembrance" (vv.24b; 25b).[106] Thus, Paul begins his interpretation of the tradition in v.26 and this interpretation continues throughout his application of the tradition to the Corinthian meal problems (11.26-34).[107]

That which prompts Paul to call upon the already known tradition is the negative effect of the Corinthian gatherings for worship (11.17). Paul says that he has heard of "divisions" (σχίσματα) which he can partly understand (11.18). But what the Apostle fails to either understand or tolerate is the fact that when the Corinthians come together for the Lord's Supper, each member goes ahead with his own meal (11.21), so that "one is hungry and another is drunk" (11.21). This is an offense to the church and an humiliation of the poorer members (11.22).

In this context, Paul reminds the Corinthians of the Lord's Supper tradition (11.23-25) and, on the basis of this tradition, exhorts them to "examine" themselves (11.28) in order that they might "discern" the body and so avoid judgment (29ff). Here too we will want to observe the extent to which Paul may have relied upon the paschal ideas implicit in the tradition as he set about applying it to the Corinthian situation. We will also want to determine the extent to which Paul's interpretation of the tradition in 11.23-25 is related to his interpretation of 10.16.

3. 1 Corinthians 5.7f

This text is particularly significant for our discussion of the relation of the Passover to Paul's theology of the Lord's Supper. Already we have seen that in 5.7f there is clear evidence of paschal language, imagery, and thought. If the text may also be interpreted in terms of the Eucharist, then we have a striking connection between the Passover and Paul's eucharistic theology in 1 Corinthians.

Having earlier observed the context of the passage in Paul's exhortation against sexual immorality (5.1ff), we may proceed to the question of the text's interpretation. Héring sees in the call to "celebrate their Passover"[108] an allusion to the Eucharist. In

connection with this suggestion, he sees in Paul's designation of the Corinthians as "unleavened bread" (ἄζυμοι) in v. 7 a reference to the unleavened eucharistic bread.[109]

Barrett, although he disagrees with Héring's eucharistic interpretation of 5.7f, sees in 10.17 an argument analogous to that which Paul makes in 5.7f.[110] Thus, on the basis of the parallels drawn by both Héring and Barrett between 5.7f and 10.17 and because of the significance of 10.17 for Paul's eucharistic thought, a brief comparison of the two texts would seem an appropriate means of testing Héring's suggestion.

The portion of 5.7f with which we are concerned reads as follows: "Cleanse out the old leaven that you may be a new lump, as you really are unleavened. For Christ, our paschal lamb, has been sacrificed. Let us, therefore, celebrate the feast...." 10.17 reads, "Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread."

Héring's interpretation of 5.7f seems, at least in part, to be based upon the presupposition that ἄζυμοι in 5.7 is to be equated with ἄρτος in 10.17. However, when Paul speaks of the eucharistic bread (10.16-17; 11.23, 26, 27, 28) he always uses ἄρτος. It is of interest that in the one instance where Paul speaks of food (βρῶμα)in a eucharistic sense without using ἄρτος (10.3), the food is coupled with drink (10.4); while there is no mention of the cup in 10.17, there is in 10.16 where the cup and bread are typically coupled. Yet, in 5.7f, there is no mention of a cup or drink with which the unleavened bread might be balanced as in Paul's other eucharistic references. In addition, Paul's interpretation of the eucharistic tradition in 10.17 is probably dependent upon a meal related problem: pagan cult meals (10.14-22). In fact, it seems that in 1 Corinthians it is, largely, meal-related problems that bring about Paul's

references to the eucharistic tradition. In 5.7f, however, the problem is not related to meal practice, but sexual immorality. It is true that in 5.12 Paul prohibits the Corinthians from eating with (συνεσθίω) immoral members of the church; but this does not seem to have direct reference to the Lord's Supper. As Bornkamm notes, Paul's technical term for coming together for worship seems to be συνέρχομαι.[111]

It may be further noted that while the arguments in 10.17 and 5.7f may be analogous, it seems that the basis upon which Paul declares the Corinthians to be "unleavened" in 5.7 is different than the basis upon which he declares them "one body" in 10.17. In 5.7f, Paul makes his declaration on the basis of Christ's sacrifice.[112] Yet, in 10.17, Paul says that being one body is the result of all sharing in one bread. In 10.17 the declaration rests upon the specific experience of the community; in 5.7f it rests upon an historical event that took place outside of the community: Christ's sacrifice on the cross.[113] In other words, 5.7f lacks an explicit reference to a common participatory experience upon which the declaration is based. Orr and Walther think of baptism in this context,[114] and, perhaps, on the basis of Romans 6.3f, they are correct; yet, in 5.7f, there is no explicit allusion to baptism either.

Hence, for the above reasons, Héring's eucharistic interpretation of 5.7f seems doubtful. Thus, we may agree with Conzelmann, that there are in 5.7f "...no lines drawn between the Passover and the Lord's Supper."[115] This is a significant conclusion for our study. If we are correct, it means that Paul's references to the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians are confined to chapters 10 and 11; further, if Paul can be seen to make connections between the Supper and Passover, it will be on the basis of the paschal material implicit in the pre-Pauline traditions, the very thing he did not do in 5.7f.

4. 1 Corinthians 10.3-4

This section of chapter 10 is of interest to us not because it has direct reference to the Lord's Supper, but because in it Paul apparently uses eucharistic terminology to describe the food and drink of the Israelites in the wilderness. The verses read as follows: "...and all ate the same supernatural food (πνευματικὸν βρῶμα) and all drank the same supernatural drink (πνευματικὸν πόμα). For they drank from the supernatural rock which followed them, and the rock was Christ."

The passage is part of Paul's larger "...self-contained, scribal discourse on passages from the biblical Exodus narrative: the cloud (Ex. 13.21), the sea (Ex. 14.21f), the manna (Ex. 16.4, 14-18), the spring (Ex. 17.6; Num. 20.7-13), the apostasy (Ex. 32.6)."[116] That the references to πνευματικὸν βρῶμα and πόμα have sacramental-eucharistic overtones is born out by the preceding reference to baptism (10.2) and by the combination of food and drink.[117]

As Paul continues his discussion of Christian freedom with respect to sacrificial foods, he attempts in 10.1-13 to identify the Corinthians with "our fathers" (10.1) and, on the basis of the fathers' experience, demonstrate "...that the greatest sacramental gifts of salvation mean no guarantee against judgment and rejection."[118] Thus, the entire passage (10.1-13) takes on the character of "awful warning."[119] The warning receives its force from Paul's identification of the Corinthians with Israel by means of the "old and new saving events."[120]

What is of particular significance for our study of these verses is the possible insight they may provide into the Corinthian eucharistic theology. It seems probable that Paul gives his warning in 10.1-13 because at least some of the Corinthians expected their spiritual food and drink to provide them with immunity from God's

spiritual food and drink to provide them with immunity from God's judgment.[121] Hence, in 10.1-13, Paul may be opposing the Corinthian enthusiasts who believe "...that the sacramental opus operatum is a pledge of the impossibility of damnation now or in the future."[122] If, indeed, this is the case, then 10.1-13 may provide singular insight for our understanding of the Corinthian eucharistic theology over and against which Paul interpreted the church's eucharistic tradition in 10.16-17; it may also tell us something of the thinking of those in 11.20f who ate not the Lord's Supper, but their own.

5. Summary

In this portion of our study, we have attempted to lay the preparatory groundwork for the exegetical study of the eucharistic texts in 1 Corinthians. In so doing, we have pointed out the potential significance of Paul's own interpretation of the pre-Pauline eucharistic traditions in both 10.17 and 11.26-34. We have also noted the probable importance of 10.3-4 for the exegesis of 10.16-17 within the context of 10.1-22 and Paul's larger concern about Christian freedom as related to eating sacrificial foods. In addition, we have begun to take into consideration the possiblity of the importance of 10.3-4 for the exegesis of 11.17-34 and we have raised the question of the relationship between Paul's interpretation of the tradition in 10.17 and his interpretation and application of 11.23-25 in 11.26-34.

Finally, in terms of the possible relation of the Passover to Paul's eucharistic thought, we have concluded that 5.7f does not warrant interpretation along eucharistic lines and that the decisive element in the question will be the use Paul makes of the paschal material implicit in the eucharistic traditions of 10.16 and 11.23-25.

Notes, Chapter 2

1. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 129f.

2. Conzelmann, p. 166.

3. Conzelmann, p. 2.

4. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 11f.

5. Conzelmann, p. 5f.

6. Kümmel, p. 202; see also J. Murphy-O'Connor, "The Non-pauline Character of 1 Cor. 11. 2-16," JBL 95/4 (1976), 615-621.

7. Kümmel, p. 178.

8. J. Weiss, The History of Primitive Christianity (1937), I, p. 323f.

9. Barrett, Paul, p. 2.

10. Héring, p. xiif; C. K. Barrett, A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians, 2nd ed. (1973), p. 11f.

11. Conzelmann, p. 2.

12. Hurd, pp. 43ff, provides a thorough summary of attempts to reconstruct the Corinthian correspondence.

13. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 125.

14. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 3 and Conzelmann, p. 3. For an argument against this method see Hurd, pp. 30ff.

15. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 4.

16. E. Lohse, The New Testament Environment (1976), p. 200, reasons that the year was A.D. 51. Barrett, Background, p. 256, suggests A.D. 52.

17. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 5, "early 54 or late 53;" Conzelmann, p. 4. , "spring, A.D. 55;" Orr and Walther, p. 120, suggest the year A.D. 56.

18. Hurd, p. 31.

19. Hurd, pp. 19ff. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 5, suggests that Paul began his work in Corinth around A.D. 50.

20. Hurd, p. 259f.

21. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 8.

22. Kümmel, p. 70.

23. Conzelmann, p. 6.

24. Conzelmann, p. 6.

Notes, Chapter 2 (continued)

25. Kümmel, p. 199.

26. Conzelmann, p. 6.

27. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 17.

28. Hurd, p. 47.

29. Héring, p. xii.

30. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 4.

31. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 261, thinks on the basis of 11.18 (ακούω), that Paul received news of the abuses of the Supper by means other than the Corinthian letter. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 125f, thinks Paul in 11.17ff is still responding to questions received in the Corinthian letter.

32. Héring, p. xi.

33. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 2f.

34. Barrett, Paul, p. 3.

35. Barrett, Background, p. 50.

36. Barrett, Things, p. 146.

37. C.K. Barrett, "Cephas at Corinth," Abram unser Vater (Festschrift O. Michel) (1963), p. 8.

38. Héring, p. xii.

39. Hurd, p. 107f, presents a clear summary of the several ways in which the Corinthian groups have been interpreted.

40. Conzelmann, p. 33.

41. Horsley, "Wisdom," p. 238.

42. Héring, p. 5.

43. W. Schmithals, Gnosticism in Corinth, (1971), pp. 199ff, referenced by Conzelmann, p. 33f.

44. Conzelmann, p. 194.

45. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 126.

46. Barrett, Paul, p. 3.

47. R. Wilson, "How Gnostic were the Corinthians?," NTS 19/1 (1972), 74.

48. Horsley, "Wisdom," p. 225.

49. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 200.

Notes, Chapter 2 (continued)

50. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 147.

51. Gunther, p. 116.

52. Barrett, Things, p. 151.

53. Horsley, "Consciousness," p. 575.

54. Horsley, "Pneumatikos," p. 228.

55. Gunther, p. vii.

56. Horsley, "Pneumatikos," p. 269.

57. Barrett, Paul, p. 13f.

58. J. Drane, Paul: Libertine or Legalist?, (1975), p. 134.

59. Conzelmann, p. 8f.

60. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 22.

61. Barrett, Things, p. 147.

62. Horsley, "Consciousness," p. 586.

63. Horsley, "Consciousness" p. 589.

64. J. Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, (1895), p. 204.

65. J. Lightfoot, Notes on Epistles of St. Paul, (1895), p. 206.

66. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 130.

67. Conzelmann, p. 99, note 49.

68. Danby, Pes. 1.1f, p. 136; see also Exodus 12.19.

69. Héring, p. 37, notes that the expression "thusai to pascha" was a technical phrase (Deut. 16.5) for the killing of the Passover lamb. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 128, notes that on the basis of the cleansing coming after the slaying of the lamb, the "...analogy with the Jewish Passover is not perfect."

70. Jeremias, Words, p. 59f.

71. W. Huber, Passa und Ostern, (1969), p. 108f.

72. Conzelmann, p. 99, note 54.

73. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 129.

74. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 129.

75. Orr and Walther, p. 189.

Notes, Chapter 2 (continued)

76. J. Lightfoot, St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, (1910), p. 206.

77. Conzelmann, p. 171.

78. L. Goppelt, "ποτήριον," TDNT VI, 154.

79. D. Cohn-Sherbok, A Jewish Note on ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΕΥΛΟΓΙΑΣ," NTS 27 (1980-81), 707.

80. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 231.

81. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 123.

82. Jeremias, Words, pp. 139-159, presents a discussion of the textual problems relating to the short and long versions of the Lucan text. For our purposes we may assume the long Lucan text.

83. Lietzmann, p. 182.

84. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 140.

85. Jeremias, Words, pp. 237ff.

86. Jones, 188.

87. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 350.

88. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 351.

89. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 351.

90. B.A. Levine, "First Fruits," EJ VI, 1313.

91. de Vaux, p. 493f.

92. G. Delling, "ἀπαρχή," TDNT I, 486.

93. Cranfield, Romans, p. 417.

94. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 152.

95. Cranfield, Romans, p. 417f.

96. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 231.

97. Héring, p. 36f.

98 Lietzmann, p. 186.

99. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 141.

100. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 139.

101. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 144.

102. Käsemann, Essays, p. 110.

Notes, Chapter 2 (continued)

103. Conzelmann, p. 14.

104. Kümmel, p. 199.

105. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 297ff, provides a helpful discussion of the place of chapter 13 in the structure of 1 Corinthians.

106. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 141.

107. Conzelmann, p. 201, note 99.

108 Héring, p. 36f.

109. Héring, p. 95.

110. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 36f.

111. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 176, note 2.

112. Héring, p. 36.

113. H. Lietzmann, An die Korinther I.II (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 9) (1931), p. 24.

114. Orr and Walther, p. 189.

115. Conzelmann, p. 99, note 50.

116. Conzelmann, p. 165.

117. Conzelmann, p. 166, note 21.

118. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 123.

119. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 223f.

120. Käsemann, Essays, p. 114.

121. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 224.

122. Käsemann, Essays, p. 116f.

Chapter 3

AN EXEGESIS OF 1 CORINTHIANS 10.14-22 and 11.17-34

Our purpose in this section is exegetical. We intend through the exegesis of 1 Corinthians 10.14-22 and 11.17-34 to determine whether or not it is the Passover meal by which St. Paul interprets the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians. If through our study of the texts we discover that it is not the paschal meal by which Paul interprets the Eucharist, then we will want to ascertain the manner in which he does interpret the Supper.

It will be recalled that in the first chapter we concluded that the Passover meal in the time of Paul was celebrated as part of the chief feast of the Jewish year (p.14). As such, it was a meal in celebration of freedom and was characterized by the joy of liberation. This freedom and joy were occasioned by the retelling of the deliverance of the ancient Israelite fathers from Egypt. In the course of the retelling, those gathered at the paschal meal were identified with their fathers who had long ago experienced God's saving work. Thus, the Passover meal was not only an occasion for looking back; it was also a celebration in the present of an historic, and yet timeless, freedom. This freedom was also linked with future messianic hope.[1] It is this image of the Passover meal that we bring to our exegetical study of the eucharistic texts in 1 Corinthians.

We will proceed with our study first reviewing the literary context of each passage; this will be followed by an examination of the text itself.

A. 1 Corinthians 10.14-22

1. The Context

While the particular context of 1 Cor. 10.14-22 is the question of participation by the Corinthians in pagan cult meals, the broad horizon of the text includes the larger question of Christian freedom and responsibility.[2] In chapter 8, Paul argues on the basis of love for restraint in the use of freedom that is based on knowledge; in chapter 9, he uses the self-restraint of his own apostolic freedom as an example of what it means to build up the church through love.[3] In 10.23ff, Paul moves, as we shall see, the question of participation in pagan feasts away from the arena of individual conscience to the community concern of what is best for the neighbor.

With this wider horizon in view, we turn our attention to 10.1-13, a section that, according to Hahn,[4] is closely related to 10.14-22. Of particular interest in 10.1-13 is the comparison made by Paul between the Corinthian sacramental experience with that of the Israelite "fathers."[5] Paul founds this comparison upon the experiences of baptism "into Moses" (εἰς τὸν Μωϋσῆν ἐβαπτίσαντο)[6] and the consumption of "spiritual food and drink" (πνευματικὸν βρῶμα, πόμα).[7] By means of adapting what was probably a rabbinic tradition about the rock in the wilderness,[8] Paul identifies the rock as Christ (ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός) and further strengthens the commonality of experience between the old and new.

The purpose of Paul's identification of the Corinthians with the Israel of old becomes clear in v. 5. In spite of all having been baptized, and all having eaten and drunk spiritual food and drink,[9] and even though the drink flowed from Christ, "...with most of them God was not pleased; for they were overthrown in the wilderness." This verse suggests that just as most of the ancient Israelites were destroyed by God (in spite of the benefits of sacramental

experience), so also, the same possibility exists for the Corinthians.[10] Verses 6-12 seem to confirm this.

In vv. 6-12, Paul makes a not uncommon use of passages from the books of Exodus and Numbers (cf. Hebrews 3-4; Wisdom of Solomon 16); here he employs the bibical stories as "warning-example"[11] for the Corinthians. First Paul states generally that the examples (τύποι) are to prevent the Corinthians from desiring evil as had the Israelites (v. 6). He then becomes more specific in vv. 7-10, giving four different examples of Israelite behaviour which ought not be imitated. Paul mentions: idolaters (εἰδωλολάτραι), immorality (πορνεύωμεν), testing the Lord (ἐκπειράζωμεν), and grumbling (γογγύζετε). As Barrett has pointed out, these specific examples of unacceptable behaviour may be indicative of the sort of troubles the Corinthians were having.[12] Idolatry is easily connected with chapters 8 and 10; fornication can be traced to chapters 5, 6, and 7. In any event, the effect of the entire section seems to serve the purpose of warning the Corinthians; this is summed up particularly well in verse 12: "Therefore let any one who thinks that he stands take heed lest he fall." It seems that the force of Paul's warning is derived from the parallel drawn in vv. 1-4 between the experience of the Israelite fathers and that of the Corinthians. In both cases the common factor is Christ.[13] Yet, most of the Israelites were destroyed; the implication of Paul's parallel seems to be that the same grim possibility awaits the Corinthians if they persist in like behaviour.

It is interesting to note that according to the Mishnah a parallel is also drawn between the participants in the Passover meal and the ancient Israelites.[14] In the Passover meal the result of the parallel is that the participants share in the freedom and joy of the ancient Israelites redeemed from Egypt. The parallel in 1 Cor. 10.1-13, however, has a much different purpose; it underscores and

empowers Paul's solemn warning. Thus the solemn tone established in 10.1-13 prior to Paul's reference to the Lord's Supper in 10.16ff is in marked contrast to the celebrative tone of the paschal meal, though both are derived by means of a parallel between the ancient and contemporary communities.

2. The Text

As the command, "shun the worship of idols" (φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας) indicates, the specific abuse with which Paul is here concerned is "idolatry" (εἰδωλολατρίας). That idolatry was forbidden under the old convenant has already been illustrated in v. 7. In that which follows, Paul demonstrates on what terms it is also forbidden under the new convenant. The criterion by which he makes his point is that of the Lord's Supper.[15]

It is, perhaps, significant that in v. 15, Paul addresses the Corinthians as "sensible men" (φρονίμοις). It seems probable that they may have preferred to be addressed as "spiritual men" (πνευματικοῖς). Paul's use of φρονίμοις here may be an indication that he wishes to reason with them on the basis of common sense.[16] If this is the case, Paul's refusal to address the Corinthians as "spiritual men" (3.1) may be an indication of his desire to turn the Corinthian thinking away from the excesses of spiritual enthusiasm back to the fundamentals of the tradition. If the freedom principle of the Corinthians is based upon their experience of the Spirit,[17] then it may be that Paul's unwillingness to accept the Corinthian understanding of "spiritual" is also a refusal to accept the Corinthian definition of freedom (cf. 6.12; 10.23). Hence, in addressing the question of Christian freedom over and against idolatry in the context of pagan meals, Paul returns to

the eucharistic tradition as it is expressed in 10.16; it is material with which the Corinthians had probably been familiar since Paul's first days among them.[18]

10.16 is constituted by the parallel traditions pertaining to the eucharistic cup and bread. The order in which Paul makes reference to the cup and bread is the reverse of that given in the eucharistic tradition in 11.23-25. It is true that Didache 9.4 maintains a liturgical order in which the cup precedes the bread.[19] It is, however, thought by some that the liturgical order in Paul's time was probably not fixed.[20] In any case, the order of the cup preceding the bread in 10.16 need not be taken as a liturgical order in reverse of that in 11.23-25. It is possible that the reversal is literary only and that this order allows Paul to formulate his own eucharistic deduction in 10.17 on the basis of the bread.[21]

Concerning the cup, Paul asks, "οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ;" He asks a parallel question concerning the bread: "οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστιν ;" What does κοινωνία in the blood and body of Christ mean? Hauck says that "Paul uses κοινωνία for the religious fellowship (participation) of the believer in Christ and Christian blessings, and for the mutual fellowship of believers."[22] Campbell has argues that κοινωνία in the body and blood of Christ does not constitute fellowship with Christ "because αἷμα and σῶμα denote things, in which one can participate, but with which one cannot properly have fellowship."[23] Conzelmann suggests that κοινωνία in the blood of Christ means a common sharing in the atoning power of Christ's death.[24] Our concern, however, must be with the bread word, since this is the portion of the tradition upon which Paul bases his formulation in 10.17.[25] Thus, in order to determine what Paul understands by κοινωνία in the body of Christ, it seems best to examine 10.17.

There is by no means agreement that 10.17 is central to Paul's use of the tradition in 10.18ff.[26] The chief difficulty seems to be the function of the ὅτι clause in v. 17a (ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἕν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν). The question, according to Barrett, is whether the clause connects with the preceding verse.[27] If this is the case, then Conzelmann says there is an artificial emphasis upon the bread.[28] However, the emphasis need not be regarded as artificial. Paul mentions the role of the one bread at the end of v. 17 as that in which all share (μετέχομεν).[29] As 10.16 demonstrates, Paul is not thinking of ordinary bread! The emphasis upon the one bread is an emphasis upon Christ himself.[30] Thus, by common sharing in the one bread, which is the body of Christ, the participants become and show themselves to be the body of Christ.[31] Thus, Paul's understanding of κοινωνία in the body of Christ seems to be developed in terms of corporate union.

Here we take Paul's ἕν σῶμα οἱ πολλοί ἐσμεν in a realistic fashion, as opposed to a metaphorical interpretation.[32] This is, of course, based upon our interpretation of what Paul means by ἕν σῶμα. In the first place, it seem probable that Paul intends a connection between the ἕν σῶμα of 10.17 and the σῶμα of 10.16. In a eucharistic context, it seems doubtful that Paul could assume a complete distinction between the body of Christ in the bread of the Eucharist and the one body of his formulation.

But is the one body of 10.17 the same as the body of Christ in 10.16? Bornkamm notes that "We may not simply equate the concept of the 'body of Christ' in v. 16 with that in v. 17. That would necessarily mean that even the gift offered in the bread is not the body of Christ sacrificed for us, but the spiritual body of Christ, the corpus mysticum of the congregation."[33] Thus, we have our first indication that the body of Christ in 10.16 is probably distinct from the one body of 10.17. But in what fashion is it distinct?

Bornkamm holds that the bread/body word of 10.17 is based upon an interpretation of the body of Christ in terms of the bread word of 11.24, "This is my body given for you."[34] Bornkamm takes the τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν ("which is for you") of the Pauline eucharistic tradition to be an indication of the dual ideas of Christ's atoning and substitutional death for us.[35] Both of these ideas, suggests Bornkamm, mean the new life of believers for Christ (2 Cor. 5.14ff), so that "...the body of Christ which we receive in the bread, implies for Paul directly the 'body of Christ' in which we are bound together in the sacrament."[36]

Thus, the body of Christ in 10.16 may be understood as the body given in death for the participants.[37] κοινωνία in the body of Christ is then understood as a common participation in Christ himself and the benefits of his death and resurrection. In this sense, the body of Christ is understood to represent the "whole person" of Christ.[38] But the one body, which, according to 12.12-27, is also Christ's, is distinct from the crucified and risen body of Christ. As Paul makes clear in 12.27 ("You are the body of Christ..."), the one body of Christ, which is the result of common participation in Christ, is the church. As we have earlier suggested, it is commonly held that the progression of thought from the body of Christ in the Eucharist to the body of Christ, the church, represents, at least in part, Paul's own distinctive theology of the Eucharist.[39]

Gundry notes that "...it is at least questionable that Paul intends to be taken realistically in writing about participation in the body and blood of Christ at the Lord's table...."[40] The force of Gundry's argument, however, is directed against Robinson's contention that the union between Christ and the believer is a physical union.[41] Nonetheless, the consequence of Gundry's convincing argument against the physical nature of the union between Christ and believers, need not be the conclusion that Paul in 10.17 is speaking metaphorically.

Schweizer notes that "For Paul it may be taken for granted that the fellowship which comes together at the Supper, and in which the many become one, is also fellowship in Christ."[42] Sanders also argues that the union between Christ and those who participate in the Sacrament is a real union with Christ.[42] But this does not mean that the union is necessarily physical. As we shall see in our study of 6.17 and 12.13, Paul can speak of the union with Christ in terms of ἓν πνεῦμά. This seems to be in keeping with his description of the resurrection body as a σῶμα πνευματικόν in 15.44. The union of the one body in 10.17 may be interpreted in terms of spirit,[44] as Paul seems to make the post-resurrection connection between body and spirit. Thus the one body union in 10.17, though not a physical union, is, nonetheless a union in realistic terms.

The reality of this union which Paul calls the "one body" is made manifest in 10.18ff. Here Paul gives two illustrations of the sort of union of which he is speaking. The first illustration is based on "Israel according to the flesh" (Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα).[45] Paul asks, "Are not those who eat the sacrifices partners (κοινωνοὶ) of the altar?" Héring notes that Paul's use of "partners of the altar" is probably a circumlocution in avoidance of offending Jews by speaking of "partners of God."[46] Thus, Paul may be seen to express the common understanding that consumption of sacrificial foods creates a partnership between the participant and the deity.[47] As vv. 19 and 20 indicate, this partnership, in the case of pagan meals, is not with idols, but with the demons to which the sacrifices are really made. It is evidently Paul's concern that Corinthian participation in such pagan meals creates a partnership that destroys their partnership or union in the body of Christ.[48] This Paul makes clear in v. 21 when he sets participation in the cup and table of the Lord over and against participation in the cup and table of demons. The

two partnerships are mutually exclusive; Barrett remarks, "Paul takes the word Lord (cf. xii.3) seriously."[49] Thus, the first thing Paul sees as a consequence of the many being one body is exclusivity; those who are members of the one body cannot also become partners with demons.

But exclusivity is not the only consequence. In 10.23ff, Paul develops the consequence of being one body in terms of his insight that the purpose of Christian freedom is the upbuilding (οἰκοδομεῖν) of the community. The guiding principle for the upbuilding of the community is expressed in v. 24, "Let no one seek his own good, but the good of his neighbor." Thus, the second consequence of being one body is responsibility for one another.[50] The ethical decision about whether to participate in a pagan meal hinges upon the identification of the community as the one body of Christ who is Lord and the consideration of what is best for the other members of the community. This, as we shall see in our last chapter, is part of Paul's principle of building up the community through love. Lohse writes, "Die Freiheit des Christen findet nicht am Gesetz ihre Grenze, sondern...in der Liebe, durch die der eine für das Gewissen des anderen mitveranwortlich gemacht ist."[51]

Our interpretation of 10.14-22 has been based upon 10.17 as Paul's commentary on the eucharistic tradition in 10.16. We have taken Paul's formulation in 10.17 to mean that the many who become one body through the common sharing in the one bread are formed into a real union with Christ. This union we have held is both exclusive and ethical. It is exclusive in that it prohibits other participatory unions,[52] such as that established with demons in the celebration of pagan cult meals. It is ethical in that, as a union of the many (individuals) into one body, it necessitates responsibility of the members of the community for one another. Having said

this, we are now ready to ask if Paul's interpretation of the eucharistic tradition in 10.16-17 is dependent upon the Passover meal.

In the first place, it is striking that Paul does not base his formulation upon the "cup of blessing," which may have ties with the third cup of the Passover meal. As we have seen, his deduction is connected with the bread. Of course, the breaking of bread was also a part of the Passover meal; but, as is well known, the breaking of bread is a standard part of every Jewish meal.[53] Thus, the bread broken at the Passover meal, although it is unleavened, is probably to be considered as part of the larger Jewish meal tradition. According to the Mishnah, the primary function of breaking bread at the meal is to give thanks to God "...who bringest forth bread from the earth."[54]

It is also true, however, that at the Passover meal, the unleavened bread served as one of the three points of reference for the Passover haggadah. Rabban Gamaliel is quoted in the Mishnah as saying that unleavened bread must be mentioned "...because our fathers were redeemed from Egypt."[55] Thus, the breaking of the unleavened bread at the Passover meal is connected specifically with the redemption of the ancient Israelite fathers. Yet participation in the unleavened bread itself does not seem to have constituted the identity of the participants as members of a Passover haburah. The table fellowship of the haburah may be said to have existed either by virtue of the participants gathering around the table[56] or by means of the saying of grace at table which accompanied the breaking of the bread;[57] but this was the case at every meal. In any event, it does not seem to have been the case that the breaking, blessing, and eating of the unleavened bread of the Passover meal was interpreted as establishing the identity of the participants as being anything

other than a Passover haburah. Yet, for Paul, it is participation in the one bread that has the effect of incorporating the participants into the one body of Christ; the members of the table fellowship are identified as the one body of Christ.[58]

This is not to deny that, as we have earlier suggested, there is an identification made during he course of the Passover meal and the forefathers: "In every generation a man must so regard himself as if he came forth himself out of Egypt...."[59] The identification made by Paul seems to be of a much different sort. Paul does not identify the participants in the one bread with those who ate the bread "in the night in which he was betrayed...." Rather, he says that the many who share in the one bread are one body, the body of Christ. Moreover, this is a corporate identification; the many are the one body. In the Passover meal, the identification is individualistic: "...a man must so regard himself...." Hence, the formulation made by Paul in 10.17 does not seem to be based upon the identification with the Israelite forefathers; nor does Paul's interpretation seem to be according to the interpretation given the unleavened bread of the Passover meal.

Käsemann says of 10.17: "...participation in Jesus and his body becomes identical with incorporation into the church as the Body of Christ."[60] Thus, Paul makes the connection between the participants and Christ's body not because for him the idea in the Supper is "community"[61] among the participants or "organic unity"[62] among those present. For Paul the identification and unification of the community is established by the community's participation in the body of Christ. This has the effect of making the participants responsible to Christ who is their Lord; in this sense, they are responsible for one another. Such an interpretation of participation in the eucharistic bread goes far beyond the interpretation given the unleavened bread of the Passover meal.[63]

B. 1 Corinthians 11.17-34

1. The Context

Paul discusses the Lord's Supper at Corinth in the context of other questions related to worship. In 11.2-16 he addresses the question of the participation of women in worship. In chapters 12 and 14, he discusses the use and allotment of spiritual gifts in the Corinthian assembly.

2. Background Questions

Before we are able to discern whether it is the Passover by which Paul interprets the eucharistic tradition in 11.23-25, it will be first necessary to discuss some of the problems relating to the reconstruction of the situation in 11.17-34. According to our earlier discussion, we have already suggested that Paul is not here challenging an unsacramental devaluation of the Supper. Rather, we have suggested that he is attempting to correct the abuses resulting from the crude sacramentalism espoused by the spiritual enthusiasts at Corinth.[64]

This general reconstruction, however, is, by no means, universally accepted. Lietzmann argued that the Corinthians were, in fact, falling away from the Pauline sacramental understanding of the Supper and, consequently, that the eucharistic elements were being treated as ordinary food.[65] According to this view, Paul is attempting to return the Corinthians to a true sacramental understanding of the Supper.[66]

Apart, however, from the question of Paul's corrective, remains the identification of the problem. Conzelmann parallels Bornkamm in his description of the problem in terms of excessive individualism.[67] Theissen sees the conflict arising out of the social distinctions between rich and poor Christians.[68] Smith agrees with Theissen that

the issue of status is at stake, but thinks the problem is not a question of socio-economic status, but spiritual status.[69] Winter contends, contrary to Bornkamm, that the abuse took place throughout the meal and not just during the Agape portion.[70] Obviously, no reconstruction of the situation can be made with absolute certainty.

We begin by suggesting that it would be unwise to reconstruct the situation in 11.17ff apart from the apparent sacramentalism that is suggested by 10.1-13. If indeed there was a portion of the congregation that believed the consumption of spiritual food and drink excluded them from the possibility of divine judgment,[71] then this factor ought to inform our reconstruction.

At the same time, it seems wise to view 11.17ff within the broad context of 11.2-14.40. Theissen has pointed to the general lack of order in the Corinthian gatherings (cf. 14.33).[72] Smith has made the connection between the discussions of spiritual gifts in 12.4ff with the factions in 11.19.[73] The general disorder at the Corinthian gatherings and the spiritual enthusiasm may be two sides of the same problem that contributes to the abuses of which Paul speaks in 11.17ff.

3. The Text

a. 11.17-22

Paul begins in 11.17 with a reversal of 11.2. There he had a commendation for the congregation (Ἐπαινῶ); here he does not commend them (οὐκ ἐπαινῶ), "...because when you come together it is not for the better but for the worse." Paul begins in v. 18 to explain why the Corinthian worship gatherings are not for the better.

In v. 18 Paul says, "I hear there are divisions (σχίσματα) among you." We have earlier noted that there is nothing here to connect these divisions with those mentioned by Paul in 1.10ff. What gives

rise to the divisions of 11.18? Theissen suggests that the divisions arise out of the established distinctions between rich and poor, distinctions threatened by the social implications of the Eucharist.[74] It is, of course, widely held that the "have nots" (μὴ ἔχοντας) of v. 22 are poor.[75] If, however, the social distinctions between rich and poor in the context of meals were as great as Theissen suggests, it seems strange that the problem was not evident at Corinth from the beginning of Paul's ministry, or, for that matter, that it does not surface in other letters. In this regard, it seems doubly strange that Paul should write as though the problem were new to him (ἀκούω). No doubt, there were social distinctions between the rich and poor. But we question whether such distinctions are the source of the divisions in chapter 11.

It seems more likely that the divisions of 11.18 should be viewed as the result of the destructive meal practice of 11.20-22. This abusive situation may be the result of the spirtiual enthusiasm of a portion of the congregation; by this we make reference to the sort of enthusiasm evidenced in the abuse of freedom in 6.12ff; 8.1ff; 10.23ff. As Bornkamm suggests, this sort of enthusiasm may have manifested itself in an extreme sacramentalism.[76] But there are problems with this reconstruction as well.

In v. 21, Paul writes, "For in eating each goes ahead (προλαμβάνει) with his own meal." It may be that προλαμβάνει indicates the temporal sense of "taking ones own meal beforehand."[77] This would agree with the suggestion that the enthusiast-sacramentalists ate their own food during the Agape meal that preceded the sacramental portion. On the other hand, the verb may "...convey the idea of selfish eating of their own food."[78] In this case the offensive eating would carry with it no reference to time, and would weigh against our reconstruction.

In order to find a solution to this problem, most scholars turn to the meaning of Paul's instruction in v. 33, "So then, my brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for (ἐκδέχεσθε) one another." Winter argues unconvincingly that the word ἐκδέχεσθε in this context ought to be translated with the meaning to "receive one another in the sense of sharing food."[79] Thus Paul's instruction in v. 33 could be taken to mean that when the Corinthians gather together they should demonstrate hospitality by sharing their food. Yet it would seem that in a meal context the exhortation of "wait for one another" would naturally include the possibility of providing for one another's needs at the meal; one waits for others at a meal in order to partake of food with them. Should a tardy participant arrive without food, then it seems to follow that those who have waited would be inclined to share with the one who arrives with no food. In addition, "wait for one another" seems to go well with Paul's instruction in v. 34, that any one who is hungry should eat at home. The hungry person who ate beforehand at home would be enabled to wait and, having already eaten his food at home, would likely have little left to share. Hence, the translation of ἐκδέχεσθε as "share" does not seem to fit well with the sense of v. 34. Finally, we may conclude that the more traditional translation, "wait for one another," seems to weigh in favour of taking προλαμβάνει in a temporal sense.[80] On the basis of this reading, we suggest that some of the Corinthians have taken their own meals beforehand; in view of this problem, Paul offers the obvious corrective, "wait for one another."

This reconstruction is, of course, far from certain. In either case, whether before or during the sacramental portion also, certain of the Corinthians were eating their own meals and this Paul holds to be an abrogation of the Lord's Supper. As far as Paul is concerned,

the solution to the problem involves more than simply "waiting" or "sharing"; this is evidenced by the rather extensive theological rationale he provides in vv. 23ff for his practical instructions in vv. 33-34. Paul's theological perspective on the Corinthian meal problem is based upon his interpretation of the eucharistic tradition in 11.23-25.

b. 11.23-25

Paul introduces the eucharistic tradition with the words, "For I received (παρέλαβον) from the Lord what I also delivered (παπέδωκα) to you...." According to Conzelmann, the verbs παρέλαβον and παρέδωκα "...are technical terms both in the Greek and Jewish world."[81] Here the terms probably function to demonstrate that Paul places himself and his teaching in a line of tradition that has its origin in Jesus himself (ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου). In our examination of this tradition, it is not our purpose to make a comparison with the traditions of the Gospels.[82] Our intention is rather to analyze the core of the Pauline tradition in order to establish a base from which to view Paul's interpretation of the tradition in the remainder of the text. Thus, for our purposes, it will be sufficient to examine the bread word, the cup word, and the twice repeated command for remembrance.

i. The Bread Word

"This is my body which is for you" (τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν). The bread which Jesus had taken, blessed, and broken, is identified (τοῦτὸ ...ἐστιν) with Jesus' body (μού ...τὸ σῶμα).[83] Jeremias holds that the personal pronoun μού placed before τὸ σῶμα is possibly indicative of Paul's editing, and also, that "...the positioning of a prepositional attribute with an article after the

noun..." (τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν) may be the work of Paul.[84] In any event, the initial meaning of the bread word is that the body of Jesus is identified with the bread.[85]

The alternative between "the body" as the crucified or the exalted body of Jesus seems unnecessary. Although the emphasis in the tradition seems to be the sacrificial giving of Jesus' body in death, Conzelmann notes that in "the sacramental food the executed body of the--now--exalted Lord is presented."[86] In other words, this interpretation understands the crucified Lord who is now exalted to be present in the meal. Thus, Käsemann's heavy emphasis upon participation in the exalted Lord seems to deny the tradition's sacrifical emphasis.[87]

As we have seen, the sacrificial emphasis is carried in the "which is for you" (τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν). Conzelmann holds that ὑπερ can carry the dual sense of atoning and vicarious sacrifice.[88] Hence, there is in the sacrificial emphasis an element of redemptive deliverance. Here the tradition may be compared to the parallel theme of deliverance in the Passover meal. Barrett argues that it is in the sense that the Passover lamb is for the participants at the paschal meal that Jesus is ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν and that in this connection it is "...worth while to note that there is no reference to the theme of x.17; Paul could see more than one line of interpretation in the Supper."[89] It is, of course, quite possible that Paul did see more than one line of interpretation in the Supper, as Barrett suggests. The question here, however, is whether or not Paul in 11.26ff develops the theme of Jesus as the new Passover lamb. It is interesting that in 5.7 where Paul does identify Jesus with the Passover lamb, the strongest textual evidence does not include ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν . Most importantly, however, we must ask whether or not we

should expect to identify evidence of Paul's own eucharistic formulation (10.17) within the traditional bread word. Hence, it seems premature, at this point, to conclude that Paul at 11.24 seems to be making the point that Jesus is the "new Christian Passover."[90]

ii. The Cup Word

"This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστὶν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι). The most striking feature of the Pauline cup word is its asymmetry in relation to the bread word. As is well known, the parallel is not between body and blood as in the Marcan tradition, but between body and "new convenant" (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη).[91] In light of the apparent sacrificial context, Hering notes that the translation of διαθήκη as "covenant" as opposed to "testament" seems probable.[92] The "new" covenant is understood by Käsemann as a reference to Jeremiah 31.31 and the eschatological covenant God promises to make with his people.[93] This covenant is established by the atoning death of Christ, signified by his blood (ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι).[94] Hence, the focus of the Pauline cup word is the new covenant of which those who share in the cup are parties by means of the shed blood of Christ.[95] The new covenant is taken by Bornkamm to mean "the new, eschatological order of salvation. In substance this means the reign of the exalted Christ established in his death."[96]

There is then a distinct difference in the construction of the Pauline bread and cup words. The bread word makes the clear identification between the body and the bread. The cup word, on the other hand, makes the identification between the cup and the new covenant. Bornkamm holds that his incongruence is explained by the separation of the two sacramental actions by a meal (ὡσαὐτως...μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι) in the Pauline tradition.[97] Thus, it may be that the

clear connection in the bread word between the body of Christ and the bread is the key to Paul's use of this element of the tradition as the basis of his formulation in 10.17.[98]

The cup word, however, does not seem to function in such a forceful way for Paul in 10.17. Yet, Barrett thinks that the drinking of the cup connects with Paul's formulation in 10.17: "In this way the drinking of the cup connects with what is said in x.17 about the eating of the loaf which constitutes the one body in which believers are joined: those who enter into covenant with the Lord naturally enter at the same time into covenant with one another, and a covenant community is thereby established."[99] Paul, however, does not seem to develop this idea in either 10.17ff or 11.26ff on the basis of the cup. If for Paul the community is a covenant community, it seems to be so on the basis of its participation in the one bread. It is through the tradition's connection of the bread with the body of Christ that Paul makes the link with the community as the body of Christ. This link Paul seems to make only on the basis of the bread word of the tradition.[100] It may be in 1 Corinthians, at least, that Paul found the concept of the body of Christ to be a more potent ethical force than that of the new covenant or the covenant community.

iii. The Twice Repeated Command for Remembrance

In connection with the bread word, the command is: "Do this in remembrance of me" (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν). In connection with the cup word, the command is: "Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me" (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν). As we have already seen, it is only the Pauline tradition that has this command twice. Luke has the command only in connection with the bread word.[101] Here it is not our

purpose to discuss whether or not the command goes back to Jesus himself.[102] It is rather our purpose to determine what the command means as part of the Pauline tradition and how it is that Paul interprets this segment of his tradition.

The command to "Do this..." (τοῦτο ποιεῖτε) is in relation to both the bread and cup.[103] Bornkamm points out that the command is attached to the "...two acts of eating and drinking in particular,"[104] and not to the whole meal. Thus, already in the tradition, it is probable that the sacramental acts are set apart as different from the rest of the meal. According to Jeremais, τοῦτο ποιεῖτε is an "established expression for the repetition of a rite."[105] Conzelmann says that the command has reference to "the whole administration, which is to be repeated in the community celebration."[106] Hence, in relation to the bread, it would refer to the taking, blessing, breaking, distributing, and eating; in relation to the cup, the command pertains to its similar administration, as the words ὡσαύτως καὶ τὸ ποτήριον seem to imply.

The much debated purpose and meaning of the command is contained in the phrase "in remembrance of me" (εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν). Jeremias holds that the "expression is ambiguous"[107] in its meaning. Conzelmann, however, is convinced of the expression's clarity; he writes, "The meaning is 'in remembrance of me.'"[108] It has been thought that the meaning of the phrase might be clarified if its origins in the history of religions were known. Thus, as previously mentioned, Lietzmann has attempted to demonstrate parallels between the phrase and rites connected with Greek and Roman commemorative meals for the dead.[109] Bornkamm insists, however, that in such parallels, "...a dead person is remembered, but not at all in the sense of religious worship, and the meal celebrations are merely a pious meeting."[110] In contrast to the efforts of Lietzmann,

Jeremias, among others, has found abundant parallels to the phrase in the texts of ancient Greek, Hebrew, and Aramaic speaking Judaism.[111] Jeremias concludes that (a) "εἰς ἀνάμνησιν is said for the most part in reference to God and (b) it then designates, always and without exception, a presentation before God intended to induce God to act."[112] Jeremias thus translates εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν to mean "That God may remember me," and finds support for his interpretation in terms of an ancient Passover prayer which asks God to remember the Messiah.[113] Yet, Jones has demonstrated that, at least in terms of the Septuagint, ἀνάμνησις "has too many ambiguities to provide authority for any particular interpretation of the New Testament passages."[114] Gregg finds the origin of the phrase in the cultic Hebrew zikkaron and concludes, "The zikkaron, as a covenant cultic act is essentially mutual."[115]

Thus, while it seems probable that the origin of the phrase may well be in Judaism, it seems doubtful that the command need be interpreted along the lines of Jeremias' suggestion. As in the Passover meal, the participants in the Lord's Supper share in the recalling of God's saving act. In the Lord's Supper tradition, the saving is bound up with the memory of Jesus' sacrificial death. It does not seem necessary or helpful to restrict the remembering to either God or the participants. Hence, the simple translation "Do this in remembrance of me" seems to allow for both possibilities. Our concern is the way in which Paul may be seen to interpret the command. It is commonly held that Paul's interpretation begins in 11.26ff.[116]

c. 11.26-34

It is on the basis of 11.26ff that we may begin to consider the degree to which the Passover meal may influence Paul's interpretation

of the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians 11.17-34. That part of the eucharistic tradition which stands out in its parallel with paschal practice is the command for remembrance.[117] In 11.26 Paul writes, "For as often as you eat the bread and drink the cup, you proclaim (καταγγέλλετε) the Lord's death until he comes." Bornkamm suggests that this verse constitutes Paul's interpretation of the command for remembrance.[118] The focus of Paul's interpretation in this verse seems to be on the proclamation of the death of Jesus.[119]

Paul's stress upon the proclamation of the death of Jesus is of particular importance if, with Conzelmann, we take καταγγέλλετε as an indicative.[120] If this is the case, then we see a probable parallel between the recitation of the Exodus credo at the Passover meal and Paul's interpretation of the command for remembrance.[121] From our point of view, however, what is important is not that a proclamation was central to both the celebration of the Passover meal and Paul's interpretation of the ἀνάμνησις command. That which is significant for us is the content of the proclamation and the significance Paul gives it in the context of the Corinthian abuse.

The content of the proclamation is given in terms of "the death of the Lord"[122] and is specifically connected with the eating of the bread and the drinking of the cup.[123] It seems that the "death of the Lord" may be interpreted in at least two different ways. On the one hand, it may be taken as a reference to the sacrifice of Christ as the inauguration of the time of salvation.[124] On the other hand, it may be taken more as a reference to the Passion of Jesus, his suffering and humiliation.[125] It is, of course, possible that the death of the Lord could carry both meanings; in which case, we would have to look further for the line of interpretation taken by Paul in this context. The importance of this point for our study is its possible connection with the recitation of the Exodus credo at the

Passover meal; in the Passover haggadah, the Mishnah says, "He begins with the disgrace and ends with the glory."[126] The "glory" is, of course, the deliverance of the Israelite fathers from Egypt; it is the story of salvation, freedom, and joy at the heart of the Passover meal. Our question is whether Paul's understanding of the "proclamation of the death of Jesus" here incorporates and expresses the "glory" which is at the center of the paschal meal, that is, God's work of salvation. If this were Paul's interpretation of the death of Jesus in 11.26ff, then the connection with the Passover meal would be confirmed. If, however, Paul's emphasis were upon the death of Jesus as humiliation and disgrace, then the role of the paschal tradition in Paul's interpretation of the Eucharist would be questionable.

Jeremias argues that the clause "until he comes" (ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ) is the means by which Paul's understanding of the death of Jesus might be interpreted.[127] Jeremias further suggests that by relating this clause to the "maranatha" of the liturgy, we may conclude that, "The proclamation of the death of Jesus is not therefore intended to call to the remembrance of the community the event of the Passion; rather this proclamation expresses the vicarious death of Jesus as the beginning of the salvation time and prays for the coming consummation."[128] We may agree with Jeremias that, at least in part and in certain contexts, the death of Jesus certainly may mean the beginning of the time of salvation.[129] But we question whether this is Paul's emphasis here.

It seems possible that "until he comes," beyond its obvious function as a time limit,[130] may serve to remind the Corinthians not of the consummation of the time of salvation, but of the eschatological judgment and of the Christ who comes as the eschatological judge. In 3.10ff, 4.1-5, and 5.1ff, Paul gives an indication of the coming judgment. In 15.24, he speaks of the "end" (τέλος) when, after his

coming, Christ delivers the kingdom to God "after destroying every rule and every authority and power." In Romans 2.16 Paul also connects the coming "day" with judgment by Christ Jesus. There is, it seems, an indication in these passages that the coming of Christ is linked with the eschatological judgment. Moreover, in 3.13f and 9.27 Paul indicates that he is not thinking only of the judgment of the world, as opposed to the faithful.

There is, yet, another possible link between the coming of Christ and judgment. Such a connection may be indicated by the joining of the curse (ἤτω ἀνάθεμα) with the "maranatha" call of the liturgy in 16.22.[131] Whether "maranatha" is taken to mean "Our Lord, come!" or "Our Lord has come!,"[132] the clear link is made between the Lord's coming and the judgment of those who stand over and against the Lord.[133] As 16.22, 19.12, 11.27ff, and 12.3 may indicate, Paul may think that some of the Corinthians are in danger of incurring God's judgment. Thus, by recognizing the connection between the "maranatha" call and the curse, Jeremias' use of the call is brought into question.

If we may accept the interpretation of "until he comes" as a reminder of the eschatological judgment brought by the coming Christ, the Christ who is already present in the sacrament "...in anticipation of the Last Day,"[134] then we begin to see that the proclamation of the death of Jesus may be interpreted in terms of Christ's Passion, suffering, and humiliation. As vv. 27ff seem to make clear, in the context of the Corinthian abuses, for Paul judgment is more than a possibility. Those who abuse the Lord's Supper incur guilt in relation to the body and blood of the Lord and, in v. 29, the consequence is judgment. Hence, it is our contention that Paul begins with the death of Christ as the inauguration of the new covenant time of salvation; this is implicit in the tradition.

But starting from the tradition, Paul charts his course in the direction of obedience within the new covenant in recognition of God's judgment in the coming Christ.[135] It is our point of view that Paul takes this interpretation of the tradition in order to correct the abusive Corinthian meal practice.

Jeremias, however, fails to recognize this. By interpreting the clause "until he comes" without reference to its wider context in 11.26-34, Jeremias is able to interpret the death of Jesus and his parousia only in terms of salvation.[136] In this way, Jeremias can interpret Paul's understanding of the command for remembrance in complete harmony with the Passover meal's messianic emphasis upon the coming consummation.[137] Such an interpretation, however, fails to take seriously the context of Paul's discussion of the Eucharist and the purpose behind his discussion of the eucharistic tradition. It is, of course, possible that Paul could have held the general view Jeremias proposes; our contention is that the context of Paul's discussion in 1 Corinthians 11 will not permit such an interpretation precisely because the Corinthian problem moves Paul not in the direction of freedom and joy in celebration of the coming consummation, but judgment against those who are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. As we have already suggested, the emphasis on eschatological judgment is further developed in vv. 27ff.

Verse 27 reads, "Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord." Käsemann says that this verse is, "...in the form of a threat of judgment."[138] Conzelmann holds that Paul is here formulating a principle of "sacral law."[139] The thrust of the formulation is against anyone who eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an "unworthy" or "careless" (ἀναξίως)[140] manner. If we ask what it is that constitutes unworthy eating and drinking,

it seems logical to think in terms of the offences outlined by Paul in v. 21.[141] Namely: each going ahead with his own meal instead of waiting for those who arrive late and, thus, humiliating the "have nots" and despising the church of God.

The striking factor in v. 27, however, is the consequence of unworthy participation. That person who participates in an unworthy manner will be "guilty" (ἔνοχος)[142] of the body and blood of the Lord. Although, as we have seen, the body and blood of the Lord are elsewhere taken to refer to the atoning and vicarious death of Christ, here Paul does not seem to understand the terms in this way;[143] as opposed to any sense of benefit or blessing, the emphasis seems to be upon the unworthy participant being guilty of the Lord's death.[144] Here the body and blood of Christ communicate the lordship of Christ in terms of judgment over and against guilt.[145]

In v. 28, Paul may be seen to provide instruction for the participants in the meal in order that they might avoid the judgment of which he warns.[146] This instruction, according to Moule, is in terms of preparation for participation.[147] Paul writes, "Let a man examine (δοκιμαζέτω) himself, and so eat of the bread and drink of the cup." According to Moule, the sense of δοκιμαζέτω is to test for genuineness.[148] Barrett thinks that the sense of the word may refer back to the δόκιμοι of 11.19, the ones tested and approved by God.[149] Regarding the purpose of Paul's instruction, Conzelmann says, "The object of this self-examination is not one's inner state in general, but one's attitude to the sacrament, that is, the propriety of the participation...."[150] Both Smith and Bornkamm interpret this self-examination on the basis of 11.29 and understand Paul's stress to fall upon the individual's examination of himself as a member of the community.[151] Smith writes, "When one tests oneself with a view to the community as a whole rather than with a sense of comparing

oneself with others, then one gives proper regard to the unity of the community rather than succumbing to the divisiveness of individualism."[152] But as Käsemann notes, this self-examination also takes place in the presence of the Lord who is the Judge and it is he who gives the community its identity.[153]

In v. 29, Paul says, "For anyone who eats and drinks without discerning (διακρίνων) the body eats and drinks judgment upon himself." Barrett points out the difficulties of translating διακρίνειν: "It is impossible to find a consistent rendering of the word 'distinguish'...because Paul does not use it consistently."[154] Best holds that the meaning of the term here probably depends upon the interpretation given to "the body."[155] If Paul is speaking of the body of Christ present in the sacramental bread, then "distinguish" is held to be a better translation.[156] If, however, Paul means by "the body" the community as the one body of Christ, as in 10.17 and 12.13, then διακρίνων might be best translated "to judge aright" or "recognize."[157]

The crucial point, then, is the interpretation given to "the body."[158] In view of the fact that Paul does not in v. 29 parallel σῶμα with αἷμα, it may be argued that he is thinking primarily in terms of the body in the corporate sense. This argument seems to be strengthened by the repetition of the two verbs "eat" (ἐσθίω) and "drink" (πίνω) in the same verse. If Paul were thinking of the sacramental presence of Christ, it seems likely that he would have balanced "body" with "blood," and so maintained the balance between "eating" and "drinking." This would seem more consistent with vv. 27 and 28 in which Paul balances eating and drinking with bread and cup,[159] and in v. 27, Paul seems to be thinking of the sacramental presence of Christ. Moreover, when Paul interprets the eucharistic

tradition in 10.17, in like manner he leaves behind the tradition pertaining to the cup in order to speak of the body in terms of the congregation.[160] Thus, it seems probable that when Paul here does not parallel "body" with "blood," he is thinking in terms of the corporate body of Christ, the church (cf. 6.12ff; 12.13, 27; Rom. 12.4-5). Hence, in the immediate context, we interpret διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα to mean "recognize the community, the church, as the body of Christ."

In a eucharistic context, it seems we ought not press too far the distinction between the body of Christ given in death for the community and the community established as one body in him.[161] Indeed, as Paul's formulation in 10.17 seems to demonstrate, the identity of the community as one body is directly connected with the common participation in the one bread, which according to the tradition, is the body of Christ himself.[162] If, however, as Bornkamm points out, "v. 29 is directed against a 'profaning' of the 'body of Christ' precisely under the mask of an increasing sacralization of the eucharistic food,"[163] then it seems likely that Paul's desire is to press on from the common understanding of the presence of Christ in the bread, to his new conception of what this presence means for the life of the community.

In v. 30, Paul seems to confirm our interpretation of διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα, when he connects the apparent failure to judge aright the body with the weakness, sickness, and death being experienced in the Corinthian congregation. In this way, "judging aright the body" is immediately connected with God's judgment against the community, which may indicate the intimate relationship between "the body" in v. 29 and the congregation. The failure to judge aright the body as the church, means that the corporate body of Christ suffers.

Paul uses the verb διακρίνειν again in v. 31. Here the object of the verb is "ourselves" (ἑαυτούς). He writes, "But if we judged (διεκρίνομεν) ourselves truly, we should not be judged (ἐκρινόμεθα)." Barrett thinks that the translation of the verb here ought not be the same as in v. 29.[164] Yet, according our interpretation, it makes good sense to translate, "But if we judged aright ourselves...." This indicates Paul's parallel between "judge aright the body" in v. 29 and "judge aright ourselves" in v. 31. In 10.17, Paul says that the Corinthians are the one body of Christ. It seems to follow that to judge aright ourselves is an essential element in recognizing the community as the body of Christ, and our place in it. As Conzelmann notes, this means that there is probably a connection between the judging aright of the self in v. 31 and the self-examination in v. 28.[165] Finally, the point of this self-examination is to avoid being judged by God; in other words, self-examination promotes worthy participation in the community meal, and in this way its positive benefits will be realized. In his comment on 10.1-13, Conzelmann makes an observation that is here appropriate: "Paul does not say that the sacrament becomes effectual only through obedience, but on the contrary that the effectual sacrament is partaken of to our judgment if we misuse it through disobedience."[166]

According to v. 32, the present punishments mentioned in v. 30 seem to be equated with "disciplined" (παιδευόμεθα). Thus, there is evidently a distinction between the final judgment that will entail the condemnation (κατακριθῶμεν) of the world and the present punishments.[167] Barrett says, "The goal of punishment is not destructive, but remedial and educative."[168] Käsemann, however, seems to hold out for the possibility that the final condemnation of the Corinthians with the world does exist.[169] Perhaps, on the basis of 9.27 and 10.1-12, he is correct.

The point with which we are concerned is that judgment, whether educative or eternal condemnation, plays a vital role in Paul's interpretation of the Lord's Supper in 11.26ff. By reminding the Corinthians of the present and future eschatological judgment, Paul can be seen to move away from the paschal themes of deliverence. His focus upon judgment in the context of the one body of the congregation, seems to serve the purpose of correcting the Corinthian enthusiasts who have abused their freedom at the expense of the congregation. It seems likely that any emphasis on participation in the meal in terms of the consummation of the time of salvation would have worked in opposition to Paul's corrective purposes.

Since Paul's purpose is, at least in part, to instruct the Corinthians so that they may avoid the judgment connected with unworthy participation, he, therefore, concludes with what Barrett terms the "practical advice"[170] of vv. 33-34. These instructions we have already discussed in our reconstruction of the Corinthian situation at the outset of the chapter. The significant point for our interests is that both of Paul's instructions in vv. 33-34, (to wait for one another and to satisfy hunger at home) are in keeping with the sort of practical advice Paul gives elsewhere in the Epistle when he is instructing the Corinthians according to his concern for the edification of the congregation (8.1ff; 10.23ff; 14.26ff). As in 14.26ff where Paul gives practical advice concerning the use of spiritual gifts on the basis of "edification," so here his advice is practical. Our contention is that by means of his linking together the eucharistic body of Christ with the body of Christ, the church, he is able in 11.26ff to correct a profound theological problem (the abuse by the Corinthians of one another at the Lord's Supper) not only in terms of the threat of judgment, but also by instructing the Corinthians in practical terms according to whatever is best for the

community, that is, whatever builds up the congregation. It is our intepretation of the text that Paul's practical instruction in terms of building up the community is based upon his theological conviction that the one body of the community is constituted, at least in part, by the community's participation in the one bread-body of Christ in the Eucharist. Furthermore, it is our conclusion that the community's participation in Christ constitutes a real union with one another and with Christ and that this union has real implications for the members' behaviour both in the context of the Supper and in the broader context of community life. It is the participation in this union and its implications for the community's behaviour that we propose to examine in chapters four and five.

C. Summary

By means of our examination of 1 Cor. 10.14-22 and 11.27-34, we have concluded that Paul does not interpret the eucharistic tradition in terms of the Passover meal. In 10.17 we saw that the interpretation given by Paul to the eucharistic bread is of a much different sort than that given the unleavened bread of the Passover meal. In 11.26ff we concluded that Paul's interpretation of the death of Christ in terms of eschatological judgment is contrary to the Passover meal's themes of deliverance, freedom, and joy. Finally, it was our conclusion that Paul's instruction in 11.29ff is connected with his formulation in 10.17, and that it is according to his understanding of the congregation as the body of Christ, by means of its participation in Christ, that he gives his practical instruction.

In the first chapter we noted the suggestion of Davies that paschal ideas dominate Paul's view of the Eucharist.[171] We are now in a position to respond that in 1 Corinthians paschal ideas do indeed dominate Paul's eucharistic tradition, but not, we suggest, his interpretation of it.

Notes, Chapter 3

1. Jeremias, Words, p. 205f.

2. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 123.

3. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 16.

4. F. Hahn, "Teilhabe am Heil und Gefahr des Abfalls" in de Lorenzi, L., ed., Freedom and Love: The Guide for Christian Life (1 Cor. 8-10; Rm. 14-15), (1981), p. 165.

5. We note the parallel between "fathers" (πατέρες) and "brothers" (ἀδελφοί). As the Corinthians are Paul's "brothers" in faith, so the Israelites are their "fathers." Hence, we need not think that Paul is here addressing only the Jewish members of the congregation or that most of the Corinthians were Jewish. For a further discussion of this point see Conzelmann, p. 165.

6. Our concern here is not with the nature of the relationship between baptism "into Moses" and baptism into the "one body" (1 Cor. 12.13), but simply that Paul is pointing out a common experience between the old and new Israel through baptism.

7. As with baptism, our concern with regard to the "spiritual food" of the fathers is the use Paul makes of it in stressing the common experience between the fathers and the Corinthians.

8. Conzelmann, p. 166f.

9. πνευματικός seems to be a key word for Paul in 1 Corinthians. Of the 19 probable Pauline instances in the New Testament, 15 occur in 1 Corinthians, 3 in Romans, and 1 in Galatians. For an analysis of the term in 1 Corinthians, see Horsely, "Pneumatikos," pp. 269-288.

10. Käsemann, Essays, p. 116f.

11. C. K. Barrett, "Response to F. Hahn for the English Speaking Group" in de Lorenzi, L., ed., Freedom and Love: The Guide for Christian Life (1 Cor. 8-10; Rm. 14-15), (1981), p. 180.

12. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 224f.

13. Käsemann, Essays, p. 114f.

14. Danby, Pes. 10.5, p. 151.

15. Conzelmann, p. 171.

16. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 230f.

17. Conzelmann, p. 14.

18. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 231.

Notes, Chapter 3 (continued)

19. Didache 9.2f reads, "First concerning the Cup, 'We give thanks to thee our Father, for the Holy Vine of David thy child, which, thou didst make known to us through Jesus thy child; to thee be glory for ever.' And concerning the broken bread: 'We give thee thanks...." The English translation is by K. Lake, The Apostolic Fathers, (1912), I, p. 323.

20. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 233.

21. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 143.

22. Hauck, 804.

23. J. Campbell, 'Κοινωνία and its Cognates in the New Testament," JBL 51 (1932), 375.

24. Conzelmann, p. 171 and note 14, same page.

25. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 143.

26. Conzelmann, p. 172, note 24, indicates that J. Weiss considered 10.17 to be a digression. Best, p. 88, thinks that 10.17 is either an interpolation or a parenthesis and on this basis he reasons, "We can, then, give to σῶμα a different meaning in v. 17 from that which it possesses in v. 16."

27. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 233f.

28. Conzelmann, p. 172.

29. Regarding the parallel between the common sharing in vv. 16 and 17b, Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 233, says, "...it does not seem possible to distinguish μετέχειν from κοινωνεῖν ." See also Conzelmann, p. 172.

30. As will be seen in 11.24, the identification is made in the eucharistic tradition between the bread and the body of Christ (τοῦτό μού ἐστιν τὸ σῶμα), whereas the cup word equates the cup with the "new covenant." Thus the bread word seems to bear a more obviously Christological accent.

31. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 144.

32. Gundry, p. 238, in his discussion of 10.17 writes, "This is Paul's golden opportunity to equate the 'one body' of believers with the physical body of Christ just mentioned. He does not....We conclude this: through their participation in the Lord's Supper believers show that they are like a single physical body, not that through their participation they are Christ's physical body."

33. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 144.

34. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 143.

35. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 143.

Notes, Chapter 3 (continued)

36. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 144.

37. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 145.

38. This definition is in keeping with Schweizer II, 1065; Bultmann, pp. 192ff; and Käsemann, Perspectives, pp. 25ff. Gundry, p. 79f, argues to the contrary that the term does not mean the whole person.

39. Käsemann, Essays, p. 110f.

40. Gundry, p. 66.

41. See Gundry, p. 223ff and p. 238 for the whole of his argument on the relationship between Sōma and the Church as the Body of Christ. The point against which Gundry contends is made by Robinson, p. 51f; a similar position was argued earlier by Schweitzer, p. 127f.

42. Schweizer II, 1070.

43. Sanders, p. 455.

44. Käsemann, Essays, p. 114, seems to imply this when he writes, "Through the Spirit of Christ, I become a member of the Body of Christ."

45. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 235, takes κατὰ σάρκα to refer to Israel's legitimate religious activities. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 145, thinks, however, that the phrase refers to "apostate Israel offering sacrifices to idols." Our concern is that, whether the activities are legitimate or otherwise, Paul can draw a parallel on the basis of the partnership established.

46. Héring, p. 96.

47. Hauck, 805.

48. Conzelmann, p. 174, note 38.

49. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 238.

50. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 149.

51. E. Lohse, "Zu 1 Cor. 10, 26.31," ZNW 47 (1956), 280.

52. Sanders, p. 454f.

53. J. Behm, "ἄρτος," TDNT, I, 477.

54. Danby, Ber. 6.1, p. 6.

55. Danby, Pes. 10.5, p. 150f.

Notes, Chapter 3 (continued)

56. Danby, Ber. 6.6, p. 7, seems to indicate this when it says, "If men sit (apart) to eat, each should say the Benediction for himself; if they reclined (around the table together) one should say the Benediction for all." See also G. Bahr, "The Seder of Passover and the Eucharistic Words," NT 12 (1970), 189f.

57. J. Jeremias, "This is my Body," ExT 83/7 (1972), 196.

58. While the unleavened bread of the Passover meal does not make the many participants into one fellowship, we may see a parallel function in the erub or shittuf loaf in which, according to J. Neusner, A History of the Mishnaic Law of Appointed Times (Part Two Erubin, Pesahim), (1981), p. 97, "all parties enjoy a share, which makes the diverse residences into a single household." Danby, p. 796, says of the shittuf loaf, "The areas and premises belonging to those participating in the shittuf are thus transformed into a single domain." It is not our suggestion here that the erub or shittuf functions as the catalyst in Paul's deduction that the many participants in the eucharistic bread become one body. Here, we simply note that there probably was in Jewish practice contemporary with Paul a bread which, contrary to the unleavened bread of the paschal meal, was understood to transform the many into one; though, in the case of the erub or shittuf loaf, the one loaf transforms the residences of the participants and not the participants themselves. Again J. Neusner, A History of the Mishnaic Law of Appointed Times (Part Two Erubin and Pesahim), p. 13f, notes that the traditions in tractate Erubin arise from concrete practice, not from a "generative problematic," and thus can have been practiced.

59. Danby, Pes. 10.5, p. 151.

60. Käsemann, Essays, p. 110.

61. Davies, p. 252, writes, "If our approach to the Pauline account of the Last Supper be correct, we should expect the idea of community to play a greater part in his thought of that Supper than that of expiation of sin, as was the case in the Jewish Passover...Moreover, in all the relevant passages for the understanding of Paul's thought on the Supper...the idea of community is prominent." But our point is that the idea of community is important for Paul only because in the Supper the community is identified with the body of Christ.

62. Orr and Walther, p. 252, write, "When the Jewish festival meal, particularly Passover, is properly understood, it provides a perception of the way in which it closely united people into an organic unity where they felt each was a part of the others. To participate in the Lord's Supper, then, is to be guests of Christ and to have table fellowship with him...." Yet Paul seems to go beyond table fellowship with Christ and the idea of organic unity which, as we shall see in 12.12ff, Paul uses to illustrate the reality of the participants being the one body of Christ. This is apart from Orr and Walter's questionable assertion that "organic unity" is the proper understanding of the Passover meal.

Notes, Chapter 3 (continued)

63. Our purpose here is not to speculate on the possible origins of Paul's theology of the body of Christ. See Käsemann, Perspectives, pp. 102ff and Gundry, p. 223ff for discussions of this question.

64. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 127f.

65. Lietzmann, p. 207.

66. Héring, p. 120.

67. Conzelmann, p. 194.

68. Theissen, p. 297.

69. Smith, 328f.

70. Winter, 77f.

71. Käsemann, Essays, p. 116.

72. Theissen, p. 298.

73. Smith, 328f.

74. Theissen, pp. 307ff.

75. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 263.

76. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 128.

77. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 126. See also Héring, p. 114.

78. Winter, 77, See also Conzelmann, p. 195, note 22.

79. Winter, 79.

80. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 262.

81. Conzelmann, p. 196, notes the parallel Hebrew terms: קִבֵּל מִן and מָסַר לְ.

82. Jeremias, Words, pp. 89ff, makes a detailed comparison of the accounts of the Last Supper and the eucharistic texts.

83. Conzelmann, p. 197f, says, "...the bread is the body in the sense of sacramental identity."

84. Jeremias, Words, p. 104.

85. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 266f.

86. Conzelmann, p. 198.

Notes, Chapter 3 (continued)

87. Käsemann, Essays, p. 114, says, "In any event, the conclusions we have reached provide us for the purpose of our chapter with a sufficient answer to the hotly debated question whether, according to Paul, the Lord's Supper conveys participation in the dying or in the exalted Lord. They answer it unequivocally in the latter sense." For a view in opposition to Käsemann's position, see Wedderburn, 74-96.

88. Conzelmann, p. 198, note 54. See also Bornkamm, Experience, p. 143.

89. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 267.

90. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 267, writes in comment on 11.24 that "Already (v. 7) we have seen that Paul regarded Jesus as the new Christian Passover; he seems to make the same point here. The Passover to the Jews was the sacrifice and festival of deliverance...Christ, the crucified...by his death, has effected a like deliverance...and this is represented in the Supper." Our point, however, is that the emphasis upon deliverance is part of the tradition and not here developed by Paul.

91. Conzelmann, p. 199.

92. Héring, p. 117.

93. Käsemann, Essays, p. 128.

94. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 142. See also D. McCarthy, "Further notes on the Symbolism of Blood and Sacrifice," JBL 92/2 (1973), 208, where the author argues for the distinctive Hebraic understanding of blood in the context of covenant sacrifice; in this context, McCarthy argues that "blood is life."

95. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 268f.

96. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 143.

97. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 142f.

98 Bornkamm, Experience, p. 143.

99. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 269.

100. Käsemann, Essays, p. 110.

101. Again, it is not our purpose here to debate the question of the longer (Luke 22.15-20) or the shorter (Luke 22.15-18) Lucan texts. For our purposes, we may accept the longer text. For a detailed discussion of the question involved, see Jeremias, Words, p. 139ff.

102. Jeremias, Words, p. 168 and pp. 237ff, provides a discussion of the command's possible origins.

Notes, Chapter 3 (continued)

103 Jeremias, Words, p. 52, note 3 and p. 121, discusses the limiting function of the clause ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε .

104. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 141. See also Jeremias, Words, p. 121.

105. Jeremias, Words, p. 249f.

106. Conzelmann, p. 198.

107. Jeremias, Words, p. 251.

108. Conzelmann, p. 199.

109. See Jeremias, Words, p. 238f, for a discussion of these parallels.

110. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 140.

111. Jeremias, Words, p. 244f. See also D. Gregg, "Hebraic Antecedants to the Eucharistic Anamnesis Formula," Tyn. Bull. 30 (1979), 165-178.

112. Jeremias, Words, p. 249.

113. Jeremias, Words, p. 252.

114. Jones, 187.

115. Gregg, 27.

116. Conzelmann, p. 201; Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 270; Lietzmann, p. 182.

117. Jones, 188.

118. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 140f.

119. Gregg, 26.

120. Conzelmann, p. 201, suggests that since the sentence begins with γὰρ , the verb is more likely indicative than imperative.

121. Jeremias, Words, p. 106f, suggests that καταγγέλλειν , "...represents the Hebrew higgid. This verb is used for the recitation of the Exodus credo, Deut. 26. 5-9, at the Passover."

122. Käsemann, Essays, p. 130.

123. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 141.

124. Jeremias, Words, p. 253.

125. Héring, p. 119. See also Gregg, 26.

126. Danby, Pes. 10.4, p. 150.

127. Jeremias, Words, p. 253.

Notes, Chapter 3 (continued)

128. Jeremias, Words, p. 253.

129. See 1 Cor. 15.3f; Rm. 3.23f, 4.24, 5.6f. For a discussion of Paul's understanding of the death of Jesus, see Sanders, pp. 463ff; see also Käsemann, Perspectives, pp. 32ff.

130. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 271.

131. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 170f.

132. Conzelmann, p. 300.

133. Conzelmann, p. 300.

134. Käsemann, Essays, p. 133.

135. Käsemann, Essays, p. 126, writes, "The self-manifestation of Christ calls men to obedience and this means that, at the same time, it calls them to account before the final Judge who is already today acting within his community as he will act towards the world on the Last Day...." Thus, Moule, p. 470, is able to write, "But allusions to self-examination...are only a prelude to the fact that St. Paul's treatment of the Eucharist itself...is in terms of judgment."

136. Jeremias, Words, p. 253f.

137. Jeremias, Words, p. 252ff.

138. Käsemann, Essays, p. 122.

139. Conzelmann, p. 202.

140. Bauer, p. 58, notes that the term occurs only here in the New Testament.

141. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 271.

142. Bauer, p. 267, notes that ἔνοχος is used mostly as a legal term to denote being "liable, answerable, guilty"; and with the genetive, the word may denote the person or thing against whom/which the crime has been committed. See also James 2.10.

143. Contrary to Jones, 190f, who writes, "St. Paul thinks in terms of the proclamation to men of the death of Christ, thus making available its benefits until the coming again. This is the proportion of his theology." Such an interpretation, like that of Jeremias, fails to consider the context in which Paul discusses the tradition. In this way, the emphasis upon judgment is disregarded.

144. Käsemann, Essays, p. 123.

145. Schweizer II, 1067.

Notes, Chapter 3 (continued)

146. Moule, p. 470, remarks that vv. 28ff contain a striking "...accumulation of juridical and legal concepts and formularies."

147. Moule, p. 469.

148. Moule, p. 470.

149. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 262. See also Smith, 329.

150. Conzelmann, p. 202.

151. Smith, 329; Bornkamm, Experience, p. 148f.

152. Smith, 329.

153. Käsemann, Essays, p. 127.

154. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 274.

155. Best, p. 108.

156. Héring, p. 120.

157. Best, p. 108.

158. In agreement with Conzelmann, p. 202, note 110, we take the reading of τοῦ κυρίου in v. 29 to be an interpolation.

159. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 275.

160. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 143, writes, "Paul can deduce the thought about the congregation as the body of Christ, expressed in v. 17, only from the participation in the body of Christ that the broken bread mediates to us."

161. Moule, p. 470, thinks that the "one body" in 11.29 should carry both meanings; thus he writes, "the discerning, penitent communicant is alert to the meaning with which the bread and the wine are charged both in regard to the incarnate Christ given for us and in regard to the fellow members of the Body which that surrender created; and it seems to me probable that St. Paul was thinking inclusively and intended to indicate the implications in their most comprehensive range...."

162. Käsemann, Essays, p. 118, writes, "The gift brings with it its Giver."

163. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 149.

164. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 276.

165. Conzelmann, p. 203.

166. Conzelmann, p. 167.

167. Conzelmann, p. 203.

Notes, Chapter 3 (continued)

168. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 276. See also Conzelmann, p. 203 and Bornkamm, Experience, p. 150.

169. Käsemann, Essays, p. 126.

170. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 276.

171. Davies, p. 250.

Chapter 4

PARTICIPATION AND UNITY IN THE BODY OF CHRIST

As is well known, the eucharistic passages in 1 Corinthians 10 and 11 are not the only passages in which Paul speaks about the body of Christ in terms of participation and unity.[1] Our purpose here is not to undertake a study of the whole range of the participation and unity terminology or of all the passages in which such terminology may be seen to function, but merely to examine three texts in which the terminology of participation and unity is employed in terms of the body of Christ. The three passages are 1 Cor. 6.12-20; 12.12-27; and Romans 12.4-5.

The intention behind our examination of the above mentioned texts is to discover the way in which participation and unity in the body of Christ functions for Paul outside of the eucharistic passages. It is hoped that Paul's use of this terminology in the three passages to be considered will, in turn, shed light on the function of the theme in 10.17ff and 11.26ff.

We will proceed in our examination of the texts according to a brief discussion of (1) the literary context, (2) the progression of thought, (3) the function of the theme of participation and unity. In conclusion, we will discuss the connection between the three texts and the eucharistic passages in 1 Corinthians 10 and 11.

A. 1 Corinthians 6.12-20

1. Literary Context

The passage is situated within the larger discussion of matters pertaining to ethical freedom:[2] sexual immorality in the church (5.1-8), association with immoral people (5.9-13), the question of

civil lawsuits in the congregation (6.1-8), marriage (7), and the consumption of sacrificial foods (8-10). The passage is preceded in 6.9-11 by a warning that the unrighteous will not inherit the kingdom; along with this, Paul makes an announcement that the Corinthians were made righteous (ἐδικαιώθητε) in spite of their past unrighteousness. It is interesting to note that those who commit "sexual immorality" (πορνεία), the πόρνοι, are at the head of the list of unrighteous people in v. 9. Orr and Walther observe that it is Paul's combination of a warning with his announcement of righteousness that leads the Apostle to address the specific problem of sexual immorality in 6.12-20.[3]

2. Progression of Thought

The sequence of Paul's thought in the passage is not always clear. Not least among the difficulties is the shift in number from "your [plural] bodies" in v. 15 to "your [plural] body" in v. 19 and v. 20. The shift seems to be from the bodies of individuals in v. 15 to the corporate body of the congregation in vv. 19 and 20.[4] In addition, there is the further problem in v. 18 where Paul seems to make a distinction between sins outside the body and sexual immorality by which the fornicator "sins against his own body."[5]

Nonetheless, the sense of Paul's argument seems to be that since the Corinthians are members of Christ, they are not to commit sexual immorality. Conzelmann holds that the repetition of the slogan-like freedom principle "All things are lawful for me" (v. 12), along with the saying regarding the purpose and transience of both food and the stomach (v. 13), suggests that Paul is addressing the Corinthian enthusiasts who may have devalued things material, including their bodies.[6] Against the idea that membership in Christ creates an inner freedom that liberates the individual from moral constraints, Paul

may be arguing for the use of freedom on the basis of what is "helpful" (συμφέρει, v. 12) for the corporate body, the church.[7] Paul gets to the heart of the matter when in v. 13 he juxtaposes the body "not for sexual immorality" with the body "for the Lord." It may be argued that sexual immorality involves the body in a unique way.[8] But so also does membership in Christ. This Paul makes clear in two ways. He relates the body to the Lord in terms of the resurrection in v. 14, and in vv. 15-17 he does so in terms of membership in Christ. It is the latter connection with which we are primarily concerned.

In v. 15, Paul writes, "Do you not know that your bodies are members of Christ? Shall I therefore take the members of Christ and make them members of a prostitute? Never!" Barrett argues that in v. 15, "The imagery shifts slightly, for Paul, writing now in individual terms, thinks of the members that make up one human body."[9] Conzelmann disagrees, saying that, "The underlying thought is that of the body of Christ."[10] It is difficult to see the rationale for the proposed shift in imagery; in 15a, the members of Christ are the individuals' bodies. It seems that Paul's emphatic "Never!" is precisely in connection with his unthinkable suggestion that the very bodies that are members of Christ should become members of a prostitute through sexual intercourse with her.

In v. 16, Paul supports his rejection of sexual immorality on the basis of the scriptures, Gen. 2.24.[11] The person who is joined sexually with a prostitute is "one body" (ἕν σῶμα) with her; over and against this union, Paul sets the "one spirit" (ἕν πνεῦμα) union with Christ (v. 17). According to Sanders, "Paul indicates that a union of 'flesh' can destroy a union of 'spirit'."[12] Perhaps another way of putting it would be that the union with Christ destroys the possiblity of an illegitimate union of 'flesh';[13] in chapter 7, Paul

allows for the legitimate sexual union between man and woman in marriage.

Paul goes on in vv. 18-20 to pick up an image from 3.16-17, the community as "God's temple." In this fashion, by means of the collective singular "your [plural] body," Paul seems to bring the question of individual sexual immorality into the larger arena of the community. It is as a corporate body that the Corinthians are to glorify God (v. 20). Paul reminds them that "...you are not your own; you were bought with a price..." (vv. 19b-20, cf. also 7.23). This seems to be a statement in corporate terms of what Paul has earlier put in terms of the individual: "the body...is for the Lord" (v. 13). Both the individual and the corporate body are under the lordship of Christ.

3. Function of the Theme

It is a debated point whether in 6.12-20 Paul has in mind corporate membership in the body of Christ. Wedderburn thinks that the passage has no corporate reference; he argues that Paul is "...thinking in terms of the communion of the individual with either a prostitute or the Lord: there is no corporate reference here. Hence it is surely significant that he [Paul] can speak of his own body as 'limbs [plural] of Christ'; this is rather different from the idea that each individual is a limb of the Body of Christ."[14] This argument, however, is not convincing. In this passage, Paul does not speak of his own body as "limbs [plural] of Christ"; he speaks of the Corinthians whose bodies are members of Christ. It seems probable that when Paul speaks of "bodies" as members of Christ, he is thinking in terms of each individual as a limb of the corporate body of Christ. It is true that a person confronts the issue of sexual immorality on an individual basis; as Gundry notes, Paul's use of the

collective singular in vv. 19 and 20 does not negate individuation.[15] But those whose bodies are members of Christ do not face the question of sexual immorality as individuals only. Paul is addressing the community, earlier termed "God's temple" (3.16-17) and later identified as the "body of Christ" (12.27), about the significance of membership in Christ as it pertains to the question of sexual immorality. Therefore, according to this text, the theme of participation and unity seems to have both an individual and a corporate ethical function.

On an individual basis, that person who, by means of his body, is a member of Christ, is excluded from the possibility of sexual immorality. Here membership in Christ has an ethical consequence for the individual. Hence, Gundry can say, "For Paul the Body of Christ is ethical...."[16] The ethical function of membership in Christ is here expressed in terms of the responsible use of freedom. Sexual immorality is not permitted because it is not "...what is for the best."[17] It is not "what is best" for the individual whose body will be raised and who is presently a member of Christ. Neither, however, is sexual immorality "what is best" for the community, the corporate body of Christ.

But does Paul's use of the collective singular in vv. 19 and 20 imply that he is thinking of the corporate body of Christ? By making reference to the corporate body as the Spirit's temple (v. 19) in which God is glorified (v. 20), Paul may be suggesting that the participation of any individual member in sexual immorality would have disasterous consequences for the entire community. The corporate body could hardly glorify God if one or more of its members were one body with a prostitute. Orr and Walther comment that Paul is "...trying to impress his readers that they collectively are Christ's body...."[18] As such, an ethical issue such as participation

in sexual immorality is more than individual in its scope;[19] it has consequences for the whole body of Christ, the congregation. This Paul has already touched on in 5.1ff.

Thus, by means of his theme of participation and unity in Christ, expressed here in terms of being members of Christ (v. 15), Paul may be seen to give the ethical conduct of the individual a collective dimension. This collective aspect of participation and unity in Christ is further developed in 1 Cor. 12.12-27.

B. 1 Corinthians 12.12-27

1. Literary Context

The text is situated within the larger section concerning issues pertaining to the Corinthian worship gatherings (11.2-14.40). Paul may be seen to address such issues as: the role of women (11.2-16), abuses within the context of the Lord's Supper (11.17-34), and the allotment and use of spiritual gifts (12-14).[20] In 12.1-3, Paul begins to answer questions concerning "spiritual gifts" (πνευματικῶν)[21] and he asserts the role of the Spirit in making the confession of faith, "Jesus is Lord" (ΚΥΡΙΟΣ ΙΗΣΟΥΣ). In vv. 4-11, he deals with the work of the Spirit in the distribution of diverse gifts for the "common good" (συμφέρον) (v. 7), according to the Spirit's will (v. 11). In both vv. 4-11 and vv. 28-31, Paul outlines the diversity of gifts and, particularly in vv. 28ff, he orders the gifts according to their value.[22] It may be significant that in both lists, the gifts of speaking in and interpreting tongues come last (v. 10 and v. 30). If the Corinthians did, as seems likely, place a high priority on the more ecstatic manifestations of the Spirit,[23] then this may be an indication of Paul's desire that they reorder their spiritual priorities. In recognition of the fact that the gifts are given for the benefit of the common good, Paul urges the

Corinthians to "seek the higher gifts" (v. 31), or, those gifts which benefit the life of the whole community. This emphasis Paul further develops in chapter 14 as illustrated by the distinction he makes between prophecy and speaking in tongues on the basis of what "builds up" (οἰκοδομεῖν).[24]

2. Progression of Thought

In 12.12, Paul again makes reference to the illustration of the one body with many members.[25] It is this illustration that Paul proceeds to develop in 12.14ff along the lines, according to Kasemann, of "...the stoic notion, of organism, which (as in Menenius Agrippa's famous fable) permits a community to be described as a body...."[26] Barrett holds that the fable functions in such a way as to illustrate Paul's point in vv. 4-11, that since the diverse gifts all have the same source, they all have a valid and necessary function in the community.[27]

It may be argued on the basis of v. 12b (οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός), however, that Paul is not simply making a comparison between the physical body and the church, but between the body and Christ himself.[28] Kasemann suggests that, "The argument is a Christological one, as in Romans 12.4, it is with Christ himself...as it is with the body."[29] In other words, it seems that Paul first uses the illustration to say something about Christ: Christ, like the body, has many members and yet, is one.[30] Already in 1.13, in the context of his discussion of the divisions, Paul suggests this point in his rhetorical question: "Is Christ divided?"[31] Paul proceeds in 12.13 to explain his point that Christ is a unity of diverse parts. This he does in terms of the work of the Spirit in baptism: "For by one Spirit we were all baptized into one body--Jews or Greeks, slaves or free--and all were made to drink[32] of one Spirit." Thus, Paul seems

to be arguing from the premise that the church is the body of Christ. On the basis of this premise, he applies the metaphor of the human body to Christ himself and then, in vv. 14-27, to his corporate membership, the church.[33]

Since Christ, like the body, is a unity of diverse parts, Paul goes on in vv. 14ff to illustrate what this means for the members. According to He'ring, vv. 14-20 contain the argument for diversity and vv. 21-25, the case for interdependence.[34] The unity of the one body of Christ means that the diversity of the members is valid and that their interdependence is necessary. Paul concludes the passage by saying, "Now you are the body of Christ and indivudally members of it." Barrett thinks that the sense of the genitive (Χριστοῦ) is in terms of possession and authority;[35] Gundry, however, thinks that the genitive may be taken as an explicative, "...for an equation of some sort is clear from 1 Cor. 6.15...and 12.12-13...."[36] Conzelmann remarks, "Now the body is no longer determined by the parts, but vice versa the parts by the whole."[37] In other words, it is Christ who gives the community and each of its members a valid identity; each person is a member of Christ's body and, as such, has a necessary place in the community. This means that no member is independent of the whole; each has need of the others.

3. Function of the Theme

In 12.12-27, the theme of participation and unity in the body of Christ seems to function as the foundation for Paul's ethical instruction concerning the use of spiritual gifts.[38] The community identified as the body of Christ is expected to demonstrate its identity in the behaviour of its many members. Conzelmann suggests that Paul's instruction is here intended to combat the extreme Corinthian individualism by which members tended to disassociate

themselves from the community.[39] Barrett thinks of Paul's purpose in terms of giving proper direction to the Corinthian spiritual enthusiasm.[40] In either case, it seems to be on the basis of his identification of the community as the body of Christ and Christ as a unity of diverse parts that Paul is able to employ the illustration of the physical body as a form of ethical instruction.

There is much debate concerning whether or not the body of Christ is pre-existent in relation to its parts. Gundry argues against the idea of any "...supramundane pre-existence of the Body of Christ."[41] Käsemann, among others, contends that the opposite point of view is essential.[42] This question requires no further discussion here; our point is simply that whether or not the body of Christ is held to be pre-existent in relation to its parts, it is nonetheless, fundamental to Paul's discussion of the ethical behaviour of the Corinthians in general, and the proper use of spiritual gifts in particular.

In vv. 12-27, Paul seems to develop his theme of participation and unity in Christ along corporate lines, according to his emphasis upon the diverse and interdependent nature of the membership. Barrett notes the nature of baptism as an individual rite and says that Paul is "...thinking of the act in which each Christian individually participated, and it is the more striking that he sees this most individualistic act...as the foundation of unity in the one Spirit and the one body...."[43] But the fact that Paul speaks of the work of the Spirit in baptism is striking only if we understand the basis of the unity to be baptism and not the body into which Paul says the Corinthians have been incorporated.[44] Moreover, Paul's emphasis, as indicated by the use of the first person plural (ἐβαπτίσθημεν ; ἐποτίσθημεν), does not seem to be individualistic, but corporate: "we were all baptized"; "all were made to drink" (v. 13). The emphasis upon the commonality of the community's experience

seems to be strengthened by the role of the "one Spirit" in baptism; this is the same Spirit who in vv. 4-11 is identified as the common source of the spiritual gifts.

Thus, it may be argued that Paul in 12.12-27 develops the corporate significance of participation and unity in the body of Christ for ethical conduct. Participation and unity in the body of Christ requires the individual to see himself in relation to Christ who is a unity of diverse and interdependent members; as such, the individual ought to exercise his spiritual gifts according to what is best for the whole community. This Paul further develops in chapter 14.

C. Romans 12.4-5

1. Literary Context

The text is located very near a major break in the Epistle. At 11.36, Paul concludes his discussion of the question concerning the unbelief of the Jews (chapters 9-11); but in a general sense, 11.36 also concludes what have been termed the "dogmatic" chapters of Romans (chapters 1-11).[45] In 12.1ff, Paul may be seen to introduce a "series of paraeneses."[46] This instruction may be seen to include "...principles for the attitude of Christians toward non-Christians (12.14-21); duties of Christians toward the state (13.1-7); the love of neighbor as the highest duty (13.8-10); the imminent end as an impluse to moral earnestness (13.11-14)."[47] The immediate context of the text may be described as a discussion of the proper place and role of the individual in relation to the whole community of faith (12.3-8).[48]

2. Progression of Thought

Cranfield holds that vv. 4-5 ought to be understood as an explanation of the standard of sober self-evaluation based upon the

"...measure of faith which God has assigned" (v. 3).[49] Barrett says that these verses express "...the reason why Christians should not be arrogant but humble and loving to one another...."[50]

As in 1 Cor. 12.12ff, Paul here employs the figure of the human body in order to illustrate the necessity of diversity within the unity of Christ.[51] Here, however, the figure of the body is not as fully developed as it is in 1 Cor. 12ff; this may be, as Sanders notes, because "...the controversial thrust is not present."[52] Nonetheless, the point of v. 4 seems to be that each of the diverse members of the physical body has a different, though valid, "function" (πρᾶξιν).

In v. 5, the figure of the one physical body is connected with Christ: "So we, though many, are one body in Christ...." (οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἕν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ). The second half of the verse expresses the corporate consequence of being one body in Christ: the members are "individually members one of another" (τὸ δὲ καθ' εἷς ἀλλήλων μέλη). Paul identifies the community as the "one body in Christ," but this does not mean that individuality is negated.[53] Käsemann sums up the point when he writes, "For Paul, unity in the body of Christ does not mean sameness of all its members; it means the solidarity which can endure the strain of the differences--the different gifts and the different weaknesses of the different members."[54]

Since the members of the one body in Christ are "individually members one of another," they cannot make use of their various gifts (v. 6f) without regard for one another. Moreover, since the gifts possessed by each member are a matter of "grace" (χάρις), no one need overestimate his value to the community. Since each gift is "...an actualization, a practical expression, of the grace...of God under which the Church stands,"[55] no members ought to dominate the others

in the expression of his gift. Thus, the recognition of the diverse and interdependent nature of the one body in Christ necessitates of the members humility (v. 3) and mutual regard for one another.

3. Function of the Theme

The parallel between Romans 12.4-5 and 1 Cor. 12.12ff is well documented.[56] It is not, however, agreed that Paul is, in fact, speaking of the church as the body of Christ in Rom 12.4-5. Barrett holds that in Romans 12 Paul is simply making a comparison by means of a simile and that, "The phrase 'one body in Christ' is...a stage on the way to 'the body of Christ.'"[57] Cranfield cautions that it is "...hardly safe to assume..."[58] that the idea of Christians being the body of Christ was in Paul's mind when he wrote Rom. 12.4-5. At the same time, however, Nygren argues that "When Paul here speaks of the body and the members, it is not merely a figure of speech; it is a spiritual reality to him....He means that we are one body in Christ, that we are members in our mutual relations."[59]

It is, however, generally accepted that Romans was written in close chronological proximity to 1 Corinthians;[60] Cranfield notes the likelihood that 1 Corinthians precedes Romans in composition.[61] If this is the case, it seems unnecessary to regard Paul's phrase "one body in Christ" in Rom. 12.5 as a "stage along the way" to his phrase in 1 Cor. 12.27, "the body of Christ." Moreover, in Rom. 6.3, Paul has already spoken of being "baptized into Christ and into his death"; and in Rom. 7.4, he has written, "you have died to the law through the body of Christ."[62] It seems likely that Paul had previously known of and employed the concept of the church as "the body of Christ" and that here in Rom. 12.5, "one body in Christ" is probably an alternative and parallel expression of the "one body" of 1 Cor. 12.13 and the "body of Christ" in 1 Cor. 12.27.

Even if it is held that the construction (καθάπερ...οὕτως...) of 12.4-5 is indicative of a simile,[63] this need not mean that the "one body in Christ" to which the comparison refers is any less real.[64] Cranfield notes the distinctive Pauline element of "in Christ" (ἐν Χριστῷ);[65] it is this element that Schweitzer contends points to the eschatological reality of the union between Christ and believers.[66] It is our contention that Paul in Rom. 12.5 gives expression to this reality in terms of the "one body in Christ" and as such, it is an example of the Pauline theme of participation and unity in Christ.[67]

What, then, is the function of the theme in Rom. 12.4-5? As the parallel with 1 Cor. 12.12ff indicates, the function is ethical. Paul utilizes participation and unity in Christ as the basis for his teaching that his readers ought to behave toward one another as fellow members of Christ, each with a particular gift and function in the community.

D. The Texts in Relation to the Eucharistic Passages in 1 Corinthians

It is important to note that of the three texts studied, only in 1 Cor. 12.12ff does Paul connect participation and unity in the body of Christ with a sacrament (v. 13); here, as we have seen, the connection is probably with baptism alone. In this regard, Barrett has suggested that Paul's use of the "body of Christ" and "membership in the body of Christ" is determined not by his sacramental theology, but by his eschatology.[68] Sanders, however, thinks that the theme of participation and unity in Christ is part of Paul's soteriological perspective.[69] The point that is significant for our study of Paul's eucharistic theology in 1 Cor. 10 and 11 and related texts, is that we may understand the theme of participation and unity in the body of Christ as a central theme in Paul's larger theological perspective.[70]

One way in which Paul gives expression to this theme is in terms of the corporate body of Christ and membership in the body of Christ.[71] Thus, we may proceed on the premise that when Paul speaks of the "one body" in 10.17 and "recognizing the body" in 11.29, he is thinking along similar lines as when he makes reference to the "body of Christ," being "members of one body in Christ," and "your bodies are members of Christ" in 1 Cor. 12.12ff; 6.12ff; and Rom. 12.4-5. In each case, we suspect that participation and unity in the body of Christ has a similar, though not necessarily identical, function.

We have observed in our study of 1 Cor. 6.12-20; 12.12-27; and Rom. 12.4-5, that Paul uses the theme of participation and unity in the body of Christ in an ethical fashion. In 6.12ff, membership in Christ means that sexual immorality is prohibited. In both 1 Cor. 12.12ff and Rom. 12.4-5, membership in the body of Christ means that members are to behave toward one another in humble and loving fashion.

In our study of the eucharistic passages, we have also observed that Paul's interpretation of the eucharistic tradition on the basis of 10.17 has ethical consequences. In 10.14ff, idolatry is prohibited because it threatens the participatory union with Christ and the welfare of the weaker members of the community. In 11.17ff, the humiliation of members of the church is corrected in terms of practical instruction: waiting for one another and satisfying hunger at home. These are practical ethical instructions based on what is best for the corporate body of Christ. Thus, it is our contention that participation and unity in the body of Christ has for Paul an ethical function. Our purpose in the final section of this study will be to examine one dimension of Paul's ethical teaching in 1 Corinthians, his principle of "building up" (οἰκοδομεῖν) the church as it relates to his discussion of spiritual gifts in chapter 14 and the interpretation of the Lord's Supper in chapters 10 and 11.

Notes, Chapter 4

1. Sanders, pp. 453ff, discusses the categories of "participation" and "unity" in Paul's thought. Sanders lists four main expressions of these categories: (1) members of Christ's body, the body of Christ; (2) one Spirit; (3) in Christ; (4) Christ's, servants of the Lord. It is the first of these expressions (Christ's body, the body of Christ) with which we are concerned. I am, of course, indebted to Sanders for the language of "participation and unity" in the body of Christ.

2. Conzelmann, p. 109.

3. Orr and Walther, p. 201.

4. Orr and Walther, p. 203.

5. See Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 150f, for a discussion of the problems related to interpreting 6.18.

6. Conzelmann, p. 109f.

7. Smith, p. 330, notes that Paul uses συμφέρον as one of his key ethical terms and that it is related to his concept of unity. See especially 1 Cor. 10.23 and 12.7.

8. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 148, writes, "Sexual intercourse, unlike eating, is an act of the whole person, and therefore participates not in the transiency of material members but in the continuity of the resurrection life."

9. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 148.

10. Conzelmann, p. 111 and note 21, the same page.

11. Conzelmann, p. 111, note 28, discusses the shift in the meaning of σάρξ.

12. Sanders, p. 454.

13. See Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 147, for his quotation of K. Barth's statement that, "It [πορνεία] is forbidden; it is intrinsically impossible."

14. Wedderburn, 75.

15. Gundry, p. 220f.

16. Gundry, p. 232. It may be noted that Gundry makes his assertion as a refutation of the physical nature of the body of Christ; hence, for him, the body of Christ is an ethical reality or theme developed by Paul in passages "...where being a member of the Body has to do with working relationships among Christians...."

17. Conzelmann, p. 109, provides this translation of συμφέρον.

18. Orr and Walther, p. 203.

Notes, Chapter 4 (continued)

19. Against Conzelmann, p. 112, when he contends that "What was said in 3.16 of the community, that it is the temple of God, that the Spirit of God dwells in it, is here transferred to the individual."

20. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 278, notes that the adjective πνευματικῶν in 12.1 may be either neuter or masculine; but in this regard, he says, "...little difference in sense is involved--spiritual persons are those who have spiritual gifts."

21. Conzelmann, p. 204, notes that the περὶ δὲ of 12.1 is probably indicative of another response by Paul to questions put to him by the Corinthians; see also 7.1 and 8.1.

22. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 295.

23. Conzelmann, p. 209 and Barrett, 1 Corinthians, pp. 286 and 296.

24. Orr and Walther, p. 289.

25. Orr and Walther, p. 250 and Conzelmann, p. 111. See Robinson, p. 59f, note 1 for a discussion of the use of the fable in antiquity.

26. Käsemann, Perspectives, p. 103.

27. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 238f.

28. Robinson, p. 59. Gundry, p. 235, thinks, however, that ὁ Χριστός may have a corporate reference.

29. Käsemann, Perspectives, p. 103 and Schweizer II, 1069.

30. Robinson, p. 59, writes, "The unity of Christ, as of the human body, is his starting point."

31. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 46, discusses the rhetorical question and the lack of the interrogative particle in the clause.

32. Sanders, p. 456, takes ἐποτίσθημεν as a reference to the Lord's Supper. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 289, however, thinks that the aorist probably indicates a non-repeatable act and is, therefore, a reference to baptism; so also, Orr and Walther, p. 284, who see a reference to baptism only. Yet J.D.G. Dunn, Baptism in the Holy Spirit, (1970), p. 130, argues that the term refers to neither the Eucharist nor baptism, but to "...the Corinthians' experience of the Spirit in conversion."

33. Best, p. 84, argues that first the church was thought of as "the Body" and then the metaphor was connected with it.

34. Héring, p. 130.

35. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 292.

Notes, Chapter 4 (continued)

36. Gundry, p. 231.

37. Conzelmann, p. 214.

38. Smith, p. 330, observes, "Thus the principle of unity, which develops from the concept of 'one body,' serves an ethical function, for it tends to prescribe certain behavior on those who participate in it."

39. Conzelmann, p. 213.

40. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 213.

41. Gundry, p. 223ff.

42. Käsemann, Perspectives, pp. 166ff. See also Bultmann, p. 310f and Conzelmann, p. 212.

43. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 289.

44. Käsemann, Essays, p. 111, writes, "Nor is the unity of this Body based on Baptism. According to 1 Cor. 12.13 we are baptized into the unity of the Body. Unity therefore is not the result of our coming together, but the sign manual of Christ."

45. Barrett, Romans, p. 230, notes that Romans has generally been divided between the dogmatic chapters (1-11) and the chapters dealing with ethics (12-13 or 12-15). In this regard, however, he warns, "...it is a serious mistake to treat the two parts of the epistle as distinct from each other."

46. Kümmel, p. 217.

47. Kümmel, p. 217.

48. Cranfield, Romans 12-13, p. 27.

49. Cranfield, Romans 12-13, p. 27.

50. Barrett, Romans, p. 236.

51. Robinson, p. 60.

52. Sanders, p. 457.

53. Nygren, p. 422.

54. Käsemann, Perspectives, p. 3.

55. Barrett, Romans, p. 237.

56. Robinson, p. 60; Sanders, p. 457; Barrett, Romans, p. 236; Cranfield, Romans 12-13, p. 27; Nygren, p. 423.

57. Barrett, Romans, p. 236.

Notes, Chapter 4 (continued)

58. Cranfield, Romans 12-13, p. 27.

59. Nygren, p. 422. See also E. Käsemann, Commentary on Romans, (1980), p. 335, who writes, "It is not surprising, then, that as in 1 Cor. 12.12ff and with the same tendency as there, the apostle continues with the motif of the body of Christ which is characteristic of his ecclesiology."

60. Kümmel, p. 220. See also Barrett, Romans, p. 5.

61. Cranfield, Romans 12-13, p. 27, notes, "Since Paul had at an earlier date given expression to the idea of Christians being the body of Christ (1 Cor. 12.27; cf. 1 Cor. 6.15)...."

62. Cranfield, Romans 12-13, p. 27, thinks that "...the use of τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ in 7.4 is quite different..." from that in 12.4-5; so also Barrett, Romans, p. 236. However, Robinson, p. 47, interprets the body of Christ in 7.4 in a double sense: the crucified body and the body to which Christians are joined.

63. Barrett, Romans, p. 236; see also Gundry, p. 235.

64. Käsemann, Perspectives, p. 104, makes this observation when commenting on the interpretation of 1 Cor. 12.14ff.

65. Cranfield, Romans 12-13, p. 27f, notes, "There is just one particular which distinguishes Paul's application of the figure of the body and the limbs here in Romans from its use in ancient pagan literature, but that one particular is, of course, all-important. The words ἐν Χριστῷ, here in verse 5, indicate that the unity of those whom Paul is addressing...is a matter...of the grace of God."

66. Schweitzer, pp. 122ff and Sanders, p. 453ff.

67. Sanders, p. 457.

68. Barrett, Romans, p. 236f. See also Schweitzer, p. 118, who contends that the "...concept of the mystical body of Christ and the concomitant concept of the being-in-Christ have their roots in eschatology...."

69. Sanders, p. 453ff.

70. Sanders, p. 456, writes, concerning participation in Christ, "...it is the theme, above all, to which Paul appeals both in parenesis and polemic. Further, the very diversity of the terminology helps to show how the general conception of participation permeated his [Paul's] thought."

71. Sanders, p. 456f.

Chapter 5

THE ETHICAL DIMENSION OF PARTICIPATION AND UNITY IN THE BODY OF CHRIST

The purpose of this final section of our study is to demonstrate the connection in 1 Corinthians between Paul's theme of participation and unity in the body of Christ and the ethical principle of "edification" (οἰκοδομή).[1] In order to accomplish this purpose, our study will be divided into four brief sections. These are as follows: (A) the principle of edification and Paul's discussion of spiritual gifts in chapter 14; (B) the principle of edification as evidenced elsewhere in 1 Corinthians; (C) the connection between edification and "love" (ἀγάπη) in 8.1 and chapter 13; (D) the connection between the edification of the church through love and the eucharistic passages in 1 Corinthians.

A. The Principle of Edification and Paul's Discussion of Spiritual Gifts in 1 Corinthians 14

Paul's discussion of the allotment and use of spiritual gifts in the diverse and interdependent body of Christ (chapter 12) is most likely continued in chapter 14.[2] In 14.1 the "love" (ἀγάπη) theme of chapter 13 is affirmed,[3] but the focus soon shifts to "edification" or "upbuilding" (οἰκοδομή) in 14.3. Concerning the opening verses of chapter 14, Conzelmann writes, "The criterion is no longer ἀγάπη, 'love,' but οἰκοδομή, 'edification,' 'upbuilding.'"[4]

The focus upon edification as the criterion for the proper use of spiritual gifts in the community's worship emerges principally on the basis of the distinction made by Paul between the gifts of "prophecy" (προφητεύητε) and "speaking in a tongue" (λαλῶν γλώσσῃ) in vv. 1-5. The gift of prophecy is more desirable in the Corinthian worship because according to Paul, "...he who prophesies speaks to men for

their upbuilding (οἰκοδομή) and encouragement and consolation" (v. 3). On the other hand, the gift of speaking in a tongue is of lesser importance in worship because, the person who exercises this gift "...speaks not to men but to God...." (v. 2). Thus, in chapter 14, "Paul gives the preeminence to prophecy not because of the phenomenon itself, nor on the ground of norms imported from without, but solely because of its value toward edification."[5]

There is an abundance of edification terminology in chapter 14. Paul employs the noun "edification" or "upbuilding" (οἰκοδομή) four times: 14.3, 5, 12, 26.[6] He uses the verb "to edify" or "to build up" (οἰκοδομέω) three times: 14.4(twice), 17.[7] Elsewhere in the Corinthian correspondence, the terms are used to indicate both the task and the result of Paul's own apostolic activity (cf. 2 Cor. 10.8; 13.10; 12.19; and 1 Cor. 3.9).[8] Here, however, it is thought that the terminology is indicative of a "spiritual task of the community."[9] Bornkamm defines the sense of οἰκοδομή here in terms of "...the helping of the other person, not only in his individuality but as a member of the 'church.'"[10] In this regard, Smith says that οἰκοδομή is a "...term that refers to community responsibility or social ethics."[11] This is one aspect of Paul's principle of building up the community.

It is thought, however, that the terminology of edification also has another dimension. This may be indicated by Paul's references to the "outsider(s)" (ἰδιῶτης, ἰδιῶται) and the "unbeliever(s)" (ἄπιστος, ἄπιστοι) in vv. 23, 24. Michel says that this second aspect of edification involves "...outer winning and convincing. It corresponds to the congregation's process of growth...."[12] Perhaps it can be said that this growth is related both to the quality and quantity of the congregation's membership. The quality of the membership is related to its own maturity (v. 20). The quantity or numerical

growth of the membership is, in turn, related to the mature use of spiritual gifts in the assembly (vv. 20-25). Gifts such as prophecy that serve to build up the church, enable the members to be effective in their ministry and mission. When edification is the goal in the use of spiritual gifts, good order prevails, everyone can participate, and all are encouraged (vv. 26-33).

Orr and Walther provide a useful summary definition of edification when they say that its emphasis is "...on strengthening the Christian character, unity, and interrelationships of the church body."[13] The "interrelationships of the church body" have to do with the ethics appropriate to behaviour within the eschatological community; it is the principle of edification which governs this behaviour, especially as it relates to the use of spiritual gifts.[14] Thus, Conzelmann holds that it is on the basis of the principle of edification that Paul gives his instructions in 14.26ff.[15]

Barrett has observed that the instructions in 14.26ff are given in a practical form and indicate that "...Paul chooses to apply the metaphor of edification to the whole body of Christians rather than to the individual."[16] The effect of Paul's instruction, as demonstrated by the admonitions for silence in vv. 28 and 30, is one of self-restraint; the individual is urged to restrain himself in the use of his gifts out of consideration for the needs of the whole community. In this regard, there is a clear connection between Paul's illustration of the interdependent membership of the body in 12.12ff and his ordering of the worship gathering in 14.26ff.[17] No one may behave in the Corinthian assemblies without regard for what is best for the whole church; the principle of edification is a "community principle."[18]

B. The Principle of Edification as Evidenced Elsewhere in 1 Corinthians

1. 1 Corinthians 8.1ff

The ethical principle of edification is not limited to Paul's discussion of spiritual gifts in chapter 14. In 8.1 Paul introduces his discussion of questions relating to "food offered to idols" (εἰδωλόθυτον); he does so on the basis of a distinction between "knowledge" (γνῶσις) and "love" (ἀγάπη): "knowledge puffs up, but love builds up (οἰκοδομεῖ)."

Our purpose here is not to offer an exegetical treatment of chapter 8. For our purposes, it will be sufficient to point out that here,[19] in the context of an ethical question other than the use of spiritual gifts in worship, Paul employs his principle of acting on the basis of what builds up the community.[20] Hence, Paul contends in 8.9ff that behaviour which imperils the consciences of those who are weak is to be avoided. Verse 13 sums up the principle of edification as it is expressed in chapter 8; here Paul writes in terms of his own behaviour: "Therefore, if food is a cause of my brother's falling, I will never eat meat, lest I cause my brother to fall." Here we see that edification, which in 8.1 is linked with love, results in the self-restraint of the free individual out of love for the weaker brother whose conscience binds him. Thus, the self-restraint of 14.26ff is here paralleled.

2. 1 Corinthians 10.23ff

Conzelmann says of 10.23ff that "...it links up with 8.13, taking over the slogan of 6.12."[21] Having already discussed the content of 10.23ff,[22] here our purpose is to see that Paul is able to express his principle of edification by means of a term other than οἰκοδομή. In 10.23 Paul writes, "All things are lawful, but not all things are helpful (συμφέρει). All things are lawful, but not all things build

up (οἰκοδομεῖ)." We have already seen that οἰκοδομεῖν has reference to the community. Here Paul uses συμφέρει in a way parallel to his use of οἰκοδομεῖ; thus Smith holds that the use of συμφέρει is here "...identical to οἰκοδομή."[23] Conzelmann also argues on the basis of 10.33 that the sense of συμφέρει is "...governed by the notion of the community."[24] Thus the principle of building up the community is terminologically broadened in 10.23 by Paul's parallel use of "build up" and "helpful."

The parallel between συμφέρον and οἰκοδομή is significant because it serves to illustrate further the extent to which Paul's principle of acting on the basis of what is best for the community undergirds his ethical instruction elsewhere in 1 Corinthians. In this regard, we will observe briefly the use Paul makes of συμφέρειν in 6.12 and in 12.7.

3. 1 Corinthians 6.12ff

In 6.12 Paul uses for the first time (cf. 10.23) the slogan-like formula "All things are lawful for me; but not all things are helpful (συμφέρει)." As we have seen earlier, the formula functions to introduce Paul's discussion of the question of sexual immorality. Here it is important to note for our purposes that his use of συμφέρειν may indicate that Paul's perspective on sexual immorality is also shaped by his concern for what is best for the community.[25] We also note that here, as in 10.23ff, the community principle is employed by Paul in close proximity to his theme of participation and unity in the body of Christ (cf. 6.15f; 10.17).

4. 1 Corinthians 12.7

In 12.7 Paul again makes use of συμφέρειν. Here he writes, "To each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good

(πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον)." This verse is part of Paul's introduction of the use and allotment of spiritual gifts (12.4-7). Commenting on v. 7, Conzelmann says, "The emphasis is not on ἕκαστος , 'each,' but on πρὸς τὸ συμφέρον , 'in order to make use of it' (literally, 'with a view to what is for the best'), that is, on the aspect of οἰκοδομή , 'upbuilding.'"[26] This emphasis on the proper use of spiritual gifts for the benefit of the community is, as we have seen further developed in chapter 14. Here we want to take note of the fact that in 12.7 Paul is already indicating the ethical emphasis he will develop in concert with his theme of participation and unity in the body of Christ (12.12-27).[27] This emphasis has already been observed in connection with the questions relating to sexual immorality (6.12ff), the consumption of sacrificial foods (8.1ff), and the participation in pagan meals (10.23ff). Now the emphasis is further developed in relation to the use of spiritual gifts. With the exception of the question concerning sacrificial foods (8.1ff), Paul makes use of his principle of building up the community in close association with his theme of participation and unity in the body of Christ.

Before entering into our discussion of the relationship between the principle of building up the community and the eucharistic passages in chapters 10 and 11, it remains for us to take note of an additional dimension of the edification principle. This dimension is seen in the relationship between edification and "love" (ἀγάπη).

C. The Connection Between Edification and Love in 1 Corinthians 8.1 and in Chapter 13

1. 1 Corinthians 8.1

We have already seen that in 8.1 Paul links his principle of edification with love; this he does when he writes that "love" (ἀγάπη), in contrast to knowledge, "builds up" (οἰκοδομεῖ). The result of this construction in chapter 8 is, as we have observed, the

self-restraint of individual liberty that is based on knowledge. This self-restraint is founded upon loving concern for the whole church community. The point of which we want here to take note is that the action (οἰκοδομεῖ) of love is the upbuilding of the community.[28]

Conzelmann, along with others, holds that Paul's commentary on the love of 8.1 is provided by chapter 13;[29] this chapter, Barrett notes has been termed the "Hymn to Love."[30] Our concern here, however, does not involve the literary question of the "Hymn's" composition; that is, whether it was composed apart from the rest of the Epistle.[31] Nor is our concern related to the relationship between chapter 13 and the several noteworthy parallels in Hellenistic and Jewish literature.[32] For our purposes, it will be sufficient to examine briefly the way in which the chapter functions in relation to Paul's theme of building up the community.

2. 1 Corinthians 13

Smith holds that "To a certain extent, the term ἀγάπη, as elaborated in 1 Cor. 13, functions to provide an extended definition of the term οἰκοδομή."[33] It is true, however, that Paul does not use either οἰκοδομεῖν or συμφέρειν in chapter 13; and these are the terms that we have identified as the key words in Paul's development of his ethical principle of building up the community. Yet, Smith contends that chapter 13, "...tends to bear out what is already stated at 8.1, that ἀγάπη provides the ethical underpinning for οἰκοδομή."[34] This may be evidenced by the conceptual kinship between what Smith calls "...the brief definition of οἰκοδομή found at 10.24..."[35] and the "...calm and untiring character of love..."[36] as it is developed in chapter 13.

In 13.4-7 for example, we read, "Love is patient and kind; love is not jealous or boastful; it is not arrogant or rude. Love does not insist on its own way; it is not irritable or resentful; it does not rejoice at wrong, but rejoices in the right. Love bears all things, believes all things, hopes all things, endures all things." Here Smith sees a "further elaboration"[37] of 10.24: "Let no one seek his own good, but the good of his neighbor." As such, vv. 4-7 clarify why Paul can say in 8.1 that "love builds up." The object of love's activity is not the self; it "...does not seek its own advantage."[38] Thus, love effects the self-restraint of the individual which the upbuilding of the whole community requires. It is apparently for this reason that Paul can exhort the Corinthians in 14.1 to "make love your aim" and in 16.24 to "Let all that you do be done in love."

In Galatians 5.22, Paul designates love as the first "fruit of the Spirit"; then in 1 Cor. 12.31, he refers to it as "the way above all others."[39] According to Stauffer, this is because love "stands under the sign of the τέλος."[40] This means that love "...is the only vital force which has a future in this aeon of death."[41] Hence, Paul teaches that love, in the eschatological community, "...provides the scale by which other gifts may be tested and measured, and also is the means by which the unity of the body is maintained."[42]

Elsewhere Paul makes a clear connection between love and the redemptive activity of God in Christ (cf. 2 Cor. 5.14; Rom. 5.6ff; 8.37).[43] Thus, Bornkamm is perhaps correct to stress that "...when 1 Corinthians refers to love it is not the self-perfection of man that is praised but the redemption accomplished in Jesus Christ..."[44] Bornkamm, however, goes further to say that "...every understanding of love as virtue and deed turns the gospel of 1 Cor. 13 into law, in that it directs itself to the striving and duty of men, instead of to the grace of God."[45]

Bornkamm's understanding of love as being exclusive of human deed seems to be based upon his conviction that love "...is the new aeon already present now; that is the presence of Christ himself in the congregation."[46] This, we do not deny, is probably at the foundation of Paul's understanding of love. Yet, Bornkamm's wholly Christological definition of love seems too narrow to do justice to Paul's use of love in connection with his principle of building up the community. Bornkamm seems to run the risk of removing the ethical force from Paul's exhortations in 14.1 and in 16.14. When Paul says, "Make love your aim" (14.1), it seems he intends the Corinthians to think in terms of human deeds of love, deeds which serve to build up the whole community. Thus Stauffer says of 1 Cor. 13, "...it is brotherly love which gives value and content to all other actions and gifts."[47] If love in 1 Corinthians cannot be understood at least partially in terms of human deed, then it is difficult, if not impossible, to make sense of Paul's own self-restraint in 8.13. Is his abstention from meat not a deed of love? Just as difficult are the practical instructions Paul gives in 14.26ff which are based upon the building up of the community, the action of love.

Our intention here is not to enter into the debate about whether Paul's ethics are founded upon "justification by faith" or participation and unity in Christ.[48] We would rather contend with Schweitzer that "Love is for Paul...directly ethical. It is the love of God, that is to say, the love which is in God, which through the Holy Spirit is shed abroad in the hearts of men."[49] Such a point of view does not deny the fundamental grace of God in ethical love; it rather affirms that "In love the work of God and the work of man unite."[50] It is for us axiomatic that, as Stauffer says, "God has the first word. He establishes the relationship...From Him proceeds everything that may be called ἀγάπη ."[51] But this does not deny that when Paul

speaks of love, he has in mind certain deeds which, in the Corinthian situation, he thinks will serve to build up the community. Such deeds may be seen to include: abstaining from sacrificial foods (8.13); foregoing certain apostolic rights (9.1ff); refraining from participation in pagan feasts (10.23ff); waiting for the latecomers at the community meal (11.33); using the gift of prophecy in the assembly as opposed to the gift of uninterpreted tongues (14.1ff). In these specific ways, love in 1 Corinthians may be seen to be ethical and understood, at least partially, in terms of human deed.

Bornkamm recognizes that the edification of the church"...happens in the practical behavior of believers towards one another...."[52] It is this practical behaviour that Paul intends to shape by his principle of building up the church through love. This love is founded upon the grace of God in Jesus Christ. But it is worked out in the lives of believers in their behaviour toward one another (cf. Gal. 5.13).

D. The Connection Between the Edification of the Church Through Love and the Eucharistic Passages in 1 Corinthians

1. 1 Corinthians 10.17

It will be recalled that in 10.17 Paul employs the theme of participation and unity in the body of Christ. He writes, "Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake in the one bread." This formulation we have taken as Paul's own interpretation of the bread word tradition in 10.16. Thus, when Paul says, "We who are many are one body...," we understand this ("one body") to be a reference to the corporate body of Christ, the church.

In addition, it will be recalled, that according to our study of 1 Cor. 6.12ff; 12.12ff; and Rom. 12.4-5 in conjunction with the eucharistic passages in 10 and 11, we concluded that Paul's use of participation and unity in the body of Christ has an ethical

function. This we have taken to mean that because Christians are members of the body of Christ, Paul emphasizes the responsibility they have for one another as fellow members of Christ. It is finally this ethical emphasis that we have understood in terms of Paul's principle of building up the church through love. This, we suggest, is Paul's community ethic in regard to behaviour appropriate vis-à-vis the community both in and out of the worship context.[53]

Thus, having in 10.17 declared that all who participate in the eucharistic bread are in fact members of the corporate body of Christ, it then follows that Paul should apply his principle of building up the community in 10.23ff. Here it is on the basis of the unity inherent in the one body of Christ, that Paul addresses the question of participation in pagan feasts in terms of building up the community.[54] This means that insofar as the ethical principle of building up the community informs behaviour within the body of Christ, the appropriate question is no longer "Does my conscience permit me to participate?"; now the appropriate question is "How can my freedom best serve the edification of the whole community?." In terms of the individual's conscience, there is no restraint of freedom (vv. 25-26). However, the princple of οἰκοδομή requires self-restraint (vv. 24 and 33), because each member of the community is a member of the body of Christ and may not be injured on account of individual liberty (cf. 8.9ff).

As we have seen, this is essentially the same argument Paul applies to the use of spiritual gifts in chapter 14. It may be argued that both in 10.23ff and 14.26ff Paul urges individual self-restraint not because self-denial is the new law, but because love which builds up the community is the guide for behaviour appropriate within the body of Christ. Each person is a member of Christ and the whole community is the body of Christ and must be recognized and

treated as such. If the upbuilding of the community depends upon the self-limitation of individual liberty, then this is what the principle of edification requires. As Bornkamm points out, the principle of building up the church through love is rooted in the "humiliation and self-giving of Christ."[55] It is, thus, consistent with his principle of edification as he applies it in 10.23ff that Paul can exhort the Corinthians to be "imitators of me as I am of Christ" (11.1).

2. 1 Corinthians 11.26ff

It is our contention that the corrective instruction in 11.26ff is also connected with Paul's principle of building up the community through love.[56] This connection is dependent, in the first place, upon the interpretation we have given to 11.29: "For any one who eats and drinks without discerning the body eats and drinks judgment upon himself." Here we have interpreted "discerning (or "recognizing") the body" in light of Paul's formulation in 10.17. Thus, we understand "recognizing the body" to refer to the community, the church, as the body of Christ. In this way, we understand eating and drinking without recognizing the body to mean failing to recognize the congregation as the body of Christ and, thus, freely going ahead with the meal before all of the members are present.

Thus, we interpret Paul's understanding of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor. 10 and 11 in terms of participation and unity in the body of Christ. As we have already seen, the ethical dimension of participation and unity in Christ is elsewhere expressed along the lines of the principle of doing what builds up the community (cf. 6.12ff; 12-14). It is true that there is little, if any terminological similarity between 11.26ff and Paul's application of the principle of edification in 10.23ff or in chapter 14.[57] However, in light of our

interpretation of 11.29 and the instructions Paul gives in vv. 33-34, it seems probable that the principle of building up the community is operative in his correction of the destructive Corinthian meal practices.

We have earlier noted the practical character of Paul's instructions in vv. 33-34: "...wait for one another--if any one is hungry, let him eat at home...." Here we want to observe that both of these commands are consistent with the practical instruction given by Paul in 14.26ff (cf. also 10.33; 8.13). In both cases, Paul urges the self-restraint of the individual in favour of what is best for the whole community.

It is worthy of note that in 14.26ff and 10.23ff Paul also employs the principle of edification in connection with participation and unity in the body of Christ.[58] Here the common participation in the body of Christ in the Supper effects and makes manifest the common membership of the participants in the body of Christ, the church. As he addresses the ethical abuses within the context of the Supper, Paul gives his instructions in terms of the practical behaviour that builds up the community through the working out of love in mutual responsibility for one another.[59]

This manifestation of the community as the body of Christ happens as each participant examines himself and the community over and against the proclamation of the death of Christ. The consequent realization is that each is a brother for whom Christ died, and, therefore each member has a valid and necessary place in the community, the body of Christ.

On the one hand, this means that unrestrained freedom, behaviour based on the liberty of ones own conscience, is inappropriate; the abuse of Christian liberty, even on the basis of spiritual enthusiasm, can be destructive for the community. The result is that

fellow members of the body are injured and guilt is incurred against Christ; this mean judgment.

On the other hand, behaviour that is appropriate to the eschatological community is measured by what builds up the church through love. This is determined by recognizing the community as the body of Christ and accordingly shaping the use of ones freedom. In addressing the Corinthian meal practice, Paul gives this general principle practical shape: waiting for one another and satisfying hunger at home. In this way, judgment is avoided and the church is built up by means of the common participation in the one body of Christ.

E. Summary

Thus, by interpreting the Lord's Supper in terms of participation and unity in the body of Christ, Paul is able to apply his practical ethical principle of building up the church to a situation in which spiritual enthusiasm probably tends to overrun common sense and the practical implications of being one body in Christ. In this way, Paul places the Lord's Supper in particular, and the church's worship in general, "...back into the realm of historical existence from the imaginary region of eschatological consummation to which the enthusiasts had removed it...He really gives it its eschatological meaning by making it the place of love's verification."[60] The "verification of love" is, in fact, the edification of the church. It is, in the language of 1 Cor. 10.24, letting "...no one seek his own good, but the good of his neighbor." In the language of 11.29, it is recognizing the community as the body of Christ, and behaving appropriately.

Thus interpreted, Paul's eucharistic theology in 1 Corinthians 10 and 11 strikes at the Corinthian situation in at least two ways. In

the first place, by interpreting the Supper in terms of participation and unity in the body of Christ, Paul confronts the recurrent problem of division (cf. 1.10ff; 11.18; 12.25). Paul does not lay down the new law that the church threatened with division must unify itself; instead, he reminds the Corinthians that just as Christ is a unity their participation in his body makes them one body also. As the body of Christ, they are also a unity of diverse members. The unity established by Christ belongs to the Corinthians by virtue of their baptism by the one Spirit into the body of Christ (12.13). Paul's intention is that the Corinthians live out this unity which is the foundation of their being the body of Christ.

In the second place, Paul's emphasis upon participation in the body of Christ brings a potent ethical corrective to bear upon the several Corinthian controversies, many of which we have understood to revolve around the central question of the responsible use of Christian freedom. As in the problem of abuses in the context of the Supper, so also in the respective issues of sexual immorality (6.12ff), sacrificial foods and pagan meals (8-10), and the use of spiritual gifts (12-14) Paul develops the significance of membership in the body of Christ in connection with building up the church. This is the proper ethical norm for the channeling of the exercise of freedom within the body of Christ. The Corinthian enthusiasm is channeled away from the excessive expression of individual liberty into the exercise of love within the community over which Christ is Lord.[61]

Thus, it is our conclusion that Paul's eucharistic theology, as it is expressed in 1 Corinthians 10 and 11, is bound up with his theology of the church as the body of Christ. In these chapters and in the related passages (6.12ff; 12-14), this theology has a decidedly functional character.[62] As Paul brings this functional

theology to bear upon the particular problems and controversies which beset the church at Corinth, the resulting instruction is inevitably practical. Such problems and controversies do not befit the body of Christ; they are not characteristic of spiritual, but of mortal, men. As such, the Corinthians are still babes, children in need of maturation (3.1ff; 4.14; 13.22, 14.20); in this sense, Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians regarding the body of Christ, and the ethics which are appropriate to it, is a fundamental and traditional sort of teaching, a sort of first century primer in Christian life and practice. As Bornkamm reminds us, it is a teaching that intends to prepare the Corinthians for the judgment that is yet to come.[63]

This being the case, it would be not only presumptuous, but incorrect as well, to suggest on the basis of this study that we have plumbed the depths of Paul's eucharistic theology. More probably, we have probed only just beneath the surface of a particular example of Paul's teaching on the Lord's Supper, a teaching directed at a particular set of circumstances the nature of which we can only approximate.

Nonetheless, it is our contention on the basis of the texts that Paul interprets the Lord's Supper in 1 Corinthians 10 and 11 in terms of participation and unity in the body of Christ and that he gives his instruction for correction in terms of building up the community in love.

Notes, Chapter 5

1. Bornkamm, Experience, pp. 162ff, provides a thorough discussion of Paul's use of οἰκοδομή in 1 Corinthians, and particularly in the chapters concerning spiritual gifts (12-14).

2. Smith, 330. See also Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 314f.

3. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 165, argues that 14.1 is "...anything but a feeble connection..." with chapter 13. Smith, p. 332, suggests that chapter 13 seems to have been written with its present context in mind. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 314, notes that chapter 14, "...though it begins by recognizing the primacy of love...links up most naturally with xii.31...."

4. Conzelmann, p. 233.

5. Conzelmann, p. 235. See also Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 316.

6. Moulton and Geden, p. 688.

7. Moulton and Geden, p. 688.

8. Michel, 140f.

9. Michel, 140.

10. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 162.

11. Smith, 331.

12. Michel, 142.

13. Orr and Walther, p. 308.

14. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 162, writes, "The principle of this regulation--the gradation of gifts--is termed oikodomē (14.26)."

15. Conzelmann, p. 244.

16. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 327.

17. Smith, 330f.

18. Conzelmann, p. 237.

19. See Barrett, Things, 42ff, for a discussion of issues relating to the comsumption of εἰδωλοθύτων in chapter 8 and related passages.

20. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 164.

21. Conzelmann, p. 175.

22. See chapter three of the present study (p. 65f) where we take particular note of the connection between Paul's discussion in 10.23ff and the unity established in 10.17.

23. Smith, 330.

Notes, Chapter 5 (continued)

24. Conzelmann, p. 176.

25. Conzelmann, p. 109, argues that Paul by his use of συμφέρον does "...not mean another new principle, but the edification of the community, and this results in the destruction of individualism as a factor in salvation."

26. Conzelmann, p. 208 and note 18, the same page.

27. Smith, 330.

28. Conzelmann, p. 141, writes that οἰκοδομεῖν in Paul does not refer primarily to the "...edification of the individual...but to the building up of the community...."

29. Conzelmann, p. 141; Smith, 332; Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 190.

30. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 299.

31. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 297ff and 314, discusses chapter 13 in relation to its position between chapters 12 and 14.

32. Conzelmann, pp. 218ff, provides an extensive excursus on the ancient parallels with chapter 13; he notes in particular 3 Ezra 4.34-40.

33. Smith, 332.

34. Smith, 332.

35. Smith, 332.

36. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 182.

37. Smith, 332.

38. Conzelmann, p. 224, offers this translation of v.5b (οὐ ζητεῖ τὰ ἑαυτῆς); he also notes the parallel between this phrase and 10.24,33.

39. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 180, here quotes Bengel's translation of καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδόν .

40. Stauffer, 51.

41. Stauffer, 51.

42. Barrett, 1 Corinthians, p. 297.

43. Conzelmann, p. 220, notes that there is no Christological reference in chapter 13, and that the Christian dimension of "love" is provided by the context.

44. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 189.

45. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 189.

Notes, Chapter 5 (continued)

46. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 188.

47. Stauffer, 52.

48. Sanders, pp. 439ff, provides a brief summary of the debate.

49. Schweitzer, p. 306.

50. Stauffer, 51.

51. Stauffer, 50.

52. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 164.

53. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 164.

54. Against Conzelmann, p. 175, who argues that "...there is no connection with the preceding section." However, the author also contends that, "The criterion, which is to be understood as an inherent unity, is conscience and the bond with our brother." Our point of view, however, is that this "bond with our brother" is not for Paul in terms of conscience, but the unity that is inherent in the "one body." Thus, it is this unity inherent in the "one body" that connects 10.23ff with Paul's formulation in 10.17.

55. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 165f.

56. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 149.

57. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 169.

58. Smith, 329ff, concludes that in terms of σῶμα and ἀγάπη "...there is a clear and explicit relationship in the argument of 1 Cor. between chapters 10-14." Smith, however, thinks that it is the interpretation of the meal in 11.17-34 that "...serves to establish the basis for an argument in which the ethical relationships of the members to one another are defined." Our interpretation, however, is that the interpretation of the Lord's Supper is of a piece with Paul's use of participation and unity in the body of Christ and his principle of building up the community as they are expressed elsewhere in the Letter. For us Paul's interpretation of the Supper is one example of his larger theological perspective, which is the "basis for" his argument in chapters 10-14.

59. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 168.

60. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 165.

61. Horsley, "Consciousness," 586, writes, "In his response to the problem posed by the 'freedom of consciousness' Paul insists on the 'real ethical question' at the interpersonal level. Both the structure and the substance of Paul's response makes the effect of one's behaviour on others the criterion of ethics."

Notes, Chapter 5 (continued)

62. Käsemann, Perspectives, p. 118.

63. Bornkamm, Experience, p. 165, writes, "But for Paul the consummation is still to be expected. Therefore, responsible life with one another and for one another gives meaning to the life and worship of believers. That means the all-embracing criterion of 'edification.' But all 'edification' still has before it the day of judgment, which alone will make known what the worth of each single deed was (1 Cor. 3.12-15; 4.5)."

Texts and Translations

A. Bible

1. Aland, K. (ed.), Synopsis Quattuor Evangeliorum. 7th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1971.

2. Kittel, R. (ed.), Biblia Hebraica. 7th rev. ed. Stuttgart: Priveleg. Württ. Bibelanstalt, 1959.

3. May, H.G. and Metzger, B.M. (editors) The New Oxford Annotated Bible with the Apocrapha, Revised Standard Version. New York: Oxford University Press, 1977.

4. Nestle, E. (ed.) Novum Testamentum Graece 25th ed. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1968.

5. Rahlfs, A. (ed.), Septuaginta. Small edition, two volumes in one. Stuttgart: Württembergische Bibelanstalt, 1937.

B. Dead Sea Scrolls. Vermes, G. (ed. and trans.), The Dead Sea Scrolls in English. Hammondsworth: Penguin Books, 1962.

C. The Didache. Warmington, E.A. (ed.), The Apostolic Fathers I (Loeb Classical Library. Translated by K. Lake. London: William Heinemann, 1912.

D. The Mishnah. Translated from the Hebrew with introduction and brief explanatory notes by H. Danby. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1933.

E. Philo. Warmington, E.A. (ed.), Philo I-X (The Loeb Classical Library). Translated by F.H. Colson and G.H. Whitaker (I-V) and F.H. Colson (VI-X). London: William Heinemann, 1929.

Articles Consulted

Bahr, G.J. "The Seder of Passover and the Eucharistic Words." NT 12 (1976), 181-202.

Bandstra, A.J. "Interpretation in 1 Cor. 10:1-11." CTJ 6 (1971), 5-21.

Barrett, C.K. "Cephas at Corinth" in Betz, O., Hengel, M., Schmidt, P. (editors), Abraham unser Vater, Festschrift für Otto Michel. Leiden, 1963, 1-12.

Barrett, C.K. "For the English-speaking Group (Response to F. Hahn)" in de Lorenzi, L. (ed.), Freedom and Love: the Guide for Christian Life (1 Cor. 8-10; Rm. 14-15). Rome, 1981, 179-181.

Barrett, C.K. "Luke XXII.15: To Eat the Passover." JTS 9 (1958), 305-307.

Barrett, C.K. "Pauline Controversies in the Post Pauline Period." NTS 20/3 (1974), 229-245.

Barrett, C.K. "Things Sacrificed to Idols." NTS 11 (1965), 138-153.

Barth, M. "A Chapter on the Church, the Body of Christ." Interpretation 12 (1958), 131-156.

Beck, N.A. "The Last Supper as Efficacious Symbolic Act." JBL 89 (1970), 192-198.

Behm, J. "ἄρτος" in TDNT I, 477-478.

Benoit, P. "The Accounts of the Institution and What they Imply" in Delorme, J. (ed.), The Eucharist in the New Testament. London and Baltimore, 1964, 71-83.

Campbell, J.Y. "Κοινωνία and its Cognates in the New Testament." JBL 51 (1932), 352-380.

Cohn-Sherbok, D. "A Jewish Note on ΤΟ ΠΟΤΗΡΙΟΝ ΤΗΣ ΕΥΛΟΓΙΑΣ." NTS 27 (1980-81), 704-709.

Coleman, P. "The Translation of παρεδίδοτο in 1 Cor. 11.23." ExT 87/12 (1976), 375.

Cuming, G.J. "ΕΠΟΤΙΣΘΗΜΕΝ (1 Corinthians 12.13)." NTS 27 (1981), 283-285.

Delling, G. "ἀπαρχή." in TDNT I, 484-486.

Delorme, J. "The Last Supper and the Pasch in the New Testament." in Delorme, J. (ed.), The Eucharist in the New Testament. London and Baltimore, 1964, 21-57.

Ellis, E.E. "A Note on First Corinthians 10.4." JBL 76 (1957), 553-556.

Finlayson, S.K. "1 Cor. 11.25 (and the Paschal Haggadah)." ExT 71 (1959 s), 243.

Articles Consulted (continued)

Goppelt, L. "Paul and Heilsgeschichte." Interpretation 21 (1967), 315-326.

Goppelt, L. "ποτήριον." in TDNT VI, 148-158.

Gregg, D.W.A. "Hebraic Antecedants to the Eucharistic Anamesis Formula." Tyndale Bulletin 30 (1979), 165-168.

Hahn, F. "Teilhabe am Heil und Gefahr des Abfalls" in de Lorenzi, L. (ed.), Freedom and Love: the Guide for Christian Life (1 Cor. 8-10; Rm. 14-15). Rome, 1981, 149-171.

Hauck, F. "κοινός -- κοινόω" in TDNT III, 789-809.

Hill, A.E. "The Temple of Asclepius: An Alternative Source for Paul's Body Theology?" JBL 3 (1980), 437-439.

Horsley, R.A. "Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8-10." CBQ 40/4 (1978), 574-589.

Horsley, R.A. "Pneumatikos and Psychikos: Distinctions of the Spiritual Status among the Corinthians." HTR 69/3-4 (1976), 269-288.

Horsley, R.A. "Wisdom of Word and Words of Wisdom in Corinth." CBQ 39/2 (1971), 224-239.

Jacobs, L. "Passover" in EJ XIII, 163-169.

Jacobs, L. "Shavuot" in EJ XIV, 1319-1322.

Jeremias, J. "πάσχα" in TDNT V, 896-904.

Jeremias, J. "The Key to Pauline Theology." ExT 76 (1964), 27-30.

Jeremias, J. "This is My Body." ExT 83/7 (1972), 196-203.

Jones, D. "Ἀνάμνησις in the LXX and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. xi.25." JTS 6 (1955), 183-191.

Jourdan, G.V. "Κοινωνία in 1 Cor. 10.16." JBL 67 (1948), 111-124.

Kaplan, Z. "Eruv" in EJ VI, 849-850.

Kuhn, K.G. "The Lord's Supper and the Communal Meal at Qumran" in Stendahl, K. (ed.), The Scrolls and the New Testament. London, 1958, 65-93.

Levine, B.A. "First Fruits" in EJ VI, 1312-1314.

Lohse, E. "Zu 1 Cor. 10, 26.31." ZNW 47 (1956), 277-280.

McCarthy, D.J. "Further Notes on the Symbolism of Blood and Sacrifice." JBL 92/2 (1973), 205-210.

Articles Consulted (continued)

von Meding, W. "1 Korinther 11,26. Vom Geschichtlichen Grund des Abendmahls." ET 35/6 (1975), 544-552.

Melconian, V.D. "First Corinthians." Interpretation 7 (1953), 62-77.

Michel, O. "οἶκος -οἰκουμένη" in TDNT V, 119-159.

Moule, C.F.D. "Sanctuary and Sacrifice in the Church of the New Testament." JTS ns 1 (1950), 29-41.

Moule, C.F.D. "The Judgment Theme in the Sacraments" in Davies, W.D. and Daube, D. (editors), The Background of the New Testament (Studies in Honour of C.H. Dodd). Cambridge, 1956, 464-481.

Murphy-O'Connor, J. "The Non-Pauline Character of 1 Cor. 11: 2-16." JBL 95/4 (1976), 615-621.

Petuchowski, J.J. "Do This in Remembrance of Me (1 Cor. 11.24)." JBL 76 (1957), 293-298.

Rengstorff, K.H. "ἀποστελλω-ἀποστολή " in TDNT I, 398-447.

Shiffman, L.H. "Communal Meals at Qumran." Revue de Qumran. 37 (September 1979), 45-56.

Schweizer, E. "πνεῦμα - πνευματικός" in TDNT VI, 332-451.

Schweizer, E. "σῶμα - σωματικός" in TDNT VII, 1024-1094.

Smith, D.E. "Meals and Morality in Paul and His World" in Richards, K.H. (ed.), Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers. Chico, 1981, 319-339.

Stauffer, E. "ἀγαπάω -ἀγαπητός" in TDNT I, 21-55.

Sykes, S.W. "Story and Eucharist." Interpretation 37/4 (1983), 365-376.

Theissen, G. "Sociale Integration und sakramentales Handeln, 1 Cor. XI 17-34." NT 16 (1974), 179-206.

Walther, J.A. "The Chronology of Passion Week." JBL 77 (1958), 116-122.

Wedderburn, A.J.M. "The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in 1 Cor." SJT 24/1 (1971), 74-96.

Wengst, K. "Das Zusammenkommen der Gemeinde und ihr 'Gottesdienst' nach Paulus." ET 33 (1973), 547-559.

Wilson, R.M. "How Gnostic were the Corinthians?" NTS 19/1 (1972), 65-74.

Winter, B.W. "The Lord's Supper at Corinth: An Alternative Reconstruction." RTR 37/3 (1978), 73-82.

Books Consulted

Barrett, C.K. A Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1957.

Barrett, C.K. A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1968.

Barrett, C.K. A Commentary on the Second Epistle to the Corinthians. 2nd ed. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1973.

Barrett, C.K. Essays on Paul. London: SPCK, 1982.

Barrett, C.K. From Adam to Last: A Study in Pauline Theology. London and New York: Black and Scribner, 1962.

Barrett, C.K. (ed.) The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. London: SPCK, 1956.

Barth, M. Das Abendmahl. Passamahl, Bundesmahl, und Messiasmahl (Th. St. 18). Zürich: Zollikon, 1945.

Bauer, W. A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. Translated from the 4th revised and augmented edition (1952) by W.F. Arndt and F.W. Gingrich. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1957.

Best, E. One Body in Christ. London: SPCK, 1955.

Betz, O., Hengel, M., Schmidt, P. (editors), Abraham Unser Vater, Festschrift für Otto Michel. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1963.

Black, M. The Scrolls and Christian Origins. Edinburgh: Nelson, 1961.

Blass, F. and Debrunner, A. A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature. A Translation and Revision of the 9th-10th German edition incorporating supplementary notes of A. Debrunner by R.W. Funk. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bornkamm, G. Early Christian Experience. Translated by P.L. Hammer. London: SCM Press, 1969.

Bornkamm, G. Paul. Translated by D.M.G. Stalker. New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1971.

Brown, F., Driver, S.R., Briggs, C.A. (editors), A Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972 edition.

Bultmann, R. History of the Synoptic Tradition. Translated by J. Marsh. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.

Bultmann, R. Theology of the New Testament I. Translated by K. Grobel. London: SCM Press, 1952.

Conzelmann, H. 1 Corinthians. Translated by J.W. Leitch. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.

Books Consulted (continued)

Cranfield, C.E.B. A Commentary on Romans 12-13 (Scottish Journal of Theology Occasional Papers No. 12). Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1965.

Cranfield, C.E.B. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans I. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1975.

Cullmann, O. (ed.) Essays on the Lord's Supper. Translated by J.G. Davies. London, Lutterworth Press, 1958.

Davies, W.D. Paul and Rabbinic Judaism. 3rd ed. London: SPCK, 1964.

Davies, W.D. and Daube, D. (editors) The Background of the New Testament (Studies in Honour of C.H. Dodd). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.

Delorme, J. (ed.) The Eucharist in the New Testament. Translated by M. Stewart. London and Baltimore: Chapman and Halicon, 1964.

Drane, J. Paul: Libertine or Legalist? London: SPCK, 1975.

Dunn, J.D.G. Baptism in the Holy Spirit (Studies in Biblical Theology, 2nd series 15). London: SCM Press, 1970.

Encyclopaedia Judaica VI, XIII, XIV. New York and Jerusalem: Macmillan and Keter Publishing House, 1971-1972.

Gese, H. Essays on Biblical Theology. Translated by K. Crim, Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1981.

Gregg, D. Anamnesis in the Eucharist (Grove Liturgical Study No. 5). Bramcote, Notts.: Grove Books, 1976.

Gundry, R. "SŌMA" in Biblical Theology with Emphasis upon Pauline Anthropology (Soc. N.T.S. Monograph Series, 29). Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 1976.

Gunther, J.J. St. Paul's Opponents and Their Background (Novum Testamentum Supplement, 35). Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1973.

Hanson, A.T. Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology. London: SPCK, 1974.

Hatch E., and Redpath, H.A. A Concordance to the Septuagint and Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament. 3v. Grand Rapids: Baker Book House, reprinted 1983.

Héring, J. The First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians. Translated from the 2nd French Edition by A.W. Heathcote and P.J. Allcock. London: Epworth Press, 1962.

Huber, W. Passa und Ostern. Berlin: Verlag Alfred Töpelmann, 1969.

Hunter, A.M. Paul and his Predecessors. 2nd rev. ed. London: SCM Press, 1961.

Books Consulted (continued)

Hurd, J.C. The Origins of First Corinthians. London and New York: SPCK and Seabury, 1965.

Jeremias, J. Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus. Translated by F.H. Cave and C.H. Cave. London: SCM Press, 1969.

Jeremias, J. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus. Translated from the 3rd German edition by N. Perrin. London: SCM Press, 1966.

Jewett, R. Paul's Anthropological Terms. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1969.

Käsemann, E. Commentary on Romans. Translated by G.W. Bromily. London: SCM Press, 1980.

Käsemann, E. Essays on New Testament Themes (Studies in Biblical Theology 41). Translated by W.J. Montague. London: SCM Press, 1964.

Käsemann, E. Perspectives on Paul. Translated by M. Kohl. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1971.

Kittel, G. and Friedrich, G. (editors) Theological Dictionary of the New Testament I-IX. Edited and translated by G. Bromiley. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1964ff.

Kümmel, W.G. Introduction to the New Testament. Translated by A.J. Mattill, Jr. London: SCM Press, 1966.

Lampe, G.W. and Woollcombe, K.J. Essays on Typology. London: SCM Press, 1957.

Lehmann, M. Passover Hagadah. London: J. Lehmann, 1969.

Lietzmann, H. An die Korinther I, II (Handbuch zum Neuen Testament 9). Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1931.

Lietzmann, H. Mass and Lord's Supper. Translated by D.H.G. Reeve. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979.

Lightfoot, J.B. Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries. London: Macmillan, 1895.

Lightfoot, J.B. Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians. rev. 10th ed. London: Macmillan, 1910.

Lohse, E. The New Testament Environment. Translated by J.E. Steeley. London: SCM Press, 1976.

de Lorenzi, L. (ed.) Freedom and Love: The Guide for Christian Life (1 Cor. 8-10; Rm. 14-15). Rome: St. Paul's Abbey, 1981.

Martelet, G. The Risen Christ and the Eucharistic World. Translated by R. Hague. London: Collins, 1976.

Moule, C.F.D. An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.

Books Consulted (continued)

Moulton, W. and Geden, A. A Concordance to the Greek Testament. 4th ed. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1963.

Neusner, J. A History of the Mishnaic Law of Appointed Times, Part Two Erubin, Pesahim. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1981.

Nygren, A. Commentary on Romans. Translated by C.C. Rasmussen. London: SCM Press, 1952.

Orr, W. and Walther, J.A. 1 Corinthians (The Anchor Bible v. 32). Garden City: Doubleday, 1976.

Richards, K.H. (ed.) Society of Biblical Literature Seminar Papers, 1981. Chico: Scholars Press, 1981.

Ridderbos, H.N. Paul: An Outline of his Theology. Translated by J.R. DeWitt. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmanns, 1975.

Robinson, J.A.T. The Body: A Study in Pauline Theology (Studies in Biblical Theology 5). London: SCM Press, 1952.

Sanders, E.P. Paul and Palestinian Judaism. London: SCM Press, 1977.

Schweitzer, A. The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle. Translated by W. Montgomery. London: Adam & Charles Black, 1956.

Segal, J. The Hebrew Passover from the Earliest Times to A.D. 70. London: Oxford University Press, 1963.

Stendahl, K. Paul Among Jews and Gentiles and Other Essays. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1976.

Stendahl, K. (ed.) The Scrolls and the New Testament. London: SCM Press, 1958.

Strack, H. and Billerbeck, P. Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch IV. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Oskar Beck, 1928.

Theissen, G. Studien zur Sociologie des Urchristentums. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1979.

de Vaux, R. Ancient Israel: Its Life and Institutions. Translated by J.F. McHugh. London: Darton, Longman, & Todd, 1961.

Vermes, G. Discovery in the Judean Desert. New York: Desclee Company, 1956.

Weiss, J. The History of Primitive Christianity I. Edited and translated by F.C. Grant. London: Macmillan, 1937.