Communion with Christ and Christian community in 1 Corinthians: a study of Paul's concept of Koinonia

Häuser, Götz Ludwig

Götz Ludwig Häuser, *Communion with Christ and Christian Community in 1 Corinthians. A Study of Paul's Concept of KOINONIA*, submitted to the University of Durham, Faculty of Arts, for the qualification for the degree of M.Theol., 1992

ABSTRACT

Although the concept of κοινωνία occurs only twice in 1 Corinthians (1:9 and 10:16), each of these two occurrences appears to be highly significant not only for the context in each case but also generally with reference to the character of the Apostle's argumentation in this epistle. In the first passage, which has almost entirely been neglected so far in the many scholarly contributions to the subject of κοινωνία, the term occurs in the summarizing climax of the letter-opening (1 Cor 1:1-9) which is remarkably packed with theological and christological statements and which is structured by a laudatory description of God's wonderful works in the Corinthians' lives in past (vv.4-6) present (v.7a) and future (vv.7b-8). The basic message which Paul wants his addressees to comprehend right from the beginning and which - according to the epistolary function of these nine verses - reveals his approach to their many serious problems, culminates in the concept of κοινωνία, in the salvific communion with Christ crucified, God's Son, their risen Lord, a communion into which they had been called once-for-all and where God's faithfulness continually preserved them until the end. The other instance in 1 Cor 10:16 is not a Pauline formulation but a presumably catechetical tradition on the Lord's Supper which the Apostle quoted and employed as an argument in the course of his lengthy discussion of the problem of idol-meat (1 Cor 8:1-11:1). Because of the communion (κοινωνία) with the body and blood of Christ, i.e. the inclusive involvement into Christ's death and resurrection as it is tangibly expressed in the celebration of the Eucharist, any other competing relationships and meal fellowships with idols are necessarily excluded. So, in both cases of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians the concept is not an ecclesiological term but rather emphasizes the communion with Christ as the constant constitutive condition of the Christians' individual and community life.

Communion with Christ and Christian Community in 1 Corinthians
A Study of Paul's Concept of KOINONIA

by

Götz Ludwig Häuser

Submitted to the University of Durham
Department of Theology
for the qualification for the degree of

Master of Theology

1992

Preface

A year's study in Durham has been a most enjoyable and valuable experience. And among the many traces which this period has left the piece of work which is presented here is not necessarily the most important, although it swallowed so many - at times fairly tiring but in the main surely exciting - hours even after I had come back to "Europe". Yet I am most grateful not only that as a guest and foreign observer I had the opportunity to catch some glimpses of the theological research and teaching at Durham University, but that, thanks to a joint study programme with its German partner university in Tübingen, it was possible to participate in all aspects of the department's scholarly and social life as a postgraduate student.

I want to express my warmest thanks therefore to Prof. Otfried Hofius who inspired and supported my stay in Durham and in one of whose seminars, on the Liturgy of the Lord's Supper in the early church and in the NT, lie the roots of my interest in the meaning and significance of the concept of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 10:16 and further in 1 Cor 1:9. I also owe to him some basic stimulus and introduction into NT research in general and in particular into the excitement of reading Paul. I am also most grateful to Dr. A. J. M. Wedderburn in whom I found a superb supervisor for my project not only as a highly attentive and instructive critic of my exegetical, theological and linguistical "output", but also as a good ἐπίσκοπος of his academic flock even in the distant pastures of Erlangen. Further, I thank Friedemann Büttel for his being such a good friend and συγκοινωνός during the Durham year and in the process of this study's growth. My final debt of gratitude, however, is to my parents who supported my long period of study and to whom I cordially dedicate this work.

A personal result of the long and intensive consideration of just a few verses in one of Paul's letters is a deeper understanding - as we hope - of the Apostle's highly explosive though strangely "unattractive" gospel of Christ crucified - the

one and only message which he had decided to "know" among the Corinthians (1 Cor 2:2). Another rather general discovery, however, which is connected to the depth and complexity which we found in Paul's thought, is a deeper understanding of the value and the necessity of a detailed text analysis for the business of interpreting biblical (and any other) texts. A high degree of scholarly attentiveness and a careful observation of the exegetical subject therefore describe the essential task and duty as well as the justification of a scientific approach to the NT and to Holy Scripture as a whole. We would like to refer to J. B. Lightfoot therefore, the great NT scholar and nineteenth-century Bishop of Durham, who was at home in both in the ancient Norman cathedral and in the Faculty of Theology next door:

"The timidity, which shrinks from the application of modern science or criticism to the interpretation of Holy Scripture, evinces a very unworthy view of its character. If the Scriptures are indeed true, they must be in accordance with every principle of whatever kind. It is against the wrong application of such principles, and against the presumption which pushes them too far, that we must protest. It is not much knowledge, but little knowledge that is the dangerous thing here as elsewhere. From the full light of science in criticism we have nothing to fear: the glimmering light - which rather deserves the name of darkness visible - hides and distorts the truth"[1].

So we hope to have shed some light on the concept of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians and on its significance for the issue of communion with Christ and Christian community.

Erlangen, April 1992 Götz Häuser

[1] Quoted in M. Hengel's recent article, "Bischof Lightfoot und die Tübinger Schule", *TBei* 23 (1992), 5-33, 28. Hengel got the quotation from another article by G. R. Treloar (see ibid., nn. 81 and 5). The article is based on a lecture which Hengel gave in December 1989 in Durham in memory of the hundredth anniversary of Lightfoot's death.

Contents

1 Introduction

1.1 Survey and Critique of Previous Research on Κοινωνία in Paul

Since Campbell's and Seesemann's basic and influental studies on the concept of κοινωνία in the New Testament in 1932/33[1] there has been quite an extensive debate among NT scholars on that subject[2]. The many publications which appeared in the following decades cover a wide variety of different approaches and interpretations picking up, and building on, Seesemann's and Campbell's suggestions or reacting to and opposing their ideas strongly, as does the most recent larger contribution, Hainz's *Koinonia. "Kirche" als Gemeinschaft bei Paulus* from 1982[3]. Seesemann's and Hainz's monographs do not only

---

[1] J. Y. Campbell, "Koinonia and Its Cognates in the New Testament", *JBL* 51 (1932), 352-380; H. Seesemann, *Der Begriff KOINΩNIA im Neuen Testament*, BZNW 14, Gießen 1933. See also E. P. Groenewald's Ph.D. Thesis *Κοινωνία (gemeenskap) bij Paulus*, (in Afrikaans) for the Vrije Universiteit te Amsterdam, 1932.

[2] Before 1932/33 there were only the relevant passages in the NT dictionaries (such as Liddell/Scott, Moulton/Milligan, Cremer/Kögel, and Bauer) and some articles dealing mainly with the interpretation of κοινωνία in Acts 2:42 (so A. Carr, "The 'Fellowship' of Acts 242 and Cognate Words" in *Expositor* 8. Ser. 5 (1913), 458-564; C. A. A. Scott, "What Happened at Pentecost", in *The Spirit*, ed. B. H. Streeter, 1919, 117-158; cf. id., "The 'Fellowship', or κοινωνία", in *ET* 35 (1923/24), 567; and cf. id., *Christianity according to Paul*, Cambridge, 1927). A reaction to Scott's position on Acts 2:42, but yet covering also the Pauline evidence, is W. S. Wood, "Fellowship", in *Expositor* 8. Ser. 21 (1921), 32-40.

[3] The relevant articles and monographs since 1932/33 are: P. J. T. Endenburg, *Koinoonia. En Gemeenschap van Zaken bij de Grieken in den Klassieken Tijd*, Amsterdam, 1937 (though it is merely a philological study of κοινωνία in classical Greek it is yet helpful for the tradition-historical background of the NT phrase and refers to, and discusses, Seesemann and Campbell); F. Hauck, *TWNT* III (1938), 798-810; G. V. Jourdan, "KOINΩNIA in 1 Corinthians 1016", in *JBL* 67 (1948), 111-124; A. R. George, *Communion with God in the New Testament*, London, 1953; S. Muñoz-Iglesias, "Concepte Biblico de Κοινωνία", in *XIII Semaña Biblica Española. El Movimiento Ecumenistico*, Madrid, 1953, 195-223; S. D. Currie, *Koinonia in Christian Literature to 200 A.D.*, Emory University, 1962; J. Schattenmann, "Gemeinschaft/κοινωνία", in *TBLNT* I (Studienausgabe), Wuppertal, 1971, 495-499; P. C. Bori, KOINΩNIA, *L'idea della communione nell' ecclesiologia recente e nel Nuovo Testamento*, Brescia, 1972; J. M. McDermott, "The Biblical Doctrine of KOINΩNIA", in *BZ* New Series 19 (1975), 64-77.219-233; S. Brown, "Koinonia as the Basis of New Testament Ecclesiology?", in *OiC* 12 (1976), 157-167; G. Paniculam, *Koinōnia in the*

provide the most extensive and detailed investigations on κοινωνία, but one can also regard their positions as the two opposite poles of the debate, which in general focuses mainly on the Pauline occurrences of κοινωνία and its cognates, for Paul uses the concept most of all the NT authors[4]. On the whole Seesemann clearly favors a "vertical" and theological interpretation of κοινωνία, especially in those instances where the phrase is related to highly significant terms of Pauline theology such as "Christ" or his "body" and "blood", "Pneuma", "faith", "gospel", etc., and he therefore generally translates *Teilhabe*[5]. Hainz on the other hand appears to be the strongest advocate of a "horizontal" understanding of κοινωνία stressing the fundamental ecclesiological implications of the concept and promoting *Gemeinschaft (durch Teilhabe)* as the adequate translation[6].

In the following passage we will now give a brief chronological and critical survey of the previous research on κοινωνία. Yet we restrict ourselves here to the major works and positions[7], as there will be opportunity to pick up and comment on others later.

New Testament. A Dynamic Expression of Life, AnBib 85, Rome, 1979; A. di Marco, "KOINONIA - COMMUNIO: FLP 2,1", in *Laurentianum* 3 (1980), 376-403; J. P. Sampley, *Pauline Partnership in Christ. Christian Community and Commitment in Light of Roman Law*, Philadelphia, 1980; K. Kertelge, "Kerygma und Koinonia. Zur theologischen Bestimmung der Kirche des Urchristentums" in *Kontinuität und Einheit*, FS für F. Mußner, ed. P.-G. Müller et al., Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1981; J. Hainz, "κοινωνία κτλ.", in *EWNT* II, Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/ Mainz, 1981, 749-755; id, *Koinonia. "Kirche" als Gemeinschaft bei Paulus*, BU 16, Regensburg, 1982. Besides the relevant passages in the commentaries it is further necessary to mention the countless works on the Eucharist as far as they deal with 1 Cor 10:16-17; see for instance the different contributions in *KOINONIA. Arbeiten des Oekumenischen Ausschusses der Vereinigten Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands zur Frage der Kirchen- und Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*, Berlin, 1957; or in F. Hahn/ K. Kertelge/ R. Schnackenburg, *Einheit der Kirche. Grundlegung im Neuen Testament*, QD 84, Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1979.

[4] Paul has 26 occurrences of (συγ)κοινων- words (in Rom, 1/2 Cor, Gal, Phil and Phlm) compared with only 17 in the other books of the NT altogether.

[5] Cf. *Koinonia*, 99.

[6] Cf. *Kirche*, 173.

[7] The works of Groenewald, Muños-Iglesias, Bori and di Marco are left out because of language problems, although they might have been interesting, especially Bori's monograph.

When J. Y. Campbell wrote his article on "Κοινωνία and Its Cognates in the New Testament" he was the first who extensively investigated the evidence of the concept in non-biblical Greek authors and in the LXX and who approached the meaning of κοινωνία in the NT literature in this way[8]. The result of his review of classical literature is that "the primary idea expressed by *κοινωνός* and its cognates is not that of association with another person or other persons, but that of participation in something in which others also participate"[9]. Yet, although he admits that associative aspects are principally possible in the Pauline and other NT instances of κοινωνία, his conclusion is very similar to his earlier results on the classical usage. This might hint at a lack of a more thorough examination and differentiation, for otherwise Campbell could hardly have promoted such a uniform scheme of interpretation and be so convinced that even in a passage like 1 Cor 1:9 "κοινωνία retains its primary, and only common, meaning" which is the idea of participation in a common **thing**[10]!

Very similar in its conclusions, yet a much more expanded and detailed investigation of the subject, is H. Seesemann's monograph *Der Begriff KOINΩNIA im Neuen Testament*, which was published almost at the same time as Campbell's study. His starting point is also an examination of the non-Christian usage of κοινωνέω, κοινωνία and κοινωνός, covering, though, many more sources and dealing with the evidence in a more systematic way, according to different grammatical constructions. In the second and major part Seesemann then studies the particular passages in the NT - especially in Paul - which employ κοινωνία (and other κοινων-words). In comparison to Campbell he, at least in principle, proposes a much greater variety of different meanings for

---

[8] Roughly the first third of the article is a survey of the usage in classical Greek, where Campbell checked about 600 occurrences in 20 authors, and of the 24 LXX passages employing κοινων- words. The second third then deals with κοινωνός and κοινωνεῖν in the NT and the last 10 pages are spent on κοινωνία in the NT, with a certain emphasis on 1 Cor 10:16. The order of the NT passages discussed, however, appears to be somewhat unstructured and confusing.

[9] "Cognates", 353; cf. also 363 and see how Campbell draws close parallels to the concept of μέτοχος (ibid., 354f; cf. 376 on 1 Cor 10:16-17) which for him expresses in principal the same meaning.

[10] "Cognates", 380.

κοινωνία in different contexts[11]. And it is therefore somewhat surprising that his interpretation of the various non-biblical as well as of the biblical instances is so much dominated by the single idea of *Teilnahme* and *Anteilhaben*[12]. The only Pauline instance where Seesemann translates *Gemeinschaft* is Gal 2:9[13], but besides that he is very cautious with any associative understanding of κοινωνία in Paul and rather strongly rejects any ecclesiological connotations of the term[14]. Yet, although Seesemann describes the idea of participation as the general underlying principle of the semantics of κοινωνία in Classical, Hellenistic and NT usage - that it is so exclusively is open to doubt - he still describes a certain peculiarity of the Pauline concept in his conclusion: Paul does not use κοινωνία in a social, juridical, economic or other profane sense, but κοινωνία appears only as a particularly religious term with religious implications[15]. And so Seesemann suggests that the most likely derivation of that usage would be from a cultic background such as sacrificial meals and that

---

[11] See *Koinonia*, 13: " Die Mannigfaltigkeit dieser Bedeutungen ist so groß, daß alle überhaupt vorhandenen Möglichkeiten nicht aufgezählt werden können."

[12] See the translations throughout "Teil I: Κοινωνία im nichtchristlichen Sprachgebrauch" (*Koinonia*, 3-23; §§1-3); but see also "Teil II: Κοινωνία im Neuen Testament" (ibid., 24-99), where the longest chapter of the entire book deals with a usage which is supposed to be unique to Paul in the NT (ibid., 31): "Κοινωνία in der Bedeutung 'die Teilnahme, das Anteilhaben'", (ibid., 31-86; §5). The concept of μετέχειν is generally regarded as synonymous ("teilhaben"), except that κοινωνεῖν has a wider spectrum of meanings (ibid., 43). Yet even in the long and thorough discussion of 1 Cor 10:16-22 (ibid., 34-56), where μετέχειν also appears, Seesemann does not distinguish the semantics of the two concepts, but concludes that the "ursprüngliche Bedeutung des Wortes κοινωνία" is "Teilhabe, das Anteilhaben" (ibid., 47; cf. 41, 48), although he finally notes that κοινωνία in v.16 "eine besonders enge Beziehung zum Ausdruck bringen will ... und in die Bedeutung 'Einswerden' hinüberspielt" (ibid., 56).

[13] But in the final conclusion he then paraphrases the "Gemeinschaft" of Gal 2:9 as "Einheit, gemeinsames Anteilhaben" (*Koinonia*, 99).

[14] "Der Begriff κοινωνία läßt sich daher zu dem Begriffe ἐκκλησία nicht in Parallele stellen und die Kirchenidee des Paulus ist von ihm aus nicht zu beleuchten, wie es immer wieder versucht worden ist." (*Koinonia*, 99).

[15] So the usage of κοινωνία in the NT and in Classical/Hellenistic Greek does not differ in the basic underlying meaning of "Teilnahme, Anteilhaben", but it differs, at least for Paul, in its employing this meaning exclusively in religious contexts and purposes (*Koinonia*, 99f). Dubious is therefore Hainz's critique of Seesemann, when he objects that the concept of *Teilhabe* could not have any religious quality (*Kirche*, 162), but does not really say why not.

κοινωνία therefore originally might have been employed in the Eucharist, where Paul picked it up and then introduced it also into other contexts[16].

An impressive feature of F. Hauck's article on κοινωνία in Kittel's *TWNT* is the density with which the author gave such an amount of information and consideration on merely about twelve pages[17]. Not only does he present a comparatively thorough survey of the concept in non-biblical Greek and in the LXX, but he also goes beyond his predecessors in drawing attention to the use of κοινωνία in Rabbinic and Hellenistic Judaism as well[18]. The second half of the article then deals with the NT evidence. Generally Hauck seems to be much more flexible than Campbell and Seesemann in his introductory notes on the semantics and the different grammatical constructions of κοινωνία, as he explains the meaning as "*Teilhabe, Gemeinschaft* ... bes. im Sinn der engen Verbindung" and as he points to the two possible sides of the concept as a passive *Anteilhaben* or an active *Anteilgeben*[19]. But on the other hand he is not always very precise, as it seems, in the particular interpretation of the relevant κοινων-passages in the NT, especially in Paul[20]. For he plays with various concepts at the same time, explaining 1 Cor 1:9 for instance as referring to "*Genossen* Christi", to "Gemeinschaft mit dem Erhöhten" and to "Teilhaben am Sohne ... [as the] Heilsbesitz des Christen"[21]. Yet concerning possible sociological or ecclesiological implications of κοινωνία he is more or less in line

---

[16] See *Koinonia*, 100-103.

[17] The limit of space might have been the reason why Hauck hardly discusses Seesemann's book and does not even mention Campbell's study.

[18] See *TWNT* III, 799f: "B. κοινων- im Profangriechischen"; and 800-804: "C. κοινων- im israelisch-jüdischen Gebiet".

[19] See *TWNT* II, 798.

[20] Like Seeseman and Campbell he also pays most attention to 1 Cor 10:16-20.

[21] *TWNT*, 804f; cf. also the comments on 1 Cor 10:16 where he speaks of "Teilhaben an Christus", "Genossen Christi", "Zusammenschluß (Anteilschaft) mit dem himmlischen Christus" and "innige Verbindung" (803f). Interesting, however, is Hauck's interpretation of the "Gemeinschaft mit Christus" in pointing to the parallel Pauline feature of the σύν-(Χριστῷ) verbs in order to elucidate the completeness of the Christ-Christian relationship that reaches from συμπάσχειν to συγκληρονομεῖν (Rom 8:17).

with Seesemann and Campbell and describes the "Christengemeinschaft" as a secondary result of the "Christusgemeinschaft"[22].

According to the title of G. V. Jourdan's brief article on "KOINΩNIA in 1 Corinthians 10ι6" one might expect a stronger focus on this particular passage. Yet the author approaches 1 Cor 10:16 on the traditional path and broadly considers κοινωνία in its context in non-Christian Greek and in Paul's letters in general before he turns to the passage mentioned as well[23]. He emphasizes the distinctness of the Pauline usage from the pagan ideas - also in the case of 1 Cor 10:16-22 where he points out that Paul was in "strict accord with Hebrew thought"[24], although he had been aware of the Hellenistic concepts too. Jourdan's further conclusions, though, are rather confusing as he claims, for instance, that κοινωνία "can mean at the same time the 'having a share', the 'receiving of a share' and the 'granting of a share'"[25]. And he does not really make clear how he relates the ecclesiological aspects of his understanding of 1 Cor 10:16-17 - the "Christian unity of association" - to "the entire field of the believer's relation to Jesus Christ"[26]. His final rendering, "sharing together in Christ"[27], does not solve the problem, however.

A more profound study is A. R. George's extensive monograph on *Communion with God in the New Testament*. After investigating the Synoptics at some length, he turns to the Primitive Church (Acts) and to Paul in particular[28], examining also their use of κοινωνία, before he briefly comments on the Johannine and the other NT writings. George finally concludes that the **idea** of the communion with God is "the heart of the Christian faith"[29] and that all the

---

[22] *TWNT* II, 807; cf. "Cognates", 376; and *Koinonia*, 47 and 99.

[23] KOINΩNIA, 111-119; the actual study of 1 Cor 10:16 covers 119-124.

[24] "KOINΩNIA", 112; see also the considerations on the difference of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 10:16 and the sense of κοινωνός in vv.18 and 20 (ibid., 121f).

[25] KOINΩNIA, 119.

[26] "KOINΩNIA", 120 and 119.

[27] See KOINΩNIA, 120f,124.

[28] The section on Paul covers more than fifty pages, two chapters of the monograph (*Communion*, 140-195) and is George's second main focus after the Synoptics.

[29] *Communion*, 262.

relevant NT passages "breathe the spirit of the Jewish rather than the Greek or Oriental piety"[30], for they do not promote any kind of deification or absorption into God. But the **terminology** of the NT (including κοινωνία), on the other hand, is regarded as closer to ordinary Greek than to the LXX[31], although the NT concepts finally still pass beyond both the Jewish "spirit" and the Greek terminology. The crucial event for Paul, however, and for his preaching and teaching on this subject, is supposed to be his Damascus experience and his recognition of the crucified and resurrected Son of God as Christ and Lord and furthermore as the ultimate condition and determination of his and any Christian's whole life ἐν and σύν Χριστῷ[32]. Yet, according to George, such a close I-Thou relationship with Christ and thus the communion with God could appropriately be expressed only in metaphors such as κοινωνία[33], in itself "a colourless word which derives warmth and intimacy from its contexts"[34]. But the concept "has a certain religious flavour in Paul[35], though it does not always refer to participation in Persons of the Godhead"[36], as it does for instance in 1 Cor 1:9 and indirectly also in 10:16[37]. Still, a weakness in George's far-reaching and

---

[30] *Communion*, 237; see generally 233-242 and for Paul also 140f. George's main argument here is the very un-Jewish and very un-Christian tendency in Hellenistic mysticism towards an absorption into the deity, and that the OT already has a certain tradition of prayer and prophetic literature reflecting the experience of a communion with God.

[31] See *Communion*, 185-187, 236.

[32] According to George the ἐν Χριστῷ phrase rather than κοινωνία is the keyword for Paul's theology (*Communion*, 187; cf. 239) and can eventually be regarded as an equivalent to the use of κοινωνία (for instance in the case of 1 Cor 1:9, cf. ibid., 176). He also stresses the importance of the σύν phrases and verbs (ibid., 150-155). But his conclusion that ἐν Χριστῷ might describe the Christian's "here and now" whereas σὺν Χριστῷ refers more to their "*will be* hereafter" (ibid., 155; cf. 240) can hardly be accepted. It is not enough just to look at the statistical record of the tenses used with σύν.

[33] *Communion*, 243.

[34] *Communion*, 244.

[35] George follows Seesemann here and also in his general rejection of an ecclesiological meaning. But he does not stress the distinction between the Pauline and the ordinary Greek usage of the concept so much, for Paul could have used the term in a secular sense also (*Communion*, 186f).

[36] *Communion*, 185.

[37] *Communion*, 171-177. In the case of 1 Cor 1:9 George regards the κοινωνία construction as corresponding to, or even identical with, ἐν (and σὺν) Χριστῷ, speaking here of "participation" in Christ (ibid., 175f) and he interprets 1 Cor 10:16 as "participation in his Body and Blood" (ibid.,

valuable considerations is surely the confusion of his terminology, using in the body of his study the same kind of "participation" (and "fellowship") language for κοινωνία which he finally rejects in his conclusion in favour of the rendering of "communion"[38]. Further, George's general emphasis on the sacramental transmission of the communion with God[39] reveals a certain exegetical inaccuracy, at least for Paul who nowhere calls Baptism the origin of that communion (rather in 1 Cor 1:9 it is clearly God's gospel-call) or the Eucharist a "*means* of grace" where "we *receive* Him in another mode"[40].

Κοινωνία, not in Paul or the NT, but *Koinonia in Christian Literature to 200 A.D.* is the topic of S. D. Currie's doctoral dissertation which was submitted a decade after George's book[41]. The title, however, is slightly misleading, as Currie's intention is to support Seesemann's thesis, that Paul's "religious" concept of κοινωνία was singular and distinct from that of Greek writers before him, and, as Currie now wants to demonstrate, from the Christian writers of the Early Church as well. Currie further complains that his predecessor did not really go "behind Paul's use"[42] to investigate the inner meaning which "this Greek-speaking Jew"[43] had imported into κοινωνία. Therefore in a first part of his study Currie investigates κοινωνία in and "behind" Paul[44] before he deals with the "other Christian writers before 200 A.D." (including the other NT scriptures!) in the other part[45] and finally confirms Seesemann's thesis in a brief

---

173; cf. 176f).

[38] *Communion*, 244.

[39] See *Communion* 152, 163f, 189f, 195, 240, 249, 261. Like Seesemann George considers the Eucharist as possibly "the whole origin of the distinctively Pauline usage" of κοινωνία (ibid., 190) and ἐν Χριστῷ (ibid., 163f).

[40] *Communion*, 177; bold type by G.H.

[41] One wonders, though, why Currie does not even mention George's monograph.

[42] Currie, *Literature*, IV.

[43] *Literature*, 14.

[44] *Literature*, 1-58.

[45] *Literature*, 59-239; Currie unfortunately does not explain what he really means by "Christian Literature" or how he relates "Christian writers before 200 A.D." to the actual process of canonization and use of what became the NT. Some methodological or hermeneutical considerations might have been appropriate here.

conclusion[46]. For Currie "koinonia means primarily ... a standing relationship of interdependence or common concern, a social nexus"[47] and the particular religious significance which the term has in Paul is therefore due to the context in which it is used[48]. The four topic groups and notions of Pauline usage that Currie proposes are more or less in accord with previous research[49]. But his new observations on "the rationale of Paul's use of koinonia"[50] which form the special contribution of his work are more than speculative and questionable and consequently also his exegetical survey of the relevant Pauline passages. Currie fails to convincingly explain why on earth Paul should have been led by "a sense of inadequacy of the Septuagint's rendering of ḥesed [sic! חֶסֶד not חֲבוּרָה as one might expect] ... to adopt koinonia and its cognates as vehicles suitable for expressing the claims of the alliance in Christ"[51].

J. M. McDermott's article on "The Biblical Doctrine of KOINΩNIA", one of the many publications of the seventies on our topic[52], is also concerned mainly with Pauline uses of the concept. After approaching the subject on the usual historical linguistic path via OT usage, Greek thought and Early Judaism[53], the author finds an underlying unity of meaning in the various Pauline instances of

---

[46] *Literature*, 239-245.

[47] *Literature*, 7.

[48] In a very unsystematic review of various texts in Classical, Hellenistic and biblical Greek (*Literature*, 1-14) Currie follows, as it seems, Campbell and Seesemann, although he actually does not share their general rendering of "participation". He rather strongly promotes an associative and "horizontal" meaning also for Paul, even in passages like 1 Cor 1:9 and 10:16 (translating in both cases "alliance" of the brothers in Christ; see ibid., 40f, 45).

[49] *Literature*, 2-4 - κοινωνία occurs in connection with: partnership/common enterprise; the collection; the Lord's supper; and with other terms of religious significance (gospel, faith, spirit, Christ, ...). This order, however, is quite revealing.

[50] *Literature*, 14-29; they are seemingly supposed to be the "behind of Paul's use" (see above).

[51] *Literature*, 29; cf. 14, 16, 20, 24, 36, 42, 57. Cf. also Hainz's critique of Currie in *Kirche*, 178-182, especially 181f.

[52] See Schattenmann (1971), Bori (1972), McDermott (1975), Brown (1976), Sampley (1977) and Paniculam (1979); see the bibliography in n. 3.

[53] "Doctrine", 64-69. See also 232, where McDermott concludes that "the Pauline doctrine of κοινωνία" was not influenced by Jewish or pagan thought and (with P.C.Bori) assumes that the word may have been used in the pre-Pauline church already where it perhaps had designated "the union attained by the reception of the Eucharist", before it was uniquely shaped by Paul (cf. Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 100-103).

κοινωνία and its cognates[54]. In the second part he then wants to show, for the first time, a certain development of thought within the chronological order of the Pauline κοινων-passages[55]. For McDermott, Paul's adaptation and transformation of κοινωνία to Christianity brought out a concept which describes "not just a given state, but also a state of community which must be actively realized by contributions from the participants ... because of the previous reception of κοινωνία"[56]. We agree with McDermott that such considerations on a single underlying meaning of κοινωνία are , as he himself puts it, "somewhat more speculative reflections"[57], but we cannot find the exegetical test-run through a chronology of Pauline letters a much more convincing proof for his thesis either. For he concludes by describing κοινωνία as the central Christian mystery of "the union in love of God and man through Jesus Christ", uniting the Christians and commissioning them "to contribute to their own salvation and the world's"[58]. Further it must be said that a Pauline epistle-chronology is still a matter of scholarly debate and that the instances of κοινων-words are far too few and different to allow the description of a development.

A committed advocate of the "vertical" interpretation of κοινωνία is S. Brown as he in his brief article questions "Koinonia as the Basis of New Testament Ecclesiology?" and deals with the common tendency to read the patristic "elaboration of *koinōnia ekklēsiastikē*"[59] back into the NT phrase. In accordance

---

[54] "Doctrine", 69-77;

[55] "Doctrine", 219-233.

[56] "Doctrine", 72; McDermott comments here on the collection passage of Rom 15:26-27. But he generally discovers such a correlation of passive and active, static and dynamic notions in all the occurrences, with more or less emphasis on either side. On Phlm 6, for instance, he notes that "the κοινωνία of Philemon can *become* active" (ibid., 72; cf. 228), and for 1 Cor 1:9 he states that the Christians are initiated "into the body of Christ" not only "through the call of faith" and baptism (ibid., 70f), but that this "κοινωνία ... is based on the free choice before the authoritative preaching of the gospel" as the Christian's active contribution also (ibid., 77).

[57] "Doctrine", 219.

[58] "Doctrine", 232f. Such semi-Pelagian sounding synergism is a feature of the entire article. Yet it is apparently more according to McDermott than to Paul, that salvation is not "given suddenly once for all" or that "God's free love [is] calling for our response" (ibid., 227f).

[59] "Ecclesiology", 165.

with Campbell and Seesemann he finds the primary meaning of the κοινων-words in the idea of participation not association[60], and thus rejects "a direct identification between *koinōnia* and *ekklēsia*" as "impossible"[61]. Ecclesiological or other religious connotations might be found in the context of κοινωνία and its cognates, but not in the concept itself[62]. Yet, although we agree with Brown's objections, at least as far as concerns the occurrences in 1 Corinthians, it seems rather extreme to us to generally state that κοινωνία "is used by Paul in an **exclusively** 'vertical' sense"[63], in the light of passages such as Gal 2:9 (cf. 2 Cor 2:23; Gal 6:6; etc.).

Quite different in its intention is G. Panikulam's monograph on *Koinōnia in the New Testament*, which is not only looking for "theological implications of the NT *koinōnia*", but also for "guidelines to a new Ecclesiology, resulting from an enriched Christology"[64]. That the ideas of participation and association are **both** more or less present in κοινωνία is essential in Panikulam's "philological considerations"[65], criticizing Seesemann for excluding too much the idea of community in his classification of the concept[66]. He rather upholds "a strict communitarian sense" also for the Pauline occurrences[67] and defines κοινωνία generally as the keyword "for the religious fellowship of the believer in Christ and Christian blessings and for the mutual fellowship of the believers"[68]. As the

---

[60] "Ecclesiology", 158.

[61] "Ecclesiology", 159; cf. 164: "Paul does not use *koinōnia* to express the 'horizontal' relationship existing between men".

[62] "Ecclesiology", 159f. See his comment on 1 Cor 10:17 for instance (164).

[63] "Ecclesiology", 165; bold type by G.H.

[64] *Koinōnia in the NT*, Foreword. Quite revealing is also the subtitle of his study, where he calls κοινωνία "A Dynamic Expression of Christian Life".

[65] After his philological introduction Panikulam investigates the relevant Pauline passages in the major part of his book (*Koinōnia in the NT*, 8-108) and then turns to the other NT instances before drawing some general conclusions (ibid., 140-142).

[66] *Koinōnia in the NT*, 1-4.

[67] *Koinōnia in the NT*, 5.

[68] *Koinōnia in the NT*, 5. Such ambiguity in Panikulam's κοινωνία interpretation runs through his entire study, see ibid., 70-73, 75, 78, 90, etc. or cf. his comment on 1 Cor 10:16: "Pauline *koinōnia* is at the same time Christocentric and communitarian". Yet both of these assumed typical features of Paul's use of κοινωνία which Panikulam claims to have detected (cf. ibid., 5) are

governing principle of Paul's idea of κοινωνία Panikulam further finds a pattern of call and response throughout the instances, where the basic divine "call to *koinōnia* with the Son", as it is described in 1 Cor 1:9, corresponds to the human "response through *koinōnia* from our part"[69]. This pattern is further described as the basic condition of the Christian life in general which shall be determined by a constant growth of κοινωνία towards "a full realisation of this *koinōnia* in the glory"[70]. However, as much as Paniculam's basically exegetical approach and his emphasis of the context of Pauline theology seem to us to point in the right direction, his results can still hardly convince and appear to have been too preoccupied by the idea of reconciling the "vertical" and "horizontal", the Christological and ecclesiological understanding into one unified scheme of κοινωνία in Paul. But neither such a general uniformity of the concept nor the theologically doubtful thesis of an ongoing soteriological "*koinōnia* process"[71] will stand a more thorough exegetical examination.

In his article "Die Einheit der Kirche unter dem Koinonia-Gedanken" R. Schnackenburg did not intend to deal in particular with the concept of κοινωνία but to survey more generally the "Gedankenkreis" of Christian unity in the NT[72]. In the section on Paul he investigates three examples which, for him, are typical for the Apostle's idea of, and contribution to, that topic: 1 Cor 1:9; 10:16; and 2 Cor 13:13[73]. His results on Paul are more or less in accord

---

dubious: a) a Christocentric stress can hardly be found in passages like Gal 2:9 or Rom 15:26; and b) that Paul never uses κοινωνία for the individual sharing of someone in Christ is not true in the case of Phil 3:10 or Phlm 6.

[69] *Koinōnia in the NT*, 108; cf. 5: all other κοινωνία instances (besides 1 Cor 1:9) "would serve as concrete modes of responding to this call to *koinōnia* with the Son". Cf. especially the "Exegetical Analysis" of 1 Cor 1:9 (ibid., 11-16) and then in the discussion of the other passages especially the conclusion sections.

[70] *Koinōnia in the NT*, 108. Cf. 9: "*koinōnia* produces a deeper *koinōnia*" and "proceeds to a total *koinōnia* with the glorified Lord". Paniculam calls that the "already-and-not-yet"-aspect of κοινωνία (ibid., 15, cf. 108) and accordingly interprets κοινωνία in 1 Cor 1:9 as a belonging to Christ until the parousia (ibid., 14).

[71] *Koinōnia in the NT*, 78.

[72] "Koinonia-Gedanken", 52-54. He also mentions Hainz's *Habilitationsschrift*, but did not actually use it for his article as it had not yet been published (ibid., 56).

[73] "Koinonia-Gedanke", 61-72.

with his general final conclusions and emphasize that "die christliche Koinonia" always includes and combines both, a theological and an ecclesiological dimension[74]. We suspect, however, whether such presumably more dogmatic considerations on the unity of the Church really find an appropriate basis in the variously used concept of κοινωνία which is still the focus of Schnackenburg's study.

The most recent and so far most extensive study of the Pauline concept of κοινωνία is J. Hainz's book on *KOINONIA. "Kirche" als Gemeinschaft bei Paulus*, largely based on his *Habilitationsschrift* of 1972 and then slightly worked over and expanded for its publication in 1982. Unlike Panikulam he covers all the various κοινων-derivatives[75] and he also adds a chapter on the further development of the concept in the Early Church and another one on κοινωνία in today's understanding of the church[76]. As those appendices indicate, and as the subtitle actually already reveals, the major interest of Hainz's study is to relate κοινωνία to Pauline ecclesiology and thus to refute "Seesemanns Behauptung von der Zusammenhanglosigkeit zwischen ἐκκλησία und κοινωνία"[77]. Such an approach and offensive starting point might explain the highly polemical tone of his discussion of Seesemann's and other scholars' works throughout his book[78]. The other object of his monograph, however, is "die Verwendung des Begriffsfeldes im Neuen Testament gemäß dem jeweiligen

---

[74] "Koinonia-Gedanke", 63, 65f, 68f; cf. 90f.

[75] Κοινωνός, κοινωνεῖν and συγκοινωνός/συγκοινωνεῖν are dealt with in *Kirche*, 102-122; and partly also 123-152, where Hainz treats the κοινων-passages related to the collect for Jerusalem. Panikulam only investigated the noun κοινωνία.

[76] *Kirche*, 206-231 and 232-272. Hainz does not deal with the question whence Paul derived the phrase κοινωνία and does not offer an alternative for Seesemann's position of a Pauline use as generally equal to the ordinary Classical and Hellenistic Greek except for Paul's religious application of the term, although he criticizes Seesemann for that (ibid., 162).

[77] *Kirche*, 12. Hainz begins his "Einleitung" (ibid., 11-13) with the quotation of Seesemann's final thesis which he wants to challenge and disprove through his own study, that: "der Begriff κοινωνία laßt sich ... zu dem Begriff ἐκκλησία nicht in Parallele stellen und die Kirchenidee des Paulus von ihm aus nicht beleuchten" (*Koinonia*, 99).

[78] See especially the fifth chapter (*Kirche*, 162-204) where Hainz not only presents his own summary, but also a critical review of the other relevant literature.

Kontext zu prüfen und daraus Folgerungen theologischer Art abzuleiten"[79]. Yet his exegetical work cannot at all be called sufficient or convincing, for it largely remains a presentation and discussion of previous research and many of his objections and his own interpretations are actually not supported by (con-) textual, grammatical or semantical evidence, but have the appearance of being mere assertions[80]. Further, the structure of the study and the sequence of the Pauline instances which he examines are not clearly explained and one wonders why "das Paulinische **Prinzip** κοινωνία", deduced from Gal 6:6 - a κοινωνεῖν passage (!), is not introduced at the beginning, but after the discussion of 1 Cor 1:9; 10:16; 2 Cor 13:13 and Phil 2:1[81]. On such an unstable basis the results of Hainz's investigation could not be expected to be so much more trustworthy as his conclusion is that all κοινων-words have an in principle uniform "Grundmuster 'Gemeinschaft durch Teilhabe'"[82] and finds the most important and fundamental case of such *Gemeinschaft* in the Eucharist. For "aus der Abendmahlsgemeinschaft durch Teilhabe *am* Leib Christi entsteht die 'Kirchen'-gemeinschaft des gemeinsamen Anteilhabens *im* Leib Christi, der Gemeinde"[83]. Κοινωνία is therefore "ein Schlüsselbegriff für die paulinische Christologie wie

---

[79] Hainz is here referring to and quoting R. Schnackenburg's "Koinonia-Gedanke", 55 (*Kirche*, 9).

[80] The interpretation of 1 Cor 1:9 for instance (*Kirche*, 15-17; the later interpretation of this verse again on 33-35 on the basis of his conclusions on 10:16 is rather eisegesis than exegesis) covers not more than three pages and hardly takes the context and structure of the prescript and the thanksgiving into account. So the results of his considerations on v.9 are accordingly unsatisfactory - he understands κοινωνία as a colourless "'Gemeinschaft mit Christus', auch wenn an dieser Stelle nicht angedeutet ist, wodurch sie entsteht und worin sie besteht" (ibid., 17; cf. 18). The origin, however, as well as the content of κοινωνία are far more than "angedeutet" and fairly clear, as we intend to show. Another symptomatic and rather serious example of Hainz's disregard of grammar and structure is the way that he treats the ὅτι in 1 Cor 10:17 in his lengthy discussion of 1 Cor 10:16-21 (17-46). He mentions this conjunction, which is so decisive for the understanding of this passage and for the relation of the Eucharist and ecclesiology, just briefly and generally in a footnote at the end of his concluding considerations of "Abendmahls- und Kirchengemeinschaft" (ibid., 45, n. 172).

[81] Bold type by G.H.; after the deduction of the Pauline principle of κοινωνία from Gal 6:6 (ibid., 62-89), the entire third chapter (ibid., 62-122) deals with all the other (συγ-)κοινων-passages in Paul.

[82] *Kirche*, 173; cf. id., *EWNT* II, 751

[83] *Kirche*, 174; cf. id., *EWNT* II, 753f.

für die paulinische Ekklesiologie - und für die Beziehung beider zueinander"[84] - quod erat demonstrandum! But although Hainz vigorously fought for his new interpretation of κοινωνία as "Gemeinschaft durch Teilhabe" we doubt whether he convincingly fulfilled his exegetical task, and believe that he rather failed to explain the Pauline understanding of the concept in all its various instances.

[84] *Kirche*, 175. Hainz further states that: "Für Paulus sind die christologischen und die ekklesiologischen Aussagen zwei Seiten ein und der selben Sache" (ibid., 175f). He even regards the temporal precedence of the proclamation of the gospel as "logisch-theologisch aufgehoben" (ibid., 176) and claims the sacramental precedence of the Body of Christ in which the members are incorporated. Yet we cannot find any Pauline evidence for such a - however "logical" - secondary position of the gospel!

1.2 The Task and Method of This Study

Reviewing the various attempts to achieve a proper interpretation of the (Pauline) concept of κοινωνία and examining the different and partly contradictory scholarly contributions to the subject, we discovered a main and more or less common feature: The tendency to subsume **all** the instances of κοινωνία under a uniform pattern of explanation, be it Campbell's, Brown's (and Seesemann's) rendering of κοινωνία as "participation", Currie's idea that Paul used the term equivalent to חֶסֶד, McDermott's notion of a development, Paniculam's call-and-response scheme or finally Hainz's *Gemeinschaft durch Teilhabe*. Such uniformity could hint at a certain preoccupation of each of these authors with a special new idea for interpreting κοινωνία - or with the objection to another idea - which the text then had to be made to prove and which had thus shaped and sometimes forced the argument, as it seems.

And so, apart from our suspicion of such uniform patterns of interpreting κοινωνία, the tendentious results of these studies surveyed make us also aware of a general danger of any kind of reading and interpreting any kind of texts: the temptation to adapt the exegesis to a certain interest of the exegete, a temptation, however, which we should try to resist. Although in the end of the day no commentator can completely avoid being trapped in his own preoccupations, he should at least be aware of that problem and should then try to minimize it, first of all by reflecting upon, and clearly explaining, his methods. And after all, the "tools" of modern exegesis are designed not only to open up the understanding of the examined text, but also to keep the examiner "out of the text" as much as possible and to prevent him from asking questions which do not derive from the text itself but from outside and which finally tell more about the person asking them than they help to elucidate the actual meaning of the subject. Yet the text itself and not its surrounding area (including the commentator!) must be the key and guide to its own interpretation and any attempt to understand and to explain its meaning must therefore start right in

the text itself, in a thorough observation and detailed analysis of the grammar and semantics of the particular word, verse and passage in its particular context. Otherwise, a staring point "outside", say in the religio- and traditio-historical setting, could be misleading and might too easily push the exegetical considerations in a direction which might match well with certain ideas of the scholar rather than reveal the actual intention of the author. Yet any further steps beyond the "borders" of the text into the wider scriptural and theological context and into the social, traditio-historical and further framework require a basis and reason in the text itself. Such **second** steps "beyond", however, will be found to be necessary and required in any case, for the setting of the text is never a remote sphere somewhere out of space and time, but a complex system of various interrelated factors among which the text plays its important part, too. Yet it seems essential to us to emphasize the primacy of the **text** as the ultimate basis, the subject and the purpose of NT research, and a detailed analysis of our passages will therefore be our main task. Such an approach might then also allow a better and more adequate notion of possible innovations and unique ideas in the work of the author (Paul in our case), so as to recognize where he is not merely responding to, or picking up, previous ideas, but introduces a new message himself.

So, in our examination we will **try** to avoid the importation of alien ideas into the relevant passages at which we are going to look, and by means of a careful observation we will try to understand and explain the texts, even more so as many of the questionable theses and positions of the commentators and of the contributors to the κοινωνία debate are based, it seems, on a rather inadequate exegesis. We will also have to be as clear and as precise as possible with our renderings and our terminology. For many of the previous attempts to explain Paul's concept of κοινωνία give the impression of actually having derived from linguistic developments which are earlier than Paul and which were then read back into his letters. "Holy Communion" for instance as a technical term for the Eucharist has strong ecclesiological connotations only since the days of the **post**-Pauline church and must not be mixed up with the concept of the **sanctorum**

communio of the Apostolic Creed[1]. So we have to say exactly what we mean when we use such expressions[2].

The following study of Paul's concept of κοινωνία is restricted to the instances in 1 Corinthians. Κοινωνία appears there only twice, but each time in a significant context and with certain consequences for Paul's argument with this troubled community.

Κοινωνία occurs first in 1 Cor 1:9, in the last and to some extent summarizing verse of the letter-opening (1:1-9), where Paul is greeting his Corinthian audience and reports on his thanksgiving-prayer for the congregation. According to the epistolary function of that passage, the mention of God's call εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν is not only the final climax of the letter-opening, but also forms the perspective from which all the following argument of the entire letter requires to be heard and seen. However, because of this position and because of the function of κοινωνία in v.9 as the culmination point of this passage, an approach via the examination of the eight preceding verses is highly necessary, all the more so as this passage in particular has largely been neglected so far in the works on κοινωνία. Among the monographs it is only Panikulam who spent about ten pages on 1 Cor 1:1-9 and who did not more or less subsume it under the interpretation of 1 Cor 10:16, although his still too fragmentary considerations remain speculative and disregard important text elements in the interest of his presupposed idea of a

---

[1] See here especially Elert's fundamental study *Abendmahl und Kirchengemeinschaft in der Alten Kirche hauptsächlich des Ostens*, and his interesting thesis that for the Church of the early centuries the credal phrase of the *sanctorum communio*/τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνία could also have strong sacramental connotations referring to the two eucharistic elements of the Lord's Supper and only in the second place to an ecclesiological communion deriving from that (*Kirchengemeinschaft*, 5-16, 166-181).

[2] As another example of an inadequate use of the term, one might refer to E. A. Judge's little monograph on *The Social Pattern of the Christian Groups in the First Century*, where the fourth chapter is titled "Unofficial associations: KOINONIA" (*Groups*, 40-48). The author does not say whence he derived that expression and does not deal at all with the hellenistic or NT concept of κοινωνία there. Apart from the title the phrase does not even occur in the chapter again. Judge rather generally comments on the structure of all kinds of religious and other interest groups. In particular "the constitutional and legal situation of the Christian associations" (ibid., 47) is labelled by Judge with the term κοινωνία, for what ever reason.

call-and-response pattern. We will therefore, maybe for the first time try to understand the concept of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 1:9 in its particular context within the structure of the letter-opening.

In the second passage (1 Cor 10:16) the concept of κοινωνία occurs in connection with the Eucharist, not only as a keyword for the understanding of the Lord's Supper but also, as it seems, for Paul's dealing with the problem of idolatry in 1 Cor 10:1-22. Pointing to the κοινωνία with Christ's blood and body appears to be an integral part of the Apostle's answer to a question which had caused a deep schism in Corinth, the question whether a Christian may still consume meat which was offered in pagan cults or not. Our exegetical approach to the meaning of κοινωνία in this passage must, however, differ from the first instance. For 1 Cor 10:16 apparently depicts the **basis** of a parenetical argument (10:1-22) which is itself only part of a lengthy discussion of a problem covering three entire chapters of the letter (8:1-11:1). Further, the verse in which κοινωνία is found is most likely not a Pauline formulation but depicts an earlier tradition about the Eucharist which the Apostle employed for his argument. We will therefore in the second passage proceed in a different, more or less diachronical way, dealing first with the background and origin of the tradition and of the concept of κοινωνία therein, before we can try to understand why and how Paul used it in his parenesis against idolatry. We will also in particular have to deal with the relation of 1 Cor 10:16 and 17, which has been an important and vigorously debated subject in the countless works about this passage, and which has frequently been regarded not only as a key to Pauline ecclesiology, but even to the understanding of κοινωνία.

The following study will start with a short historical-geographical and sociological introduction to the community in Corinth[3]. The interpretation of 1

[3] After our hermeneutical considerations above one might wonder about this starting point in the "surrounding area" of the κοινωνία passages which are, after all, the subject of this study. The same could be held against the entire introductory chapter. But the presentation of the results of a work need not necessarily display its actual development and its methodological principles. An introduction to the church which Paul addressed in 1 Corinthians is helpful at this point, in order to grasp the full significance of the Apostle's words.

Cor 1:9 and 10:16 will then mainly focus on a detailed structural, grammatical and semantic exegesis of these two passages in their particular context, in order to elucidate the specific meaning and significant function of κοινωνία τοῦ Χριστοῦ and κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος/σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ in 1 Corinthians. But we will also briefly survey related concepts appearing in the context, such as the frequent ἐν Χριστῷ phrase or Paul's use of a corporate σῶμα in 1 Corinthians, and will further consider the meaning of κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος in the postscript of 2 Cor 13:13 (and Phil 2:1). The last chapter, finally, will summarize the results of our examination and will draw some conclusions of Paul's concept of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians.

2 Κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians

2.1 The Community in Corinth

Corinth, the Greek city at the Isthmus, had always been an eventful and turbulent place as it was located at the main land route between the east and west Mediterranean and was in control of two harbours - Lechaeum on the Gulf of Corinth, a gateway for travel to, and trade with, Italy and Spain, and Cenchreae on the Saronian Gulf for the connection to Asia[1]. After Corinth had been destroyed in 146 BC and had lain in desolation for a hundred years the strategically so well located city quickly regained its old strength when Caesar founded it again in 44 BC, and soon after in 27 BC Augustus even made it the capital of the province of Achaia. In the time of Paul the city was a prosperous metropolis which was famous for its banking and its crafts and for its cosmopolitan and pan-religious population, but also for its vice[2]. Besides the various religious groups and Graeco-Roman cults, above all at the ancient temples of Apollo and Aphrodite, there was a relatively large Jewish community in Corinth as well[3]. And when the Apostle came to the city in 49 AD on his second missionary journey[4] he even found some Jewish Christians there already who had escaped from Rome because of Claudius' edict (cf. Acts 18:2). But Paul's first converts in Corinth also most probably came from a Jewish

---

[1] On Corinth cf. generally Murphy-O'Connor's most helpful and scholarly book about *St. Paul's Corinth* which gives the ancient texts referring to the city or elucidating the background of Paul's letters, with a commentary, and gives some information and conclusions about the relevant archaeological discoveries in and around Corinth; see also Riesner's article "Korinth", 815-819.

[2] That κορινθιάζεσθαι was a Greek expression for match-making or fornication speaks for itself; see Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinth*, 55-57; and Riesner, "Korinth", 818.

[3] See Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinth*, 78-80, 134-139.

[4] For this chronology see Murphy-O'Connor, *Corinth*, 140; Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 234; Riesner, "Korinth", 816; and Roloff, *Neues Testament*, 49; cf. Guthrie, *Introduction*, 421.

background, for the Apostle used to preach in the synagogues first. However, when Paul moved on to Ephesus and Palestine about one and a half years later (Acts 18:11), the majority of the - not many more than fifty[5] - members of the young Corinthian church were, it seems, Gentile Christians (1 Cor 6:9-11; 12:2)[6].

Although it was a comparatively small group there was an enormous potential for social conflicts, moral and dogmatic problems which became the subject of a quite extensive and partly most passionate correspondence between the "father" of this church (1 Cor 4:14-15) and his disobedient "children". And the two letters which are contained in the NT today are merely the remains of a fairly complex process of communication between the Apostle and the Corinthian community, as some references in 1 and 2 Corinthians hint at: there were other letters, messengers and delegations and Paul's own visit, and presumably quite a bit of unofficial information and rumours flowing between both sides.

1 Corinthians, which Paul perhaps wrote sometime in spring 54 or 55 AD on his third missionary journey while in Ephesus (1 Cor 5:7; 16:5, 8), was already at least his second letter to the Corinthians (1 Cor 5:9)[7]. It was designed as an

---

[5] Cf. Rom 16:23; 1 Cor 16:15 and 14:23; and see Murphy-O'Connor's considerations on the possible size of the Corinthian congregation (*Corinth*, 153-161); see also Riesner, "Korinth", 819.

[6] Yet one has to consider that the term "Gentile Christians" includes at least the so-called Godfearers, if not the proselytes as well, and that most likely a great number of the Christians in Corinth might have come from the ranks of these. The many references and allusions in the letter, most obviously a passage like 1 Cor 10:1-11 where Paul mentions ancient Israel as οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν (!) (10:1), hint at such a Jewish-influenced majority.

[7] The different older (Weiß) and later revived attempts (Klauck, *Kult*; and Sellin, "Vorbrief") to trace at least two originally independent sources of 1 Corinthians of which one is the letter mentioned in 1 Cor 5:9, are not convincing (see most of the commentaries and introductions [Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 238-241; Lohse, *Entstehung*, 40f; Schweizer, *Theologische Einleitung*, 60; and Guthrie, *Introduction*, 47-62, 62-64]; and see Willis, *Idol Meat*, 286-275; and Hurd, *Origins*, 43-47, 131-142). Sellin's recent article is interesting in so far as his compilation theory does not rely on inconsistencies usually assumed in the argument of chapters 8-10 (so Weiß, 212f; Klauck, *Kult*, 283-285, cf. 241). Instead he finds the major reason in an inconsistent structure of chapters 5-6 (Sellin, "Vorbrief", 540-549, 557). The further *Teilungshypothesen* for the other chapters of the letter are then no more than a necessary consequence of these observations and are regarded even by himself as hypothetical and questionable ("Vorbrief", 557); here we agree, although we cannot find his conclusions for 1 Cor 5-6 (and 7) so much more convincing. These chapters can very well be explained as a compelling thematic unit (see for instance Meek's considerations in *Christians*, 128f). And compilation theories must always remain the last option of literary criticism when all

answer to several particular questions which the young church had raised in a letter (1 Cor 7:1, 25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1, 12) but includes his comments on various issues which they had not mentioned but of which he had heard as well (1:11; 5:1; 11:18; 15:12). Besides the immoral behaviour of individual members (5:1-13; 6:12-20) and the general topic of marriage and sexual purity (7:1-39) Paul also reacts to some heretical tendencies (15:1-58). But mainly he deals with different occasions of disunity among the Corinthian Christians. They were split into competing parties (1:10-4:21) and were accusing each other in public trials (6:1-11); they were divided into groups of those who liberally consumed idol-meat and claimed the victory of their Christian γνῶσις over idolatry and of others who anxiously refused such food related to the pagan rite (8:1-11:1); they spoiled the Lord's Supper through a selfish behaviour (11:17-34) and their common worship resembled more an arena for everyone's self-realization than it displayed the self-denying love of God and his Spirit distributing gifts for each other's οἰκοδομή (11:2-16; 12:1-14:40)[8]. The reconstruction of this particular church's social scenery has lately been a prominent object of scholarly investigation and, as much as it can be guessed from our sources, might prove a helpful tool to understand the conflicts which had made this letter necessary.

Paul's mission was a city mission. As far as we know he never founded churches in the countryside but only in some of the bigger and strategic cities of the Roman Empire which then became bases for a further spread of the gospel in the surrounding area (cf. 2 Cor 1:1)[9]. So the clientele of his evangelization were generally people from the wide social spectrum of the urban society which in Corinth was even more than usually colourful and ranged between various extremes of status criteria, according to the particular grades of power, prestige, wealth, education, religious and ritual purity, family and ethnic group position,

---

attempts to explain a text as consistent have failed. Such methodological precautions will protect a text from conclusions drawn too quickly by the reader who tries to explain it and who should be aware always of the limits of his hermeneutical position.

[8] For a good and brief theological outline of 1 Corinthians cf. Friedrich's exciting article "Christus, Einheit und Norm der Christen".

[9] See Meeks, *Christians*, 9-50; and Hengel, *Christianity*, 185.

etc.[10]. Yet, because this city was much younger than most and because its inhabitants could therefore not as easily be pigeonholed into the set patterns of a traditional class structure as in the other Graeco-Roman cities of the Empire[11], one has to expect general and individual status inconsistencies among the population[12]. A sufficient classification of the Corinthian church's social status structure might therefore be a much more complex task than our sources allow and we have to be cautious not to form too quickly an image of the congregation and jump to conclusions from the comparatively scanty information about **some** of the members. About the personal conditions of the majority of the believers there we do not know very much.

Most of the people who are mentioned by name were probably fairly wealthy and might have had a certain influence in the church (and in the secular society)[13]: Crispus the former head of the synagogue (Acts 18:8; 1 Cor 1:14), Erastus a higher official who had probably been quaestor or later even aedile (Rom 16:23), Stephanas a house-owner who served the congregation as a host and is mentioned travelling with Fortunatus and Achaicus (Cor 1:16; 16:15-18), Gaius whose house also served as a meeting place and who accommodated Paul when he wrote Romans (Rom 16:23; 1 Cor 1:14), and a few others[14]. Maybe they were the people Paul was thinking of in 1 Cor 1:26 as the "not many ... wise ... powerful ... of noble birth"[15] and probably some of them belonged to the

---

[10] Cf. Meeks, *Christians*, 53-54.

[11] Cf. Riesner, "Korinth", 818; and Theißen, "Schichtung", 260-263; but see especially Meeks' considerations in *Christians*, 73, 79, 120, 191.

[12] Meeks convincingly criticizes Theißen's description of the urban society as too static and emphasizes that not only the whole Corinthian society and likewise the church represented a mixture of social levels, but that accordingly also each individual could belong to "different dimensions of status" (*Christians*, 73) and that the "dominant characteristic" of those people "was status inconsistency or social mobility" (ibid., 191).

[13] See here especially Theißen's thorough and extensive survey ("Schichtung", 232-260).

[14] Priscilla and Aquila (Acts 18:2, 3, 18), Sosthenes (Acts 18:17; 1 Cor 1:1?), Phoebe (Rom 16:1), Titius Justus (Acts 18:7), Lucius, Jason and Sosipater (Rom 16:21), Tertius (Rom 16:22), Quartus (Rom 16:23), and Chloe's people (1 Cor 1:11). At least for a certain period of time these people were members of the church in Corinth.

[15] Although the scope of this passage, frequently quoted concerning the Corinthian community structure is actually a theological one: God's election of the weak and the poor turning worldly standards and social boundaries upside down. It is not a sociological statement but must be seen

γνῶσις-claiming Christians. On the other hand, and more anonymously, slaves are mentioned (1 Cor 7:21-24) and a group of μὴ ἔχοντες (1 Cor 11:22). But one must not therefore construct a polarized image of the Corinthian church where a small wealthy and powerful upper class patronizes and rules over the majority of the other members who are on the other end of the social hierarchy. More likely than the picture of two opposite groups is the assumption that also in Corinth "the majority of early Christians will have belonged to the 'middle class' of antiquity"[16]. And although there are good reasons to presume the "weak" being recruited mostly from people of a lower wealth and status[17], one must also consider that some members of the congregation who were wealthy still might have had an unstable status in society and/or the church community; and there is no reason why there should not have been a "weak" conscience also among the leaders of the congregation[18]. It is at least questionable therefore to suggest that Paul solved the conflicts in Corinth, the problem of idol-meat for instance, with some sort of a social integration-model such as the *Liebespatriarchalismus*[19] - "ein menschlicher Versuch, soziale Beziehungen zu

---

from a tradition-historical point of view (cf. Isa 53; Ps 22; etc. and 1 Cor 9:22).

[16] Hengel, *Christianity*, 185;

[17] See Theißen, "Die Starken", 279-286.

[18] See Meeks (*Christians*, 51-73) who agrees with Theißen that social levels played an important part in the conflict of idol-meat but who also further points out that a high status in some respects does not necessarily mean a high status in all dimensions or a high level of integration in society. So, people belonging to lower classes probably were much more integrated in society (ibid., 70) and were thus in a "strong" position although they were not very wealthy. See also Hurd, who convincingly argues against the theory of two opposing groups of the "weak" and the "strong" (*Origins*, 123-125); Willis' observation is also important here that Paul never mentions a group of the "strong" (*Idol Meat*, 89).

[19] See Theißen, "Die Starken", 288; id., "Schichtung", 268-271; und id., "Integration", 315. Theißen obviously chose this concept in allusion to the so-called "urchristlicher Liebeskommunismus" of Acts 2:44-47 (cf. Troeltsch, *Soziallehren*, 49-51) and probably also derived it from Troeltsch who describes Paul's social concept as "Typus des urchristlichen Patriarchalismus" (ibid., 67). Yet such a classification and likewise such a distinction between the socially "revolutionary" Jesus movement and the "conservative" Pauline concept are more than problematic, for the modern social and political terminology does not necessarily fit the ancient models. Paul was not at all less radical and should not be called less revolutionary only because he does not promote a life-form such as that described in Acts 2:42. Cf. Dobbeler's critique of Theißen (*Teilhabe*, 43), although we cannot agree with his own conclusions either, when he for instance claims social ethics among the members of the Christian community to be not a consequence, "sondern vielmehr **konstitutiv** für die Zugehörigkeit zur christlichen Gemeinde und

gestalten"[20] where the differences were accepted and religiously legitimized and where the deal was that the dominating patrons cared for poorer members who accepted a subordinate role in return[21]. Not only did the social structure of the congregation in Corinth probably not really fulfill the conditions for such a concept, but it must be noted too that Paul does not treat the problems from a sociological point of view. Apparently he does not so much give practical instructions on how to ease the social tensions between rich and poor, "strong" and "weak", as combat a general lack of spiritual maturity (3:1-4) and the disobedience of the "puffed up" Corinthians (4:6,18f; 5:2; 13:4). According to his analysis of the conflicts and according to his answers and admonitions, he regarded the problems in Corinth mainly as resulting from his addressees' unawareness of their **soteriological** status. And accordingly Paul's solutions are actually not based on social grounds, but remind the Corinthians of what they themselves have received from God, which involves social consequences, of course[22]. So, although attention must be given to the social background of the conflicts in Corinth and to the social consequences of the Pauline paraclesis, one has to take care not to make modern sociological analysis the basis for understanding the Pauline argument which had a different perspective.

---

damit für das Christsein" (ibid., 240; bold type by G.H.).

[20] Theißen, "Schichtung", 271.

[21] The idea that Paul "mit seinem temperierten sozialen Konservativismus" may have prepared Christianity for receiving the masses in the coming decades (Theißen, "Schichtung", 269) has hardly any evidence in Paul's letters which - no less than the "ethische Radikalismus der Jesusüberlieferung" (268) - rather seem to be characterized by strong expectation of the end of the world.

[22] Similarly Paul does not regard the "complete abolition of differences in means" as a necessity, for the "concern for property and possessions had become a quite secondary matter" in the light of the κύριος who was expected to come soon and who had already overcome the separation imposed by social boundaries (1 Cor 7:15-24, 29-32); Hengel, *Christianity*, 187, 189.

2.2 Κοινωνία in 1 Cor 1:1-9

Since Paul Schubert's influential study on the *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings*[1], it is no longer open to question that the proemium passages in Paul's letter-openings[2] are much more than "mere formal, meaningless devices, but [are] an essential element within each letter"[3]. The same must be said for the prescript passages, where a similar variety in the different letters can be observed, according to the various topics which the Apostle is addressing in each. In our case we further find that the two parts of the letter-opening are closely connected and that the prescript (1:1-3) is not related to the following proemium (1:4-9) in a purely formal way, as our exegesis shall show[4]. The end of that letter-opening unit is marked clearly after v.9 with the beginning of the letter-body in v.10, where Paul begins with a longer section of paraclesis concerning the Corinthian parties (1:10-4:21) in a rather different and not at all laudatory tone. Yet the gulf between the letter-opening and the actual business of the letter is not as big as this surprising change from an overall thankful introduction to the following admonitions and fundamental corrections might suggest. Rather Paul seems to recapitulate the basis of, and to prepare the ground for, the lengthy treatment of the many problems in Corinth in this short prescript and thanksgiving passage. In using the common epistolary form with respect to the actual addressees and their particular situation Paul already touches on some of the major topics of the letter, as the plentiful allusions and

---

[1] BZNW 20, Berlin 1939.

[2] A proemium is only missing in Galatians; in 2 Corinthians we have a eulogy instead of the thanksgiving. As the basic source material for this study on Paul we took into account only those of his letters that, according to the *communis opinio* among NT scholars, are regarded as Pauline (Rom, 1/2 Cor, Gal, Phil, 1 Thess, Phlm).

[3] Schubert, *Form*, 25.

[4] Neither Schubert nor O'Brien (*Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*) in their fundamental and detailed investigations on Paul's thanksgivings have sufficiently taken account of these relations between prescript and proemium, which together form the unit of the letter-opening.

keywords in these verses demonstrate. It was the actual function of the opening-passage of each letter to be an introduction to the letter-body and the influence of what was going to be said later on the letter-opening is therefore not accidental. One must emphasize, however, that Paul was not manipulating the customary phrases of the thanksgiving in order to impress or even indirectly criticize his audience[5], but that behind these words "lay actual prayers of the Apostle"[6]. There is no irony and no hidden message in his words[7] and it might be for that reason that these few verses of the Corinthian prescript and thanksgiving bear such a evocative power, presenting so much theology and Christology[8]. In all his thanksgivings Paul more or less refers to the congregation's status of salvation based on the apostolic gospel ministry[9], but the remarkable way in which this letter-opening in 1 Corinthians points again and again to Christ the Lord and saving Son of God is unique and most significant in relation to its epistolary function as an introduction to the letter. And therefore it can be said, that if "the Corinthians had read, marked, learned and inwardly digested this report of their Apostle's thanksgiving, then many of their errors and problems might have been speedily put right"[10].

Because of the importance of the letter-opening passage for the interpretation of the entire letter and because v.9 functions as the conclusion

---

[5] Contra Conzelmann, 40f concerning v.4; see also Edwards, 6; Weiß, 10.

[6] O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 113. See also O'Brien, "Gospel", 146; and cf. Schnider/Stenger who emphasize that the thanksgivings are prayer reports and that they have an epistolary function as they are addressed to the Corinthians not to God (*Briefformular*, 47).

[7] See Godet, 50; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 112f, 134, but cf. 136 (!); Fee, 36f; Robertson/Plummer, 4; Schlatter, 61.

[8] At least statistically 1 Cor 1:1-9 must be counted as one of the most Christological passages in Paul's writings. Christ is mentioned 10 times (including ἐν αὐτῷ in v.5) and we find the full range of christological titles. God is mentioned 8 times (including ὅς in v.8 and δι' οὗ in v.9). Cf. passages with a similar christological density like 1 Cor 15:12-28; 2 Cor 5:10-21; Gal 2:15-21, but also the whole first chapters of 1 Cor and Phil.

[9] See Schnider/Stenger, *Briefformular*, 47f.

[10] O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 137. But we doubt whether, besides the customary epistolary form and function of introducing the letter, Paul intended any didactic or parenetic function for the thanksgiving as O'Brien thinks (ibid., 13f, 135-137). Although the thanksgiving surely mirrors Paul's concern for the Corinthians, these verses should be taken seriously as reporting a real thanksgiving prayer. The didactic and parenetic aspects are therefore more consequences than intended functions.

and to some extent as the summary of this paragraph, a detailed exegesis is required to understand the meaning and significance of κοινωνία in that verse.

2.2.1 The Prescript (1 Cor 1:1-3)

As in all his letters Paul also in 1 Corinthians follows the Hebrew oriental pattern of the prescript[11] which consists basically of three elements in two sentences: the superscription in the nominative (v.1), the adscription in the dative (v.2) and in the second sentence the salutation (v.3) addressing directly the recipient with a wish or blessing of peace (שָׁלוֹם)[12]. On the basis of this pattern Paul was free to expand its elements according to the special purpose of the letter. And as he could make the superscription six verses long in Romans, writing to a congregation that he did not know personally (Rom 1:1-6), and as he emphasized the salutation in his letter to the backsliding Galatians by adding a pointed summary of the basic gospel (Gal 1:3-5), so he filled up the adscription in 1 Corinthians with a number of attributes to describe the state of his addressees in a most challenging way[13].

VERSES 1 and 2: Only in Romans and 1 Corinthians Paul added the verbal adjective κλητός when he introduced himself as Christ's Apostle (Rom 1:1; 1 Cor 1:1)[14]. And only in these two letter prescripts one finds a corresponding

---

[11] See Lang, 15; Kümmel, *Einleitung*, 213; and Schnider/Stenger, *Brieffomular*, 3. The Greek prescript formula has only one sentence including the salutation; see Acts 15:23; 23:26; James 1:1.

[12] Cf. Rom 1:1-7; 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:1-5; Phil 1:1-2; 1 Thess 1:1; Philem 1-3; in the OT see Dan 3:31.

[13] See Fee, 28:"Even as he formally addresses the church in the salutation [=the prescript], Paul's mind is already at work on the critical behavioural and theological issues at hand"; see also Schrage, 97; and Wickert, "Einheit", 77f.

[14] According to Kramer ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ is a unique Pauline formulation (*Christ*, 60; [13e]); but see Fee, 29f. Weiß deletes κλητός with A and D, because it would overload the sentence (1). But his argument is not convincing as Fascher shows (72).

κλητοῖς ἁγίοις in the adscription (Rom 1:7; 1 Cor 1:2)[15], indicating that the Apostle is related to his addressees by virtue that they have alike been called by God. But as much as Paul and the Corinthians are united in that they are called by God, who is in both instances the source and subject of that calling[16], some important differences are found here too: Paul is more than a called saint, he is Christ's Apostle[17] and did not hear the saving and sanctifying gospel from a human witness, but he received it in the revelation on the Damascus road from Christ himself (cf. 1 Cor 9:1; 15:8; Gal 1:11-12, 17), who then commissioned him to proclaim the gospel ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (Gal 1:16) - including the Corinthians (v.6)[18]. Paul, the **called** and not selfmade Apostle does therefore not only claim divine authority for his earlier missionary work in Corinth, but also makes it clear right from the beginning that this epistle is an integral part of the same apostolic ministry also and is written διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ "as the word of Jesus Christ"[19].

Likewise κλητοῖς ἁγίοις in v.2 contains more than merely a reference to the past, to this fundamental event when the Corinthians first heard and followed and were overcome by the apostolic proclamation of the gospel, which was God's call in fact happening ἐν Χριστῷ (v.2) and transposing them into the κοινωνία with Christ (v.9)[20]. But the κλητός phrase describes the Corinthians'

---

[15] Rom 1:6 has in addition κλητοὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

[16] See Lightfoot, *Notes*, 142; and Fee, 32. The phrase διὰ θελήματος θεοῦ in v.1 confirms that it is God who is calling **through** Christ, not Christ himself. The διά with the genitive construction in v.1, like the δι' οὗ in v.9, does not describe a mediating action, but expresses God as the *auctor* and origin of the action; see BDR §223,3; and Coenen, *TBLNT* I, 89f. See also Fee, 29; and cf. Gal 1:1, 6, 15.

[17] Παῦλος κλητὸς ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ is a *genitivus possessoris* and bears an interesting chiasm which underlines the close relation of the Apostle to Christ: in the centre are Paul's and Christ's title and office (Apostle/Christ) and at the edges there are the names (Paul/Jesus). The added adjective κλητός breaks up this order and thus emphasizes and interprets it.

[18] Τοῦ Χριστοῦ is an objective genitive in v.6; see below.

[19] Grosheide, 21. Cf. Fee, 28-30; Schnider/Stenger, *Brieffomular*, 10; and Lang, 15.

[20] That κλητός refers to the preaching of the gospel and that v.2a is parallel to v.9b is also observed by Grosheide, 23; Lietzmann, 4; Robertson/Plummer, 2; Weiß, 2; and Wendland, 11; cf. also Schlatter, 57.

present state as well[21]. And so, addressing his audience as κλητοῖς ἁγίοις Paul reminds them what they have become when they were saved and who they truly are now; he identifies them as being called into a new existence of holiness, created by God's dynamic call (Rom 4:17; 2 Cor 5:17)[22] and even as elected before all time and sustained until the end of time (cf. Rom 8:28-34; 9:11-12, 24-29; 11:29; 1 Cor 1:9, 24-26)[23]. The **fact** of this first call, its **content** (the gospel of Christ) and its **effect** (the sanctity in Christ) are also major topics of the thanksgiving and then of the entire letter too, not only in such passages where καλέω and its derivatives expressly appear, as for instance in 1:17-2:5 and 7:15, 17-24[24]. That the sanctity which the Corinthians had once gained by God's call[25] is the **present** condition of Paul's addressees, however, is further indicated by the other attribute of the adscription[26], the perfect participle ἡγιασμένοις, a divine passive[27]. And it seems as if it had been most essential for Paul to describe God's ἐκκλησία ἡ οὖσα ἐν Κορίνθῳ in terms of soteriology as God's holy institution and as consisting of sanctified saints. Such a start of his letter

---

[21] See Conzelmann, who points out that the address of ἅγιος is rooted in cultic language (cf. מִקְרָא קֹדֶשׁ in Ex 12:16), but he also assumes ethical implications. Cf. Barrett, 32; Fee, 32; Robertson/Plummer, 2; and Grosheide, 23f.

[22] Concerning this creative aspect of God's word and calling see Isa 40:26; Ps 105:16; Jer 32:29; and Hofius, "Wort Gottes", 160-163. See also Coenen, *TBLNT* I, 87f, 90 on the meaning of καλεῖν in the OT (from קרא in the LXX).

[23] For the connection of the concepts of καλέω and προγινώσκω/προορίζω and ἐκλέγω see also Rom 11:2, 5-6; 1 Cor 2:7f; and Eph 1:11; cf. Rom 1:1 (ἀφωρισμένος); Gal 1:15; Isa 49:1; Jer 1:5. See also Calvin, 215. The idea of the irrevocability of God's call is also expressed in 1 Cor 10:13; 2 Cor 1:21; 7:9-10; 1 Thess 5:23f.

[24] For Paul's recalling the fundamentals of the gospel see also passages like chap. 9, dealing with the Apostle's evangelizing ministry, and chap. 15, where the basic gospel-tradition is repeated and is followed by an explanation and confirmation of the resurrection message, which was doubted in Corinth. But see also 3:16, 21-23; 5:7; 6:11, 19-20; 7:15; 8:6; 10:13; 12:2-3; etc.

[25] The adjective κλητός in vv.1 and 2 should not be translated as "called to be saints", which implies a future aspect, sounding like an invitation (so the RSV and the NIV) and also suggests a temporal distinction of the act of call and the somehow following act of sanctification. Therefore "called saints" or "saints by call" is more adequate and less misunderstandable. See Barrett, 32; Lightfoot, *Notes*, 142; and Grosheide, 21.

[26] The change of the order of the words in v.2a that some exegetes together with some textual witnesses (P^{46} B D* F G et al) propose (Godet, 41; Lightfoot, *Notes*, 144) is not convincing. See Bengel, *Gnomon*, 200 ; and Lietzmann, 5.

[27] See Robertson/Plummer, 2.

clearly indicates the attitude of the Apostle and must be considered in the light of his further argument with a congregation which obviously not behaved in a holy way at all. It is interesting to note that the concept of οἱ ἅγιοι is often used as an equivalent for ἐκκλησία, most frequently in the Corinthian correspondence and most obviously in 1 Cor 14:33[28]. And just as the motif of God's initial call recurs in the body of the letter, so these concepts of sanctification and sanctity in v.2 with their strong soteriological connotations[29] have a basic significance for Paul's argument in the whole of 1 Corinthians as well. In 1 Cor 6:11, for instance, we find the passive indicative ἡγιάσθητε, in a parenetic context among other aorist forms, pointing out the sharp contrast of the Corinthians' old depraved existence and their new life which they received when they were once for all saved in the name of Christ and the Spirit of God. And likewise 1 Cor 1:30 demonstrates the exclusive soteriological use of ἁγιάζω and its derivatives in 1 Corinthians, as even ἁγιασμός - elsewhere in Paul used in an ethical sense only[30] - has to be taken here among the terms σοφία, δικαιοσύνη and ἀπολύτρωσις as a soteriological reference to the benefits of Christ which the Corinthians, being ἐν Χριστῷ, received from God[31]. It can further be observed, in v.2a as in the whole letter, that the Corinthians' holiness is never understood to be their **own** property and quality, because ἁγιάζω and its derivatives never appear absolutely, but they are always and constantly determined through Christ

---

[28] See 1 Cor 6:1; 16:1, 15; 2 Cor 1:1; 8:4; 9:1, 12; 13:12; see also Rom 1:7; 8:27; 12:13; 15:25-26, 31; 16:2, 12; Phil 1:1; 4:21-22; 1 Thess 3:13; 5:27; Phlm 5:7.

[29] Both concepts are not meant ethically as κλητοῖς clearly indicates. Cf. in the OT Deut 7:6; and Dan 7:17-28. For the correlation of ἅγιος and ἡγιασμένος in the OT cf. Lev 16:4; 21:12; 20:3 (LXX).

[30] See Rom 6:19, 22; 1 Thess 4:3, 4, 7.

[31] To some extent 7:14 is an exception in the general concept of sanctity in 1 Corinthians. But the forms of ἁγιάζω and ἅγιος there are also not used in an **ethical** sense, claiming an improvement of Christian behaviour, but they seem to describe in a more **cultic** sense the relation of a believer to his unbelieving partner and to his unbelieving children. That these closest family members are yet "sanctified" does not mean their salvation through any magical, biological or any other mysterious ways besides faith in Christ, but it describes the nature of these unequal relationships in relation to the believer, whose sanctity cannot be disturbed or harmed through these family bonds. See Delling's detailed and convincing studies on this passage in his articles "Nun aber sind sie heilig" and "Zur Exegese von 1.Kor 7,14".

and thus through his holiness or through the Holy Spirit[32]. Holiness and salvation can therefore be gained and held only in **communion** with the Holy, in a relation which is here described through ἐν Χριστῷ (v.2) and occurs elsewhere in the letter-opening (vv. 4-5; cf. v.9) and throughout the letter[33].

In none of Paul's other letters does the concept of ἐκκλησία occur so often (22 times)[34] and nowhere else does the Apostle talk about the church as **God's** ἐκκλησία so much (see 10:32; 11:16, 22; 15:9; cf. 3:9, 23)[35]. The concept of ἐκκλησία in the LXX is mostly a rendering for קָהָל[36] and as such refers to a congregation called together out of the people of the covenant. קָהָל/ἐκκλησία ".. umfaßt nur diejenigen, die einen Ruf vernommen haben und ihm folgen"[37], and that fits well our previous observations about the concept of καλέω. Paul is confronting the Corinthians in their self-centredness in focussing on God who called and thus created his church[38].

But after reminding his addressees of the origin and the "owner" and also of the true character of the church community in Corinth, Paul turns his attention to the ecumenical shape of the ἐκκλησία in the second half of the adscription. With the preposition σύν he adds this second part to the actual address and thus, in an interesting parallelism to the first part, transposes the local

---

[32] See 1:30; 3:17 in relation to 6:19; 6:11; 7:34; cf: 12:3.

[33] Cf. other letter-openings, Phil 1:1; and 1 Thess 1:1. Schnider/Stenger point to the christological emphasis which Paul laid on the church's attributes (*Brieffomular*, 21f). For a further investigation of the ἐν Χριστῷ phrase see the excursus below.

[34] Cf. Rom, 5; 2 Cor, 9; Gal, 3; Phil, 2; 1 Thess, 2; Philem, 1.

[35] See also 2 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:13; 1 Thess 2:14 and Rom 16:16 (τοῦ Χριστοῦ !). Most of the commentators take τοῦ θεοῦ in v.2 as a *genitivus possessoris*. Schlatter further points out that the reference to the church as **God's** property already implies its holiness and that ἡγιασμένοις and ἁγίοις are therefore no more than logically consistent (57). See also the parallel to ἀπόστολος Χριστοῦ in the previous verse: the Apostle of **Christ** through **God**'s will writes to the church of **God** which is in **Christ**.

[36] As parallels to 1 Cor 1:2 cf. Deut 23:2-9; Mi 2:5; and also Deut 4:10; and Judg 20:2. The concept of συναγωγή in the LXX is mostly a translation of עֵדָה and in Judaism normally described the local Jewish community and their building. Cf. here Schnider/Stenger who see in the early church's choice of ἐκκλησία instead of συναγωγή also a certain critique of the cultic-ritual Judaism and its close ties with the law and the temple (*Brieffomular*, 20f).

[37] L. Rost, *Die Vorstufen von Kirche und Synagoge im AT*, 1939, 103; quoted in Coenen's article on "Kirche/ἐκκλησία" in *TBLNT* II, 786.

[38] Cf. Chrysostom, *Homilies on Corinthians*, 3: "..he puts down their swelling pride"!

Corinthian congregation into the context of the universal church. After telling them **who** they are, he now shows them **where** they are. Yet v.2b is not connected to κλητοῖς ἁγίοις only, as some commentators propose[39], which would raise some problems of grammar and style[40], but to the whole of v.2a[41]. That does not mean that Paul is writing a catholic letter - the body of the letter is indeed too specifically related to the Corinthian situation. And Paul is therefore not including all Christians everywhere in the address, but he is including the Corinthians in the community of **all** believers everywhere. The synthetic parallelism in v.2a and b reveals this correlation: The dative τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ (τῇ οὔσῃ ἐν Κορίνθῳ) (2a) corresponds to the dative (πᾶσιν) τοῖς ἐπικαλουμένοις τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (2b) and indicates that the Corinthian congregation, **called** into existence and **called** together by God, is part of an even greater number of believers who are **calling** upon the name of the Lord Jesus Christ[42] (cf. Acts 9:14, 21; 2 Tim 2:22). In Rom 10:12-15 (cf. Acts 2:21) we find this "invocation of the Lord", a quotation from Joel 3:5, at the end of Paul's description of the *ordo salutis* which starts with God's commissioning his apostles (Rom 10:15; cf. ἀπόστολος in v.1 in our context!). The participle ἐπικαλουμένοις might therefore first of all have a soteriological meaning, although in our verse we should also take into account the aspects relating to the regular daily church life, in prayer, worship, baptism and everything else which happened in the name of the Lord (cf. 1:10, 13, 15; 5:4; cf.

---

[39] So Bengel, *Gnomon*, 201; Godet, 43ff; Grosheide, 24; Robertson/Plummer, 3. Fascher (81); Schnider/Stenger (*Brieffomular*, 23); and Weiß (3) even take v.2b as a redactional phrase of a later editor with catholizing tendencies.

[40] Lightfoot (*Notes*, 145f) points out that linking v.2b to κλητοῖς ἁγίοις only would require a participial construction or a different word order. See also Barrett, 33; Conzelmann, 37; Schrage, 104f; and Weiß, 3. The present participle ἐπικαλουμένοις (v.2b) goes well as an extension of the whole address, in parallel to the present participle, τῇ οὔσῃ (v.2a), whereas the perfect participle ἡγιασμένοις and the verbal adjective κλητοῖς indicate another kind of action, which makes a connection of v.2b to them in particular rather unlikely.

[41] So Barrett, 33; Chrysostom, *Homilies on Corinthians*, 3; Fee, 33; Lang, 16f; Lietzmann, 5. Cf. also Paul's use of the preposition in other letter prescripts (2 Cor 1:1; Phil 1:1; cf. also the superscription in Gal 1:2).

[42] It looks as if Paul plays on the concept of καλεῖν in v.2.

12:3)[43]. The other corresponding elements of v.2a and b, the attributive phrases ἐν Κορίνθῳ and ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν are pointing out the union of the Corinthian Church with all the other non-Pauline (αὐτῶν) and Pauline (ἡμῶν) congregations[44], but ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ may also refer to Paul's missionary claim and purpose (cf. Rom 15:8-12; and 2 Cor 2:14-15)[45]. This ecumenical perspective is another motif which appears frequently elsewhere in the letter (see 4:17; 7:17; 10:32; 11:16, 22; 14:33; 15:9; cf. 6:4; 12:28; 14:4-5, 12, 19, 23, 28, 34; 16:1, 19)[46].

VERSE 3: In the salutation Paul follows the Oriental prescript pattern in greeting and blessing his addressees with שָׁלוֹם/εἰρήνη. But with regard to the additional χάρις, which is in the first position, it also looks as if he modified the salutation in allusion to the Greek custom which uses χαίρειν[47]. Exactly the same formula appears in all the other Pauline prescripts (Rom 1:7; 2 Cor 1:2; Gal 1:3; Phil 1:2; Phlm 3; cf. 1 Thess 1:1; Rom 15:13) and similar formulae can be found in the postscripts as well (Rom 16:20, 24; 1 Cor 16:23; 2 Cor 13:13;

---

[43] See Conzelmann, 37; Schlatter, 60. For the use of ἐπικαλέομαι τὸ ὄνομα in the OT see further Gen 4:26; 13:4; 21:33; Ps 99:6; etc.

[44] According to Baumann, *Mitte*, 27; Grosheide, 24; Kling, 12; Lang, 17; Meyer, 13; Schlatter, 59; Schrage, 105; Weiß, 3; and especially Wickert's thorough study on 1 Cor 1:2 ("Einheit", 81), the disjunctive phrase αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν belongs to ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ and does not refer back to κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. This is, however, what many other commentators suggest (see Calvin, 215f; Chrysostom, *Homilies on Corinthians*, 3f; Lietzmann, 5; Lightfoot, *Notes*, 146; Orr/Walther, 143; and Robertson/Plummer, 3), because the connection to τόπῳ would very awkward in Greek. A decision is not easy to make here, but as the phrase αὐτῶν καὶ ἡμῶν could be understood as paratactical (something like an exclamation mark) and would further underline the universal scope of the verse, the first option seems to be the more likely to us. Wickert also points out that Paul, relating himself and the Corinthians (ἡμῶν) and all the other Christians (αὐτῶν), already anticipates *in nuce* a major topic of the following admonitions, the unity of the church ("Einheit", 76-81). Further, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ is a rather fixed phrase where one would not expect such an addition.

[45] See Conzelmann, 37; and Fascher, 81.

[46] Besides the ecumenical meaning one has to distinguish between: the **local** meaning of ἐκκλησία in 1:2; 11:18 (Corinth) and 16:1, 19 (other churches) and on the other hand the more general **theological** sense in passages like 6:4; 12:28; 14:4-5, 12, 19, 23, 28, 34-35. Concerning the idea of the (universal) church see especially Wickert's article "Einheit".

[47] See Orr/Walther, 143; Robertson/Plummer, 3; and Conzelmann, 37. But there are examples of a combination of χάρις and εἰρήνη in pre-Pauline scriptures too (*Apoc. Bar.* 78:2 and 2 Macc 1:1) as Barrett notes (34).

Gal 6:18; Phil 4:23; 1 Thess 5:28; Phlm 25), emphasizing especially the χάρις of Christ. This framework of χάρις which Paul gave his letters seems to be more than just a formality. It might indicate that he wanted God's χάρις to be the first and the last word on all the subjects he was dealing with in the letters, the constant basis and norm for all the matters on the actual agenda. For Paul χάρις presumably already in the customary greeting of the salutation had a much deeper meaning than merely pointing to "the Divine good will"[48], as it was the central concept of his theology and teaching on justification and reconciliation (cf. Rom 3:24; 4:2-25; 5:2, 15-21; 6:14-23)[49]. The nominal sentence in v.3 therefore is not just a "wish" and should be understood in the indicative or to some extend even in the imperative mode of a blessing, rather than in an optative mode only[50]; it expresses reality, not imagination.

Similarly the concept of εἰρήνη contains a much deeper meaning and should be considered with respect to its theological and soteriological connotations as referring to the end of all enmity towards God (cf. Rom 5:10; 8:7; 2 Cor 5:18) and to the "peace with God" (cf. Rom 5:12; 8:6) to which the Corinthians were called (1 Cor 7:15) when they heard the gospel of Christ.

Calling God "our Father" and calling Jesus Christ "Lord" (cf. vv.2, 7-9) is a consequence of, and an obvious sign for, the fact of reconciliation and the new existence of "life and peace" (Rom 8:6), guided by the spirit of God, who leads us to call out "ἀββα ὁ πατήρ" (Rom 8:15) as well as to confess "κύριος Ἰησοῦς" (1 Cor 12:3). Regarding these theological and christological titles of v.3, it could very well be that the language of liturgy and worship, which according to O'Brien had influenced the thanksgiving passages (cf. especially v.9)[51], left its

---

[48] Godet, 48.

[49] Or, as Eßer (*TBLNT* I, 593) puts it: "Daher ist die Verwendung von χάρις ... in den Briefanfängen und -schlüssen des Apostels und seiner Schule weit mehr als bloße Höflichkeitsfloskel: 'Gnade' ist nicht nur Heilswunsch, sie ist dadurch qualifiziert, daß sie Gnade Christi ist"; see also Lang (17): "An den Anfang stellt Paulus regelmäßig den Hauptbegriff seiner Theologie 'Gnade'"; and Schrage, 106.

[50] Contra Fascher, 82; cf. also Schnider/Stenger's terminology (*Brieffomular*, 25-41). But see Schlatter, 60; and Lang, 17f.

[51] O'Brien, "Gospel", 147; and O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 131ff.

traces here in the prescript also[52]. One can also observe a close relation between the concluding verses of the prescript and the proemium: God, **our** Father according to v.3, is in v.9 presented as the Father of Jesus Christ, who is there called **our** Lord.

2.2.2 The Thanksgiving (1 Cor 1:4-9)

According to Schubert's thorough investigation one can classify the proemium in 1 Cor 1:4-9, as in Rom 1:8-17 (?) and 1 Thess 2:13 (not a proemium but yet a thanksgiving prayer), into a second category of thanksgivings, different from the first and more frequent type which is found in Phil 1:3-11; 1 Thess 1:2-5; and Phlm 4-6 (cf. Col 1:3-14)[53]. O'Brien, whom we follow here, slightly modified Schubert's classification and differentiates three categories: a) thanksgivings with petitionary prayers (Phil, Phlm and Col); b) thanksgiving prayers alone (1 Cor); and c) mixed categories (1 Thess, Rom and 2 Thess)[54].

1 Cor 1:4-9, the only example of its category, is characterized by the following structure: An εὐχαριστῶ-clause (a common feature in all the categories), which introduces the addressees, the object and the reason of the thanksgiving (**v.4**), is followed by a subordinate causal clause (ὅτι, **vv.5-6**), so that vv.4-6 form the

---

[52] It is furthermore christologically most significant that grace and peace come from (ἀπό) Christ too (cf. 16:23; 2 Cor 13:13; etc.) even if he is mentioned second; see Kling, 13; and cf. the homology in 8:6, which has the same titles and the same order (although God is there more generally called "the Father" not "our Father"); and cf. 11:3; 15:26-28. Differentiated as **two** persons, our Father and the Lord are still **one** in their act and the κύριος is true God like the Father (cf. 12:4-6; 1 Thess 3:11). Schnider/Stenger who in accordance with W. Schrenk's considerations on Phil 1:2 object to God's and Christ's common authorship of grace and peace in the salutation and take ἀπό as referring to God only (*Brieffomular*, 29-32) do not take postscript-passages such as 1 Cor 16:23, 2 Cor 13:13, etc. into account which explicitly speak of the "grace of Christ".

[53] See Schubert, *Form*, 10-39.

[54] See O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 3, 107, 259f, see also the index of his book and the introductions to the particular chapters. Cf. also Schnider/Stenger, *Brieffomular*, 46f.

basic εὐχαριστῶ period[55]. In **v.7** we then have a result clause (ὥστε), which is subordinate to the previous ὅτι clause and finally leads into a relative clause in **v.8** (ὅς). **V.9** is a separate sentence consisting of two cola[56] and functions as a conclusion and confirming climax of the thanksgiving, after the so-called eschatological climax in vv.7-8[57]. **V.6** has a certain exceptional role in this complex structure: it is subordinate to v.5 and therefore contributes to the ὅτι clause, yet a paratactic aspect of the καθώς clause must be noted too[58], so that it slightly retards the subsequent flow of the passage and marks a certain break between vv.4-6 and vv.7-8, which is also indicated and confirmed by the change of tenses.

Before we move deeper into the exegesis of the passage, we suggest a substructure of the sentences, in order to make its complexity more easily accessible:

V.4: can be divided into two sections; the first presents the conventional beginning of Paul's thanksgivings (v.4a) and the second, from ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι on, giving the particular reason for giving thanks in 1 Corinthians (v.4b).

V.5: also consists of two parts and states first generally the Corinthans' enrichment in everything (v.5a) and comes then with the repetition of the ἐν παντὶ phrase to a more detailed specification (v.5b).

V.6: has no subdivision.

V.7: is clearly marked by two verb constructions, an accusative with infinitive stressing the actual giftedness of the congregation (v.7a) and a present participle clause starting with ἀπεκδεχομένους (v.7b).

---

[55] See Schubert, *Form*, 31; cf. Schnider/Stenger, *Brieffomular*, 46. But actually the whole section of vv.4-8(+9) is dominated by the εὐχαριστῶ-clause.

[56] Schubert, *Form*, 30: a) πιστὸς ὁ θεὸς; and b) δι' οὗ κτλ.

[57] See O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 107f.

[58] Schubert is wrong when he takes v.6 as a paratactic **clause** (*Form*, 31), because καθώς is clearly a hypotactical conjunction (see Robertson, 429, 968; Turner, 320), and subordinates a sentence. But on the other hand the link of a comparative conjunction like καθώς to its principal clause is much weaker than the link of a consecutive, causal, or final clause (Robertson, 429). And therefore v.6, indicating a comparison, is indeed comparable to a paratactic clause.

V.8: does not require any subdivision either.

V.9: as we already mentioned, has a short nominal sentence (v.9a) which is followed by a relative clause, δι' οὗ κτλ (v.9b).

VERSE 4: Χάρις, the first word and major concept of the preceding salutation (v.3), and according to v.4b also the reason for the thanksgiving, seems to be mirrored in the principal verb εὐχαριστῶ (v.4a). It is a pattern similar to the ἐκκλησία/κλητοί-ἐπικαλέω correlation which we observed in v.2[59], and gives the impression that εὐχαριστῶ was meant to appear as the appropriate answer to the χάρις of God and Christ given ἐν Χριστῷ. And thus χάρις seems to connect the prescript and the thanksgiving in a significant way, so that in the light of v.4 the blessing of v.3 even more appears as a confirming word of blessing rather than a wish. For the Corinthians had received God's grace already. And Paul has good reason to thank his God[60] **all the time**, because this grace, given ἐν Χριστῷ has not been taken away since. It is rather the constant condition of the Corinthians' existence, as has been similarly pointed out already in the foregoing adscription in v.2a (ἡγιασμένοις **ἐν Χριστῷ** κλητοῖς ἁγίοις)[61], and as the temporal adverb πάντοτε boldly underlines[62]: the constancy of the Apostle's thanksgiving prayer for the Corinthians (περὶ ὑμῶν[63]) corresponds to the constancy and validity of their being saved once for all.

---

[59] Cf. O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 109.

[60] The addressee of the thanksgiving (τῷ θεῷ) is also a stereotype element in all of Paul's proemium passages. The possessive pronoun μου must not be deleted (so Weiß, 6; and O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 108), not only because it corresponds very well to "ἀπόστολος **Χριστοῦ**" and "ἐκκλησία **τοῦ θεοῦ**" in vv.1-2, but also because it mirrors the Psalms' style of prayer (for instance Ps 3:8; 5:3; 7:2; etc.) which presumably influenced Paul's own way of praying; see O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 20f. And finally it has good manuscript support and parallels in Rom 1:8; Phil 1:3; and Phlm 4.

[61] The aspect of constancy is there indicated by the perfect participle and is also an implication of the verbal adjective.

[62] This phrase is common in all the other thanksgivings too (see Rom 1:10; Phil 1:4-5; 1 Thess 1:2; Philem 4); cf. also ἀδιαλείπτως in Rom 1:9; 1 Thess 1:2-3; 2:13; 5:17. See Schrage, 113.

[63] Περί with genitive introduces the **object** of the thanksgiving, ἐπί with dative the **reason**; see BDR §235,2; and Conzelmann, 39.

But πάντοτε also counts as another example of the frequent occurrence of πᾶν-phrases in the prescript and proemium passage (see: v.2b: σύν πᾶσιν ... ἐν παντὶ, v.5: ἐν παντὶ ... ἐν παντὶ ... καὶ πάσῃ, v.7: μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ[64]), which actually reflect the divine character and origin of the subjects to which they the relate, for God is the origin and giver of the absolute and of the ultimately sufficient. Similarly such divine exclusiveness is expressed by the genitive τοῦ θεοῦ which describes the reason for the thanksgiving as **God's** χάρις[65], and makes clear that Paul does not ground his praise on any qualities or capacities of the Corinthians[66] - "what have you that you did not receive" (1 Cor 4:7)! Such a focus on God's works and doings can certainly be observed in all the Apostle's thanksgivings, yet it is most obvious in 1 Corinthians. "In no other introductory thanksgiving is the grace of God found to be the basis or ground for the giving of thanks"[67] and is "the work of Jesus"[68] emphasized so much.

After the description of the origin of grace the second qualification of χάρις by the attributive participle τῇ δοθείσῃ is also quite significant. It presents the intrinsic nature of God's grace as **given** grace. But this phrase ἡ χάρις ἡ δοθεῖσα provides another interesting feature too, because it is "almost a technical term ... [of the] ministry of the Gospel to the Gentiles, i.e. of Paul as an apostle to them (so Rom 12:3; 15:15-16; 1 Cor 3:10; Gal 2:9)"[69]. So even though δίδωμι

---

[64] These absolute phrases are another feature of Paul's letter-openings, cf. Rom 1:5, 7, 8, 10, 16; Phil 1:2, 3, 4, 8, 9; 1 Thess 1:2; Philm 4, 5, 6.

[65] Cf. χάρις .. τοῦ θεοῦ in v.3 and similar constructions and determinations in vv.1-9.

[66] Fascher's statement, that Paul's thanksgiving is based "letztlich auf dem guten Zustand der ... Gemeinde" (83), can hardly be accepted.

[67] O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 111.

[68] O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 110. See also Godet, 51; and Schlatter, 61. But cf. Fee, who does not take χάρις so much in a soteriological sense, but understands it from χαρίσματα (v.7) as "concrete expressions of God's gracious activity" (37; similarly Grosheide, 26; Lang, 18; and Weiß, 6). He does not take the conjunction ὥστε in v.7 into account enough which clearly distinguishes χάρις from χάρισμα in this context and puts both terms in a certain order, where the "graces" are subsequent to the "grace". See our argument on this below.

[69] O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 111. Cf. Allo, 4: "lorsqu' ils ont été constitués 'dans le Christ', par l'intermédiaire de Paul"; Cf. also Lightfoot, who understands the phrase as pointing back to the admission to the privileges of the gospel (*Notes*, 147).

in connection with χάρις appears in all its Pauline instances as a divine passive (God as the giver), it yet refers to the preaching activity of the Apostle among the nations and also in Corinth. That means, however, that Paul, under God's authority (cf. 1 Cor 15:10) and fulfilling God's commission, is God's way of calling. Through Paul God sanctifies his chosen people and creates his ἐκκλησία. And the "grace given to you" implies the "grace given to Paul" first[70]. Such connotations must be heard here in v.4[71]. That Paul thinks in terms of soteriology, and is reminding his audience of the proclamation of his gospel, is further indicated by the aorist form of the phrase, which indicates a punctiliar kind of action (*Aktionsart*) and refers to an event which happened once in the past[72]. In this respect it is essential to observe that the other aorist passive forms in the thanksgiving seem to refer to this same past event too, for all these verbs provide a certain connection to the apostolic gospel ministry: In vv.5-6, which form the unit of the explicative causal clause and are thus closely attached to v.4b anyway, Paul talks about the "being made rich in all word and knowledge" (ἐπλουτίσθητε) and, most obvious, mentions the "consolidation of the testimony of Christ" (ἐβεβαιώθη); and in v.9 Paul emphasizes "God's call into the communion with Christ" (ἐκλήθητε). So we get the impression that the Apostle's mind in the thanksgiving is occupied still with the matters which concerned him already in the prescript and which appear to be - with regard to the epistolary function of the letter-opening - relevant for the entire epistle: the salvation of the Corinthians which happened once for all, when the gospel was powerfully announced to them, and which is the valid basis and norm of their lives ever since.

It is something fairly striking in vv.1-9, that all the passive verbs, having the Corinthians as their logical object, are not only divine passives, but are connected to Christ also, mostly through the prepositional phrase ἐν Χριστῷ

---

[70] See Rom 12:3 and 6; and 2 Cor 8:1.

[71] On this whole topic of χάρις and the gospel see especially O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 110-112, following here A. Robinson.

[72] The only exception is 2 Cor 8:1, where χάρις is not connected with an aorist, but with a perfect passive participle of δίδωμι.

Ἰησοῦ in vv.2, 4 and 5[73]. The question, whether this phrase in v.4 is linked either to δοθείσῃ (adverbial) or to ὑμῖν (adjectival), does not really pose alternatives. Because of the following verse a connection with ὑμῖν might be more likely[74] and in the light of the parallel constructions with ἐν Χριστῷ the preference for δοθείσῃ makes sense[75]. But there is actually no giving without a receiving object anyway, so that δοθείσῃ and ὑμῖν cannot be separated "and it is doubtful whether Paul intended to exclude either one or the other"[76]. Much more important is how the phrase ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ itself should be understood, a question which the following excursus might answer, at least concerning its use in our thanksgiving passage.

EXCURSUS: The ἐν Χριστῷ Phrase

Apart from the prescript and proemium passage of 1 Corinthians the ἐν Χριστῷ or ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ phrase appears throughout the whole letter again (see 1:30; 3:1; 4:10, 15, 17; 15:18, 19, 22, 31) and is even generally the last word of this letter (16:24)[77]. But one finds it frequently throughout the other Pauline letters and, as it rarely occurs elsewhere in the NT[78], a Pauline authorship for this

---

[73] See v.2: ἡγιασμένοις ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; v.4: (τῇ χάριτι) τῇ δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; v.5: ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε ἐν αὐτῷ; see also v.6: τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐβεβαιώθη ἐν ὑμῖν; and v.9: ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κτλ.

[74] So Barrett, 36; and Allo, 4.

[75] So Conzelmann, 40; cf. Weiß, 6f.

[76] O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 115.

[77] Cf. ἐν κυρίῳ in 1:31; 7:22, 39; 9:1-2; 11:11; 15:58. Neugebauer's distinction between (Ἰησοῦς) Χριστός and κύριος, assuming a more personal meaning for the first and a more titular function for the latter ("In Christo", 127f, 133), is highly questionable. Further his descriptions of the two concepts in terms of indicative and imperative, soteriology and ethics seem to follow a certain (existentialist) understanding of Paul and might to some extent hint at Neugebauer's theological presuppositions. See Wedderburn's critique, pointing to Rom 16:7-13, where the two terms (ἐν Χριστῷ and ἐν κυρίῳ) are used without any difference ("Observations", 83, cf. 87f); cf. also 1 Cor 15:31.

[78] Wedderburn convincingly rejects any religio-historical sources or parallels for the phrase; it is an expression *sui generis* ("Observations", 89).

characteristic "formulaic expression" becomes very likely[79]. Therefore an investigation on the meaning of ἐν Χριστῷ must go further than surveying the various grammatical options of ἐν with dative constructions, because the Pauline could possibly go beyond the conventional usage. If the phrase actually is Paul's invention[80], another approach to its meaning is required which must carefully consider the phrase in the context of Paul's language and theology[81].

Turning to grammar first, it can be recorded that Paul uses ἐν in adverbial and adjectival phrases which define "the circumstances in which something is or happens"[82]. Concerning the various circumstances which ἐν can describe, there are two main proposals how to explain the use of the preposition in connection with Christ, the local and the instrumental sense of ἐν Χριστῷ, although some commentators actually combine both options[83]. But the local sense is very doubtful, at least when understood literally, mystically or ecclesiologically (ἐν

---

[79] See Wedderburn who describes it as "Paul's own coinage" ("Body", 87). Neugebauer thinks it is a "formelhafte Wendung", not a fixed formula, as the variations (ἐν Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ; ἐν τῷ Χριστῷ; ἐν αὐτῷ) demonstrate ("In Christo", 126). Neugebauer there also presents detailed statistics of Paul's use of ἐν Χριστῷ (25 times) and ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (27 times).

[80] Cf. Wedderburn's remarks about an OT background of the idea of a representative ἐν ("Body", 86-90). Yet George's suggestion to trace the ἐν Χριστῷ phrase back to the Jewish Passover-liturgy and understanding of the Exodus-event which incorporated all the following generations (*Communion*, 163f) is not fully convincing. For neither do the OT-passages which he refers to (Amos 3:2; Deut 26:5-10; Jos 24) contain an equivalent ἐν phrase, nor are these traditions really a parallel to Paul's idea of σύν and ἐν Χριστῷ: the Jewish worshippers believed that they were saved from the angel of death by the blood of a lamb which was slaughtered **instead** of their firstborn son and that they were led out of Egypt with (σύν/ἐν) their forefathers, whereas Paul speaks about the believers themselves dying and rising **with** and **in** Χριστῷ (the "lamb"). Problematic is also a link to baptism and the Eucharist (cf. also 189f), for Paul employs the ἐν/σύν terminology also and much more in passages which do not obviously refer to these rites.

[81] We agree here with Neugebauer's claim, that ἐν Χριστῷ must be examined in the light of Paul's Christology and not so much from the grammar of the preposition ἐν ("In Christo", 128). Cf. also Wedderburn who notes that the ancient writers and readers did not follow the precise distinctions of modern grammarians ("Observations", 86), which should not mean, though, that Paul did not have a clear concept when using that phrase.

[82] Wedderburn, "Observations", 84. Cf. Neugebauer's "bestimmt von" as a paraphrase for ἐν with dative constructions ("In Christo", 129), though he rejects any ontological understanding of ἐν Χριστῷ ("In Christo", 131f).

[83] See for instance Oepke, *TDNT* II, 542; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 115; Fascher, 80; Schrage, 103, 114; and Betz, who draws very interesting parallels to Isa 53, an OT passage which could have influenced Paul's understanding of ἐν Χριστῷ ("Jes 53", 212).

Χριστῷ = "ἐν σώματι Χριστοῦ" as the church)[84]. And it is not at all adequate to speak of Christ in terms of a "sphere"[85] or "scope"[86], because it depersonalizes Christ too much, in a very un-Pauline way, and takes sufficient account neither of Paul's Christology in general, nor of the relation of ἐν Χριστῷ to the many other phrases connected with Christ (διὰ Χριστοῦ for instance[87]) which surely give no hint of a local meaning.

The instrumental use is a much more promising explanation, because the ἐν Χριστῷ phrase in far more than half of the passages where it occurs is connected with verb structures which have God as their grammatical or at least logical subject - clearly so in our prescript and proemium passage (vv.2, 4-5)[88]. In such a context the phrase reveals its full Christological - and thus according to Paul its full soteriological - impact[89]: God is here acting as the saviour, sanctifier, giver of love and life - ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ; that means that he is acting in a way which is completely determined and indissolubly connected with Jesus the Christ, who is the divine crucified and risen King.

However, that Christ is more than just an instrument, a mediating tool in God's hand, which he used to give out his grace, must be said too and can, for instance, be observed in the context of our thanksgiving passage. For Christ here is not only indirectly involved in God's donation of grace (v.4), describing **the**

---

[84] Cf. George, *Communion*, 160-162, but also 188f.

[85] Oepke refers to the Adam/Christ-typology, speaking of the old and the new "Sphäre" (*TDNT* II, 542). But ἐν Χριστῷ does not appear in Rom 5:12-21 (Paul uses the preposition διά instead!) and only once in 1 Cor 15 in such a connection. Cf. O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 115.

[86] BAGD, 259. See also Schmitz, who, like his teacher Deißmann (*Die neutestamentliche Formel 'in Christo Jesu'*, Marburg 1892), understands ἐν Χριστῷ in a mystical way and speaks of a "pneumatische Sphäre" (*Christus-Gemeinschaft*, 238 e.g.). That is also the basis of his interpretation of constructions with the genitive 'of Christ' and the sphere where he wants to locate the communion with Christ. Deißmann, however, in his later book on Paul does not emphasize a local understanding of the phrase anymore but interprets it first of all from his concept of Paul's Christ-mysticism which is for him matter of a personal and spiritual "Christ-intimacy"/"Christ-Innigkeit" (*Paul*, 135; cf. generally 135-157).

[87] Deißmann even regards διὰ Χριστοῦ as probably identical with ἐν Χριστῷ (*Paul*, 142).

[88] See Conzelmann, 34; Fee, 32; Weiß, 6f; and also Chrysostom, who takes the ἐν with dative as an equivalent to a διά with genitive phrase (*Homilies on Corinthians*, 6).

[89] See Rom 3:24; 6:11, 23; 8:1-2, 39; 1 Cor 1:30; 15:22; 2 Cor 1:19-20; 3:14; 5:17, 19, 21; Gal 2:17; 3:14, 26; 5:6; Phil 1:1; 2:1, 5; 3:14; 4:4, 19, 21; cf. Rom 12:5; 1 Cor 4:15; 2 Cor 2 :17; 12:19; 13:4; Gal 2:4; 3:28; 1 Thess 5:18.

condition of God's act of giving, but he himself is honoured as **the giver and the source of grace** too (v.3, cf. 16:23; 2 Cor 5:19; 13:13; etc.). And in the light of the often closely corresponding reverse phrase Χριστὸς ἐν ἐμοὶ/ ἐν ὑμῖν (Rom 8:10; 2 Cor 13:5; Gal 2:20; cf. Gal 4:19)[90] he could actually be regarded even as **the gift** himself.

These many further aspects of the ἐν Χριστῷ phrase which indicate such a close relation and communion of the divine giver, his act of giving, the gift and the gifted, are not covered under the label of an "instrumental" usage. To explain the use of ἐν here as modal might therefore be the more appropriate way, because it is flexible enough to include instrumental aspects and to go beyond them for "a sense of togetherness, association (σύν)"[91] of Christ with those who were sanctified and were given grace ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ[92]. Or, as Neugebauer puts it: ἐν Χριστῷ stands for "ein Bestimmtsein vom Christusgeschehen und ein Einbezogensein in dieses"[93], which means for him cross and resurrection. Yet it is not only where ἐν Χριστῷ occurs **explicitly** in a context of God's justifying and sanctifying work that we find the modal understanding of the phrase to be the most adequate[94]. The same can be said also for those instances where the Apostle uses ἐν Χριστῷ as an attribute of his

---

[90] Some of these phrases occur very close to ἐν Χριστῷ phrases (Rom 8:1-2; Gal 2:17); cf. also Rom 8:9 (ἐστὲ ... ἐν πνεύματι) and 8:11 (τὸ πνεῦμα ... οἰκεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν).

[91] Wedderburn, "Observations", 90.

[92] For the modal explanation see also BDR §219,4; and Wedderburn, though he pleads mainly for the instrumental sense of ἐν Χριστῷ, in equivalence to διὰ Χριστοῦ ("Observations", 85f). But he also shows the differences between ἐν and διά and points to Paul's usage of σύν phrases which is partly related to, and sheds light on, the Apostle's understanding of the ἐν phrases (see his considerations on Gal 8:8-9 (90f)). See also passages like Gal 2:19 (next to vv.20 and 17!); Phil 3:9-10; and 2 Cor 4:10-11.

[93] Neugebauer, "In Christo", 132.

[94] Neugebauer's three categories for Paul's usage of the ἐν Χριστῷ phrase (connected either with soteriological terms, ecclesiological terms or with the Apostle) are more confusing than really helpful, when he for instance takes passages like 1 Cor 1:2, 30; 2 Cor 5:17; or Phil 1:1; and 4:21 as referring primarily to the church and not to soteriology ("In Christo", 131-138). A distinction according to the particular grammatical or logical subject of the state or the action described by ἐν Χριστῷ might be more appropriate.

own actions or of a congregation's condition[95]. Most of these passages would not fit the instrumental usage anyway (e.g. 1 Cor 3:1; 4:17: Gal 1:22; Rom 16:7). And thus it seems to make much more sense if we understand ἐν Χριστῷ as describing not only the mode and **basic condition** of the conversion of Paul's addressees, when they received God's saving grace in the past, but to take ἐν Χριστῷ even more generally as describing the mode and the **constant constitutive condition** of believers' entire life in all their being and doing since then. Therefore all the ἐν Χριστῷ phrases - in whichever context and also in our case (vv.2.4-5) - provide a fundamental soteriological meaning, because the salvation which happened once for all is a constant determining factor ever since. And the communion with Christ which ἐν Χριστῷ describes is the mode of grace and actually the gift of grace itself dwelling in the Christian's life in the Christian community (see for instance 1 Cor 3:1)[96].

VERSE 5: According to the formal structure of a thanksgiving prayer the conjunction ὅτι introduces a causal clause[97]. Yet this clause in 1 Cor 1:5 mainly depends on the second part of this verse, ἐπὶ τῇ χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ τῇ δοθείσῃ ὑμῖν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ, which is already a causal phrase itself. The ὅτι clause therefore does not add another reason for the thanksgiving, but further **explains** what was said about God's gift of grace in Christ Jesus[98]. The parallel verb forms (aorist passive) and the repetition of the ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ phrase (ἐν

---

[95] See Rom 9:1; 12:5; 15:17; 16:3, 7, 9, 10; 1 Cor 3:1; 4:10, 15, 17; 15:18-19, 31; 2 Cor 2:17; 12:2, 19; 13:4; Gal 1:22; 2:4; 3:28; 1 Thess 2:14; 4:16; Phlm 8, 20, 23. The relation to the (Passover-) liturgy which George (in accordance with W. D. Davies) assumes for ἐν Χριστῷ (*Communion*, 163f) is rather doubtful in view of such widespread attestation in different contexts.

[96] Kramer points in the same direction, when he states in his summary on the title of "Christ" and all the connected phrases (ἐν, σύν, διά,..): "As a **result** of Paul's interpretation of the significance of *Christ* for salvation, we can understand how *Christ* comes to be employed in ecclesiological statements also" (*Christ*, 149 [41]). Neugebauer's contrasting statement seems to be questionable therefore: "Das Heil ... **wird** eschatologische Gegenwart in der Ekklesia" ("In Christo", 134), because he thus makes the church prior to salvation, which is actually the other way round to Paul, for in his eyes salvation is the foundation for the church (cf 1 Cor 3:10-11). (Bold type in both quotations by G.H.).

[97] Schubert, *Form*, 31.

[98] See Baumann, *Mitte*, 32; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 116; Fee, 38; Conzelmann, 38; Grosheide, 27; Schrage, 113f; Weiß, 7; and Calvin, who understands the clause as a specification (216f).

αὐτῷ) confirm this epexegetic function of the ὅτι clause for the preceding words. And vv.5-6 should therefore be understood as an elucidation of v.4b, which refers to the Corinthians' conversion, before v.7 then turns to the actual consequences (ὥστε) and leads further to the prospect of the parousia of the κύριος Ἰησοῦς, who is expected to come soon as the final judge (vv.7b and 8). Thus we have a past-present-future structure in vv.4b-8 which is indicated by the different tenses of the verb-forms (vv.4b-6: aorist; v.7: present; v.8: future)[99]. And so this passage covers the whole of a Christian life, from its starting point - the grace of Christ's cross and resurrection which was received ἐν Χριστῷ through the Apostle's gospel - to its finale - the day of the Lord Jesus Christ[100]. And in a certain way Paul seems to come back to the idea of the "greater context" on which he had touched in the prescript already, transcending now again, though in a different way, the apparently much too narrow horizon of the Corinthians as they were so much preoccupied with their present community affairs. Had he addressed them before as part of God's worldwide church "in every place", he reminds them now how firmly fixed their present situation is in God's great eschatological framework of time. And the verbs before and after v.7a, which marks the present point of time, are therefore most significant in their functioning as links to the past and the future, not grammatically but semantically. For the past confirmation and consolidation (v.6: ἐβεβαιώθη) of the gospel implies that the gospel still **is** and remains the firm and solid foundation "ἐν ὑμῖν". And in v.7b the present participle ἀπεκδεχομένους bridges the present and the future in pointing forward to the second coming of the Lord[101].

---

[99] Something similar occurs also in Phil 1:5-6.

[100] Note the different kinds of action (*Aktionsarten*): the punctiliar aorist marking an initial point, and the linear present and future tenses denoting continuation.

[101] Wendland also detects a past-present-future structure in the thanksgiving (12; cf. Lang, 18), but he understands v.5 already as a reference to the present riches of spiritual gifts, which confuses the whole structure; Wendland, like the majority of commentators, does not take sufficient account of the significance of the aorist in v.5 and the ὥστε in v.7, not to mention the dubious interpretation of v.5 as referring to spiritual gifts; see our discussion below.

This basic structure and subsequent line of thought is summed up in v.9 and has important consequences for Paul's argument in the epistle and for how he wanted the Corinthians to understand him in his paraclesis. For the words of the letter-opening were the very first words which they heard and which determined the audience's further attitude in listening to Paul's argument on the many problems on the community's agenda concerning unity and purity. It is thus in the light of the introductory passage that the letter's topics reveal their dimensions, in the time and space coordinates of a faithful God's lordship over his ecumenical and eschatological church. A thorough examination of these verses is therefore important also for our understanding of the letter, and even more because of some major problems which arise from most of the previous interpretations, mainly on v.5.

When we understand ὅτι as explicative in relation to v.4b, it is not surprising that the passive aorist ἐπλουτίσθητε correlates so well to the foregoing aorist participle δοθείσῃ (ὑμῖν)[102]. For the other side of God's act of giving in Christ is naturally the recipient's being made rich in Christ, although the former focusses more on the gracious giver and the latter on the abundantly gifted. We might therefore also expect a corresponding meaning of the two verbs and presume πλουτίζειν in connection with ἐν παντί and ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ to be a similar reference to the Corinthians' conversion under the apostolic gospel ministry such as we recorded for the phrase in v.4b. As a matter of fact the concept of πλουτίζειν is restricted to the Corinthian correspondence and occurs only twice again, in 2 Cor 6:10 and 9:11, yet on both occasions with helpful hints for the understanding of our passage:

In 2 Cor 6:10 Paul powerfully describes himself and his fellow workers as the paupers who possess **πάντα** and make rich (**πλουτίζοντες**) the many (πολλούς). In such poverty as well as in such enriching of many from the supplies of the πάντα-property Paul appears as a true follower of Christ (cf. 2 Cor 8:9; 4:5-18; 1 Cor 2:1-5; 4:9-13; etc.)[103]. And the "making rich" with "everything" must thus

---

[102] Cf. Weiß, 7.

[103] See also 1 Cor 9:23, where Paul describes himself as συγκοινωνός of the εὐαγγέλιον.

be understood in terms of Christology and soteriology and is happening according to Christ's commission "durch die Verkündigung des Evangeliums"[104]. Likewise the phrase in 2 Cor 9:11, ..ἐν παντὶ πλουτιζόμενοι εἰς πᾶσαν ἁπλότητα, in the context of chapters 8 and 9 and especially in the light of 8:1-2 (χάριν δίδωμι!) and 8:9 reveals the soteriological meaning of πλουτιζεῖν and confirms the close connection of the verb with the apostolic gospel ministry (2 Cor 9:13). For the generous attitude of the Corinthians towards their fellow Christians is a consequence of, or, as Paul puts it, a ὁμολογία to, the saving message of the εὐαγγέλιον, by which the Corinthians had received Christ's riches and had first experienced his generosity[105].

This evidence fits very well the parallel statements in 1 Cor 1:4 and 6 and we can now conclude that πλουτίζειν also points to the preaching of the gospel which was God's sanctifying call ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (cf. vv.2 and 9)[106]. Such a meaning of ἐπλουτίσθητε then sheds further light on the attributive ἐν παντί phrase (cf. also 2 Cor 6:10 and 9:11), which is put here at the start of the sentence and is thus emphasized. It interprets the riches gained ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ in an absolute way and it is by no means "limited by the words which follow"[107]. Rather v.5 could be paraphrased as : you received the **whole** gospel

---

[104] Wolff, *2 Kor*, 143.

[105] O'Brien considers also 1 Cor 4:8 as a parallel passage to v.5 (*Thanksgivings*, 117), but he does not take note of the differences. For the verb there is actually πλουτέω which describes more a state (being rich) and not πλουτίζω which indicates an event (making rich). Πλουτέω also occurs in Rom 10:12 and in 2 Cor 8:9, where it is clearly soteriologically referring to **Christ's** riches and to the wealth of salvation which he donates to those calling upon his name (ἐπικαλέω). But in 1 Cor 4:8, Paul uses the verb absolutely without any soteriological or other specification and speaks about the **Corinthians'** riches, which must not be understood positively. In a dialectical and sharply ironic way the Apostle rather confronts his own truly Christlike behaviour (becoming poor for others' sake, cf. 4:9-13; 2:1-5) with the Corinthians' self-sufficient conduct. Paul does not deny that they had received Christ's riches, but he is accusing them of an inadequate handling of, and responding to, these gifts, so that they lacked the true and constitutive character of the grace they had received, which flows out into the readiness to give freely for others' sake.

[106] See Schlatter, who notes the parallelism of the statements in vv.2, 4 and 5 because of the common ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (62).

[107] O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 117; see also Conzelmann, 40; Grosheide, 27; Schrage, 114f; and Fee 38. Such limitations become necessary only, when ἐπλουτίσθητε is understood as referring to spiritual gifts, and ἐν παντί then collides with Paul's mentioning only the two gifts of λόγος and γνῶσις. But once one realizes the gospel reference and the soteriological tone of πλουτίζειν, there is no need anymore to restrict the sense of this absolute adjective πάν. Paul did not use this

which truly sanctified you as you heard and believed it, and the saving grace which God gave you is not just **something**, but encloses **everything** - a καινὴ κτίσις ἐν Χριστῷ (2 Cor 5:17; cf. 1 Cor 3:21-23)[108].

This sense of ἐν παντί becomes even more obvious in the second half of v.5 which explicates the phrase and gives it a more precise meaning. Yet the understanding of the two concepts of λόγος and γνῶσις, which were introduced by Paul apparently to elucidate v.5a have led more or less all previous commentators to an interpretation which raises serious problems for the logical structure and a proper comprehension of the thanksgiving. We must therefore deal with the common exegesis of 1 Cor 1:5 first[109].

Since Chrysostom or even before him λόγος and γνῶσις were understood in the sense of special **gifts** (χαρίσματα) which God had bestowed on the Corinthians, and the two concepts were not taken as as a reference to the single **gift** of God's saving grace (χάρις) which he had supplied through the gospel ministry of his Apostle. There are two major suggestions: **a)** Many exegetes regard λόγος and γνῶσις as charisms (cf. v.7) - somehow similar to λόγος σοφίας and λόγος γνώσεως in 1 Cor 12:8 - which were given to be used within the congregation for the purpose of οἰκοδομεῖν (cf. 1 Cor 14:4). These commentators further think that the two terms covered gifts like speaking in tongues, prophecy, discerning spirits, interpreting tongues, etc[110]. **b)** A slightly different view of the matter is held by some scholars who understand λόγος and γνῶσις also as divine gifts, yet not as the kind of charisms referred to later in

---

phrase and repeat it again and again in this short verse and then not really mean it (cf. Schlatter, 62). On the contrary he strongly emphasized it, seemingly to make plain the absolute newness that God had given and the Corinthians had received ἐν Χριστῷ.

[108] The ἐν αὐτῷ thus determines the preceding and the following ἐν παντί.

[109] We checked all the commentaries available to us, but none of them supported our own observations and conclusions, which are therefore presented here in a more expanded and detailed argument.

[110] Advocates of this interpretation or something like it are Barrett, 36f; Baumann, *Mitte*, 33; Butler, 13; Conzelmann, 40f; Craig, 19; Fee, 39f; Godet, 51f; Klauck, 19; Lang, 18; Lightfoot, *Notes*, 147f; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 118; Photius of Constantinople, *Pauluskommentare*, 545; Robertson/Plummer, 5f; Schrage, 114f; Severian of Gabala, *Pauluskommentare*, 226; Talbert, 3; Walter, 26; Weiß, 7; Wendland, 12; cf. also Bachmann, 44f; Barth, *Resurrection*, 15f; and Bengel, *Gnomon*, 20.

the epistle, but more or less as the Corinthians' capability to understand their faith deeply (γνῶσις) and to consequently express and explain it in an eloquent way (λόγος)[111]. We will now give a brief survey of the various problems and inconsistencies of these interpretations befor we come to explain our own position.

a) The second type of interpretation especially, which takes λόγος as "speech", as "utterance of christian truth"[112] or even as the "ability to discuss the faith", and which accordingly understands γνῶσις as the "knowledge of its deeper meaning"[113], has to deal with the problem of the order of these gifts, because knowledge should naturally come first before it can be communicated and outwardly expressed[114]. b) Another inconsistency which is seldom realized arises from the conjunctions which Paul employed and which subsequently structure the thanksgiving: the main sentence (v.4) followed by an explicative causal clause (ὅτι; v.5-6) and leading into a result clause (ὥστε; v.7). In the traditional interpretations, however, the logical line of thought is seriously neglected and confused when the same spiritual gifts (χαρίσματα) must on the one hand in v.5 provide a deeper explanation of the **cause** of thanksgiving, that is the one and unique soteriological gift (v.4b - χάρις)[115], and then on the other hand must be the **consequence** of this cause as well (v.7), so that spiritual gifts

---

[111] See Allo, 4; Bruce, 31; Burger, 7; Edwards, 6; Gutjahr, 6f; Henrici, 17; Kuß, 119; Moffatt, 6; Orr/Walther, 149; Senft, 29; Sickenberger, 8; Strobel, 30f; cf. also Calvin, 217; Grosheide, 28; Hainz, *Kirche*, 17; Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 10; and Schlatter, 62. O'Brien also has some elements of type b); *Thanksgivings*, 118f; see also Chrysostom, *Homilies on Corinthians*, 6. A more cautious or somehow undecided position is held by Fascher, 85; Héring, 16; Lietzmann, 5f; and Meyer, 15.

[112] Edwards, 6; cf. Bruce, 31.

[113] Both quotations from Moffatt, 6. Cf. Grosheide who renders γνῶσις as "the fruit of intution" (28).

[114] This problem is noted, but not really solved by the scholars concerned, see Chrysostom, *Homilies on Corinthians*, 6; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 119; cf. Schlatter, who also has γνῶσις as "Erkenntnis ..., die jetzt das Handeln ermöglicht" (62).

[115] Χάρισμα can certainly be used soteriologically in the same sense as χάρις (Rom 5:15-16; 6:23; 11:29), although it normally stands for spiritual gifts (Rom 12:6; 1 Cor 1:7; 7:7; 12:4, 9, 28, 30-31). But on the other hand χάρις never has this second meaning of a charism and further, here in v.4b, the term is clearly soteriologically determined and distinguished from χαρίσματα in v.7. Contra Schrage, 114.

would at the same time be their own cause and consequence.[116] That does not make much sense and the explicative character of ὅτι would have to be questioned. For charisms can hardly explain God's gift of grace in Christ, even less since they occur as a consequence of this event in v.7. c) A further problem emerges when λόγος is regarded as denoting the special gift of eloquence and γνῶσις is taken as "the intellectual apprehension ... of Christian truth". For it would then indeed be "remarkable that the apostle should give thanks for those gifts ... which were misused in such a way as to create serious problems within the Corinthian congregation"[117]. And such amazement would be heightened all the more if one considered the attitude of Paul's own speaking and preaching which the following verses of the first and second chapter of 1 Corinthians describe. For he did not at all regard himself as eloquent, nor did he want to be such, but he rather claimed that his speech was meagre and poor for the sake of the gospel and in accordance with Christ's lowliness and humility (1:17- 2:5). These tensions between 1 Cor 1:5 and the argument some verses below in the same chapter are in fact a problem for the traditional interpretations, which try to find a solution in presuming a certain critical overtone in the thanksgiving-passage[118], or even in supposing that Paul "looses sight for a moment of the irregularities which had disfigured the church at Corinth"[119]. But a hidden critique is very unlikely for the report of a thanksgiving prayer which was originally directed to God, and that Paul "looses sight for a moment" contradicts not only his πάντοτε (v.4) but also the many distinct epistolary allusions and peculiarities of the 1 Corinthians letter-opening. Apparently Paul knew very well what he was talking about and did not refer to the gifts of eloquence and "intellectual apprehension". d) Finally the often stressed "parallel" to 1 Cor 1:5

---

[116] Conzelmann, although he takes the ὅτι as explicative (38), yet understands v.5 as an illustration of the χάρις of v.4 by the χαρίσματα of v.7 (40); cf. also Lang, 18; Schrage, 114; and O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 118, 121. The ὥστε cannot be connected with the καθὼς clause, but must be related to the ὅτι clause; see below.

[117] Both quotations from O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 119.

[118] See Conzelmann, 40; Edwards, 6; Fee, 40; Lietzmann, 6; Weiß, 7; cf. Robertson/ Plummer, 5.

[119] Lightfoot, *Notes*, 148; cf. O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 119.

in 12:8 must be questioned too. For in the latter passage λόγος and γνῶσις do not occur as two separate, coordinate entities, but the one qualifies the other in the phrase λόγος γνώσεως. In 1 Cor 12:8 it is without doubt that Paul speaks about charisms, gifts which are given "διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος". But λόγος γνώσεως is actually not the same as **πάς λόγος** and **πάσα γνῶσις**, and there is no other instance in Paul or in the NT where (πάς) λόγος would denote a charism[120], whereas there are in 1 Corinthians alone several occasions where λόγος is used in the sense of εὐαγγέλιον (1 Cor 1:18; 2:4; 14:36; 15:2!)[121], which seems to be the more likely rendering in 1 Cor 1:5 too. But also the concept of γνῶσις might similarly have a basic soteriological meaning and significance in our thanksgiving passage, although in general it can, of course, denote a charism too (cf. 1 Cor 13:2, 8; 14:6)[122]. In 1 Cor 2:7-8, for instance, one finds the concept of γινώσκω referring to the salvific recognition of Christ and appearing as an effect of the preaching of the gospel (cf. μυστήριον in 1 Cor 2:1, 7)[123], an idea which Paul uses elsewhere in the Corinthian correspondence too. Above all 2 Cor 4:4-6 could shed some light on our particular verse, because γνῶσις there is used of the recognition of Christ (cf. 2 Cor 5:16; Phil 3:8, 10[124]) and is linked to God's creative word (cf. 2 Cor 5:17) in a parallelism with εὐαγγέλιον (v.4)[125], which

---

[120] There is also no other charism with the attribute πάς.

[121] Cf. 2 Cor 1:18-19; 2:17; 4:2; 1 Thess 1:6; 2:13.

[122] In 8:1,7,10-11 γνῶσις is used in picking up a presumably Corinthian slogan (see Wolff, 4) and Paul concludes that only those who are known by God can know and love him, which recalls the structure of 3:21-23 and the Hebrew verb ידע, which always implies a bilateral relation. Cf. also George, *Communion*, 165-168.

[123] Cf. also 1 Cor 2:16: "ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν" as a parallel to 1:5; and see Rom 15:13-14: "... πεπληρωμένοι πάσης γνώσεως ..." (cf. 11:33) in comparison to 1 Cor 1:3-6.

[124] See Tannehill, who argues that γνῶσις Χριστοῦ in Phil 3:8 and 10 does not mean a "theoretical knowledge about Christ, nor simply an existential acknowledgement of Christ as Lord, but involves participation in Christ", which means his death and resurrection (*Dying and Rising*, 118). Such connotations of γνῶσις are important for the understanding of κοινωνία in the concluding verse of the thanksgiving (v.9); see below.

[125] The light-creating word of God which illuminates the hearts πρὸς φωτισμὸν τῆς γνώσεως τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ ἐν προσώπῳ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (2 Cor 4:6) appears previously as the φωτισμὸν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τῆς δόξης τοῦ Χριστοῦ ὅς ἐστιν εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ (v.4).

recalls the structure of 1 Cor 1:5b and the connection of λόγος and γνῶσις[126]. Another good parallel is 2 Cor 2:14, where γνῶσις appears - also in a thanksgiving prayer - as the essence and the effect of the gospel as it is spread ἐν Χριστῷ and ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ (cf. 1 Cor 1:2). And likewise 2 Cor 11:6-7 refers to the same event, when the Apostle preached as an ἰδιώτης τῷ λογῷ ἀλλ' οὐ τῇ γνώσει, i.e. when he proclaimed the humble "word of the cross" (1 Cor 1:17-2:5) in a correspondingly humble way. Yet not only the humility of Paul's speech, and thus its true gospel character, is stressed in this verse, but also the abundance of the γνῶσις was revealed (aorist) ἐν παντί and ἐν πᾶσιν![127].

On the basis of all these considerations one must finally conclude that v.5 should no longer be interpreted as referring to God's giving of certain (spiritual) gifts. According to the evidence of grammar (see the aorist forms) and semantics (see the keywords πλουτίζειν, λόγος and γνῶσις) and according to the structure of the thanksgiving (see the conjunctions) and of the wider context within the Corinthian letters, the most natural interpretation of v.5 is rather to understand it as another reference to the event of the Corinthians' salvation. The verse is designed to explain God's gift of χάρις ἐν Χριστῷ (v.4b), by pointing to the recipients of the gospel as the abundantly gifted ἐν Χριστῷ and thus endowed with all word (the gospel) and knowledge (the recognition of Christ)[128], although in the case of γνῶσις the significance of this concept for

---

[126] See on this passage and on the soteriological sense of γνῶσις especially Hofius, "Wort Gottes", 161- 163 (cf. 155f). And Paul is talking here not only of his **own** conversion when he actually saw and encountered Christ (cf. 1 Cor 9:1; 15:8; Gal 1:16), but he is also saying, "daß durch die Christusverkündigung ... den Hörern des Wortes Gottes die gleiche Erkenntnis geschenkt wird wie er sie empfangen hat" (Hofius, ibid., 162).

[127] Cf. also 2 Cor 8:7, where λόγος and γνῶσις are mentioned together with πίστις. In the light of 8:1-2 (γνωρίζομεν δὲ ὑμῖν ... τὴν χάριν τοῦ θεοῦ) and 8:9 (γινώσκετε γὰρ τὴν χάριν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ) this verse should also be understood as a reference to the proclamation of the gospel and to the Corinthians' conversion. Here lies the reason for their overflowing ἐν παντί (the riches of the χάρις of Christ) and therefore they are supposed to accordingly (ἵνα) overflow ἐν ταύτῃ τῇ χάριτι, which means here not "grace", but the financial support, the collection for the poor fellow Christians in Jerusalem (for this meaning of χάρις see also vv. 4, 6 and 19). See Wolff on this passage (*2 Kor*, 165-174).

[128] Luther seems to be the only commentator who understood v.5 as soteriological in the sense "that God gives us the kind of power through which all our sins are remitted and eradicated" (*Sermons on 2 Peter*, 154). He took this passage as referring to the preaching and teaching of the word of God which provides all the riches of God - his grace, his Son, the recognition of God and

the Corinthians might have had some influence on the Apostle's choice[129].

Verse 6: As if Paul could not emphasize enough his reference back to the Corinthians' first hearing and believing the gospel, he adds another clause in v.6, which confirms and further explains this constant cause of his giving thanks to God. The comparative conjunction καθώς which links the statement to v.5, should therefore not be understood as causal[130], because v.5 does not refer to endowment with spiritual gifts[131], and even if it were so, the structure presupposed (a reason [v.6] for an explanation [v.5] of the same reason [v.4b]) would be rather confusing and would disturb the clear structure of the thanksgiving. Godet's suggestion of a modal καθώς[132] is not convincing either, at least not in the traditional framework of his interpretation of v.5, because it would make the consolidation of the testimony of Christ (indicative aorist) the mode of God's distributing spiritual gifts. That conflicts with passages such as 1 Cor 12:31; 14:1, 12 and 39, where the Corinthians are called to seek (present imperative) certain gifts, which are given freely and personally by the Spirit (1

---

eternal life (see Luther's sermons on 1 Cor 1:4-9 in *Korintherbriefe*, 13-25, and cf. *Lectures on Psalms*, 214f; and *Lectures on Galatians*, 24). See also Kling, 13f, although he interpretes γνῶσις as the understanding of Christian doctrine and not as the recognition of Christ.

[129] 16 of the 20 occurrences of γνῶσις in Paul are in 1 and 2 Corinthians (cf. also γινώσκω). And it could be that Paul picked up the phrase from the Corinthians, who might have used it for some kind of speculation on higher and deeper knowledge about God and the world (cf. 2:8-16; 8; 13:2, 8-12; cf. 2 Cor). But Paul also filled this term in his special way and thus corrected their concept (1:5; cf. 2:6-16: γνῶσις as the recognition of God's σοφία which is Χριστὸς ἐσταυρωμένος [2:2]; 8:2-3, 11!).

[130] Contra BDR §453,2; Hoffmann/Siebenthal, 541; Allo, 4 (he translates καθώς as "en raison de"); Conzelmann, 41 ("da ja"); Héring, 16; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 120 ("even as"). O'Brien refers also to the grammars of Turner and Robertson. But Turner takes καθώς in 1 Cor 1:6 as "quandoquidem = even so as" (Turner, 320), which is not necessarily causal; and Robertson, although he mentions the general possibility of a causal sense of καθώς, does not assume it for 1 Cor 1:6.

[131] The doubtful interpretation of v.5 necessarily led to the conclusion of a causal καθώς, if one did not want to put the supposed "charisms" of v.5 and the gospel of v.6 on the same level, but wanted to somehow uphold the order which v.7 reveals, that the charisms are consequent upon the gospel grace (ὥστε).

[132] Godet, 53; cf. Barrett, 37.

Cor 12:11)[133]. The best solution, therefore, is to give καθώς an explicative and comparative meaning, similar to the meaning of the previous ὅτι conjunction[134]. V.6 is specially related to the ἐπλουτίσθητε phrase in v.5 and paraphrases it by pointing again to God's part in the preaching of the gospel, which recalls v.4b. The comparison introduced by the conjunction is therefore not between two different actions but between two aspects of the very same action, with God as the logical subject of both verbs. The other components of the comparison, the Corinthians and the preached gospel with all its effects, are only changing positions as the (grammatical) subject of v.5 becomes the object in v.6 and *vice versa*[135].

The term τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ is the most explicit indicator in vv.4b-6 for the main reason and the major topic of Paul's giving thanks: God's work through the gospel word. The genitive attribute τοῦ Χριστοῦ, however, is objective and indicates the content of the testimony[136], which in its essence is actually a person (cf. 1 Cor 1:23; 2:1; 15:12)[137]. The subjective solution is not as likely, for Paul later explicitly refers to his giving testimony to Christ among the Corinthians (1 Cor 15:15)[138], which is his proclamation of the gospel according to Christ's commission (cf. 1 Cor 1:1-2; 3:6, 10; 4:15; 9:1-2, 16; 15:11). The message of this testimony was clearly fixed and based on a well preserved

---

[133] For the same reason Schrage's suggestion that we understand καθώς as "proportional" (117) is also problematic in the framework of his interpretation of v.5. He wants to detect an implicit critique here of any charismatic exuberance.

[134] See Fee, 40; Kling, 14 ("indem"); Lightfoot, *Notes*, 148; Robertson/Plummer, 6; Schlatter, 63. See also Winer who notes: "καθώς und ὡς in angefügten Sätzen drücken mehr Erläuterung als eig. Begründung aus" (Winer, 397). In the light of the new interpretation of v.5, Godet's and Schrage's proposals would now make sense too.

[135] For this reason ἐν ὑμῖν can hardly be understood as a reference to an inner process of confirmation (Calvin, 217; Lightfoot, *Notes*, 148; Meyer, 15). The preposition simply marks the objective dative (cf. BDR §220,1 and the parallel in Gal 1:16) - so that the best translation might be "among you".

[136] Cf. τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τοῦ Χριστοῦ in Rom 15:19; 1 Cor 9:12; 2 Cor 2:12; 9:13; 10:14; Gal 1:7; Phil 1:27.

[137] Cf. also Gal 1:16; 2 Cor 1:19; 4:5; Phil 1:15, 17-18 and see on this matter especially Hofius, "Wort Gottes", 152; and O'Brien, "Gospel", 153.

[138] Only in 1 Cor 1:6 and 15:15 does Paul use this normally more juridical terminology in connection with the gospel. Probably he wanted to underline its undoubted truth and objective validity. The variant μαρτύριον in 1 Cor 2:1 is uncertain.

and carefully passed on tradition (1 Cor 15:1-3) and its fundamentals are further recalled and reflected on various occasions all over the letter (see for instance and most obviously 1 Cor 1:17-2:5; 6:11, 19-20; 15; etc.). And so τὸ μαρτύριον here means Paul's testimony through which God himself spoke, his creative and dynamic word[139]. The feature of the Apostle's first mission preaching appears in other thanksgivings too, although it particularly dominates the 1 Corinthians letter-opening. O'Brien calls it "another source of words and motifs in these prayers"[140], besides the OT language and prayer tradition and besides the influence of formulations from early Christian worship. Different "terms such as εὐαγγέλιον, μαρτύριον, ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ, χάρις, ... recall the first preaching and its effects"[141], which is most obvious in our verses. Paul apparently wanted his audience to realize that "not only was the word of God active when they first believed, [but that] even now their continued Christian existence is dependent on it"[142].

The aorist passive ἐβεβαιώθη seems at first not to belong to the customary gospel language[143], but in the Philippians' thanksgiving the concept (βεβαίωσις) occurs in connection with εὐαγγέλιον (Phil 1:7). And in a passage like Rom 4:16-17 (βέβαιος), which employs some other vocabulary of our thanksgiving as well (χάρις, καλέω), the concept refers to God's absolute reliability concerning his promise of salvation. From such a point of view the juridical overtones of the verb fit those of μαρτύριον very well and emphasize the firm foundation which the gospel provides[144], though one should not attach too much

---

[139] See 1 Cor 1:18, 24; 2:4; and Rom 1:16.

[140] O'Brien, "Gospel", 147.

[141] O'Brien, "Gospel", 147f. He further mentions κοινωνία, οἱ ἅγιοι and πληρόω. Next to 1 Corinthians it is especially Philippians where this feature is emphasized: in Phil 1:5 the κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον is even the reason for the giving thanks.

[142] O'Brien, "Gospel", 153.

[143] Βεβαιοῦν κτλ. does not appear very often in Paul; see Rom 4:16; 15:8; 1 Cor 1:6, 8; 2 Cor 1:7, 21; Phil 1:7.

[144] The usual rendering of βεβαιοῦν as "confirmation" should not be understood in the sense of "providing evidence for the truth of the gospel", what many commentators do according to their interpretation of v.5. Therefore the idea of "consolidation" might be less misleading.

importance to the juridical language[145].

Verse 7: In v.7 Paul's thanksgiving reaches another stage of its unfolding structure, which covers the whole spectrum of a Christian life from conversion to the coming of the Lord. The change to the present stage is clearly indicated by the conjunction ὥστε, which introduces the topic of χαρίσματα after the basic topic of χάρις in vv.3 and 4-6, and further by the switch from aorist and passive verbs to present tense and active verbs, and finally by the future prospect in the second half of v.7. Among the three periods of time in the thanksgiving the present covers by far the smallest space, actually just v.7a, a striking feature in view of the fact that right there in the actual present time lay the serious problems of the Corinthian community which after all had made this letter necessary.

The conjunction ὥστε introduces a **consequence** of Paul's **reason** for giving thanks in vv.4b-6 and grammatically mainly depends on the ὅτι clause in vv.5-6, according to the pattern of this thanksgiving type[146]. Attaching ὥστε to v.6 only, as some commentators suggest[147], is a logically and theologically necessary result of their false interpretations of v.5, which regard vv.5 and 7 as parallel statements and therefore certainly cannot subordinate v.7 to v.5[148]. Yet on the other hand those scholars who correctly relate v.7 as hypotactical to vv.5-6[149] get into the very troubles which the others obviously wanted to avoid: they make the **actual** charisms (v.7) a consequence of what they have interpreted as charisms given in the **past** (v.5), so that one would finally have to speak of charisms resulting from charisms, which is certainly very odd. But with v.5 as a reference to God's gospel work among the Corinthians the relation between v.5

---

[145] See O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 122; and Baumann, *Mitte*, 34.

[146] See Schubert, *Form* 31; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 107.

[147] O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 124; Lightfoot, *Notes*, 148; Schrage, 113, 115, 119; and Fee, 41.

[148] See our argument above.

[149] So Bengel, *Gnomon*, 201; Conzelmann, 41; Godet, 54; Weiß, 8.

(ἐν παντὶ ἐπλουτίσθητε) and v.7 (ὥστε ὑμᾶς μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι[150] ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι) is no longer problematic. For it is not a repetition where the same thing is expressed first in positive and then in negative terms[151]. But it is a relation of consequence according to which all the χαρίσματα are included in, and derived from, God's χάρις δοθεῖσα ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ. All the giftedness of the actual Christian existence has its origin and norm in the gift of salvation which God gave once for all by means of the preached gospel. And in this way "ἐν παντί" and "μὴ .. ἐν μηδενὶ" and also the two verbs truly correspond, for the fullness of salvation flows over into the abundance of the Christian life. The particular formulation of v.7a emphasizes that quite strongly: "μὴ ... μνδενὶ" intensifies the negation ("surely not")[152] and the whole phrase is seemingly a litotes, so that "you are surely not lacking any charism" could be paraphrased as: "you have plenty and more than enough"[153]!

The term χάρισμα need not refer to spiritual gifts, for Paul occasionally used it in a soteriological sense as well[154]. But mostly, and especially in 1 Corinthians, the χαρίσματα denote special or spiritual gifts of God[155] which might be the case here also in v.7. And according to the epistolary function of the thanksgiving, this reference could be an allusion to a major Corinthian problem which Paul addresses in 1 Cor 12-14 and which had disturbed the unity of the Christian community in Corinth so much.

In the second half of v.7 the present participle ἀπεκδεχομένους refers to

---

[150] Ὑστερεῖσθαι is an infinitive of consequence; see BDR §391 (cf. also §§406,2 and 408,2).

[151] Contra Baumann, *Mitte*, 35; and Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 10.

[152] See BDR §431,2; and Hoffmann/Siebenthal, 429.

[153] The interpretation of ὑστερεῖσθαι as "coming short" in comparison to the wealth of other churches (Barrett, 38; Calvin, 217; Godet, 54; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 123; Schlatter, 64) is not convincing (Grosheide, 30; Weiß, 9), because the Corinthians' problem does not so much seem to have been an inferiority complex but rather their pride and boasting (cf. for imstance 4:8-10; 8:1-3).

[154] See Rom 5:15; 6:23; 11:29; and 2 Cor 1:11. Cf also Rom 1:11, where χάρισμα presumably means Paul's preaching.

[155] See 1 Cor 7:7; 12:4, 9, 28, 30, 31; see also Rom 12:3-8, a passage where a similar relation of χάρις δοθείσα (vv.3 and 6) and χαρίσματα (v.6) as in 1 Cor 1:4-7 can be observed. The preposition κατά in v.6 clearly forbids us to confuse the two concepts in the way of the traditional interpretation of 1 Cor 1:4-7.

another present condition, but the phrase is also already pointing beyond the present state to the ἀποκάλυψις of the κύριος Ἰησοῦς, whom the Christians are expecting to come[156]. Such an eschatological prospect is an element in other letter-openings too (cf. Phil 1:6, 10), yet Paul apparently onsidered it as specially significant for the Corinthians, for he concluded his letter with the same prospect on the Lord's coming in 16:22: μαρὰν ἀθά[157].

Verse 8: The following verse can be understood as a further development of that final perspective, although it introduces a new aspect and provides an important change of the verb-subject again. After v.7, the only passage of the prescript and proemium that actually mentions an activity of the Corinthians, the following relative clause in v.8 appears like a necessary amendment to, and comment on, the preceding words: It is actually not so much the Corinthians bridging and filling the period until their Lord's coming, but it is God himself who continually provides the basis, the driving force and the final success of all their being and doing, all their spiritual overflowing and waiting, and it is he who cares for them as their constant consolidator and protector ἕως τέλους[158].

Hardly by accident the concept of βεβαιοῦν appears twice in the last part of the thanksgiving in vv.6 and 8, as the καὶ before βεβαιώσει in v.8 might further hint[159]. Rather it seems to be a common feature of a thanksgiving that terms

---

[156] The verb ἀπεκδέχεσθαι has always an eschatological meaning; see Rom 8:19, 23, 25; Phil 3:20; and Gal 5:5.

[157] Conzelmann, 42, and Fascher, 86 note this *inclusio*.

[158] The relative particle ὅς seems at first sight to refer to Christ who is mentioned last in the previous verse. And neither the repetition of Χριστός after ὅς nor the fact that he would then preserve the Corinthians from judgement while being himself their judge rules out a possible interpretation of ὅς as Christ. So most of the commentators follow this view (Allo, 5; Barrett, 39; Godet, 58; Lightfoot, *Notes*, 148; Meyer, 17; Orr/Walther, 145; Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 10; Robertson/Plummer, 7; Schlatter, 65; Weiß, 11; Wendland, 12). But because **God** is the logical subject of all the divine passive constructions in the letter-opening, especially in the correlating ἐβεβαιώθη in v.6, in the parallel "πιστὸς ὁ θεός" κτλ. in v.9 and also in other parallel passages elsewhere in Paul (2 Cor 1:21; Phil 1:6-7; 1 Thess 5:23-24), we tend more to take ὅς as referring to God (see also Baumann, *Mitte*, 39f; Bengel, *Gnomon*, 202; Calvin, 217; Conzelmann, 42; Fascher, 86; Fee, 44; Grosheide, 31; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 127; and Severian of Gabala, *Pauluskommentare*, 226). A definite solution is not possible and ultimately both options could be true as God the Father and the Lord Jesus distribute grace and peace (v.3). Cf. Schrage, 121f.

[159] See O'Brien, "Gospel", 154.

which were used in connection with the gospel are then employed for the believers themselves too (cf. 1 Thess 1:5-6; Col 1:5-6)[160]. In our case the repetition indicates that v.8 is more than a wish or hope. For God who provided the continually solid foundation of his χάρις when he first gave and anchored the testimony of Christ among the Corinthians is yet the same God who then implements what he began in consolidating the lives of his called saints.

Another striking parallel in vv.6 and 8 is the juridical terminology, which further stresses the past and future reliability of God's βεβαιοῦν - God's acquittal which happened in anticipation of the final judgement is incontestable. The term ἀνέγκλητος, a *hapax legomenon* in Paul, should therefore not be understood in a moral sense[161].

For the same reason the *lectio* of P^{46}, reading τελείους for τέλους, is dubious[162], for Paul gives attention not so much to the **Corinthians'** perfection as to **God's** perfect caring for his called saints[163]. Further, the concept of τέλος occurs elsewhere in Paul in connection with the final judgement too (Rom 6:21; 1 Cor 15:24; 2 Cor 11:15; Phil 3;19; 1 Thess 2:16) and in general in the context of eschatology (1 Cor 10:11; 2 Cor 1:13). The description of that "end" as "the day of our Lord Jesus Christ" is christologically very significant, because it relies on a fixed OT phrase (cf. Joel 2:1; 3:4; Amos 5:18-20) which had probably even before Paul already been adapted to Christian usage[164] and which declared the divinity of Christ. In 1 Corinthians the term appears again only twice (3:13; 5:5; cf. 4:3-5)[165], but actually the theme of eschatology and judgement runs like a thread through the whole letter and greatly influences the argument of Paul's paraclesis[166]. And so the τέλος, which Paul believed to be so close (1 Cor 7:29,

---

[160] See O'Brien, "Gospel", 154f.

[161] See Conzelmann, who calls it "forensischer Stil" (43); Fee, 43; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 129.

[162] See O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 129; cf. also 1 Cor 2:6; and Phil 3:15!

[163] Cf. Fee, 44.

[164] Cf.Kramer, *Christ*, 157f.

[165] Cf. Rom 2:5, 16; 13:12; 2 Cor 1:14 ; Phil 1:6, 10; 2:16; 1 Thess 5:2.

[166] See passages like 3:13-15; 4:3-5; 5:5; 6:2-3, 9-10; 7:28-31; 9:24-27; 10:11-13; 11:26, 32; 13:8-13; 15:22-28, 35-58; 16:22.

31; 10:11) not only formed the prospect at the end of Paul's thanksgiving prayer as the essential counterpart to his retrospective view of God's χάρις δοθεῖσα, but throughout the body of the letter Paul keeps to this pattern of drawing the Corinthians' attention to their past salvation and to the final judgement[167].

Verse 9: The last verse of the letter-opening is the "confirming climax"[168] of the **whole** passage of 1 Cor 1:1-9, not only of the thanksgiving period (vv.4-9). The parallel concepts and allusions to the prescript which are reflected in v.9 and all the relations and correspondences between the prescript and the proemium that we described already, require us to take both parts of the letter-opening as a single unit and thus to enlarge the "catchment area" of the summary in v.9[169].

Yet not only the inner coherence, but also the formal structure give us some hints of the unity of the letter-opening. And before we observe the particular function and meaning of v.9, a brief look at some formal aspects in prescript and proemium is necessary. In particular vv. 3 and 9 reveal some interesting formal parallels and correlations: Both verses contain a comparatively short sentence and asyndetically follow another much longer and much more broadly developed sentence, which forms the first part of the prescript (vv.1-2) and of the thanksgiving respectively (vv.4-8). Further, both v.3 and v.9 show a striking accumulation of titles for God and Christ and a particularly formal kind of language, which presumably has its source in early Christian worship[170] and recalls the style of a benediction[171]. An interesting feature here is the statement of the close relation of God and Christ, calling God the πατήρ in v.3 and calling "our Lord Jesus Christ" υἱὸς αὐτοῦ in v.9. The switch to these full divine titles

---

[167] Even the letter as a whole - although presumably not on purpose - resembles that pattern, with the proclamation of the word of the cross in the first chapter and the assurance of the coming resurrection at the end.

[168] Schubert, *Form*, 4; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 130.

[169] See the concept of καλέω in vv.1-2 and 9 and the gospel topic in vv.4-6; see διὰ θελήματος in v.1 and δι' οὗ in v.9; see "all places" in v.2b and "all time" in vv.4-8; see χάρις in v.3 and v.4 (5+6); and compare generally the expanded adscription in v.2 and the conversion-theme of vv.4-6.

[170] See Kramer, *Christ*, 153; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 132f.

[171] Schubert, *Form*, 31.

strengthens the two concluding statements of vv.3 and 9 and gives full weight especially to the "confirming climax" in v.9, which picks up the language of v.3 and presumably is much more a unique and carefully designed formulation of Paul than the rather stereotype salutation in v.3.

V.9 can thus very well be understood as the conclusion of the whole unit of the letter-opening[172], which marks something like an entrance hall and a threshold which Paul wanted his audience to pass and which determined their further listening. Unfortunately the importance of this verse for understanding 1 Corinthians has largely been underestimated among scholars up to now, although in respect to its position at the end of the proemium it takes the same place as Rom 1:16-17. Our comparatively long path to v.9, which is our main interest because of the κοινωνία phrase, is justified therefore, because the high density of this verse can be understood and explained only in the light of a detailed analysis of the previous verses.

Looking at the grammar and at the temporal structure of v.9 one has to distinguish two sentences, a short nominal sentence (v.9a) and a longer relative clause depending on the former (v.9b). The subject of the first part is obviously God, yet the relative connection δι' οὗ makes him the logical subject of the aorist passive ἐκλήθητε in v.9b as well, which therefore appears explicitly as a divine passive. And in the light of the concluding and summarizing function of v.9 we may count that as a confirmation of our previous interpretation of the other passive and aorist passive verb-forms of the letter-opening as divine passives too (vv. 2 and 4-6)[173]. And so v.9b recalls the past event of the Corinthians' conversion, which came about through God's sanctifying call (cf. καλεῖν in vv. 1-2 and 9) by means of Paul's apostolic gospel ministry. On the other hand the statement about God's faithfulness in v.9a seems to cover all the time since that starting point of God's call and in respect to vv.7 and 8 the affirmation "πιστὸς ὁ θεός" is especially important for the present and future

---

[172] Cf. Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 49; and Hainz, *Kirche*, 16; who both regard v.9 as summarizing vv.4-8.

[173] See ἡγιασμένοις in v.2; δοθείσῃ in v.4; ἐπλουτίσθητε in v.5; ἐβεβαιώθη in v.6; and cf. also κλητός/κλητοῖς in vv.1-2.

time[174]. So the two sentences of the thanksgiving passage (vv.4-8 and v.9) resemble something like a chiastic structure of past (vv.4b-6) - present/future (vv.7f) - present/future (v.9a) - past (v.9b). And the temporal stages of a Christian existence which we observed in vv.4-8 appear again in the last verse in a reverse order. That this is not merely an overemphasizing of the use of tenses in the proemium it will be our task to show in our further review of the meaning and the context relations of v.9[175]. We will explore the verse as we subsequently deal with its particular elements.

"Πιστὸς ὁ θεός" is not a fixed formula[176], but still an important topic and phrase for Paul, especially in the Corinthian correspondence (see 1 Cor 10:13; 2 Cor 1:18; cf. 1 Thess 5:24)[177]. And just as in 2 Cor 1:18 and in 1 Thess 5:23-24 the concept is closely related to God's καλεῖν and to the preaching of the gospel. The strong eschatological significance of this phrase further fits the eschatological outlook in the immediately preceding verses very well, most of all God's constant activity of βεβαιοῦν (v.8), which seems to be summed up in these three words at the beginning of v.9. Actually the intention and momentum of the brief statement of God's faithfulness at the beginning of this letter cannot fully be understood before one passes on to the body of the letter, to the

---

[174] O'Brien denotes that πιστὸς ὁ θεός is normally used in conjunction with verbs in the present and future tense (*Thanksgivings*, 131).

[175] Paniculam's suggestions on the context relations of vv.4-8 and v.9, however, are somewhat confusing and must be seriously questioned (*Koinōnia in the NT*, 10f). He notes a parallelism between vv.4-8 and v.9, where χάριτι τοῦ θεοῦ δοθείσῃ is parallel to ὁ θεὸς δι' οὗ ἐκλήθητε (past), ἐπλουτίσθητε to πιστός (present), and finally τέλους to κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ (future). But that he has to rearrange v.9 in order to match it to the past-present-future structure which he supposes for vv.4-8 reveals already the problems of his conclusions. They are again due to a false interpretation of v.5, which he takes as a reference to the **present** distribution of gifts and to "the continuation of God's activity in the community" (10). Yet Paniculam completely ignores the **aorist** in v.5 which expounds v.4b and is surely no parallel to God's ongoing faithfulness (v.9a), not to mention the false view of λόγος and γνῶσις. Further, a parallel between the τέλος of Christ's judgement day (!) and (as he takes it) a future κοινωνία with Christ is more than problematic and would require a more detailed explanation, especially concerning his idea of a "growing fellowship" with Christ (12) and concerning his presumption that "the *koinōnia* with the Son proceeds to a total *koinōnia* with the glorified Lord" (11). It is much more natural and comprehensible to describe the structure of vv.4-8 and v.9 as a chiasm and not to separate God's calling from the purpose of the calling or to multiply κοινωνίαι.

[176] See O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 131. Lang classifies it form-historically as "Treuespruch" (19).

[177] Fee points to OT parallels (44): Deut 7:9; Ps 144:13 (LXX).

discussion of the many and severe Corinthian problems. They reveal the sharp profile and the significance of these remarkable words: God's faithfulness confronts human ignorance.

The relative connection to v.9b δι' οὗ does not so much show God as the mediator, **through** whom the Corinthians were called. But διά with a genitive denotes here, as already in v.1 (διὰ θελήματος), rather the principal **cause**, the agent and origin of this action[178].

The parallel construction in vv. 1 and 9 further indicates that the καλεῖν which met the Corinthians was basically the same kind of calling which Paul received from God, although the circumstances were different of course and Paul's call uniquely included his apostleship (v.1) through which the gospel was brought also to the Corinthians (vv.2 and 9). But as regards the salvific power of that call and in its efficacy ἐν Χριστῷ (v.2) and εἰς κοινωνίαν Χριστοῦ (v.9)[179] it was just the same creative word of God (cf. Rom 4:17; 1 Cor 1:18, 24; 2 Cor 5:17), who called the Corinthians and the Apostle alike irrevocably (v.9a; cf. Rom 11:29) διὰ τῆς χάριτος αὐτοῦ (Gal 1:15) and ἐν χάριτι Χριστοῦ (Gal 1:6; cf. vv.3 and 4 in our passage). And here again we find **God's grace** (cf. vv.3-4) and **God's call** (cf. vv.1, 2 and 9) to be inseparably connected with one another and with the proclamation of the **gospel**, a triple connection which we already detected as implicit in the phrase χάρις δοθεῖσα in v.4[180]. Vv.4-6 in the thanksgiving can therefore indeed be described as parallel to ἐκλήθητε εἰς

---

[178] The ὑπό which C D* and G have instead of διά shows such a causal understanding too; see Robertson who denotes διά as a common substitute for ὑπό (*Grammar*, 636). The translation "through whom" which some scholars suggest (see Barrett, 39; Fee, 45; Lightfoot, *Notes*, 150; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 130) must be questioned therefore and "by whom" is to be preferred (see Conzelmann, 43; Grosheide, 32; Lietzmann, 6; Robertson/Plummer, 8). That **God** is the calling subject is further confirmed by passages such as 1 Cor 7:15-24; Rom 8:30; 9:12, 24; 11:29; Gal 5:8; Phil 3:14; 1 Thess 2:12; 4:17; and 5:24; and for the use of διά denoting a cause cf. also 2 Cor 1:1; 8:5; Gal 1:1; and 4:7!

[179] The parallel between the vv.2 and 9 is noted by Lietzmann, 5; Weiß, 2; Wendland, 11; and by Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 49.

[180] But there is surely no evidence for McDermott's strong emphasis that "the Corinthians were called by baptism" ("Doctrine", 219; cf. Schnackenburg, "Koinonia-Gedanke", 63) as an "initiation into the body of Christ" (71). Paul does not mention the sacraments here and ἐκλήθητε is a clear reference to the gospel preaching and gives no hint of ecclesiological connotations (that is how McDermott understands "the body of Christ", cf. 219) or of a "sacramental union" (219).

κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κτλ. in v.9b, a parallel which is formally most obvious in v.5: ἐπλουτίσθητε ἐν Χριστῷ (ἐν αὐτῷ) in respect of the aorist passive in the second person plural and of the determination of the verb through a christological phrase[181]. And so, 'being called (in-)to communion with Christ' means basically nothing else than 'being given God's grace in Christ' (v.4), 'being made rich in Christ in all word and recognition (of Christ)' (v.5) and 'being the object of God's firmly rooting the testimony of Christ' (v.6)[182].

Due to this correlation of the verbs we can now also expect to receive helpful hints for the interpretation of εἰς κοινωνίαν κτλ. from the other, corresponding christological determinations (ἐν Χριστῷ and τὸ μαρτύριον τοῦ Χριστοῦ) which characterize the event described in vv.4-6. But we should briefly look at the preposition εἰς first. The verb καλεῖν occurs in a construction with εἰς only once again, in 1 Thess 2:12, where it denotes God's calling (καλοῦντος - a present participle) εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ βασιλείαν καὶ δόξαν. The context is the Apostle's report about his previous gospel preaching and teaching in Thessalonica and has clearly eschatological and parenetical overtones[183]. But such an eschatological and future use of the concept of καλεῖν cannot be found in 1 Cor 1:9[184].

---

[181] On the parallel of vv.4b-6 and v.9 cf. Lang, 18. Chrysostom denotes a parallel between v.5 and v.9 too (*Homilies on Corinthians*, 8).

[182] We cannot agree therefore with Panikulam, who understands v.9 as "an appeal made to the Corinthians to respond to the demands of the call faithfully" (*Koinōnia in the NT*, 9, cf. also 108), nor with his assumption that Paul wanted to challenge the Corinthians' reaction to God's calling to κοινωνία by an ongoing process and progress of κοινωνία responses (ibid., 12-16). The Apostle is not dealing with the Corinthians' but with **God's** faithfulness and with his call in the **past**.

[183] Cf. βασιλεία in Rom 14:17; 1 Cor 4:20; 6:9-10; 15:24, 50; and Gal 5:21. Some of these passages have also a parenetical context.

[184] Highly questionable is Currie's interpretation regarding 1 Cor 1:9 as a close parallel to 1 Thess 2:12 and therefore referring to the same "kingdom" in which the Christians were "brought by faith and baptism, appropriate to that alliance [his translation for κοινωνία] which is theirs in Christ ... until they are with Christ in the end" (*Literature*, 41). He not only neglects the eschatological meaning of the passage in 1 Thessalonians and strangely relates σύν Χριστῷ to the τέλος of the Christian life exclusively (ibid., 41), but also fails completely to examine the grammar and context structure of v.9. Otherwise he would hardly call κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ κτλ. a subjective genitive designating the "covenant relationship of brothers in Christ" (ibid., 40) or paraphrase an assumed close relation of vv. 9 and 10 as "God has called us into the alliance in Christ: therefore let us be of one mind" (ibid., 40). Besides the obvious differences of these verses in topic and tense the formulaic παρακαλῶ δὲ (not ὅτι!) clearly indicates the introduction of the letter-body (cf. Schnider/Stenger, *Studien*, 42-45).

Despite the immediately preceding verses, v.9b is not an eschatological statement and the "communion with God's Son Jesus Christ our Lord" is not meant as a future prospect referring to the τέλος of Christian existence (cf. vv.7b-8)[185]. The aorist (ἐκλήθητε εἰς κοινωνίαν), the parallels with vv.2 and 4-6 and the chiastic structure which we observed in the thanksgiving rather indicate that v.9b is a reference to the past and once-for-all event of the Corinthians' conversion, which was initiated by the gospel and which transposed those who were called into a relationship with God's Son which has existed ever since. The aorist plus εἰς is used to clearly emphasize that **starting point** of the κοινωνία[186], and Paul is writing to a congregation which actually **is** ἐν κοινωνία with Christ (cf. ἐν Χριστῷ in vv.2 and 4-5 and our excursus above)[187]. He used an εἰς with accusative construction, which indicates a certain direction and a movement from one point to another, presumably in order to stress the radical change of the Corinthians' position, when they were removed from former existence in idolatry and immorality (cf. 1 Cor 6:11; 12:2-3) and were brought into the communion with Christ, into the new life ἐν Χριστῷ. And so 'κοινωνία' - the communion with Christ - describes, no less than 'ἐν Χριστῷ', the **mode** of the Corinthians' salvation and of their new existence since then; it is the constantly constitutive condition of their life since God had called them[188].

---

[185] Contra Chrysostom, *Homilies on Corinthians*, 8; Kling, 16; Meyer, 19; Strobel, 31; cf. Fascher, 86; Schnackenburg, "Koinonia-Gedanken", 62; and Weiß, 11; they all understand the "communion with Christ" here as something only **partly** fulfilled yet. See also Lightfoot, who takes κοινωνία as an equivalent to βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (*Notes*, 150). Eschatological aspects are recorded by Bachmann, 50; Hainz, *Kirche*, 17; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 132: "Such participation does not refer to the future alone"; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 50; Robertson/Plummer, 8; and Wendland, 13, pointing to 1 Thess 2:12.

[186] Cf. the punctiliar kind of action (*Aktionsart*) that the aorist is denoting.

[187] Note Paul's use of ἐν-constructions with καλεῖν: 1 Cor 7:15 (εἰρήνη); Phil 3:14 (κλήσις ἐν Χριστῷ!); 1 Thess 4:7 (ἐν ἁγιασμῷ); cf. Gal 5:13 (ἐπ' ἐλευθερίᾳ ἐκλήθητε!). Cf. also George, *Communion*, 176, 239.

[188] See Seesemann, who notes that κοινωνία means the "εἶναι ἐν Χριστῷ, das der Gläubige hier schon auf Erden erlebt" (*Koinonia*, 49). He also points to the aspect of σύν Χριστῷ in v.9 (50). The soteriological interpretation of the κοινωνία phrase, referring to a past event which determines the actual present state, is also advocated by Baumann, *Mitte*, 42; Conzelmann, 43; Fee, 45; Grosheide, 31f, who speaks about the audible vocation to salvation through the gospel; Lang, 19; Schlatter, 66; Wendland, 13; and Photius of Constantinople, *Pauluskommentare*, 545 ("κοινωνία σωτηρίου"); cf. also Calvin, 218f; Lightfoot, *Notes*, 150; Moffatt, 9; O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 131f; and Robertson/Plummer, 8.

A very interesting parallel, elucidating especially the soteriological meaning of our passage, is Rom 8:28-39, where Paul deals in principal with a similar topic and uses partly the same phrases, although in a much broader and much more explicit way[189]. In Rom 8:28 the Apostle describes God's work of salvation in the Romans when they became Christians (Rom 8:1 - οἱ ἐν Χριστῷ). They were predestined by God to be συμμόρφους τῆς εἰκόνος τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ and to become brothers of Christ the firstborn (Rom 8:29; cf. 8:14-17) and were thus elected, called (ἐκάλεσεν!), justified and glorified (Rom 8:30; all aorist). And according to Phil 3:10[190] the concept of συμμορφίζεσθαι means κοινωνία with Christ's suffering and dying on the cross[191]. So, according to these passages, the purpose of God's calling the unbelievers is their being

---

[189] Besides our focus on the meaning of κοινωνία in this instance it is interesting to note the parallel between Rom 8:33-34 and v.8-9 of our thanksgiving. The passage in Romans raises also the question of accusation (τὶς ἐγκαλέσει - also a hapax legomenon in Paul like the parallel ἀνεγκλήτος in 1 Cor 1:8) in the context of looking ahead to the final judgement and switches then to Christ's justifying death and resurrection and exaltation. Cf. Schlatter's mention of Rom 8:29 as a parallel to 1 Cor 1:9 (66).

[190] See here von der Osten-Sacken's "Exkurs II: Röm 8,14-30 im Spiegel paulinischer Leidenstexte außerhalb des Römerbriefs" in his *Römer 8 als Beispiel paulinischer Soteriologie*, 287-309, especially 300-304 on Phil 3:2-14. Yet we doubt whether Paul really understood suffering as constitutive for soteriology ("im Leiden vollzieht sich die Rechtfertigung", 304); very questionable is similarly McDermott's position on this matter when he points out that Christians "must also suffer to work salvation for themselves and others" ("Doctrine", 77, cf. 75-77, 227, 233). It rather seems to us that Christian suffering according to Paul happens in consequence and in conformity to Christ's saving παθήματα, death and resurrection, rather than in order to achieve salvation. The causal overtones of the εἴπερ conjunction in Rom 8:17 do not make suffering the **condition** of future glorification (cf. the parallel in v.30 and the aorist there). Note also the switch from εἰ in the previous verses and statements; Paul summarizes the preceding passage in v.17b in a general emphatic statement about the firm basis of Christian hope; see BDR §454,2 who translate "so gewiß".

[191] Cf. Phil 3:21 which speaks of σύμμορφον τῷ σώματι τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ, which means Christ's bodily transformation or glorification (cf. Rom 8:17), not necessarily his resurrection (ἀναστάσις) which was mentioned already in 3:10. It remains interesting, however, that Paul can describe the glorification with Christ as an event of the past (Rom 8:30) and as an event which is still expected to come (Rom 8:17; Phil 3:21).

Very significant are some other phrases in the context of Phil 3:10, which draw our attention to the parallel between v.5 and v.9 in the thanksgiving of 1 Corinthians. Paul speaks about his own conversion in terms of γνῶσις Χριστοῦ (cf. 3:8, 10; and 1 Cor 1:5) which means recognizing Christ, i.e. recognizing the power of his resurrection and the κοινωνία with his suffering by becoming like him in his death. Cf. von der Osten-Sacken, *Römer 8*, 302f, who notes that γνῶσις means the recognition of Christ in faith and happens "in der Leidensgemeinschaft, in der Gleichgestaltung mit dem Tode Christi"(303). And note also Paul's mention of God's upward call (κλήσις) ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (3:14).

shaped into the image of his Son, Christ crucified, who is the risen Lord. And as such God's call means justification, sanctification and even glorification once for all. And the transposition εἰς κοινωνίαν with God's Son is thus the transformation into his εἰκών (Rom 8:29) - an allusion to the motif of (new) creation (cf. Gen 1:26-27, LXX) ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ (2 Cor 5:17; Gal 6:15)[192]. So the kind of relation between Christ and the Christian which κοινωνία in 1 Cor 1:9 describes is clearly soteriological and must be interpreted on the basis of Paul's proclamation of Christ's atoning death and resurrection in which the ungodly had been included and had thus been reconciled to God. Κοινωνία means a relation of "**one** for all" (2 Cor 5:14) which is valid "once for all" (Rom 6:10), so that all who were called were tied into an ultimate communion with the firstborn Son of God.

In the light of such an understanding many of the proposed explanations and translations of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 1:9 appear to be rather dubious and might be due to a questionable interpretation or even disregard of the context and thus of the strong soteriological implications of the phrase. The choice of a rendering is always revealing and particularly in this case it requires careful consideration.

Κοινωνία is more than "fellowship"[193], which always implies a kind of social

---

[192] Cf. Tannehill on Rom 8:29 (*Dying and Rising*, 110ff) and his conclusion that "the motif of dying and rising with Christ and the motif of being conformed to Christ or taking on his image are closely related in Paul's thought" (ibid., 111).

[193] So Barrett, 39; Fee, 45; Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 5, and generally 8-16; Robertson/Plummer, 4, 8; cf. Wood, "Fellowship", 35. Among the German commentators see Fascher, 87; Lang, 19; Meyer, 19; Weiß, 11; and Cremer/Kögel, 613; who all translate *Gemeinschaft*. Hauck, *TWNT* III, 804f, is somehow undecided, speaking also of "Anteilschaft"(804) and "Teilhabe am Sohn"(805), but he generally tends more to understand κοινωνία in the way of a mystical *societas*, paraphrasing 1 Cor 1:9 as saying that the Christians were "zu *Genossen* Christi erhoben"(804), and emphasizing the importance of the σύν-verbs for κοινωνία. Hainz clearly promotes the associative interpretation (*Kirche*, 15-17), although throughout his monograph on κοινωνία he compromises, at least linguistically, with *Teilhabe*/participation and proposes as the general rendering: "Gemeinschaft (mit jemand) durch Teilhabe (an etwas)" (ibid., 34). But "Teilhabe" is for him only "als gedankliches Zwischenglied bedeutsam" (ibid., 48). Yet Hainz has to admit that 1 Cor 1:9 alone does not reveal such a sense of *Gemeinschaft durch Teilhabe* and therefore he reads it into this text (which he calls a "zunächst 'offene' Kurzformel", ibid., 33) from 1 Cor 10:16. But neither is it true that in 1 Cor 1:9 "nicht angedeutet ist, wodurch sie [κοινωνία] entsteht" (ibid., 17), as the origin (God) and the way of its creation (God's call, i.e. the gospel) are clearly stated, nor is it for any reason justified to suppose for 1 Cor 1:9 a sacramental mediation of the κοινωνία with Christ as a result of his (questionable) exegesis of 10:16, a passage with a completely different context and scope and probably not even of Pauline origin (see below); cf.

grouping of a pair or group of several equal and somehow independent individuals. This term therefore cannot adequately express the dying σύν Χριστῷ (cf. Rom 6:4-6; Gal 2:20; 6:14), where the idea of the **one** for all (not all together) is important (cf. Rom 5:8-10, 15-21; 2 Cor 5:14-15). So κοινωνία must describe another kind of togetherness.

But also the other major suggestion, to translate κοινωνία as "partaking" or "participation"[194] is not really appropriate or could at least be easily misunderstood. Such renderings include the notion of a **share** of one or more persons in a common matter or event and do not adequately cover the personal aspects of that kind of interrelation (ἐν, σύν) which κοινωνία describes and which go beyond the idea of a common sharing. The consequences of such a quantifying interpretation are problematic, because the "participation **in** God's Son"[195] makes Christ the **object**-matter of others' sharing and Campbell in his fundamental article could even conclude that τοῦ υἱοῦ κτλ. in 1 Cor 1:9 was a genitive of the **thing** shared and that Paul would speak here "in a curiously impersonal way" about Christ[196]. Further, if one takes the concept in its very literal meaning - how would it then be possible only to "**par**ticipate in Christ", did not **all** of his death and life become the death and life of each of us **all**?

---

also Hainz's considerations in *EWNT* II, 753.

[194] So BAGD, 439, although they hold "fellowship" as a linguistically possible translation also; Moffatt, 9; Campbell, "Cognates", 380; Brown, "Ecclesiology", 159, cf. 163 ("sharing in Christ" and also "spiritual communion with Christ"); and O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 131. The German *(An-) Teilhabe/-nahme* can be found in Baumann, *Mitte*, 42f; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 48; Kertelge, "Kerygma", 336; Schattenmann, *TBLNT* I, 497f; Schlatter, 65f; Schnackenburg, "Koinonia-Gedanke", 61; Schrage, 123; and Wendland, 13. Cf. also Jourdan, who takes "giving of a share" as the basic meaning ("ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ", 118); George uses mainly the participation terminology for 1 Cor 1:9, although he can also speak of "fellowship" or "communion" (*Communion*, 175-177), but in his conclusion he then generally rejects "fellowship" and "participation" as inadequate translations for κοινωνία and pleads for "communion" (ibid., 245f).

[195] O'Brien, *Thanksgivings*, 131 (bold type by G.H.); cf. Seesemann, *Koinonia*: "Anteilhaben an seinem Sohn"(48), "im Sinn von 'in engster Berührung stehen'"(51). He does not generally want to exclude associative aspects and points to the σύν and ἐν Χριστῷ phrases (ibid., 49f), but at the same time he strongly rejects the meaning of *societas/Gemeinschaft* because of its rare occurrence and because the idea of *Gemeinschaft* with Christ would be "völlig unpaulinisch" (ibid., 48).

[196] Campbell, "Cognates", 380, cf. 358, 353. 1 Cor 1:9 is finally paraphrased as "Participation in the spiritual blessings made available in his person" (ibid., 380). See here McDermott who rightly notes that Christian salvation "is not the sharing of a thing, but the relationship with the divine person" ("Doctrine", 70).

Both proposals miss the soteriological aspects of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 1:9, which include Paul's one-for-all and all-in-one concept of atonement and his ideas of σύν and ἐν Χριστῷ which were found to be so relevant for the understanding of the call into the κοινωνία with Christ from observing the context and parallel passages[197]. Neither the associative translation (fellowship) nor the more objective interpretation (participation) take such soteriological connotations of the κοινωνία phrase in this last and summarizing verse of the thanksgiving sufficiently into account. "Κοινωνία with the Son of God our Lord Jesus Christ" must be understood rather in terms of **identification** and **inclusion** (cf. Rom 8:29-30 and Phil 3:10): The Son of God was identified with the sinners[198], who were correspondingly identified with him, and when he died and rose they died and rose "with him" and "in him" (2 Cor 5:21; Gal 3:13; 1 Cor 1:30; Rom 6:4-11; 8:3; etc.) so that they were consequently themselves counted as sons of God (Rom 8:14-15, 29; Gal 4:6-7) once they were called by God and thus received all these benefits[199]. In the light of these aspects of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 1:9 the concept of "communion"[200] is a more appropriate translation and rendering

---

[197] Other proposals by other scholars are not really satifying either: Conzelmann translates κοινωνία as "Zugehörigkeit zum Herrn bis zur Parusie" (43); Grosheide calls it simply a "relation" with Christ (32); McDermott similarly speaks about "a relationship with Jesus Christ, the Son" ("Doctrine", 75, cf. 70 and 219), although he can also use "share in Christ" (70) or "participation in Christ" (71); the worst and theologically most questionable translation, in regard of the soteriological connotations, is "partnership" by Orr/Walther, 143, 146.

[198] Christ was even identified with sin when God ἐποίησεν him ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν (2 Cor 5:21), and when he became ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα, to free us ἐκ τῆς κατάρας τοῦ νόμου (Gal 3:13).

[199] See on this matter Hofius' article, "Sühne und Versöhnung. Zum paulinischen Verständnis des Kreuzestodes Jesu"; and id., "Wort Gottes", 148f. But see also Tannehill, who emphasizes in his study of Paul's understanding of the *Dying and Rising with Christ* that Paul regarded "the death of Christ as an inclusive event" (70) and speaks about "the believer's inclusion in this movement from the old world to the new" which "has been created with the death and the resurrection of Christ" (71). Tannehill's talking of a "movement" fits very well our previous observations on the use of the preposition εἰς.

[200] Among the few who suggest this rendering cf.: LSJ, 970; Allo's paraphrase of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 1:9: "la communauté de vie avec le Christ" (5), apparently does not include the soteriological and christological notions and the French "communion" appears to be understood here in the sense of association. And κοινωνία with Christ in v.9 does not only mean a communion of life, but also and primarily a communion of death, in respect to Christ's cross; Lightfoot understands κοινωνία only as the "spiritual communion with Christ in the present life and participation in his glory hereafter" (*Notes*, 150), but he also misses the soteriological aspects and emphasizes eschatology too much.

Deissmann is interesting here too, for he translates 1 Cor 1:9 as "communion with Christ"

than "fellowship" and "participation". For it describes the relation between Christ and the called believers in terms of a comm-**union** and so covers the ideas of identification and inclusion, of the soteriological σύν (*cum*/comm-) and of ἐν Χριστῷ, which describes the constant constitutive condition of the Christians' new existence[201].

The special nature of the κοινωνία relationship as a relation with the crucified and risen Son of God and the closeness of this kind of communion which the phrase signifies, is further emphasized by the construction of κοινωνία with the genitive of the person (τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυριοῦ ἡμῶν), which is certainly not a subjective genitive and does not denote "the *person by whom* the sharing is effected" as it has been suggested[202], because it

---

(*Paul*, 144; "fellowship" on pp. 135 and 139 apparently means the same) and regards Paul as "a *communio*-mystic" (ibid., 152) experiencing the "most intimate possible fellowship of the Christian with the living spiritual Christ" (ibid., 140). According to Deissmann's classification Paul's mysticism is not "anabatic" but "catabatic" and initiated by God and it is fellowship/*communio* not oneness/*unio* with God (ibid., 149-152). But besides such helpful terminological hints and considerations about Paul's relation to Christ, Deissmann fails to say *how* this relation with Christ is initiated by God as he regards Paul's Christ-mysticism as an "inner experience without the mediation of reasoning" (ibid., 149). He neither mentions the function of the gospel nor relates the origin and the character of the communion with Christ to its soteriological basis of dying and rising with Christ. And where he actually deals with this topic in another chapter of his study he describes the dying and rising with Christ as a **consequence**, not as the **reason** of the "mystical" relationship with Christ (ibid., 181f).

[201] See George, who also in the end rejects the ideas and renderings of "participation" and "fellowship" as inadequate and argues for a translation of κοινωνία as "communion" (*Communion*, 244f). Yet, it seems problematic to us that he speaks about the "communion with God", but hardly about "communion with Christ" and that he regards baptism as the initiation event of "our sharing the experiences of Christ, our dying and rising with him" (ibid., 240, cf. 152, 176f, 189f, 195, 249f) whereas Paul apparently talks about God's calling, i.e. the gospel-preaching, as the event of conversion and transposition into κοινωνία with Christ. Paul's concept of God's creative and converting καλεῖν also makes it clear that he does not understand salvation as a "sharing of **experiences**", or reconciliation as "God's **offer**" (258, bold type by G.H.), which the sinner then could accept. Further, although George might be right in rejecting any connotations of union, identity or absorption for κοινωνία (245-249; cf. Deissmann's classification, see the previous note), one may not exclude the ideas of Christ's identification (not identity) with sinners and of our inclusion in his death and resurrection; and also "union" might be appropriate if understood as analogous to a marriage relationship, where two become **one** flesh (cf. for instance 1 Cor 6:12-20), rather than in terms of a mystical fusion.

[202] Jourdan, "ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ", 118. Jourdan's starting-point for this interpretation is not the context of 1 Cor 1:1-9, but his understanding of passages like 2 Cor 13:12 and Phil 2:1. Yet he disregards the soteriological meaning of God's καλεῖν and of κοινωνία and confuses it with a "horizontal" and ecclesiological meaning, so that he finally suggests even "an objective and subjective force" of the phrase "at the same time" (ibid., 119). Similarly confusing is Currie's subjective interpretation of the κοινωνία with genitive phrase as "alliance" or "covenant

is here quite obviously God who is the origin of κοινωνία (δι' οὗ) not Christ. That sort of construction of κοινωνία with an objective genitive of the person is generally not very frequent[203], and in non-Christian hellenistic usage it mostly denotes very close connections of persons, such as marriage and sexual intercourse, parenthood and other blood relationships[204]. And here probably lies the reason for Paul's choice of this special phrase and construction for the Christ-Christian relationship. He had regarded it as a most appropriate expression for the most intimate kind of relationship and communion, which in a way is comparable to marriage where "the two shall become **one** flesh" (cf. Gen 2:24; 1 Cor 6:15-20; 2 Cor 11:2; and Eph 5:30-32), a union though, which does not overrule an I-and-Thou relation and which does not mean a mystic fusion (cf. Gal 2:19-20); Those thus united are completely inseparable yet distinguishable[205].

Quite interesting, however, is the genitive itself which occupies about half of the space of v.9 and which covers the full range of christological titles[206]. Such an expanded and weighty attribute further emphasizes the significance of the κοινωνία phrase, as if the position in the summarizing and "confirming climax" of the thanksgiving would not make it important enough. After the many

---

relationship of brothers in Christ" (*Literature*, 40). Cf. also George, *Communion*, 175; and Willis, *Idol Meat*, 210f; and see Cremer/Kögel, who do not want to press too sharply the distinction between subjective and objective genitives (613). They call κοινωνία with an objective genitive "eine entschiedene Verschlechterung des Sprachgebr[auch].s." (ibid., 613) and in disregard of the divine passive emphasize that it is actually the Son who set up "d. Gemeinschaft" (ibid., 613). But cf. already Wood's strong objections against the subjective interpretation of κοινωνία with genitive ("Fellowship", 34-39).

[203] See Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 47. In view of all the evidence that Seesemann, Hauck and others present (see the next note), the statements of Cremer/Kögel (613) and Schnackenburg ("Koinonia-Gedanken", 56f) that the genitive of the person would be completely alien in non-biblical Greek cannot be upheld.

[204] See here especially Endenburg's detailed survey (*Koinoonia*, 106-108; cf. 27f, 62-65); but also Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 15f; and Hauck, *TWNT* III, 799-803; cf. also Campbell, "Cognates", 356-358; and BAGD, 439. According to Endenburg κοινωνία in classical Greek is used next frequently for political associations and then for participation in religious cults (see 108-116).

[205] See here Deissmann's classification of mysticism again (*Paul*, 149-152) as he stresses that Paul "was not deified nor was he transformed into spirit by this communion, nor did he become Christ" (152).

[206] Cf.Kramer, *Christ*, 191f (57d); and see O'Brien who notes that theses titles (cf. v.3) reflect the language of benediction and worship (*Thanksgivings*, 132f).

repeated references in the thanksgiving to Χριστός, to Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς and to the κύριος Paul finally concentrates all these titles at the end of the passage and adds the christologically most relevant title υἱὸς θεοῦ which occurs only fifteen times in his letters altogether[207]. Mostly it marks a climax of Paul's argument and has special soteriological implications. For it describes the relation between God and Christ in terms of a father-son relationship (cf. Gal 4:4; 1 Cor 15:28) which according to Paul is the basis for salvation in general (cf. Rom 5:10; 8:3, 32; 1 Thess 1:10) and for our calling God **our** Father in particular (v.3!; see Rom 8:29 14-30; Gal 4:6)[208]. And even the order in this accumulation of titles might therefore be not accidental, for Christ's being God's Son is always and essentially prior to our recognizing and confessing him as our Lord (cf. v.3; 12:3).

And so the last words of the thanksgiving resemble again a basic principle of Paul's theology and ethics which we found indicated to some extent also in the ὅτι-ὥστε structure of the thanksgiving: the Christians' individual and communal existence in present and future times (vv.7-8/v.9a) is ultimately based on the fundamental event of salvation in the past (vv.4-6/v.9b). In other words, Christology and soteriology are essentially prior to ecclesiology[209], although this is not so much a temporal as a material and compellingly theological order. An ecclesiological interpretation of κοινωνία in v.9 therefore becomes even more questionable, as when Barrett for instance paraphrases, "that God has called you into the community - that is the church - of Jesus Christ"[210]. Yet, God's call was not a call into a Christian community, but it was a call into the communion with

---

[207] See Rom 1:3-4, 9; 5:10; 8:3, 29, 32; 1 Cor 1:9; 15:28; 2 Cor 1:19; Gal 1:16; 2:20; 4:4, 6; 1 Thess 1:10; Cf. κύριος which occurs 184 times altogether.

[208] That the title 'Son of God' is occasionally used in close connection with, or even substitution for, the message of the gospel (2 Cor 1:19; Gal 1:16) also fits our context very well.

[209] Cf. here George as he notes that although for Paul communion with Christ and church-membership are inseparable, the church is not prior to the individual and not the mediator of κοινωνία with Christ (*Communion*, 160). Κοινωνία is therefore not a synonym for ἐκκλησία (188).

[210] Barrett, 40. Cf. also Currie, *Literature*, 40; Senft, 29; Schrage,123f; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 210f; and Calvin who emphasizes the membership of the Christians in Christ (219). But see Severian of Gabala who rightly emphasizes that the Corinthians were called into communion with Christ "οὐκ εἰς ἀνθρώπου κοινωνίαν" (*Pauluskommentare*, 226).

his Son, and so with his Son's death and resurrection. Or, to put it as its sharpest: God's ἐκκλησία ἐν Κορίνθῳ and anywhere else was not created by, and does not exist because of, God's **call** which Paul could also describe as a very individual experience (1 Cor 7:17-24 [ἕκαστος!], cf. Rom 1:1; 1 Cor 1:1; Gal 1:15). But the church was created by, and exists because of, God's will and purpose to call the **many** (cf. the plural ἐκλήθητε)! His call leads strictly into the saving and sanctifying communion with Christ, according to which, however, the many are consequently united and immediately integrated into the community of the κλητοῖς ἁγίοις, which is the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ (v.2). And only in this respect the church must indeed be described as a *creatura verbi divini*.

2.2.3 Conclusion

The concept of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 1:9 occurs in a verse which depicts the summarizing and focal point of the letter-opening of 1 Corinthians and at the same time marks the bold headline of the following chapters of paraclesis and admonition. It contains a fundamental and highly significant message which Paul wanted the badly shaken and disturbed Christian community in Corinth to listen to, to comprehend and ultimately to digest: You were called into communion with Christ! - and even as you display such a poor condition of disunity and impurity and are in danger of loosing the truth of the resurrection, your communion with Christ, your communion with the crucified and resurrected Son of God, our Lord, remains the constant constitutive condition of your individual and community life. And so κοινωνία is a distinctly soteriological term in this passage. Yet it refers not merely to an initial event in the past, but because of the faithfulness of the one who has once called so efficaciously, describes the ultimate determination of the actual situation of those who were called as well: they are still in communion with Christ as they are ἐν Χριστῷ, for Christ's sake.

Schlatter paraphrased v.9 very well: that κοινωνία τοῦ υἱοῦ θεοῦ Ἰησοῦ

Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν "verleiht das Mitgekreuzigt- und das Mitauferwecktsein mit ihm und macht es zum Ziel, das Gottes Vorherbestimmung feststellte, 'gleich geformt mit der Gestalt seines Sohnes zu sein' Röm 8.29. Das macht aus seinem Ruf die Gnadentat, zu der sich Gott in unwandelbarer Treue bekennen wird."[211]

Excursus: Κοινωνία in 2 Cor 13:13 and Phil 2:1

There are only two more instances in the NT where κοινωνία in a construction with a genitive probably describes a relation to a divine person, in 2 Cor 13:13 and in Phil 2:1[212]. Both of these instances are very difficult to understand and have been the object of many scholarly investigations and debates. We cannot possibly pick up all the various arguments and positions and discuss them sufficiently in the framework of this study. And so some brief considerations must be enough.

Above all the interpretation of 2 Cor 13:13, the last verse of the letter, contains many exegetical problems and theological questions: Is the genitive construction ἡ κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος to be understood as objective (κοινωνία **with** the Spirit) or is it a genitive of the same kind as in the seemingly parallel preceding constructions ἡ χάρις τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ and ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ which are subjective genitives or genitives of origin (κοινωνία **of** the Spirit)[213]? For us, however, the latter seems to be the most natural reading and the more apparent understanding of the phrase, although on the other hand the objective option cannot be excluded, but requires the

---

[211] Schlatter, 66. See similarly Schattenmann's conclusion on κοινωνία in Paul, *TBLNT* I, 498, although he generally pleads for "Anteilnahme".

[212] Although the question, whether Paul regards the spirit as a person (of the godhead) or merely as a kind of power, is still a matter of debate, one must at least recognize, however, that Paul frequently relates attributes of an individual person to God's (ἅγιον) πνεῦμα (cf. 1 Cor 2:10-11; 12:11; Rom 15:30).

[213] For the subjective understanding of the genitive see Currie, *Literature*, 39; Hainz, *Kirche*, 50; von Dobbeler, *Teilhabe*, 62; but also Wolff, *2 Kor*, 269; and Hughes, *2 Cor*, 489f, cf. Lang, 360; and Schlatter, 66.

explanation why Paul[214] had switched to another genitive in the last element of the triadic benediction[215].

Yet although some uncertainty remains on this grammatical question, one can be much more confident concerning the other relevant question, what κοινωνία τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος means. Here again one meets two options: a "vertical" interpretation of κοινωνία mostly by those commentators who take the genitive to be objective, emphasizing the relationship with the Spirit as a "participation in the Holy Spirit"[216]. Others understand the phrase in a "horizontal" way, with basically ecclesiological implications, referring to the "fellowship" of the Christians in Corinth which is understood as a gift of the Spirit[217] or as a consequence of their "participation in the Spirit"[218]. Yet in the light of the context of this phrase and of the language and the function of the benediction, an ecclesiological meaning becomes very unlikely. For the parallel concepts of χάρις and ἀγάπη are clearly soteriological (i.e. "vertical") and belong to the special kind of benedictory language which Paul uses in his letter-openings and

---

[214] The unusual expansion of the postscript benediction in 2 Cor 13:13 (cf. Rom 16:20; 1 Cor 16:23; Gal 6:18; Phil 4:23; 1 Thess 5:28; Phlm 25) must not be regarded as redactional and there is indeed "no reason why Paul himself could not have expanded his own more usual form, just as he expanded the peace-blessing in v. 11*b*." (Furnish, *2 Cor*, 587).

[215] Advocates of the objective interpretation are LSJ, 970; Wood, "Fellowship", 36; Campbell, "Cognates", 379f; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 56f, 62-70; Hauck, *TWNT* III, 807 ("Gen. obj. der Sache); Furnish, 2 Cor, 584; Brown, "Ecclesiology", 158 (a partitive genitive); Dunn, "Instruments", 206; Kertelge, "Kerygma", 337; Schattenmann, *TBLNT* I, 597; Schnackenburg, "Koinonia-Gedanke", 68f. McDermott pleads for both the subjective and the objective meaning at the same time: "One need not limit Paul's grammar too narrowly" ("Doctrine", 223f). See also Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 66-70; and Jourdan, "KOINΩNIA", 119. But one should be careful with such a liberal approach to Paul's grammar; presumably he knew quite well what he wanted to say and expressed it adequately. If there are **aspects** of the implications of both grammatical options here together it is more likely due to the semantics of the words which Paul used here.

[216] Furnish, *2 Cor*, 581; cf. Hauck, *TWNT* III, 807: "*Teilnahme am Geist*".

[217] So especially those who take the construction as subjective; see Currie: "the alliance of the spirit, those gifts by which members of the body render those mutual ministries which acknowledge and fulfill the fraternal claims of *ḥesed* in the New Covenant" (*Literature*, 39); Hainz: "Gemeinschaft [der Christen], vermittelt durch den heiligen Geist" (*Kirche*, 50); and von Dobbeler, *Teilhabe*, 62.

[218] Among those who hold the objective genitive see for instance Dunn, "Instruments", 206: κοινωνία "denotes 'participation in the Spirit', that is the shared experience of the Spirit. Fellowship arises out of the *koinonia pneumatos*"; see also Kertelge "Kerygma", 336f; and Paniculam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 70.

letter-postscripts, a certain terminology from which he may have derived the concept of κοινωνία as well. And indeed the term is comparatively frequent in Paul's proemia, not only in 1 Cor 1:9, where we observed another correlation of κοινωνία and the χάρις of God and Christ (vv.3-4), but also in Phil 1:5 (κοινωνία εἰς τὸ εὐαγγέλιον) and Phlm 6 (κοινωνία τῆς πίστεως)[219]. In all these three instances κοινωνία signifies soteriological reasons for Paul's thanksgivings: the Corinthians' communion with Christ; the Philippians' communion with the gospel - that is with Christ[220], and Philemon's faith[221].

Another relevant factor for the interpretation of the passage is Paul's flexibility in switching his attribution of the concepts of love and grace to the (three) persons of God[222], so that he could accordingly have described κοινωνία also as originating from God (cf. 1 Cor 1:9) or Christ[223]. And although it is not very frequent that Paul describes the Spirit, not as an instrument of God, but as taking himself an individual and active part, these statements still display an important feature of Paul's pneumatology[224]. And so

---

[219] But in 1 Cor 1:9 and Phlm 6 we have an objective genitive of course and also the prepositional phrase in Phil 1:5 has such an objective meaning; see Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 74-76; Campbell, *Communion*, 182; and also Hainz, *Kirche*, 93f.

[220] Christ himself as the gospel is the object of the apostolic preaching (cf. Gal 1:16; 1 Cor 1:18-24; 15:12; Phil 1:14-18; etc.); see Hofius, "Wort Gottes", 152 (especially n. 29); and Brown, "Ecclesiology", 163. Also Seesemann (*Koinonia*, 74-79) and George (*Communion*, 182) point in this direction and regard the whole phrase as an equivalent for "faith"; cf. Hauck, *TWNT* III, 805. Hainz (*Kirche*, 89-95) and Paniculam (*Koinōnia in the NT*, 80-85) are much too complicated in their interpretations, which, however, seem to be strongly governed by their general presumption on κοινωνία. Cf. also Sampley, *Partnership*, 70-72.

[221] This passage should also be understood in line with the other proemium occurrences of κοινωνία (cf. Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 79-83; Brown, "Ecclesiology", 163; and Schattenmann, *TBLNT* I, 498). Paul does not praise Philemon's fellowship with his fellow Christians and Paul (so Hainz, *Kirche*, 107f; cf. Paniculam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 86-90), but his faith which goes along with ἐπίγνωσις ... εἰς Χριστόν (Phlm 6; cf. 1 Cor 1:5)!

[222] See for instance ἀγάπη Χριστοῦ in 2 Cor 5:14 and Rom 8:35 next to 8:39, or ἀγάπη πνεύματος in Rom 15:30. In 1 Cor 1:3-4 we have one of the many examples of how χάρις derives from Christ **and** God (the Father). Cf. Chrysostom, *Homilies on Corinthians*, 419; and cf. also Smalley's conclusions in "Relationship", 96-99, especially 98.

[223] It is an interesting feature of ancient liturgical texts which use 2 Cor 13:13 that they actually made such alterations, although presumably for dogmatic reasons; see for instance the *praefatio* of the Gallican Liturgy.

[224] Cf. passages like Rom 8:9, 14; Gal 5:18; 1 Cor 3:16; 12:3, 4-6, 11, 13; 2 Cor 3:6, 17! The δύναμις of the Spirit is also an integral part of God's calling and converting through the gospel (cf. 1 Cor 2:4-5; 2 Cor 3:6; 4:13). See also Lang, 361.

the Holy Spirit in 2 Cor 13:13 can be understood as the inititator of a sanctifying κοινωνία, which can mean the communion with himself and thus with Christ dwelling in the believers (cf. Rom 8:9-11; Gal 2:19f)[225].

The second instance of a κοινωνία τοῦ πνεύματος in Phil 2:1 is different from the benedictory postscript passage and occurs in a parenetic setting. The genitive is not subjective here (a "fellowship" created by the Spirit)[226], but should be taken as objective (communion with the Spirit)[227]. Yet the meaning does not differ very much from 2 Cor 13:13. According to the context and in parallel to the first of the four conditions (εἴ) in 2:1 which is determined by an ἐν Χριστῷ phrase, the κοινωνία phrase can probably be understood as equivalent to ἐν πνεύματι. And thus κοινωνία τοῦ πνεύματος could be paraphrased in allusion to Rom 8:9-11: "if you are in the Spirit", that is "if the Spirit and thus Christ is dwelling in you ...".

---

[225] See Wolff, 2 Kor, 269: "Freilich wird man, entsprechend den voranstehenden Genitiven, auch den letzten so zu verstehen haben, daß von einer Teilhabe am Pneuma die Rede ist, die der Geist selbst schenkt."

[226] So Hainz, *Kirche*, 53. But he hardly takes the context into account. Cf. also Paniculam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 74-79; and McDermott, "Doctrine", 227.

[227] So Wood, "Fellowship", 35; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 60; Hauck, *TWNT* III, 807; George, *Communion*, 178; Brown, "Ecclesiology", 158f; Campbell, "Cognates", 378.

2.3 Κοινωνία in 1 Cor 10:16

After we have discussed the first passage which employs the concept of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians, the introductory passage (1 Cor 1:9), we will now examine the second instance of the phrase. In 1 Cor 10:16 it occurs twice in a parallel statement concerning the Lord's Supper in the context of an argument against idolatry (10:14-22), which is again only a subsection of a rather lengthy discussion of the problem of idol-meat in Corinth (8:1-11:1)[1]. There are basically two reasons why we do not investigate the meaning and the function of κοινωνία starting from the "outskirts" - so to say, from the context of the relevant verse as we did in the other instance, but start with an analysis of 10:16: The verse and the concept therein are not placed at the end of a passage, for instance as a summarizing climax, but v.16 is made the **basis** of an argument, so that it appears to be a priority to understand its intention first in order to sufficiently examine its significance for the context. Yet the other reason is far more important. For it seems very likely that the phrases in v.16, probably including the concept of κοινωνία, are not originally Pauline, but are picking up, and building on, an earlier tradition[2]. If this is the case, as we intend to show, we must first try to reconstruct as far as possible the original shape and *Sitz im Leben* of the tradition and its initial meaning and function in such a pre-Pauline

---

[1] In the course of investigating this second instance of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians we do not only have to deal with quite a lot of literature - besides the commentaries on 1 Corinthians and the studies on κοινωνία there is the vast number of works concerned with the Eucharist. But we will further find our passage involving and touching on several important topics of NT or Pauline theology, such as the relation of Paganism and Christianity, Paul's use and understanding of the OT tradition, the Eucharist (and its tradition) and generally the understanding of the Christian rites ("sacraments"), questions of ethics and ecclesiology, etc. We will not be able to comment on all these issues in a sufficient way, of course, but we will try to find our way through this thicket, stepping aside now and then when it is helpful for the explanation of the meaning and function of κοινωνία in this passage.

[2] Hardly any of the studies of the concept of κοινωνία in Paul which we surveyed at the beginning of our thesis even mention the possibility that 1 Cor 10:16 might not depict a uniquely Pauline formulation and that this occurrence of κοινωνία might therefore not necessarily count as an authentically Pauline interpretation of the Eucharist or as highly typical for **his** concept of κοινωνία. Only Panikulam and Hainz consider such questions.

context, in order to understand its selection and employment here and the Apostle's intention in quoting exactly this tradition in the context of an argument against idolatry[3]. The occurrence of a quotation within a text always raises the question of its original meaning and requires an independent exploration therefore, on the basis of which one might then ask why and how the author connected it to a new context. This is even more important in our case where we have a (catechetical) tradition, which, as it seems, was already known to both the author and his readers as a commonly accepted authority. And one gets the impression that not so much the tradition was meant to be reinterpreted by the new context, but that the context, the issue of idol-meat, was "interpreted" by the tradition, which, we presume, Paul and the Corinthians understood more or less as we will outline below. So, although on the other hand it is also true that the new context certainly sheds some new light on the tradition of the Lord's Supper and highlights some of its aspects more than others, the key for the interpretation of the tradition and thus of the concept of κοινωνία remains v.16 itself[4]. With the task of analysing the tradition first individually we tread on hypothetical ground of course, for the textual basis is fairly narrow, even if we take into account the other traditions concerning the Lord's Supper in both the following chapter (11:23b-25) and in the Synoptics, and we will therefore have to be careful of not getting lost in speculations.

---

[3] See Neuenzeit who calls 1 Cor 10:16 "eine eigenständige, vorpaulinische Formel" which should be interpreted at first neither in the light of Pauline theology nor from its actual context in Corinthians (*Eucharistieauffassung*, 60). See also Wolff's excursus on the pre-Pauline tradition in 1 Cor 10:16 before he begins to comment on the verse in its actual context (50-52).

[4] Willis' way of reaching an interpretation of κοινωνία in v.16, which for him is a central and decisive issue for the argument of his entire thesis and important for his defence of the integrity of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 (cf. for instance *Idol Meat*, 281-286), must be questioned, however. Although also for him v.16 is "a piece of pre-Pauline Christian tradition in content and in wording as well" (193), his investigation starts with an analysis of the other κοινων-relations as they are described in 1 Cor 10:18-20 (182-192). Thus he makes Paul's actual parenetical argument the key for understanding a phrase which is older than, and as such originally had nothing to do with, the Corinthian problem of idolatry which is here at stake. To understand the meaning and the function of v.16 one cannot **start** by considering the context, if it depicts a tradition which **both** sides previously knew in another context and with another function. Beginning with the "less controversial" passages and then turning to the important part (192) is further no methodologically reasonable argument and the order in which Willis examines the relevant verses (vv.14-15, 18, 19-20, 17, 16, and finally 21-22) is rather confusing and misleading (182-222).

However, we will follow the Apostle's appeal (v.15: κρίνατε ὑμεῖς ὅ φημι!) and carefully consider the origin and meaning of the words in v.16 before we proceed to ask concerning their contextual integration into the argument against idolatry.

2.3.1 The Shape and Origin of the Tradition in 1 Cor 10:16

There are a few signals in the **context** of v.16 which may hint at an originally independent existence of the verse or of parts of it. In the preceding verse (15) Paul addresses the Corinthians as φρονιμοί, as people who are in a position to judge for themselves - note the emphasized ὑμεῖς - and who are thus expected to draw their own conclusions from what the Apostle is going to say next. Apparently Paul is convinced that this following argument will not fail but even more bring the desired result, that his endangered and yet "beloved[5] children" (cf. 1 Cor 4:14) should come to their senses and flee from idolatry (10:14). So the Apostle obviously expected a particular positive reaction and did not with a sudden notion of democracy intend to involve their independent judgement on the issue, but they should rather "judge for themselves that Paul is right"[6]. It might have some probability therefore that both sides - the writer of the letter and its receivers - already had some knowledge of what Paul came up with in the course of his argument in 10:16[7].

---

[5] According to Wischmeyer's article ("ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ"), the adjective generally is a "jüdische, spezifisch theologisch gefüllte Diktion ..., die Gottes Erwählung aussagt" (478) and thus a very honorific form of address. In 1 Cor 10:14 it is further a call for special attention and might imply certain expectations.

[6] Fee, 465.

[7] It is further striking that the parallel constructions to v.16, in vv.18 and 20, especially concerning the κοινων- with genitive phrases, do not really match: the difference between the plural forms of the nominalized adjective "κοινωνός" in vv. 18 and 20 and on the other hand the abstract form of κοινωνία in the singular in v.16 should not too easily be neglected. Either Paul did not consider the differences - which does not seem very likely to us, for the κοινων- phrases are obviously meant to be the *tertium comparationis* in these verses, or he wanted to do precisely the opposite and point to a certain difference and quality of the κοινων-relations. But a third option is also posssible which could go with the second, that Paul was bound in the case of κοινωνία to a fixed formulation and for certain reasons did not want to make the other two

The way in which the actual statement is then presented in **v.16** seems to confirm our supposition. For the particle οὐχί, right in the middle of each of the two parallel halves of the verse, indicates that the two sentences are formulated as questions to which an affirmative answer is expected - "isn't it? - of course it is!"[8]. The parallelism is another striking formal indication, although it presumably derives from the traditional form of the Lord's Supper[9]. But the parallel structure could further display a typical feature often found in traditional phrases[10], for it helps one to memorize not only the content but the exact words of a formula as well (cf. 1 Cor 8:6; 11:24-25; Rom 1:3-4; 4:25)[11]. The only breaking of the parallelism in our case is the additional genitive attribute of the subject of the first sentence (τῆς εὐλογίας) and the position of the verb ἐστίν which in the first sentence immediately follows the predicate nominative κοινωνία and in the second is placed at the end after the genitive attribute of κοινωνία, τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ. But on the whole we have the same structure: a subject (the cup of benediction/the bread) which is closely

---

completely parallel.

[8] See BDR §427,2; cf. Ellis, "Tradition", 487; Grosheide, 231; Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 19; Weiß, 256; Willis; *Idol Meat*, 194; Wolff, 52.

[9] The parallel of bread and cup, body and (new covenant in the) blood is fundamental in Mark 14:22-24; Matt 26:26-29; Luke 22:19-20; 1 Cor 11:23b-25; and even John 6:53-56 displays this parallel.

[10] The criteria of formal and structural peculiarities should be added to the criteria which Ellis denotes for traditional pieces ("Traditions", 485).

[11] That parallelism was an important and fairly frequent technique for memorization in antiquity and especially in semitic poetry has lately been considered by Riesner in his *Jesus als Lehrer* which deals with the question of the origin of the Synoptic traditions; see for our purpose especially his §15 "Bewahrende Formung" (392-404), according to which parallelisms played a prominent part (398f); cf. also BDR §489f. Whether this technique and generally such parallel forms in supposed traditions in the Synoptics, however, indicate originality and age or rather a certain process of reflection in worship and catechism of the early church remains to us an open question. Yet, in the case of Paul's letters and the pre-Pauline traditions therein, the second option is the more likely one, and the Apostle surely did not share in the modern idea that older traditions are the more authentic and valuable ones. Concerning the two Eucharistic traditions in 1 Corinthians, though, if we may already count 10:16 as such, it seems likely that the parallelism of the paradosis (11:23b-25) with its formal inconsistencies depicts the older formulation - reflecting a different *Sitz im Leben* - than the much more smoothly arranged phrases which are in the background of 10:16.

connected with a following brief relative clause also by inverse attraction[12] (which we bless/break), and in the second part the verb of the main clause (is) with a rather lengthy complement with a double genitive attribute which is nearly identical in the two sentences save one word (κοινωνία of the **blood/body** of Christ). The inverse attraction, which attaches the hypotactic relative clause even closer to the main sentence "by agreement of the relative and antecedent not only in number and gender but even in case"[13], is a very rare construction and occurs probably only once more in Paul[14]. Such a grammatical rarity further strengthens our impression that v.16 is a pre-Pauline Eucharist tradition which preserved fixed phrases. And it makes it rather unlikely that v.16 is an "ad hoc construction"[15] by Paul where he would merely use, or allude to, earlier language[16], at least concerning the first parts of the two sentences. But also for the other halves of the parallelism, where especially the (pre-Pauline) combination of κοινωνία with σῶμα Χριστοῦ and αἷμα Χριστοῦ is debated, one has to note the position of οὐχί. The interrogative particle is placed immediately

---

[12] That τὸ ποτήριον ... ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν depicts an inverse attraction as well and that the subject is thus an accusative form is not obvious, for the nominative and the accusative singular forms in the neuter do not differ, but it is most likely, because of the parallelism; so BDR §295; Henrici, 261; Meyer, 237; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 58; Robertson/Plummer, 213; and Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 21 (although he is wrong to call the phenomenon a "relative attraction").

[13] Robertson, 429; cf. 488,717.

[14] Rom 6:17; see Hoffmann/Siebenthal, 569. But this instance has a much more complicated structure than 1 Cor 10:16 and it could also be just an ordinary relative attraction; see BDR §294,6. In the NT the only other instances of an inverse attraction are Matt 21:42 = Mark 12:10 = Luke 20:17 (and some MSS of 1 Pet 2:7) - a quotation from Ps 117:22 (LXX); and probably Luke 12:48 - a metrically structured antithetic parallelism which is reminiscent of a proverb, maybe a tradition (cf. Jeremias, *Theologie*, 35); Acts 10:36 and Luke 1:73 are doubtful; see BDR §195. The ordinary relative attraction, where the relative particle adapts to the antecedent in the main clause, not to its function in the relative clause, is far more frequent (for instance 1 Cor 6:19); cf. BDR §294; and Hoffmann/Siebenthal, 569.

[15] Fee, 468, n.28.

[16] Many commentators hold such a position, that v.16 is a mixture of traditional language and Pauline interpretation, especially concerning the concept of κοινωνία; among the investigators of the κοινωνία phrase see Hainz, although he gives no reason for his assumption (*Kirche*, 22); but see also Hahn, who understands the second parts of v.16a and b as Pauline ("Gefahr", 165f); see Seesemann, who understands κοινωνία in v.16 not really as a Pauline invention in that context, but as Paul's deliberate allusion to the sacrificial terminology of the Greek cults (*Koinonia*, 102f). See further Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 143; Burchard, "Importance", 125, 130; Conzelmann, 201f; Fee, 468, who is undecided concerning the origin of κοινωνία; Strobel, 158; and cf. Grosheide, 231f.

before κοινωνία and it is thus emphasizing the expected positive answer to the questions even more for these debated second parts of the parallel sentences[17].

The particle οὐχί and thus the form of the question are presumably not original. But besides this apparently Pauline adoption of the statements for the particular use in 1 Corinthians, the two grammatically not related but still parallel clauses seem to be phrases of a formerly independent and well known tradition. That the two sentences originally belonged together is undoubted, yet the order - the cup before the bread - is striking. It has no real parallel which could confirm the possibility of another practice of the celebration of the Eucharist[18], even more so as the paradosis in the following chapter clearly points to the regular order (11:24-25). Most likely Paul himself altered the order; for what reason he did so the context analysis must reveal.

So, to summarize; from considering merely the formal aspects in and around 1 Cor 10:16 we might already well conclude that Paul quoted "a previous tradition which was already known to the Corinthians"[19], not only "in content" but "in wording as well"[20]. And we can reconsruct the original shape of the

---

[17] If Paul had formulated those phrases himself one might wonder why he constructed them with such different positions of the verb ἐστίν. That he took it over from the tradition might be the better explanation of that astonishing feature, which some of the MSS already attempted to correct and altered the position of the first ἐστίν according to the second (ℵ C D F G Ψ 𝔐 and lat). Cf. Klauck, who describes v.16 as "paralleler Aufbau bei chiastisch verschränkter Schlußstellung" (*Kult*, 258). But with respect to the parallelism and to the position of the verbs in the depending statements in vv. 17, 18 and 20, the MSS could also have correctly reconstructed the original form which had been corrupted at some stage of the tradition process.

[18] The εὐχαριστία in *Did.* 9:1-5 and the order of cup and bread there do not refer to the Lord's Supper but probably to a kind of Agape Meal as 10:1 hints. According to Hofius ("Paradosis", 222f, n. 144) the ποτήριον in 9:2 and similarly in Luke 22:17-18 points to the Qidduš cup which in the Jewish paschal rite had its special function for a pre-supper prayer and was then followed by the usual meal, beginning with an eulogy and breaking of the bread and concluding with an eulogy over the ποτὴριον τῆς εὐλογίας (cf. Luke 22:19-20); see the references to the relevant rabbinic sources in Hofius, ibid.

[19] Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 19 ; Walter, "Christusglaube", 432, calls 10:16 "eine ihm [Paul] überkommene Deuteformel zum Herrenmahl ..., die er auch bei den Korinthern als bekannt und anerkannt voraussetzt"; see also Barrett, 231, 234; Delling, "Mahlverständnis", 54; id., "Abendmahlsgeschehen", 323; Ellis, "Traditions", 487; Friedrich, "Christus", 162; Goppelt, *Theologie*, 476f; Käsemann, "Anliegen", 12; Klauck, *Kult*, 262f; and id., "Eucharistie", 332f; Lang, 127, 157; Murphy O'Connor, "Community", 63; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 59f; Weiß, 256; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 193-195; and Wolff, 50-52; cf. Meeks, *Christians*, 159.

[20] Willis, *Idol Meat*, 193.

tradition as follows[21]:

a) τὸν ἄρτον
ὃν κλῶμεν
κοινωνία
τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ
ἐστιν

b) τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας
ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν
κοινωνία ἐστὶν
τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ
(ἐστιν)

That this tradition must have been of a different kind and quality than the ones which Paul argues with in chapter eleven (11:23-25) and fifteen (15:3b-5) - two further examples for the Apostle's frequent argumentative use of accepted traditional material[22] - is clear from how they are introduced there[23]. These two traditions are apparently not of Pauline origin and most likely they are not even interpreted by Pauline insertions[24], but are preserved as fixed and somehow "holy" formulae which the Apostle had received once from others and which had then been transmitted also to the converts of the newly founded

---

[21] The position of ἐστίν at the end of each of the sentences could be the original as some MSS might have preserved or correctly reconstructed; cf. n. 17.

[22] On this important feature of Paul's letters see generally Eichholz's observations and considerations in his *Umriß*, 7-13, 101-154, 202-214; and cf. Guthrie, *Introduction*, 658-661. Concerning 1 Corinthians see especially Ellis' article "Traditions".

[23] See for instance the ὅτι recitativum in 11:23.

[24] Especially in the case of 1 Cor 11:23b-25, that it was entirely a pre-Pauline tradition was long debated. The attribute to τὸ σῶμα in v.24, τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, was commonly regarded as a grecism which could not be translated back into a semitic language; so for instance Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 99, 160; Weiß, 285; and Klauck, *Kult*, 304, 308. But that Paul should have changed or amplified the wording of such a text is rather unlikely, for he always differentiated between his own and the Lord's words (cf. e.g. 1 Cor 7:10, 12, 25; 9:14; and see Schlatter, *Theologie*, 40, 351), so that it is likely that he quoted the tradition precisely as he himself had received it from others and as it had been transmitted to the Corinthians; see Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 82-89; Hofius, "Paradosis", 204; and Wolff, 83. And that the attribute τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν can very well have a semitic original and that the Pauline tradition could thus depict an even older version of the paradosis than Mk 14:22-24 (the ὑπὲρ πολλῶν in Mark 14:24 could be a later interpretation alluding to Isa 53:11-12), has been convincingly shown by Hofius in his recent article, "Τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν 1 Kor 11,24", with a large number of Hebrew, Aramaic and Syriac references. Cf. Delling, "Mahlverständnis", 51; Goppelt, *Theologie*, 265, n. 10. On the integrity and originality of 1 Cor 15:3b-5 see Wolff's excursus, 153-158.

church in Corinth[25]. The existence of another tradition of the Lord's Supper, not only in the Pauline Corpus in general but even in the same letter and only some verses below, is striking and of great importance for our investigation of 1 Cor 10:16. And we will have to deal with the relation of these two traditional references to the Eucharist further in the course of our studies. For the moment it is enough to register that the quotation of the paradosis in chapter 11 had not been altered by Paul whereas we found the formula in 10:16 transformed into a question and presented in an altered order. We may therefore conclude that the paradosis was a more important tradition, an aetiology[26] of the Lord's Supper which explained the establishment of this Christian rite and provided the norm for its continuous practice. Whether it was ever used in the worship and "liturgy" of the early church in Corinth is not clear[27]. Yet it narrows the options for the origin and function of the other tradition in Corinth for which it seems fair to say that it might have been used for some kind of catechetical purpose for the new believers who were thus introduced into the understanding of the

---

[25] Παραλαμβάνειν (קִבֵּל מִן) and similarly παραδιδόναι (מָסַר לְ) are technical terms in rabbinical literature for the transmission of traditions; see Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 95-98, 195; Ellis, "Traditions", 481f; Hofius, "Paradosis", 203, nn. 2f; and see the references in Str-B III, 444. Dunn's suggestion, however, that we should understand 11:23 as a reference to the visionary reception of the paradosis and thus to "the direct authority of the exalted one" is rather doubtful (*Unity*, 67). Not really "much more satisfactory", but rather more fantastic is Murphy O'Connor's solution, that Paul in his reference to the "Lord" actually meant the Christian community, for - according to Murphy O'Connor - "Christ ... in a real sense ... *is the community* (6:15; 12:12)" ("Community", 56f).

[26] See Hofius, "Paradosis", 203; Roloff, *Neues Testament*, 213; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 96-98; Lang, 150; and Wolff, 84.

[27] In favour of the use of the aetiology in the celebration of the Lord's Supper are Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 100; Wolff, 84; and Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 98. However, Barrett, 264; Weiß, 284,293; Burchard, "Importance", 125f; and Hofius, "Paradosis", 229, n. 148, doubt that. Although we agree that neither καταγγέλλετε in 11:26 nor the τοῦτο εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν in 11:24 and 25 allow us to reach conclusions about the use of the paradosis in the "liturgy" of the Eucharist, Neuenzeit's suggestion that the formula (or parts of it) could have been included in the eucharistic prayers (98) has some probability. Maybe the words appeared there in the course of an *anamnesis* of the events of salvation history, which was a prominent part also in the Jewish εὐχαριστία, for instance in the celebration of the Passover. Similarly the *verba testamenti* were included in the *anamnesis* of the Eucharistic prayers of most of the Christian liturgies of the Ancient Church. That the prayer of the bread and the prayer of the wine were originally separated by a meal need not be a problem for this thesis, but could even more explain the differences between these basically parallel parts of the paradosis.

actual celebration of the Lord's Supper in their church[28]. The appeal to the κρίνειν of the φρονιμοί in the preceeding verse (10:15) and Paul's insertion of οὐχί fit very well such an assumption of the original *Sitz im Leben* of the tradition in 1 Cor 10:16. The subject of the relative clauses in the first person plural and the present tense of those two verbs, pointing to a durative and iterative action[29], could further count as typical features of catechism, which reflected and explained the actual ritual customs of the early church.

Far more difficult to answer, however, is the question of the traditio-historical origin of 1 Cor 10:16. In principal it could be either a fairly recent creation by Paul (or his fellow workers) when they stayed with the Corinthians or even before in the course of the mission to the Gentiles; and then, if so, one must ask where he took the "ingredients" from[30]. The other option is that the Apostle himself had received it at some point of his Christian life, maybe in Antioch or in Damascus, when he himself had been introduced into the tradition of the Christian faith and practice as a new believer[31], and that he had used it since likewise for the catechism of his converts[32]. The important point of such considerations is, of course, the question of the amount of the possible influence

---

[28] So Delling, "Mahlverständnis", 54; Klauck, *Kult*, 262 ("in der Katechese der hellenistischen Gemeinde beheimatet"); id., "Eucharistie", 232f; Lang, 127; Wolff, 51 ("vielleicht aus der Abendmahlsunterweisung"). Ellis' suggestion, however, of categorizing v.16 and similarly the paradosis in 11:23b-25 as "Jesus-Traditions" or as "teachings of the earthly Jesus" ("Traditions", 485-487) is not very convincing. For both traditions do not seem to be very much concerned with events in the life of 'Jesus' and speak either of the 'κύριος Ἰησοῦς' or of 'Christ'. It is further not really clear what Goppelt means with his description of v.16 as a "Formel für die Segnung und Spendung der Elemente" ("Abendmahlsgemeinschaft", 25).

[29] Robertson calls the tense of these verbs an "iterative or customary present" (880).

[30] That the tradition should have come to the Corinthians from some other source in the time after Paul's departure, and that he might have heard about it in a letter, is in principle possible, but quite improbable. One would have to explain why the Corinthians did not have some catechetical instruction on this issue before, although they already celebrated the Lord's Supper and had received the paradosis from the Apostle as well (11:23!).

[31] That would be Damascus (or Arabia, Gal 1:17; cf. Acts 9:1-25). We also doubt that Paul received the paradosis of the Lord's Supper to which he refers in 1 Corinthians, in Antioch (so Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 181). At least it leaves open the question how Paul then celebrated the Eucharist before he came to Antioch and what made him take over another tradition (if it differed anyhow). Presumably he received both Eucharist traditions already in Damascus; cf. Goppelt, *Theologie*, 261; and Lang, 157, 160.

[32] See Ellis who also notes these two possibilities for the origin of a tradition, the formulation by Paul or his co-workers or the transmission of antecedent material ("Traditions", 485).

of Jewish or Greek ideas and words on the tradition, especially concerning the concept of κοινωνία. A more Jewish (-Hellenistic) background would have to be expected in case of the second option - which seems the more likely to us, although one need not exclude Jewish influence either if one decided that the tradition had been created particularly for the Greek Gentile Christian churches.

However, to find out whether this first impression proves to be right or not, we must now investigate more closely the particular phrases of the tradition in v.16 and ask the question from where they possibly derived.

2.3.2 The Meaning of the Tradition in 1 Cor 10:16

When we now try to shed some light on the meaning of the presumably catechetical tradition, we begin with considering the subjects of the main clauses, the bread and the cup and their being broken and blessed, to continue then with their equivalents in the predicate, the body and the blood of Christ, before we finally deal with κοινωνία (ἐστιν) as the concept which in both cases relates the two corresponding elements[33].

2.3.2.1 The Bread and the Cup

In all the paradosis traditions which we find in the Synoptics and in Paul, the custom of breaking the bread and the prayer of benediction over the cup are integral parts. From the traditions themselves, which once existed independently as 1 Cor 11:23-25 shows, a derivation of the Lord's Supper is possible neither

[33] A brief look at the other Eucharist traditions, especially at 1 Cor 11:23b-25, confirms this approach of considering κοινωνία last. For we find all the other elements of 1 Cor 10:16 in these traditions as well, so that κοινωνία is the *proprium* here and must have been introduced for certain reasons, which an examination of the other, apparently constitutive elements of the Eucharist might help us to understand.

from the Jewish Passover[34] or the Toda meal[35] nor from the table fellowship after Easter with the risen Lord[36] or before, of Jesus with the tax collectors and sinners[37]. As far as the history of the tradition is concerned the only elements in the paradosis formula of the Lord's Supper which allow us to infer anything about the Last Supper, apart from the mention of the night before the κύριος (!) Ἰησοῦς was crucified (1 Cor 11:23), are the prayers over the bread and the wine, which were elements of **any** Jewish meal marking its beginning and its end[38].

"The bread which we break"[39] refers to an act which in Judaism ritually opened a meal and which was normally performed by the *pater familias*, the host or the head of the relevant party[40]. It was always connected to a prayer of thanksgiving and blessing[41] and was followed by the distribution and consumption of the κλάσματα. Yet, the κλᾶν τὸν ἄρτον could also, as *pars pro*

---

[34] Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 35-82; cf. Orr/Walther, 250-252. But see already Schlatter's objections to this thesis (324); cf. Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 149.

[35] See for instance H.Gese, "Die Herkunft des Herrenmahls", in id., *Zur Biblischen Theologie. Alttestamentliche Vorträge*, BEvT 78, Tübingen ²1983, 107-127.

[36] Hahn, "Thesen", 233.

[37] Cf. Roloff, "Heil", 180-186; id., *Neues Testament*, 217-219; Goppelt, *Theologie*, 263f; Hahn, "Thesen", 233f.

It must be also noted that a derivation of the Lord's Supper from the Hellenistic cults (so for for instance H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, Berlin, ³1955) can be surely excluded; see Delling, "Mahlverständnis", 48; Roloff, *Neues Testament*, 213f; Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 149. Cf. Käsemann, "Anliegen", 11f, who assumes some Hellenistic **influence** only; and similarly Klauck, for instance concerning the anamnesis in 1 Cor 11:24-25 (*Kult*, 317) or in 10:16 the concept of κοινωνία (260-262).

[38] See the large number of references in Hofius, "Paradosis", 211-216, who objects to the frequent thesis that wine was used only in the Jewish banquets or at the Passover feast, not in the daily meals as well, if it was available (213); see also Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 166-170; Goppelt, *Theologie*, 262, 477; Roloff, *Neues Testament*, 217; Banks, *Community*, 84f; Weiß, 257; and Str-B IV, 611-639.

[39] In the NT κλᾶν is only used for the breaking of the bread (cf. Jer 16:7; Lam 4:4 LXX).

[40] See Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 166, 168; and Hofius, "Paradosis", 211, with a number of references in n. 48; cf. also Str-B II, 619f; and IV, 621f.

[41] The semitic root ברך includes both, a notion of blessing and a notion of praising and thanksgiving. The most appropriate rendering might be the concept of benediction, from the Latin equivalent to εὐλογία. Apart from the paradosis formula in Matt 26:26; Mark 14:22 (both εὐλογήσας ἔκλασεν); Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor 11:24 (both εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν) we find this connection also in Matt 15:36; Mark 8:6 (both εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν); Matt 14:18; Mark 6:41; Luke 9:16; and 24:30; cf. John 6:11.

toto, describe this whole rite, and so the ὃν κλῶμεν in our case apparently includes an εὐλογοῦμεν which appears in the parallel sentence and also the distribution and consumption of the pieces of bread[42]. That the two verbs of the relative clauses stand for the **whole** ritual act which is connected to them, is also clear from their form in the first person plural[43]. For neither, of course, was the bread broken nor were the prayers spoken by the whole congregation ("we"), so that one may conclude that the active parts of those members who did not themselves pray or break and distribute the bread but who merely received and consumed the eucharistic gifts, are also included and meant in these verbs[44]. If we now compare 1 Cor 10:16 to what is said about the breaking of the bread in the other "Corinthian" tradition of the Eucharist, we do not find a great difference, at first glance. That 1 Cor 11:23b-25 employs the concept of εὐχαριστεῖν instead of εὐλογεῖν is not really a problem. The ritual which is described there in greater detail (ἔλαβεν ἄρτον καὶ εὐχαριστήσας ἔκλασεν) is exactly the same, for εὐχαριστεῖν and εὐλογεῖν could be used synonymously for the benediction prayers which marked the beginning and the end of each meal (cf. in Paul also 10:30; Rom 14:6)[45]. What this verbal difference might hint at,

---

[42] See Hofius, "Paradosis", 224; Klauck, *Kult*, 259f; Meyer, 240; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 56; Robertson/Plummer, 213; Weiß, 257; and Wolff, 53. But cf. also how κλᾶν τον ἄρτον later might have become a technical term for the whole celebration of the Lord's Supper, in Luke Acts 2:46; 20:7, 11; *Did.* 14:1; cf. the κλάσις τοῦ ἀρτοῦ in Luke 24:35 and Acts 2:42. A look at the Synoptic traditions is also helpful here, where the distribution of the κλάσματα, their reception (only Matt and Mark) and even their consumption (only Matt) are mentioned.

[43] The subject of the relative clauses ("we") implies more than just a general reference to the customs of the Christian church (in Corinth). It also seems to depict more precisely the subject of the concrete congregation as it is gathered to celebrate the Eucharist; the close association of the verbs with the elements of bread and wine by inverse attraction shows that it is more than a general statement. So one could render it as "we as we are gathered to celebrate the Lord's Supper".

[44] But on the other hand εὐλογοῦμεν and κλῶμεν further reveal that the majority of the mere recipients were understood, though as being more than passive spectators in some parts of the ritual, but rather as participants who were actually involved in the **whole** act.

[45] These two further instances where Paul mentions prayer before a meal are not enough, though, to allow us to conclude that εὐχαριστεῖν would be the word which is more typical for the Apostle (contra Willis, *Idol Meat*, 194). And neither is εὐλογεῖν a semitism nor εὐχαριστεῖν a distinctly Greek, and in connection with the Eucharist particularly Christian, phrase (so Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 167,178). Cf. passages such as Mark 8:6-7/Matt 15: 36 and Mark 14:22-23/Matt 26:26 where the two concepts are both used side by side without any recognizable difference; cf.

however, is that the formulation of the catechetical tradition did not build on the wording of the paradosis, but rather independently preserved another phraseology, though not another meaning. That is likely, at least, with regard to the part which deals with bread and wine. And it could be a point against the possibility that Paul himself constructed this tradition, when he at the same time must count as the one who also passed on the paradosis and could thus be expected to make the catechetical material match with the other.

Similarly "the cup of the benediction which we benedict[46]" refers to the same cup and to the same act which 11:25 describes[47]. The ποτήριον which the κύριος Ἰησοῦς took and over which he prayed μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι[48] is the ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας as it is fully designated in 1 Cor 10:16, the כּוֹס שֶׁל בְּרָכָה, which normally indicated the end of any Jewish meal[49]. It is striking, however, that this technical term occurs in none of the other Eucharist traditions and nowhere else in the NT or even in the LXX[50]. The only other Greek parallels are in JosAs 8:9 and 19:5[51], in a Jewish-Hellenistic novel, written in the first

---

also Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieverständnis*, 56f; and the excursus in Str-B IV, 611-639.

[46] A proper translation of the phrase is fairly difficult. One can use either renderings like "thanksgiving", "blessing" and "praising" and then have a corresponding verb but lose the full meaning of εὐλογεῖν/εὐλογία, or on the other hand choose the Latin equivalent of "benediction" and then invent the relevant verb which does not exist in English.

[47] The adverb ὡσαύτως in 11:25 refers back to the preceding verse, so that one must add: ἔλαβεν ... καὶ εὐχαριστήσας; cf. Hofius, "Paradosis", 211f, especially nn. 44 and 49; Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 169f; Wolff, 91. The article before ποτήριον (cf. the parallel but indefinite ἄρτον) is another way in which this special cup could be emphasized in the rabbinic tradition as **the** cup (Hofius, ibid., 212; Jeremias, ibid., 106).

[48] This adverbial phrase refers to the ἔλαβεν ... καὶ εὐχαριστήσας which must be added to complete the sense of ὡσαύτως and cannot be a prepositional phrase qualifying ποτήριον, for it would require another τό; see Hofius' detailed discussion of the phenomenon and of the meaning of the phrase ("Paradosis", 208-216).

[49] In the Passover ritual that would be the third cup (cf. Str-B IV, 72).

[50] Εὐλογεῖν with accusative in the sense of a benediction before a meal is also rare. It depicts a rendering of the rabbinic phrase ברך (pi) + עַל. See 1 Sam 9:13 and 1QSa 2:19-20 (Hofius, "Paradosis", 228).

[51] Burchard, "Importance", 125; cf. 110; Barrett further mentions JosAs 8:5; 15:5; and 16:6 (231).

century before or after Christ[52], which tells the story of the conversion of Aseneth, the daughter of the Egyptian highpriest, when she met Joseph (cf. Gen 41:45, 50; 46:20) and left her pagan religion. Although there is apparently no literary relation between the occurrence of the term in the two works, it could still hint at a similar religious sphere of Hellenistic diaspora Judaism and at a Jewish background to our tradition, where the old terminology and distinct designation of the cup had been preserved more than in the other traditions[53]. That "the cup of the benediction" is a fixed phrase further indicates that the relative clause ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, which picks up the preceding concept of εὐλογία, is not a superfluous tautology[54]. Like the parallel κλῶμεν the phrase has an important function as it stands for the whole ritual act of prayer over the cup, distribution and consumption of the wine[55]. Whether it should further point particularly to the **Christian** eucharistic prayer, in opposition to the Jewish custom[56], is not obvious at least, and rather unlikely[57]. In general one can say that there were surely structural similarities, due to the Jewish setting in which the Christian rite was instituted, and probably a basic common understanding of the benedictions as "consecrating" the in itself profane elements of bread and

---

[52] See Burchard, "Importance", 104; and generally this whole article, his *Untersuchungen*; and the introduction in his edition of the novel in JSHRZ II/4. See also Klauck (*Kult*, 187-196) who assumes the derivation of some of the "Schlüsselbegriffe" in JosAs from the Hellenistic mystery cults (196), however.

[53] That on the other hand the full terminology was used in order to elucidate the actual origin and meaning of the cup for non-Jewish converts, who lacked the relevant knowledge, is not as likely. For, if in all the other traditions a mere τὸ ποτήριον could do, which is surely not as clear, there was seemingly not a great need for such distinctions of different cups.

[54] Contra Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieverständnis*, 55; and Orr/Walther, 250; but see Wolff, 52; and cf. Hofius, "Paradosis", 228.

[55] It was not the cup that was the object of the benediction (contra Goppelt, who further finds here a deliberate differentiation from the Jewish rite: *Theologie*, 477) but rather the wine (mixed with water) which it included; τὸ ποτήριον is a metonymy where the container stands for the content (Hofius, "Paradosis", 224; Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 162) as is also obvious from the correspondence to αἷμα.

[56] Goppelt, *Theologie*, 477; Grosheide, 231; Hofius, "Paradosis", 228; and Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieverständnis*, 56. Cf. Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 21; Schlatter, 295f; and Wolff, 52.

[57] Not the verb εὐλογοῦμεν as such, but only its subject ("we", the Christian community), points to a Christian benediction. If the phrase was supposed to have an anti-Jewish nuance one would not expect such a particularly Jewish wording.

wine and lifting them into a somehow sacred status which they had not had by nature before[58]. The **content**, though, of the Christian prayers was different, of course, and apparently included a praising proclamation of Christ's work of salvation and maybe a reference to his body and blood[59], so that bread and wine in the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον accordingly conveyed something fundamentally different from what the participants of the Jewish meal received. But κλῶμεν and εὐλογοῦμεν alone are no basis for such assumptions.

These two relative clauses, however, mark a most remarkable difference between 1 Cor 10:16 and 11:23-25. For the catechetical tradition does not report a **past** event as does the paradosis (note the aorist) but generally speaks of an **actual** and seemingly repeated event (present tense); it does not describe, either, an action of the "**Lord Jesus**" but of the **congregation** as a whole. So, the first parts of the parallelism do not refer to what happened at the **Last Supper** of the κύριος Ἰησοῦς ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο - that is rather assumed - but to what happens again and again when the congregation comes together to celebrate the **Lord's Supper**, the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον (11:20), at the τράπεζα κυρίου (10:21).

---

[58] See for instance Burchard's considerations on parallel phrases in JosAs 8:5 (cf. 8:9; 15:5; 16:14-16; 19:5; 21:13-14). According to him the ἄρτος εὐλογουμένος ζωῆς, the ποτήριον εὐλογουμένον ἀναστασίας and the χρίσμα εὐλογουμένον ἀφθαρσίας are not special kinds of food, drink and ointment, but receive their distinct quality and effect of life and immortality through the εὐλογεῖν, thus through the ordinary benedictions which a Jew speaks over food, drink and oil, which is "the proper Jewish use of the things" ("Importance", 113; cf. 105-118). Concerning the Christian rite Burchard concludes: "what gave the cup its power to impart a share of the New Covenant was the blessing pronounced over it, just as in JosAs the blessing enabled the bread, cup and ointment to convey eternal life" (126). Cf. Allo, 238; Banks, *Community*, 85; Goppelt, *Theologie*, 477f; Hofius, "Paradosis", 228; and Klauck, *Kult*, 260. How the Corinthians understood that act of "consecration" in the Lord's Supper is therefore not clear; cf. for instance Wedderburn's remarks on the terminology of 1 Cor 10:3-4 (πνευματικὸν βρῶμα and πόμα) which might depict or allude to traditional or customary phrases (*Baptism*, 241-248).

[59] See Hofius' convincing interpretation of the meaning and function of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν in 11:24 and 25. He understands these phrases and likewise the Pauline statement in 11:26 as references to the eucharistic prayers which therefore were a proclamation (καταγγελία) of the θανάτου τοῦ κυρίου, "der seinen 'Leib' den Seinen zugute in den Tod gegeben hat und in dessen Sühnetod (='Blut') die eschatologische Heilsordnung konstituiert ist" ("Paradosis", 230; see 227-238). Cf. Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 158-160; Goppelt, *Theologie*, 477f; und Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 241, 243f.

2.3.2.2 The Body and Blood of Christ

Our next step is now to investigate the meaning of the elements which correspond to the bread and blood in 1 Cor 10:16, τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ and τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ. Although these concepts are merely the genitive attributes of the complement of the predicate (κοινωνία ἐστιν) of the main clause, we deal with them at first apart from this relation, and we can do so because they originally existed on their own, as all the other Eucharist traditions in the NT show. So we can expect to come closer to an understanding of κοινωνία which apparently was introduced into this context of the Eucharist, if we understand the concepts to which it was attached. The concept of κοινωνία always describes a relation of two or more parts, and in order to explain the kind and quality of that relation an investigation of the connected objects or subjects is required first.

In no other letter does the concept of σῶμα occur so often as in 1 Corinthians[60]. And still, these other instances are of little help (apart from 1 Cor 11:23-29), for they more or less reflect **Paul's** usage, and even the occurrence of σῶμα in the immediately following verse cannot explain the initial meaning of the same word in the preceding pre-Pauline tradition which has its origin in the words uttered at the Lord's Supper, on which we therefore have to focus. In all the paradosis formulae in the Synoptics and in Paul we find Christ relating the broken bread to his body: τοῦτό (μού)[61] ἐστιν τὸ σῶμά μου[62]. In

---

[60] The 45 instances of σῶμα in 1 Corinthians are more than in all the other Pauline letters together (Rom, 13; 2 Cor, 8; Gal, 1; Phil, 3; 1 Thess, 1; cf. Eph, 9; Col, 8). But this high frequency is also due to the topics which Paul deals with in this letter, fornication in chap. 6 or resurrection of the body in chap. 15; and the large number in chap. 12 (18 times) has its reason in Paul's extensive comparison of the Christian community with an organism (cf. our excursus below).

[61] Only the Pauline version (1 Cor 11:24) has the possessive pronoun put first and thus emphasized; similarly the possessive adjective ἐμῷ in the parallel clause (11:25). So, not the body and the blood as such are important, but that they are the body and the blood of the κύριος Ἰησοῦς! The τοῦτο instead of the correct οὗτος - according to the masculine ἄρτος - is an attraction to the neuter σῶμα and might further express the close relation of the broken bread and Christ's body.

[62] Hofius emphasizes that Jesus' words are no **interpretative** words (*Deuteworte* - as for instance in the Passover liturgy) but that they are closely attached to Christ's **distribution** of the gifts of bread and wine; the participants at the meal receive not only bread and wine, but actually

the catechetical tradition we accordingly have σῶμα **Χριστοῦ**, for it is not Christ but his church talking here (cf. "we" in the relative clauses). Yet, both types of tradition are referring to the same body, for the **κύριος Ἰησοῦς** who, according to the paradosis, distributed the broken bread as his body ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ᾗ παρεδίδετο (11:23), is no other than the **Χριστός** of 1 Cor 10:16, at least for Paul as the mention of the ποτήριον κυρίου and the τράπεζα κυρίου in 10:21, which is constructed in parallel to v.16, reveals[63]. If we further consider that the use of κύριος Ἰησοῦς in 11:23b, which recalls the confessional formulae in 1 Cor 12:3 and Rom 10:9, demonstrates the early church's conviction that the crucified Jesus is no other than the risen and exalted Lord (cf. Rom 14:14; 1 Thess 2:15; and 4:14-15), it is even more doubtful that the σῶμα of "Christ" could be another than the σῶμα of the "Lord Jesus". So there is no reason, for instance, to interpret the body in 1 Cor 10:16 as a reference to the pneumatic body of the exalted Christ[64], as if it would not be one with the body of the martyred Christ[65]. Even more questionable is an explanation of σῶμα Χριστοῦ as

---

Christ's body and blood ("Paradosis", 224f). Cf. Bornkamm: "hier wird in direkter Prädikation ein Dargereichtes bezeichnet" ("Herrenmahl", 156). Hofius opts for *Gabeworte* (words of giving) as the more appropriate term (ibid., 205, n. 10; following O. Bayer, *Promissio. Geschichte der reformatorischen Wende in Luther's Theologie*, FKDG 24, Göttingen, 1971, 212, n. 62), and refers to JosAs 16:4 (τοῦτο τὸ κηρίον ἐστὶ πνεῦμα ζωῆς) as the only actual and formal analogy to this phenomenon in 1 Cor 11:24-25 (and 10:16); ibid., 225. Cf. Burchard on this passage in JosAs ("Importance", 114-118); and Klauck, *Kult*, 187-196.

[63] Cf. 10:22; and 11:26-27; and cf. Χριστός in 10:4 and 9. See also κύριος in Paul's own introduction to the paradosis in 11:23a.

[64] So Soden, "Sakrament", 26f; and Hainz, (*Kirche*, 21) for whom κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος/αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ is a Pauline phrase. Cf. also George, *Communion*, 172; Käsemann, "Anliegen", 20, 33 (but cf. id., "Motiv", 192-194); Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 40; and Schmitz, who understands σῶμα in V.16 **and** v.17 "im Sinne einer einheitlichen Größe, in der der κύριος und die Seinen zu einer 'mystischen Einheit' geworden sind" (*Christus-Gemeinschaft*, 175).

[65] Yet it is also questionable to understand σῶμα as a reference **only** to "the once-for-all death of **Jesus** under Pilate" (Willis, *Idol Meat*, 200; bold type by G.H.), as if he would not be the risen and exalted Christ who is present in his church. Similarly doubtful is the interpretation which takes σῶμα as a reference to Christ's 'self' and only αἷμα as pointing to his death (Berger, "Kirche", 204); see therefore Conzelmann's objections (*Theologie*, 73); and especially Gundry's detailed examination of the meaning of σῶμα in Biblical Theology. He concludes that σῶμα can represent but never mean the whole person (*SŌMA*, 29-80) and that the term generally "denotes the physical body, roughly synonymous with 'flesh' in the neutral sense" (50).

referring to, or implying a notion of, the church as the body of Christ[66]. In both Eucharist traditions which are quoted in 1 Corinthians the concept of σῶμα rather means the one and only body of the εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός through whom all things exist (1 Cor 8:6)[67] and who ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς καὶ ... ἐτάφη καὶ ... ἐγήγερται τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ τρίτῃ κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς (1 Cor 15:3b-4)[68]. That σῶμα Χριστοῦ contains a special reference to the event of the crucifixion and thus to the vicarious death of Christ[69], however, is obvious in 1 Cor 10:16 from the parallel with αἷμα Χριστοῦ, and in the four paradosis formulae even more from their narrative context and from the various attributes which determine σῶμα there: the setting of the meal in each version is the night of the betrayal and thus the night before the execution, so that bread and wine as Christ's gifts of his body and blood depict a prolepsis of, and have their basis in, what was going to happen the following day. Only in the light of the crucifixion and of the resurrection was the great significance of the Last Supper and of the eucharistic words of Jesus fully understood[70]. So, the prepositional attribute τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν in Paul and Luke determines the σῶμα of

---

[66] This position is held especially by those commentators who regard v.17 as a key for the interpretation of v.16, which is methodologically highly questionable as we showed above and will continue to do when we consider the relation of the two verses below. But see Barrett, 233; Hainz, *Kirche*, 25f, 30-33, 53-46, although for him the actual ecclesiological concept is κοινωνία; cf. also Conzelmann, 203; Ellis, "Traditions", 487; and Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 61.

[67] 1 Cor 8:6 is a tradition as well. Similarly in 1 Cor 1:3, which also depicts traditional language, the attributes occur side by side without any difference in meaning (see Kramer, *Christ*, 191f, who assumes Christian worship as the origin of such a full designation of **Christ** as the **Lord Jesus**: 153).

[68] In this clearly traditional passage "Χριστός" does not refer to the resurrected Christ only but to the one who suffered death and was buried as well.

[69] See Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 164; Delling, "Abendmahlsgeschehen", 324; Grosheide, 232; Hofius, "Paradosis", 225; Klauck, *Kult*, 261; Schlatter, 296f; and Wolff, 53; cf. Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 173, but see also 61; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 38; and cf. Conzelmann, 202; and Willis, *Idol Meat*, 198f, 208.

[70] The paradosis is no report of one of the last events in Jesus' life, as the setting in the Synoptic passion narratives and likewise the few introductory words in 1 Cor 11:23b reveal; apart from "κύριος Ἰησοῦς" which we mentioned already see παρεδίδετο which might be a divine passive (see Wolff, 85), similar to Rom 4:25 - another pre-Pauline tradition (cf. Rom 8:32; Gal 2:20; but also 2 Cor 4:11; Eph 5:2, 25; and Isa 53:6, 10, 12). Any search for the original words of Jesus is therefore difficult, if not impossible, and maybe not really important. One cannot say more than that the paradosis tradition is presented as originating from the κύριος, that Paul presumably did not intervene in the wording and that it could be translated back into Aramaic.

Christ and thus his death as an atoning and reconciling sacrifice[71], which is further emphasized in Luke 22:19[72] by the passive participle δεδόμενον, and by κλωμένον in some MSS of 1 Cor 11:24, which is the only instance in the NT where the pre-supper ritual of breaking the bread is directly related to Christ's body as being "broken"[73]. So, we may conclude that τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ in 1 Cor 10:16 refers to the body of Christ who was crucified for our sake and is yet the risen and exalted Lord[74].

The concept of αἷμα occurs much more rarely in Paul than σῶμα[75], only two more times apart from the Lord's Supper passages (1 Cor 10:16; 11:25, 27), in Rom 3:25 - presumably also a pre-Pauline tradition[76], and in Rom 5:9. Yet if

---

[71] Cf. other passages in Paul which employ this or similar ὑπέρ- phrases, such as Rom 5:6-8; 8:32 (!); 14:15; 1 Cor 1:13; 15:3; 2 Cor 5:14-15, 21; Gal 2:20; 3:13; 1 Thess 5:10; but see also Eph 5:25 (!); 1 Tim 2:6; Titus 2:14; and in the context of the Eucharist further Mark 14:24; and Luke 22:20. According to Klauck the tradition of the Lord's Supper is the primary *Sitz im Leben* of the ὑπέρ- phrases (*Kult*, 307); cf. Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 162f.

Concerning reconciliation and atonement cf. especially Hofius' "Sühne und Versöhnung", where he builds on H. Gese's investigation of the OT concept of atonement (H.Gese, "Die Sühne", in id., *Zur Biblischen Theologie. Alttestamentliche Vorträge*, BEvT 78, München, 1977, 85-106) and convincingly objects to a common misunderstanding of Christ's sacrifical death merely as an act of satisfaction and propitiation which should temper God's wrath. Yet it was not God that had to be changed, but the sinner. And atonement must be understood in terms of identification and inclusion where the "enemies of God" (cf. Rom 5:8-10) died with Christ and were thus made new. So Christ's vicarious death can be called an act of inclusive representation (*includierende Stellvertretung*; cf. "Sühne und Versöhnung", 44); cf. also id., "Erwägungen zur Gestalt und Herkunft des Paulinische Versöhnungsgedankens", in id., *Pauluststudien*, WUNT 51, Tübingen, 1989, 1-14; and Tannehill's, *Dying and Rising* which also concludes that the death of Christ was understood as "an inclusive event" (70; cf. 110); see further H.-J. Findeis' detailed investigations and conclusions in his *Versöhnung - Apostolat - Kirche. Eine exegetisch-theologische und rezeptionsgeschichtliche Studie zu den Versöhnungsaussagen des Neuen Testaments (2 Kor, Röm, Kol, Eph)*, FB 40, Würzburg, 1983. The wording of our traditions of the Lord's Supper, however, might reveal that this understanding of Christ's death as an act of atonement was not merely a Pauline speciality!

[72] Also in the coptic MSS of 1 Cor 11:24.

[73] The MSS which added κλῶμεν are ℵ² C³ D² F G Ψ M and the Syriac tradition. The additional θρυπτόμενον in D* is a similar interpretation. All these participles seemingly must be understood as divine passives; cf. παράδοσις in 1 Cor 11:23b.

[74] Paul further mentions the body of the crucified and resurrected Christ (as the mode of "our" dying to the law) in Rom 7:4; cf. also 1 Cor 11:27 (σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου) and 29.

[75] For Willis this is another hint that 1 Cor 10:16 depicts a tradition (*Idol Meat*, 194).

[76] See Stuhlmacher, *Röm*, 57; and Eichholz, *Umriß*, 191, 196f; and Michel, who further presumes a connection to the Lord's Supper (*Röm*, 150-154).

one compares the formulations in Rom 3:25; 5:9; (Eph 2:13)[77] and in the paradosis formulae of Luke and Paul one can observe something like a common pattern of reference to the blood of Christ (**ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ/αὐτοῦ αἵματι** μου/αὐτοῦ/τοῦ Χριστοῦ) which could hint at a common origin of this ἐν with dative construction, presumably in the traditions of the Lord's Supper. Concerning αἷμα in the eucharistic traditions in the Synoptics and in Paul we can reconfirm what we emphasized for τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ already, that similarly τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ has no other subject and meaning in the catechetical tradition than the αἷμα of the κύριος Ἰησοῦς in the four paradosis traditions. These four aetiologies, however, differ much more from one another in their statements on Christ's blood than in the case of his body. Although in all of them αἷμα is an integral and fundamental part it has yet a different position and function; one can distinguish two main lines: Mark and Matthew have τοῦτό (γάρ) ἐστιν τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης ..., in principle constructed analogously to the σῶμα word[78]; but Luke and Paul have τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη ἐστιν ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι (μου) ..., which is not parallel to the preceding σῶμα word[79]. Which one of these two patterns (cup/blood of the covenant; or cup/new covenant in my blood) depicts the older version can

---

[77] Cf. Eph 1:7; Col 1:20. The blood of Christ is an important theological concept in the NT although it is generally not very frequent; cf. also Matt 27:4, 24-25; John 6:53-56; 19:24; Acts 20:28; Heb 9:12, 14; 10:19, 29; 12:24; 1 Pet 1:2, 19; 1 John 1:7; 5:6, (8); Rev 1:5; 5:9; 7:14; 12:11; (19:13).

[78] At least in this point the tradition in 1 Cor 10:16 seems to show a certain relation to the traditions which these two Synoptic authors used.

[79] This difference in the wine word is just one of a number of differences which allow the conclusion that in general we have two strains of tradition reflected in the paradosis formulae, in which on the one hand Paul and Luke and on the other Mark and Matthew went together. The differences are most obvious in the eucharistic words themselves: see for instance the additional invitation in Mark and Matthew to take (and in Matthew also to consume) bread and wine; or τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν as an attribute to σῶμα in Paul and to σῶμα and αἷμα in Luke (expanded by διδόμενον and ἐκχυννόμενον) - where Mark has the ὑπὲρ (Matthew περὶ) πολλῶν phrase as an attribute to αἷμα only (plus ἐκχυννόμενον in Mark and Matthew); and further the anamnesis command which only Paul and Luke have in the bread word and Paul again (slightly expanded) also in the wine word, but which is missing completely in Mark and Matthew. Cf. finally also the eschatological outlook in the Synoptics, of which only a faint reflection can be seen in Paul's brief commentary following the paradosis (1 Cor 11:26). For further details and considerations of the traditio-historical background see the investigation - with helpful synoptic tables - in Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, especially 90-99, 105-108, 132-195; and see also the good analysis in Delling, "Mahlverständnis", 47-55.

hardly be reconstructed[80] and probably the process of tradition went independent ways here quite early. Yet, the differences are not as great as it might seem at first glance. Both patterns of the αἷμα word in the paradosis formulae show a certain formal disagreement and expansion[81] compared to the preceding statement about the bread and Christ's σῶμα, for they both employ a combination of blood and (new[82]) covenant. Further, as regards content, the wine word in all four paradosis traditions and likewise in 1 Cor 10:16 depicts a strong and clear reference to the sacrificial death of Christ, the crucified and yet risen and exalted Lord. Like the two (pre-) Pauline instances in Romans, αἷμα indicates atonement and reconciliation of the former enemies of God, who himself accomplished forgiveness for the sinners and thus realized their justification - "in the blood" of his Son, shed ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν at the cross (cf. Rom 3:21-26; 5:8-10)[83]. The various attributes of αἷμα in the Eucharist traditions

---

[80] See Delling, "Mahlverständnis", 48, 51; and Hofius, "Paradosis", 205. Among many, Jeremias (*Abendmahlsworte*, 165, 178, 181) and Goppelt (*Theologie*, 261) decided in favour of the Markan tradition. That the Pauline paradosis could represent not only the oldest written version, but might have a certain primacy also in the history of the tradition must be emphasized, however, even more so as the debated τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν could easily have derived from a Semitic ambience and language, as Hofius showed (see above); cf. Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 168f.

[81] If one takes into account that between the two words with which Christ, according to the paradosis distributed bread and wine in the night before his execution lay a whole meal (note the μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι in 1 Cor 11:25 and Luke 22:20), such disagreements in the structure of the two words are not surprising. Even more so as the Lord's Supper was still celebrated in that way in Corinth (see Hofius, who convincingly objects to a common misinterpretation of 1 Cor 11:17-33; "Paradosis", 208-223; Lampe's most recent reconstruction of the background of that passage suggests an order according to the Graeco-Roman evening meal ["Mahlpraxis"], but is really only another variation of the old theories; his references to ancient writers sometimes seem to be a bit unsystematic and too little differentiated, and his conclusions seem to be highly hypothetical, neglecting the Jewish background of the aetiology in 1 Cor 11 too much; unfortunately he also does not discuss or mention Hofius). So a more parallel structuring of these words of distribution, as it is reflected in the formulae in Mark and Matthew, could hint at a later stage of the history of the tradition, when the Lord's Supper began to develop out of its origin in the setting of an evening δεῖπνον (cf. Jude 12; *Did.* 9 and 10; and cf. later for instance Hippolytus' *Traditio Apostolica*). Luke may, probably for some narrative reason, have preserved the more ancient form. The perfect parallism in the tradition which we find in 1 Cor 10:16 would then be due to its use presumably in the catechetical instruction of the neophytes of the early church. Yet such considerations will remain more or less likely speculations.

[82] The καινὴ διαθήκη in Luke and Paul is an allusion to the promise of Jer 31:31-34; cf. also Exod 24:6-11; Lev 24: 7-8; Jer 32:40; and Zech 9:11. Cf. in 2 Cor 5:14-21 the close relation of Christ's death ὑπὲρ παντῶν (5:14-15,21; cf. 1 Cor 11:24) and the καινὴ κτίσις (17).

[83] See Eichholz, *Umriß*, 188-202; and Hofius, "Sühne und Versöhnung", 33-39.

speak the same language, most obviously in Matt 26:28, where Christ's blood is characterized as τὸ περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχυννόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν[84].

Comparing now the results concerning τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ to our conclusions concerning τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ and to our previous considerations on bread and cup, we find that the message of the two corresponding sentences in each of the five traditions of the Lord's Supper is basically identical and that the parallel clauses actually depict a union[85]. So we may conclude that the catechetical tradition in 1 Cor 10:16 in agreement with all the other Eucharist traditions contains a statement on the significance of Christ's atoning death[86] in the form of a **synonymous *parallelismus membrorum***[87], although only in the case of 1 Cor 10:16 we have a nearly complete parallelism not only in content, but in structure as well.

Yet a word must be said about the striking feature that the two types of

---

[84] One has to note, of course, that this formulation is most likely due to the - presumably liturgical - shaping of the early church, as a subsequent and thus really more precise expression of Christ's words as they had been passed on. Mark's ὑπὲρ πολλῶν might be older than Matthew's version for it is closer to the other strain of tradition and apparently alludes to Isa 53:11-12.

[85] Contra Conzelmann who doubts the correlation of σῶμα and αἷμα, for Paul would already think of the ecclesiological σῶμα (203) - that is how Conzelmann understands v.17. And see his *Theologie* where he points out that each of the two parts of the rite depicted "eine vollgültige Mitteilung" (73); cf. similarly Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 161f. It is correct, of course, that the two statements need not be added in a synthetic manner. Yet, that they do not differ in their intention and must not be understood separately either - although in the beginning still separated by a δεῖπνον - is the obvious conviction of the early church's catechism (1 Cor 10:16). Still, Hahn wants to detect a kind of climax from αἷμα (Christ's sacrificial death) to σῶμα (Christ's resurrection) and finally in v.17 even to the "konkreten Wirklichkeit der eschatologisch neuen Schöpfung". An important reason for such exegetical errors is obviously the disregard of the traditional character of v.16. Finally, Fee's doubtful assumption that the cup would refer to a vertical (Christ - Christian), the bread to a horizontal (Christians) dimension (467), may have similar roots.

[86] It must be emphasized, however, that none of the traditions of the Lord's Supper, nor the parenetical context of 1 Cor 10:16 as an argument against idolatry, allow the conclusion that the Eucharist was understood as "un repas de sacrifice" (Allo, 237, 239). And the parallel concepts of σῶμα and αἷμα in 1 Cor 10:16 do not reflect a development in the early church's understanding in comparison to 11:24-25 and thus a focus on the gifts as "Opfermaterien" (Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 169f) or "geopferte Speisen" (Hainz, *Kirche*, 34; cf. 24 where he concludes on the basis of the parallels with the pagan meals in 1 Cor 10 that the Lord's Supper similarly was understood as an *Opfermahlzeit*). See therefore George who strongly rejects such assumptions (*Communion*, 173); and cf. also Fee, 468; Hahn, "Thesen", 235; and Willis, *Idol Meat*, 207f.

[87] See also Delling, "Abendmahlsgeschehen", 324; Grosheide, 232; Hofius, "Paradosis", 225f; Lang, 127, 157; Schlatter: "eine einzige Handlung", 295; and Wolff, 53.

tradition which Paul quotes in 1 Corinthians, on two distinct occasions and only a few verses apart from each other, still differ so much in their wording[88]. The best explanation, to us, however, is that they had in general a common origin, but a different function in a different *Sitz im Leben*. For the purpose of catechism a simpler form was created which was easier to memorize and understand, although it did not intend to reinterpret what had been passed on to the early church as the words of Christ. One must further note that the catechetical tradition actually dealt more with the Lord's Supper which was celebrated in the Christian Church than with the Last Supper of the Lord, as was the case with the aetiology[89]. Therefore it is less likely, although possible, that the catechetical tradition should have derived from the different type of formula which Mark and Matthew also display and which then would have existed alongside the other strain which Paul and Luke have[90], so that Paul knew both kinds and combined them in the "arsenal" of his traditions[91]. Yet, the most simple and conclusive explanation remains, for us, that the catchetical tradition and the paradosis have a singular background, but that their distinct form is due to a different function, and that Paul received them both at the beginning of his Christian life and later passed them on to his own converts.

---

[88] The differences are all in the wine word: the fuller designation of the cup, the appropriate concept for the benediction in the relative clause and αἷμα as the parallel to σῶμα instead of the reference to the new covenant.

[89] It is rather problematic therefore, to regard 1 Cor 10:16 as an "interpretation" of the aetiology, or of the τοῦτό ἐστιν in 11:24-25 - so Hainz, *Kirche*, 23; Klauck, *Kult*, 262; id., "Eucharistie", 333; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 172; cf. Käsemann, "Anliegen", 28; and Bornkamm who speaks of a "Kommentar" ("Herrenmahl",157), for the catechetical tradition does not actually deal with the paradosis, as the differences reveal, but might rather assume it. 1 Cor 11:23-25 explains more **how** the Last Supper **was** celebrated and **why** the church still celebrates the Eucharist; 10:16 on the other hand explains **what** the Eucharist **actually** means for the celebrating congregation, what significance it has for them.

[90] Note that there still remain quite a few differences between the Markan version and the catechism, which are all in the wine word as well: Mark has εὐχαριστεῖν for the benediction of the cup where 1 Cor 10:16 has precisely the other term (εὐλογεῖν) with the "cup of benediction" and further lacks the reference to the covenant.

[91] Wolff, who holds this second position of a common origin of the paradosis formula in Mark/Matthew and of 1 Cor 10:16 (cf. Klauck, "Eucharistie", 333), rightly notes, however, that Mark/Matthew was neither influenced by, nor derived from, the catechetical tradition (51). It is more likely and natural that a catechism builds on an aetiological tradition than the other way round.

2.3.2.3 The Concept of Κοινωνία

The lengthy approach to the concept of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 10:16 was necessary in order to understand the particular meaning of this term, which is without doubt, in comparison to the other Eucharist traditions, the *proprium* here, apart from the tense and subject of the relative clauses, and which further appears as a keyword in the context in which Paul quoted this tradition (cf. κοινωνοί in 1 Cor 10:18 and 20). A deduction of the meaning of κοινωνία was not possible via Paul or the actual context of 1 Cor 10:16, because of the pre-Pauline origin of this piece of catechism, but only via a consideration of the concepts which are immediately related to κοινωνία within the tradition and which we also found in the relevant and likewise pre-Pauline (and pre-Synoptic) paradosis formulae of the Lord's Supper. And one must further consider that the concept "κοινωνία" - no different from its possible English renderings such as "fellowship", "participation", "association" or "communion" - is in itself a very undefined and somewhat colourless term which in itself describes no more than some kind of relation of one or more subjects and/or objects[92]. The particular quality of that relation therefore largely depends on the factors which are involved[93], and for this reason we examined those first[94]. Another problem, however, which must be considered because of the traditional origin of the verse is the further conceptual and traditio-historical background of κοινωνία. And we will return to this issue at the end of this chapter. But our first and next task will be to put together all the bits and pieces of our analysis so far, to consider

---

[92] Κοινωνία is an abstract noun deriving from the verb κοινωνεῖν and from the adjective κοινωνός. Even in those instances where κοινωνία depicts a more or less fixed term and does not explicitly express a relation (cf. for instance Rom 15:26; or the absolute forms in Acts 2:42; Heb 13:16; and cf. Gal 2:9), the relation of two parts is still the basic idea which is implied.

[93] Elert has pointed to the fact that κοινωνία is an ambigous and multifunctional word and that its meaning largely depends on the meaning of the concepts to which it is related (*Kirchengemeinschaft*, 5, 9); and cf. Willis' statement that κοινωνία is "not used in a univocal sense by Paul" (*Idol Meat*, 209).

[94] Cf. Schnackenburg who also emphasizes the importance of the relevant context of κοινωνία as he considers it "eine noch nicht erschöpfte Aufgabe ..., die Verwendung des Begriffsfeldes im Neuen Testament gemäß dem jeweiligen Kontext zu prüfen und daraus Folgerungen theologischer Art abzuleiten." ("Koinonia-Gedanken", 55).

the general grammatical and semantic structure of 1 Cor 10:16 and the particular position, function and meaning of κοινωνία therein.

We recall the grammatical structure first. The subject of the main clause is ὁ ἄρτος[95]. Yet, because of the close attachment of the attributive relative clause (ὃν κλῶμεν) to this subject, by inverse attraction, one should regard this first part of the sentence as a unit and take the whole phrase as the subject, although a certain emphasis remains on the bread. So the subject is actually more than just the noun, but, in combination with the relative clause where τὸν ἄρτον is the object of an action of the congregation, the subject of the main clause eventually involves and includes the whole eucharistic rite - the bread which we break. The predicate of the main clause is formed by the verb ἐστίν which is complemented by the noun κοινωνία. A bit controversial, however, is the analysis of the last part of the sentence, the attribute to κοινωνία, the genitive τοῦ σώματος (τοῦ Χριστοῦ), whether it is subjective or objective. The subjective solution which would make the body of Christ the subject - not of a κοινωνία of those who break the bread with each other[96] but of a κοινωνία of the body of

---

[95] Because of the parallelism and in order to simplify the following passage, we will refer to the "bread which we break" and to "the body of Christ" only, from now on. The results then include the corresponding statement about the cup and the blood as well.

[96] That is presumably the most fundamental error in Willis' interpretation of 1 Cor 10:14-21. He understands κοινωνία as an association of the members of the church as they are gathered together for the celebration of the Lord's Supper, an exclusive fellowship because of its peculiar qualification by the σῶμα and αἷμα of Christ. "Κοινωνία means the relationship established among members of a covenant and the obligations ensuing from it" (*Idol Meat*, 209). Willis' conclusions build on the preceding exegesis of vv.18 and 19-20 where he finds κοινωνοί referring to associations among worshippers as well. Similarly impossible is Currie's suggestion to which Willis also refers and according to which κοινωνία is "a vehicle for that part of ḥesed which speaks of the claims of the fraternal bond within the covenant" (*Literature*, 42); Currie therefore renders 1 Cor 10:16 as "alliance of the body of Christ" (45). Both interpretations, however, are wrong. Their explanations and renderings in terms of a subjective genitive (that is at least what they apparently intended), would require another grammatical structure and wording: the association among the members of the church could be expressed for instance in an absolute use of κοινωνία (cf. Gal 2:9; and Acts 2:42) or with a dative construction (κοινωνία ἀλλήλοις). But κοινωνία with a genitive always means that the subject or object which the genitive describes is a part of, and directly involved in, the relation of κοινωνία. Therefore κοινωνία τοῦ σῶματος can only mean a relation between σῶμα and something/someone else, of whatever sort. Cf. Hauck on the constructions which are possible with κοινωνία, and their meaning (*TWNT*, 798f).

Christ with the bread (which is broken)[97], bears little probability. For such a construction usually requires that the object of κοινωνία is expressed either in the dative (κοινωνία τινός τινί) or by a prepositional phrase (with εἰς, μετά or πρός)[98], none of which we have here. And furthermore the subjective interpretation could actually not really escape objective consequences, because of the peculiar nature of the concept of κοινωνία which always describes a relation of at least two parts, so that the subjective or objective genitive merely lay emphasis on either side, and so that if we have **κοινωνία of** the body of Christ (subjective) it always implies something or someone else's **κοινωνία with** the body of Christ (objective)[99]. So κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ must be interpreted - in agreement with the majority of the commentators - as an objective genitive of the thing[100].

And therefore we can now generally say that the predicate κοινωνία ἐστίν relates the subject τὸν ἄρτον (ὃν κλῶμεν) to τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ and on the basis of our results so far we can paraphrase the statement as follows: the bread which we, the gathered church, break and thus benedict, which we distribute among us and consume as we celebrate the Lord's Supper, this bread is κοινωνία with the body of Christ crucified, in which atonement and reconciliation were achieved for the former enemies of God.

It is a striking feature of the catechetical tradition that κοινωνία ἐστίν does

---

[97] So Soden, "Sakrament", 8, n. 1; cf. 30; cf. Kremer/Cögel, 613.

[98] Cf. Hauck, *TWNT*, 798f.

[99] Note that κοινωνία is an abstract noun deriving from the verb κοινωνεῖν, which in construction with a genitive has always some kind of objective genitive (BDR §169,1: a partitive genitive). Κοινωνεῖν is further very rarely used in the sense of an active "giving κοινωνία" but rather denotes a state ("having κοινωνία"), as Seesemann points out; *Koinonia*, 3f. Cf. also his objection against Soden's position ("daß der Genitiv ursprünglich das Subjekt des (sich selbst) Mitteilenden oder des Mitgeteilten bezeichnet", "Sakrament", 8, n. 1) on 14.

[100] Cf. for instance Hauck, *TWNT*, 798, 806; Cremer/Kögel, 612; BAGD, 439; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 41, cf. 14f; and Wood, "Fellowship", 37. Hainz, however, wants to understand it as an objective genitive of the thing ("(gemeinsame) Teilhabe an") and at the same time of the person ("Gemeinschaft mit"; *Kirche*, 20). That is, at least grammatically, impossible: τοῦ Χριστοῦ determines body and blood, but not κοινωνία. There is further no need to let the genitive stand "in seiner offenen Vieldeutigkeit" without explanation (Blank, "Eucharistie", 178).

actually not relate persons but things[101], the bread which we break and the body of Christ. So that, just as in the paradosis in 1 Cor 11:24, the formulation lays a certain emphasis on the bread and on the act in which it is involved. The bread which is broken and the one who originally broke it and gave up his body, are ultimately constitutive for the Eucharist, and only in a secondary position - although not less important - those who consequently broke and break it and for whom it was and is broken[102]. Most of the many interpretations of that passage neglect this feature of the statement and too quickly turn to describe the κοινωνία of "us" and Christ crucified[103]. But it is important to note that Paul does not say "**our breaking** the bread is ..." but "the **bread** which we break is ...". The stress is on the bread, although the breaking (including the benediction, distribution, etc.) essentially qualifies it. Such an emphasis on the eucharistic bread and wine in their relation to the body and blood of Christ, might reflect the early church's conviction that it were actually not the Christians - although they performed the rite - who were the subjects of this wonderful act of the Eucharist, that they were surely not the givers, but always no more than the receivers of such bread which conveyed the body of their crucified Lord[104]. The

---

[101] Or an act and a thing. The only other instance where we do not explicitly find at least one person involved in the relation which κοινωνία describes is 2 Cor 6:14: ... ἢ τίς κοινωνία φωτὶ πρὸς σκότος; Interestingly enough it is also most likely a pre-Pauline tradition which the Apostle (or, as some hold, a later redactor) integrated in his paraenesis; cf. Wolff's excursus (*2 Kor*, 146-149).

[102] Note also the position of the bread and the cup at the beginning of the two parallel statments of the tradition.

[103] Among many see for instance Klauck: "Es kommt eine personale Gemeinschaft mit Christus zustande" (*Kult*, 261).

[104] It is highly interesting therefore also to note how Paul describes the eucharistic bread and wine as singular gifts which are always one and the same as those which the Lord once gave to his disciples as his body and blood in the night of his betrayal. That the bread in any celebration of the Eucharist is always the very bread which Christ himself broke and distributed before he died is an idea which is most obvious in 1 Cor 11:26, Paul's brief comment on the preceding paradosis tradition: ὁσάκις γὰρ ἐὰν ἐσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον (τοῦτο) πίνητε ... (the second demonstrative pronoun is only in P^{46} ℵ² C^3 D^1 Ψ 𝔐 and quite a few other MSS). So Paul holds the view that the Corinthians and seemingly any Christian community (note the ὁσάκις and the present tense) eat the bread which Christ broke and drink of the cup over which he spoke the benediction and therefore, even more important, eat the bread which he gave as his body and drink the wine which he gave as his blood. Similarly the parallelism in 11:27 points in the same direction, with another **general** statement on those who eat of the bread and drink of the cup **of the Lord**; cf. further ποτήριον and τράπεζα **κυρίου** in 10:20; Christ as the giver of typologically

main purpose of the tradition in 1 Cor 10:16 was therefore apparently to say how the eucharistic bread comes to be the body of Christ: According to the catechism it is because the bread is **κοινωνία with** Christ's body! And this κοινωνία is brought about, as εὐλογοῦμεν and implicitly also κλῶμεν in the relative clauses of the catechism reveal, by the customary ritual prayers[105] which "consecrated" the ordinary bread and caused it to be eucharistic bread which was κοινωνία with, and thus conveyed, the body of Christ[106].

Yet, according to these relative clauses, which essentially qualify the subject and which we identified as even belonging to the subject, one must also stress, that not just the bread is κοινωνία with the body of Christ, but "the bread **which we break**". And if the subject therefore involves the entire eucharistic rite, then this whole act of the congregation and eventually the congregation which performs it are included in the κοινωνία relation with the body of Christ crucified. So that, in the light of the relative clauses, one might even understand "the bread which we break" as a metonymy meaning: what happens when we celebrate the Lord's Supper, what "we" experience there as we break the bread - that is κοινωνία with our Lord who died and rose ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν.

Yet we are still on the way to explain the meaning of the predicate κοινωνία ἐστίν, to explain what kind of relation "the bread which we break" and "the body of Christ" describe. It seems to be a helpful approach to an answer if we deal

---

eucharistic food and drink in 10:2-4; and generally the designation of the ritual meal as the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον (11:20). But especially the emphasis of the εἷς ἄρτος in 10:17, which does not refer to a single loaf but to the **one** eucharistic bread, strongly supports the view that the eucharistic bread and wine were understood in that way (see below). See Burchard, "Importance"; and especially Hofius, "Paradosis", 226f.

[105] The Christian eucharistic benedictions presumably praised God for the creation of the bread which his Son gave as his body and thanked him for his work of salvation in Christ's death and resurrection. Creation and salvation history seem to have been essential elements not only in the eucharistic prayers in the Jewish tradition (especially in the Passover liturgy), but this structure occurs also in the Ancient Church's liturgies of the Lord's Supper; still our suggestion is certainly no more than a guess at the content of these prayers. Yet note the καταγγέλλειν τὸν θάνατον τοῦ κυρίου in 1 Cor 11:26, with which Paul presumably refers to the eucharistic prayers; and see further Christ's anamnesis command in 11:24-25, where τοῦτο ποιεῖτε presumably points back to the preceding benedictions, so that these prayers from then on would have included an anamnesis of Christ; cf. n. 59 above and the references there.

[106] Cf. Weiß, 258.

with some other suggested, although rather questionable, interpretations first and reflect then on the various renderings which were given for the concept of κοινωνία. So, *via negationis*, we might come closer to a solution.

That κοινωνία ἐστίν does not refer to some sort of identification[107], is undoubtedly clear because of the complement "κοινωνία" which presupposes and describes a certain interrelation of **two individual** entities, not their entire absorption into one. The concept of κοινωνία therefore prohibits any interpretation in terms of a (trans-) substantial realism in the Lord's supper, as if this meal were a Christophagy. Not Christ's body is consumed but the eucharistic bread which is κοινωνία with his body and is not substantially or ontologically identical with it[108]. And it would not be adequate either to speak of the κοινωνία between "us" and Christ crucified in terms of identification. Yet, on the other hand, κοινωνία excludes also the notion that the verb ἐστίν merely refers to a symbolism or an analogy (for instance in the sense of a *significat*)[109], for κοινωνία refers to an actual and concrete relation, not just to the noetic compatibility or interpretation of the bread. Both extremes of looking at the Eucharist are therefore misleading and are not found in the NT but rather seem to belong to later and more rational and philosophical trends in Church history[110]. As a first result we can say: the two parts involved in the κοινωνία relationship keep their particular individuality in a real and close interrelating with each other.

---

[107] Murphy O'Connor emphasizes that bread and wine "are **in fact** the body and blood of Christ" and speaks of a "real participation" ("Community", 59; bold type by G.H.).

[108] Cf. the objections to the idea of identification in Burchard, "Importance", 124f; Conzelmann, 202; Hofius, "Paradosis", 227; Lampe, "Mahlpraxis", 208; and Jourdan, "ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ", 121.

[109] Cf. Orr/Walther: "the wine **is like** the blood of Christ ... only to the believer" (251; bold type by G.H.). See Wood who renders ἐστίν as "signifies", "represents" or "stands for" ("Fellowhip", 36). Similarly problematic is Soden's suggestion for the translation of v.16: "Unser gesegneter Kelch **bedeutet** Teilhabe am Blute Christi ..." ("Sakrament", 8; bold type by G.H.); and similarly Bauer, 893. See also Calvin's interpretation of the wine as a "symbolum sanguinis Domini" (331); and Anderson/Scott who speaks of the bread as a "symbol" for the unification with Christ and among the Christians ("Κοινωνία", 567); cf. Meeks, *Christians*, 159-162; and Berger, "Kirche", 204; and Grosheide's statement about "a spiritual communion with the fruits of the work of the risen Lord" (232).

[110] See for instance the adoption of the Aristotelian distinction of substance and accident. Cf. Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 165f.

Further, the wording of v.16, especially the present tense of the verbs, does not allow the idea that the Lord or his body were specially reified or hypostasized through the eucharistic rite (we have κλῶμεν and ἐστιν not γίγνεσθαι). The tradition does not say that, and presumably Christ's presence in the Eucharist was not believed to go beyond his constant and continous presence among his believers[111], although it could be experienced there in another way, by breaking and consuming the eucharistic bread according to the example which the Lord had given in the night of his betrayal. The verb ἐστίν rather implies a certain constancy of the κοινωνία relation, a "having κοινωνία"[112] of the bread which we break, i.e. of those who celebrate the Eucharist, with the body of Christ. And finally, the predicate κοινωνία ἐστίν rejects all attempts to explain the Lord's Supper as a means of salvation[113], or

---

[111] That is at least clear for Paul, if one considers his frequent application of ἐν Χριστῷ to all kinds of contexts, or his conviction that the Corinthians were called into the κοινωνία, the communion, with Christ, as a constant constitutive condition of their entire Christian existence, as we showed in the first part of this study. We cannot see, therefore, in which way Paul wanted to prove in our context that "das Herrenmahl die Gemeinde in eine lebendige Beziehung zum erhöhten Herrn setzt" (Wolff, 53); cf. Lampe, who holds that for Paul "die Quintessenz des eucharistischen Ritus" would be "die **Vergegenwärtigung** des Todes Christi" ("Mahlverständnis", 208; bold type by G.H.) in the sense of a "kommemorative Aktualpräsenz" (208; with Klauck, *Kult*, 373f); and cf. Walter, "Christusglaube", 432. Rather doubtful is also Käsemann's idea of the Eucharist as a pneumatic epiphany of the exalted Lord ("Anliegen", 19-21; cf. 31-34). See Hofius, who objects that Paul knows "überhaupt keine *besondere* Realpräsenz Christi im Herrenmahl, die sich von seiner ständigen realen Gegenwart in seiner Gemeinde unterschiede" ("Paradosis", 227, n. 136).

[112] Cf. also how the verb κοινωνεῖν, from which the abstract noun κοινωνία derives, generally describes a "having κοινωνία" rather than a more active "giving κοινωνία" (see Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 3f).

[113] The idea of salvation as a once-for-all event is generally fundamental for Paul's theology, as Eichholz shows: "So kommen wir in dieser Geschichte [of Christ] schon ursprünglich vor. Wir brauchen nicht erst nachträglich [as for instance through the sacrament] in sie hineingenommen zu werden" (*Umriß*, 210; cf. 201-214). Cf. Wedderburn as he similarly emphasizes that Baptism was "no re-enactment of Christ's death and resurrection" (*Baptism*, 357f). But still such a sacramental soteriology is fairly frequent among scholars. See for instance Käsemann who thinks that the church would be "nachträglich ... am Kreuzesgeschehen beteiligt" through the sacrament ("Motiv", 197). Or Hainz who regards even the κοινωνία to which one is called by God (1 Cor 1:9) as **based** (!) in the participation in Christ's blood and body in the Eucharist (*Kirche*, 35) and detects a "sakramentale Grundstruktur in der Paulinischen Theologie" (41). Cf. Wolff: "Es geht beide Male um das Mithineingenommenwerden der Glaubenden in die Dahingabe des Christus in den Tod" (53); and see Barrett, 232; Berger, "Kirche", 203; Lampe, "Mahlverständnis", 210; Lang, 161; and Walter, "Christusglaube", 432. A bit problematic is further Neuenzeit's "Sakramentsrealismus" (*Eucharistieauffassung*, 59f) and his idea that "in der Eucharistie das Heilsgeschehen (mehr als nur

even as the event where the essence or the reality of the church as a community would generally be transmitted - although this depicts a common idea among NT scholars[114]. But the participants in the Lord's Supper ("we") **are** Christians already and had once been called by God into the communion with his crucified and risen Son (cf. 1 Cor 1:1-9), so that they did not at all receive an increase of their salvation in the Eucharist or something which they would not have had before[115]. What actually "happened" there was apparently nothing more than what had happened already once for all, and what the bread breaking community received was nothing else than what they had already received. The ἐκκλησία is therefore neither specially "realized" or created in the Eucharist - it is not even mentioned in this piece of catechism, apart from the subject of the relative clauses[116]. And so, in a certain sense and with a glimpse at Pauline theology one might say that celebrating the Lord's Supper in the Christian community was understood like listening again to the saving and sanctifying word of the gospel. Its present and continous reality and effect do not go beyond what has happened at God's first call and eventually not beyond what had

---

effektiv) gegenwärtig und zugeeignet wird, ohne daß die zeitliche Vorgängigkeit des ehemaligen Heilstodes Jesu dadurch angetastet würde" (173), so that for him the "neue Heilsordnung" is indeed "im Tode Christi begründet" but "in der Eucharistie realisiert" (219). Cf. generally Conzelmann's considerations in §34 of his *Theologie* (295-301).

[114] So for instance Schnackenburg, who speaks of a "neu im Herrenmahl verwirklichte Gemeinschaft der Christen untereinander ... mit größerer Wirklichkeitsdichte" ("Koinonia-Gedanken", 67); and Hainz : "aus der Abendmahlsgemeinschaft durch Teilhabe *am* Leib Christi entsteht die 'Kirchen'gemeinschaft des gemeinsamen Anteilhabens *im* Leib Christi, der Gemeinde" (*Kirche*, 174); cf. Delling, "Abendmahlsgeschehen", 333; and Schlatter, 297. Conzelmann gives his chapter on Baptism and Eucharist in Paul the title, "Die Eingliederung in die Kirche durch die Sakramente" (*Theologie*, 295).

[115] But cf. for instance McDermott: "the union with Christ **grows** by the constantly renewed expressions of faith and love that the Eucharist demands" ("Doctrine", 221); or Hauck: "Das Teilhaben an Christus, das grundsätzlich und vollständig im Glauben erlebt wird, wird **in gesteigerter Form** ... im Sakrament verwirklicht und erlebt" (*TWNT*, 805). Similarly questionable is Seesemann: "Die Gemeinschaft Christi ist **nicht ein soweit abgeschlossenes Ereignis** der Vergangenheit, daß der Gläubige nicht im Herrenmahl die κοινωνία Χριστοῦ immer aufs neue erleben könnte und müßte" (*Koinonia*, 51); and further George: "it is surely possible to have **some** participation in Christ before one first receives the Holy Communion" (*Communion*, 176f); he further speaks of a "means of grace" (177). See also Schnackenburg: "So wird hier **eine neue und eigentümliche Verbindung** mit Christus hergestellt" ("Koinonia-Gedanken", 64f). Bold type by G.H.

[116] Fee also rejects that view (467); and see Weiß who speaks of the "längst ἐν Χριστῷ lebende Gemeinde" which does not enter the communion with Christ by consuming bread and wine in the Eucharist (258).

happened in the once-for-all event of the cross and resurrection of Christ. In this way the Lord's Supper is a tangible proclamation and documentation of Christ's ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν which the κύριος spoke at the Last Supper and which was addressed not only to the twelve but actually included the Christians of the following generations as they received Christ's body in the Eucharist[117]. And in this sense the concept of κοινωνία (ἐστίν) in 1 Cor 10:16 relates the body of Christ - τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ referring to Christ's παράδοσις ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν - and the celebration of the Lord's Supper of the Christian church - τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν.

On the basis of our considerations so far, we can now test the variety of renderings which have been proposed for the concept of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 10:16 and make our own choice. There are basically two main lines in the multitude of suggestions, a "vertical" (Christ-Christian) and a "horizontal" (Christian-Christian), which are differently emphasized, however. We start our critical survey on the more "vertical" side of the spectrum.

a) The kind of relation between the bread which we break and the body of Christ is difficult to render in terms of an association. And concepts such as "partnership"[118], "fellowship"[119] or "alliance"[120] with the body of Christ express a notion of a side by side companionship which cannot sufficiently express how the bread which we break actually conveys the body of Christ crucified, i.e. how

---

[117] Cf. Banks who calls the eucharistic meal "a visible proclamation of the death of Christ to all who participated" (*Community*, 85); Neuenzeit: "die soteriologische Heilsgabe ist der erste Sinn der Eucharistie" (*Eucharistieauffassung*, 208). Grosheide emphasizes that the Eucharist "does not bring the congregation in contact with Christ, ... but Holy Communion signifies the connection with Christ's suffering and death" (232). And see further Deissmann's conclusion that "the Lord's Supper is not ... the real cause of communion with Christ, but an expression of that communion ... [which] brings it into prominence" (*Paul*, 145).

[118] So Orr/Walther, 250f; and Wood, "Fellowship", 37.

[119] Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 18, 24 ("fellowship with the Lord"); and cf. Deissmann, *Paul*, 135, 140.

[120] So Currie (*Literature*, 45) and Willis (*Idol Meat*, 283), but they do not mean the relation to God anyway. Amongst the advocates of the associative interpretation, see Hauck who speaks of "Genossen" of Christ (*TWNT*, 805) and of a "innige Verbindung" "mit dem himmlischen Christus" (806); and Meyer who renders similarly "Gemeinschaft mit" and understands it as "eine *innerliche geistige* Verbindung" (238); cf. Henrici, 263; Krause, "Frage", 40; Lampe, "Mahlpraxis", 208; and Bauer's suggestion that we should render κοινωνία as: "*Mittel zur Erlangung enger Beziehung zum Blut (Leib) des Christus*" (893).

the participants in the Eucharist are ultimately connected to, and included in, their Lord's salvific death. In our context κοινωνία means more than an associative being together of two entities, even if they do not become identical as we pointed out already.

b) More promising is the rendering of "participation" in the body of Christ[121], although it contains the danger of being misunderstood in terms of quantitative calculations, as if those who break the bread would receive merely a **part** of the body of Christ and not the whole[122].

c) Some others actually combine the two ideas, the associative and the participatory[123].

d) Fairly doubtful, however, are the attempts to introduce a communitarian or ecclesiological idea into the concept of κοινωνία, because the church is not mentioned here, apart from the "we" in the relative clauses, but rather presupposed. There is no word about the relationships among the members of the congregation but a strong statement about its relation to the body of Christ

---

[121] Most influential here is Seesemann who wants to give up the partitive understanding of the concept only when it makes no sense at all (*Koinonia*, 41-43) and therefore translates "Teilnahme am Blut Christi" (and accordingly "Leib Christi"; 43; cf.47). But Seesemann further emphasizes, with a reference to Chrysostom, that κοινωνία also implies the aspect of "Einswerden mit dem Blut und Leib Christi" (44). See also Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 156f; Brown, "Ecclesiology", 164; Conzelmann, 202f (because of μετέχομεν in v.17; but he can also speak of "Gemeinschaft"); Delling, "Abendmahlsgeschehen", 323f, 333; Elert, *Kirchengemeinschaft*, 18f; George, *Communion*, 171-173; Hahn, "Gefahr", 116f; id., "Thesen", 235, 239; Hofius, "Paradosis", 224; Käsemann, "Anliegen", 12 (but cf. 25); Klauck, *Kult*, 260 ("Anteilhaben"); Murphy O'Connor, "Community", 59 ("real participation in the body and blood of Christ"); Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieverständnis*, 55, 59, 62, 178f; Schattenmann, *TBLNT* I, 498; Schlatter, 296; Schnackenburg, "Koinonia-Gedanken", 64 (he emphasizes that κοινωνία is more than an association and refers to the synonymity with μετέχειν); Soden, "Sakrament", 8 (n. 1); Strobel, 158; and also the translations of the NIV and RSV.

[122] Robertson/Plummer's critique of the term is justified therefore, as they point out the difference to the concept of μετέχειν in v.17 which expresses participation and remark that "in Holy Communion each recipient has a share of the bread and of the wine, but he has the whole of Christ" (212). Hainz's conviction that κοινωνία should express "den Gedanken des miteinander [Christ and the Christian!] Teilhabens [in Christ's body and blood]" (*Kirche*, 25; cf. 19f) further raises the serious question of what kind the relation of Christ to his own body and blood must be, if he himself can **participate** in it.

[123] See Hainz who renders "Gemeinschaft mit Christus durch Teilhabe an seinem Blut" (*Kirche*, 20; cf. 23, 25, 32); or Roloff who assumes the point of κοινωνία "in der schwebenden Doppelbedeutung" ("Heil", 190); cf. Kertelge: "Teilhabe-Gemeinschaft" ("Kirchengemeinschaft", 100); Lang, 127; Walter, "Christusglaube", 432.

crucified. Still, quite prominent are interpretations such as for instance "participation (with others)"[124] or "common participation"[125] in the body of Christ.

e) Others lay even more emphasis on the Christian community, so that the relation to Christ's body seems merely to have an instrumental function for it, as they describe κοινωνία as referring to a fellowship (with one another) **through** participation in Christ's body[126]. Yet the words and the structure of our tradition contain no evidence at all for that idea; on the contrary the first person plural of the relative clauses suggests that the community as a whole is performing the rite rather than resulting from it. Such interpretations mostly derive from a certain understanding of v.17 which is often made the clue for the preceding verse[127]. Looking at 1 Cor 10:16 as a piece of tradition of its own

---

[124] Campbell, "Cognates", 375; Jourdan's conclusions are very confusing as he speaks of "a company of 'sharers together'" and of a "Christian unity of association" ("KOINΩNIA", 119; cf. 120f); Cf. BAGD, 439.

[125] Barrett, 229, 231; cf. 232: a "share all Christians enjoy ... together"; cf. Bauer who suggests as a possible rendering of κοινωνία: "gemeins. Genuß v. Blut u. Leib des Christus" (893); and Weiß, 258.

[126] See for instance Hainz, who explains κοινωνία as "die reale 'Gemeinschaft mit Christus', die durch das sakramentale Mahl gestiftet wird und die Mahlgenossen auch miteinander verbindet" (*Kirche*, 26); id., *EWNT* II, 753f. For him κοινωνία has both dimensions, the "vertical" and the "horizontal" at the same time, but the real aim is not the 'communion with Christ through common participation with him in his body and blood' - however that might be understood - but actually the communion among the Christians through their common participating in Christ's body and blood. See also Allo who concludes that v.16 (and 17) means: "entrée en communauté *avec le Christ*, et *entre nous*, par la *participation commune* aus corps et le sang du Christ" (239). Calvin held the view that "fideles sociari per Christi sanguinem, ut unum fiant corpus" and spoke of an "inter nos κοινωνία" (331). For Meeks the social intention of the Lord's Supper, which he calls the "Ritual of Solidarity" (*Christians*, 157), is revealed in 1 Cor 10:16 - "the transformation of a multiplicity of individuals into a unity" (159; cf. 157-162). See further Blank, "Eucharistie", 178-182; Dunn, *Unity*, 165; id., "Instruments", 206; Kertelge, "Kerygma", 337; id., "Kirchengemeinschaft", 104; and Wolff, 53. But see also Brown's categorical objection to such an interpretation of κοινωνία: "Paul does not use *koinonia* to express the 'horizontal' relationship between men" ("Ecclesiology", 164, n. 32), but employed it "in an exclusively 'vertical' sense" (165).

[127] Schnackenburg explicitly speaks of an "Ausweitung des Koinonia-Gedankens in V.17 von der Gemeinschaft mit Christus zur Gemeinschaft der Christen untereinander" "(Koinonia-Gedanken", 66) and applies "Koinonia" also to the relationship "unter den Mahlteilnehmern" (65); note how he previously strongly argued for the rendering "Anteilhabe", but that would of course not fit this latter conclusion so well. Cf. Panikulam who also holds the idea of a double κοινωνία and concludes that "Pauline *koinōnia* is at the same time Christocentric and communitarian" (*Koinōnia in the NT*, 30, cf. 20).

first, however, would have helped to avoid such severe misinterpretations[128]. And further, the connection of vv.16 and 17 is not necessarily of the kind which these commentators in particular have assumed (see below).

The most appropriate term, to us, seems to be the concept of "communion"[129], for its ability to include all the aspects of κοινωνία which we outlined above and to express a kind of relation where both the bread which we break and the body of Christ, the believers who break it and Christ crucified who once broke it and who gave his body ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν, are indissolubly and yet distinguishably connected - a kind of union therefore which transcends the restrictions of time as well as the boundaries of the ordinary character of the corresponding parts, although it leaves the bread which we break and the body of Christ completely what they are *per se*[130]. The concept of communion therefore combines both the aspect of **association**, a certain togetherness (**com-**) of the two individual parts which forbids the idea of a substantial identification,

---

[128] Highly questionable and rather fantastic is Fee's idea of assigning a vertical dimension to the cup and Christ's blood and a horizontal to the bread and Christ's body, for the two statements depict a synonymous parallelism. Fee understands the Eucharist as the celebration of the Christians' common life in Christ. See also Hahn's doubtful idea of a threefold climax from v.16a to b to v.17 ("Gefahr", 166f).

[129] See Robertson/Plummer who advocate this translation (212); and McDermott, "Doctrine", 221. In LSJ "communion" is mentioned first among the possible renderings of κοινωνία (970). Hamer who renders also "communion au *corps* de Christe" understands it, though, as a reference "horizontale" (*Église*, 57); cf. Allo, 237-239.

[130] George in his harsh rejection of that idea understands "union" in terms of a (substantial) identification or of a mystical fusion in which the individual character of either side would be lost (*Communion*, 174), and in this concern his critique is right. But the idea of a union must not necessarily be understood in this way, nor Chrysostom's statement on 1 Cor 10:16: "οὐ γάρ τῷ μετέχειν μόνον καὶ μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἑνοῦσθαι κοινωνοῦμεν" (quoted in Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 44; cf. *Homilies on Corinthians*, 139f), to which George objects in particular. The terminology of marriage, for instance, can describe the relation between two individuals as **μία σάρξ**, a union in which the two persons involved still do not loose their distinct character and individuality (cf. the analogy to the Christ-Christian relationship in 1 Cor 6:16-17). Cf. also McDermott who understands κοινωνία as a "personal union with Christ", although his idea that it is "established by baptism [and] finds both its fullest expression and the best opportunity for further deepening in the Eucharist" ("Doctrine", 221) is surely problematic. His sacramental understanding of soteriology and his idea of growth of "the union with Christ" (ibid., 221) cannot be accepted. Further, his terminology is a bit confusing when he renders this relation to Christ also as a "share in Jesus Christ" (ibid., 70) or speaks of "the union **in love** of God and man through Jesus Christ" (ibid., 233; bold type by G.H.). A mystic notion of a union with Christ characterizes Schmitz's interpretation (in accord with his teacher Deissmann), for he understands κοινωνία "im Sinne eines wirklichen Einswerdens" (*Christus-Gemeinschaft*, 172; cf. 172-177); cf. above chapter 2.2, n. 200.

and the aspect of a real **union** which could be described not inadequately in the paradoxical terminology of the symbol of Chalcedon, explaining and at the same time veiling the relation of the two natures of Christ ἀσυγχύτως and ἀδιαιρέτως! Κοινωνία, communion with Christ's body and blood, therefore means "our" inclusion in his work of salvation, which was achieved at the cross and efficaciously proclaimed in the gospel and confirmingly received and experienced in the Eucharist as "we" break the bread. It is the constant constitutive condition of any believer's life, a relation to Christ which is always and entirely a gift (cf. the emphasis on the bread) and still a dynamic relation between two individuals which consequently includes our response to what we once for all received.

Elert pointed out that the Latin concept of *communio*, like κοινωνία, "ist ein vieldeutiger Begriff, es kommt immer auf die Verbindung an, in der er gebraucht wird"[131]. In our case we found it sufficiently determined through the context in the tradition of the Eucharist, but now we still have to ask a final question which we already mentioned above: the question of the linguistic and socio-cultural context of κοινωνία[132], whether it occurred elsewhere probably in a similar context and maybe even with a similar meaning, which could then help explain its employment here - a question which is even more required in a traditional phrase for which the author is not known[133].

The question of the derivation of the term κοινωνία in the catechetical

---

[131] *Kirchengemeinschaft*, 5; cf. 9.

[132] It is striking that Hainz does not deal with the usage of κοινωνεῖν κτλ. in Greek literature outside the New Testament.

[133] The use of a certain concept in a tradition requires such questions much more than the use in a clearly Pauline passage like 1 Cor 1:9, in which the preceding verses culminate, thus providing a reasonable and sufficient basis for the interpretation. But in the case of 1 Cor 10:16 one must consider that the form of the tradition as such already points beyond itself to a certain history which is prior to the actual context and to an older and, within a certain group, commonly accepted authority. To seek for the origin of a tradition and its particular concepts is therefore a task which emerges eventually from the text in 1 Cor 10 itself. Yet it is also essential that we did not start with a survey of the variety of the usage of κοινωνία in popular Greek (that is the way which many works on the concept of κοινωνία choose), but tried to approach it from its particular context first, in order to prevent ourselves from introducing false assumptions.

tradition in 1 Cor 10:16 is, of course, closely connected to the question of the origin of the tradition of the Lord's Supper in general. The other concepts in 1 Cor 10:16 could be traced back to a fairly Jewish background as the distinct terminology of the customary meal rites concerning the bread and, even more, the cup indicated, and as further the idea of the atoning sacrifice of Christ revealed. According to this circumstantial evidence we could exclude a Greek or Gentile-Christian origin of these concepts in the tradition in 1 Cor 10:16, which we think was not compiled by Paul or his fellow workers for use in the Corinthian church (and other newly founded congregations), but which points, like the paradosis in 11:23b-25, to a presumably Jewish (-Hellenistic) Christian milieu such as Damascus or Antioch where Paul had initially learned both traditions himself and then spread them among his new converts. On this basis we now ask about the origin of κοινωνία and seek to test our previous conclusions.

A brief survey of the many and diverse uses of the concept of κοινωνία in the contemporary and earlier (non-) biblical Greek must suffice now[134], for we can limit the number of comparable occurrences according to the two main features of our case: the context of a ritual meal; and the determination of κοινωνία as a communion where the two parts involved relate in a union in which they are one, though not identical.

In various ancient sources the concept of κοινωνία and the other κοινων-derivatives occurs in the context of ritual cult meals, referring to a more or less associative relation either "vertically" between one or more persons and the relevant numen or deity or[135], much more frequent, a relation among the

---

[134] For further general and much more detailed information see Campbell, "Cognates", 352-360; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 3-23; Endenburg's learned monograph on κοινωνία in classical Greek (*Koinoonia*); and Willis, *Idol Meat*, 167-181. See further the articles in the dictionaries: Hauck, *TWNT* III, 798-803; Cremer/Kögel, 610-614; and BAGD, 438f. And cf. Jourdan, "ΚΟΙΝΩΝΙΑ", 111-113; McDermott, "Doctrine", 64-69; and Klauck, who mentiones κοινωνία throughout his detailed examination of the various kinds of cultic meals in the environment of early Christianity (*Kult*, 31-233).

[135] See the references in Willis, *Idol Meat*, 171f; Klauck, *Kult*, 49 (n. 66), 133, 156 - above all the last two references from the mystery cults of Serapis and of Zeus Panamaros denote a real communion with the deity, yet the inscriptions are both from the second century A.D.! See also Hauck, *TWNT*, 799f; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 102f; and Endenburg, *Koinoonia*, 113-115; he also

worshippers who participate in the meal[136]. Yet in comparison to the piece of tradition in 1 Cor 10:16 some significant differences emerge. For, in the catechetical tradition κοινωνία does not, at least not explicitly, relate persons, but a ritual act - the bread which we break - and the body of Christ, which is not just a designation of his person but a metonymy for his sacrificial and atoning death in which the recipients of his body are involved. And the concept of κοινωνία in our case does not therefore describe a certain "mystical" unification of a worshipper with a deity actually achieved in a sacrificial meal, but the term refers to the communion with Christ's body, i.e. to the inclusion in his atoning and sanctifying death and resurrection which had happened once for all and was a constant constitutive condition of the believers' existence since then, a communion which was tangibly expressed and confirmingly received in the Eucharist, not created, reenacted or even sacramentally repeated there[137]. Such an idea of κοινωνία in terms of atonement and reconciliation has no real parallel in Hellenistic thought, not even in the mysteries which belong to another, later period anyway. The other possibility of a derivation of κοινωνία from Hellenistic cultic language, concerning the relation of the participants in

---

objects to Seesemann's thesis of κοινωνία as a **technical** term in Hellenistic sacrifices (*Koinonia*, 102), and concludes that "kan men op grond van de bekende plaatsen niet bewijzen" (115). In the Jewish literature (LXX, Apocrypha, Rabbinics, etc.) the term is never employed for "vertical" relationships between JHWH and men, although the Jewish tradition also knows sacrifical meals in the presence of God (cf. Exod 24:11). Only in Isa 44:11 and Hos 4:17 is the Hebrew equivalent חבר used in a somehow "vertical" sense, but negatively as a reference to the fellowship with idols. The only positive exception is Philo *Vit Mos* I 158; *Spec Leg* I 131, 221; on the use in Judaism see Hauck, ibid., 800-804; Willis, ibid., 174-181; cf. McDermott, "Doctrine", 68.

[136] See Willis, *Idol Meat*, 172f; and Klauck's references, *Kult*, 63, 69, 71, 172; Hauck, *TWNT*, 800; Endenburg, *Koinoonia*, 112f. See also the use of the concept in general for table fellowships, for which one can find also some examples in the Jewish tradition (Sir 6:10; and cf. the term חֲבוּרָה for sabbatical or other festival table fellowships; see Hauck, ibid., 203).

[137] The kind of communion of the Hellenistic cultic table fellowships either with deities or among men was not a continuous determination of the life of the participant but actually had to be renewed in every new meal. "Gott und Mensch werden zu *Mahl- und Tischgenossen*" (Hauck, *TWNT*, 800) "in het hiernamaals verinnigd" (Endenburg, *Koinoonia*, 115), yet the Lord's Supper actually has no sacrifices which could produce the relation to the deity, but only one sacrifice once-for-all which the eucharistic bread confirmingly conveys to those who break it.

a cultic meal, must be also excluded[138]. We cannot agree therefore with Klauck's suggestion that "κοινωνία stammt aus der griechisch sakralen Mahlterminologie, es wurde in der hellenistischen Gemeinde auf das Herrenmahl angewandt"[139]. It is doubtful anyway that the Christians in the first century should have consciously imitated the terminology of their former cults. Wedderburn's conclusion on a similar issue is important therefore, according to which "Gentile Christians ... may have ... interpreted the Christian faith in terms of their own religious traditions, reading into it interpretations that had not previously occurred to their Jewish Christian teachers, who, once they realized them, repudiated them"[140]. And Paul did obviously not consider the concept of κοινωνία as a dangerous term, but rather made it the basis of his argument against any kind of relation to the former cults and its idols and demons.

So, if a Hellenistic cultic derivation of the concept of κοινωνία can be excluded, the other feature of the tradition, the particular quality of κοινωνία as a comm-union, remains. The only other compatible pattern one could think of for such a kind of communion, where the two parts are one though not identical, is the use of κοινωνία for the relation of marriage. This use is fairly

---

[138] This is Willis' view, however, who describes Paul in line with the associative idea of Hellenistic and especially Jewish meal traditions from which the latter points to "mutual obligation related to the worship of Israel's God" (*Idol Meat*, 181). That this interpretation is impossible for grammatical and many more reasons was shown above.

[139] *Kult*, 261; cf. 237-240. Klauck does not consider the problems which result from his assumption: the question of the origin of 10:16, for instance, which he also thinks is a tradition. Did the Corinthians themselves - the former idol worshippers (1 Cor 6:10-11; 12:2) - or Paul derive this technical term (for Klauck; but cf. Endenburg, *Koinoonia*, 115) from the pagan cultic phraseology and apply it to the Christian rite? Or what kind of "hellenistische Gemeinde" would have had the authority to adapt a tradition which it apparently received from the Jewish Christian church to the standards of their own religous environment - and why then did they leave other Jewish terms (τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας) unchanged? (Klauck also notes the "Zusammenprall" of Jewish and Hellenistic categories; ibid., 262). One must further ask if Paul would have used precisely this tradition and the concept of κοινωνία as the basis of his argument against any mixing of the Corinthians with pagan rites, if he would have had to fear being misunderstood according to these former idolatrous habits of his addressees. And one should finally not underestimate the proportion of Christians with a more or less Jewish background (including proselytes and Godfearers) in the Hellenistic churches.

[140] *Baptism*, 163.

frequent in Hellenistic sources as well as in Jewish sources[141]. But the use of κοινωνία in the tradition of 1 Cor 10:16 shows no sign of direct dependence on such a background[142].

Yet we must be satisfied with a rather general assumption that the concept of κοινωνία like the other concepts of 1 Cor 10:16 derives from the ambience of Jewish Hellenism. So, Antioch or even Damascus could well be the origin of this piece of catechism which Paul had taught the Corinthians and which he then quoted in his letter for the support of his paraenesis against idolatry.

2.3.3 The Relation between 1 Cor 10:16 and 17

From the introduction to the catechetical tradition in 1 Cor 10:15 - the appeal to the Corinthians' competence to draw the correct and expected conclusions from the following argument - and from the interrogative particle οὐχί which Paul inserted in the tradition and which requires an affirmative answer, one can deduce that the Apostle and his addressees agreed over the authority and meaning of this piece of catechism in 1 Cor 10:16 and might have understood it more or less as we outlined above. Such an understanding of the Lord's Supper, at least for Paul, is obvious from the context of the paradosis tradition in 1 Cor 11:23b-25[143], but also from the context of the catechism, as particularly the

---

[141] See the references in Endenburg for whom this use of the κοινων-words is the most prominent (*Koinoonia*, 27f, 62-65, 106-108); Hauck, *TWNT*, 799, 801f; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 15. Cf. 3 Macc 4:6 (βίου κοινωνία); and JosAs 7:5-6. See also how in the biblical tradition marriage is described in terms of a μία σάρξ (Gen 2:24; Mark 10:8; Matt 19:5; 1 Cor 6:16; Eph 5:31), and further provides a prominent image for the relation of God/Christ and his people in the OT and NT (see Isa 61:10; 62:4-5; Hos 2:21-22; 1 Cor 6:16-17; 2 Cor 11:2; Eph 5:31-32; Rev 14:4; 21:2, 10).

[142] Cf. the aspect of continuity or the importance of the initial and binding act of the constitution of the relation.

[143] Above all 1 Cor 11:26 displays Paul's agreement with the preceding paradosis formula and contains notions which we found to be essential for the catechetical tradition as well: The bread and the cup over which the benediction was spoken and which are consumed at eucharistic meals are the same (τοῦτον) which Christ once consecrated and distributed (cf. v.26a and vv.24a/25a); and the Eucharist is rooted entirely in the death of the κύριος (cf. v.26b and the *verba testamenti* in vv. 24b/25b) which is proclaimed at the Lord's Supper (actually in the eucharistic benedictions; cf. the anamnesis in vv.24c/25c) until he comes (v.26c); see above n. 104.

following verse 17 reveals.

The relation between the two verses has been a field of extensive scholarly debate[144] which was mainly centered around the question of the relation of sacrament and ecclesiology, whether the former forms a basis for the latter or not. That v.16 and the concept of κοινωνία therein could be understood on the basis of the community idea of v.17, as some commentators think, proved to be a false idea, as the traditional character of this originally independent phrase demonstrates. Yet the other question remains for consideration, how Paul's statement about the unity among the participants in the Lord's Supper relates to the preceding statement about the communion of those who break the bread and the body of Christ.

As regards the syntactical integration of v.17, it is striking that its relation to both the former and the following verse is loose and asyndetical[145]. For the conjunction ὅτι introduces a causal protasis which depends on the following main clause, to which another main clause is allied by the conjunction γάρ: "Because (it is[146]) one bread, one body are we the many, for we all partake of

---

[144] The number of variations of the interpretation of these verses is immense and Weiß's scholarly sigh, "überhaupt ist V.17 sehr schwierig" (258), is symptomatic of the struggling of generations of commentators with this verse. Our attempt to explain it is therefore probably not more than a provisional result of a fairly long process of considering alternative solutions.

[145] Some scholars, however, still hold the view that ὅτι depicts a causal or explicative connection to the preceding v.16. Heinz for instance regards v.17 as "eine weiterführende Explikation des κοινωνία-Gedankens von V 16" (*Kirche*, 25, 45); cf. Henrici, 266; Meyer, 241; Robertson/Plummer, 214; Roloff, "Heil", 189f; Schmitz, *Christus-Gemeinschaft*, 174; and Weiß who eliminates εἷς ἄρτος, so that v.17a becomes "eine verständige Begründung zu V. 16" (259). Yet such a causal function of the conjunction here is very unlikely, not only because v.16 is a tradition which in the case of a causal ὅτι would become the **result** of a Pauline statement and would thus lose its usual normative function - a kind of neglect of the authority of the tradition which can hardly be assumed for Paul. But such interpretations of ὅτι are further improbable because they raise some serious problems of structure, logic and comprehension: "ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος" could principally depict an independent elliptic sentence, immediately and causally attached to v.16, so that ἓν σῶμα κτλ. would then appear as the beginning of a new sentence; but then it would disturb both the parallelism of v.16 and the chiastic structure of v.17. On the other hand, if the whole first part of v.17 (ὅτι ... ἐσμεν) would be directly related to v.16, one would not only have to take ἓν σῶμα but equally εἷς ἄρτος as the complement of the predicate ἐσμεν and would then still have to explain how "we are one bread" and how the unity of the many can result in, or explain the condition of, the bread which we break.

[146] See Turner: "It may be that we are to supply ἐστίν in 1 Cor 10[17] ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος (sc. ἐστίν) ... : *because there is one bread*" (303).

the one bread"[147]. Further, the syntactically independent and "somewhat parenthetical"[148] status of the verse is confirmed, if one considers the particular content and message which makes it even more appear as a digression of Paul's train of thought. For the statement on Christian unity in v.17 has no function in the course of the argument against the Corinthians' participation in idolatrous meals which is the Apostle's main concern, after all, and to which he returns in v.18, in a statement formulated in parallel to v.16! So, the only cause and point of integration of v.17 remains the preceding catechetical tradition to which, however, it is conceptually and formally closely related[149], especially to the statement about the bread[150].

The verse itself has a chiastic structure where the subjects of the main clauses

---

[147] More or less such an explanation is given also by Barrett, 229, 234; Grosheide, 233; Hofius, "Paradosis", 226f n. 135; Eichholz, *Umriß*, 213; Klauck, *Kult*, 264; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 202; Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 25; Schlatter, 297; Schnackenburg, "Koinonia-Gedanken", 66; Strobel, 159; cf. Allo, 240; and the translations of the NIV and RSV.

[148] Grosheide, 234; cf. Fee who calls the verse a "sideswipe" (169); Wolff: "Assoziation" and "Zwischengedanke" (54); and Hofius, "Anmerkung" ("Paradosis", 226, n. 135). See also George, *Communion*, 172; Hauck, *TWNT* III, 806; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 219; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 45; Weiß, 258f. Different Allo, 240; and Hainz who, because of his horizontal understanding of κοινωνία, accordingly interprets the parallel κοινων- derivatives in vv.18 and 20 as references mainly to horizontal relationships among the relevant groups of worshippers (*Kirche*, 26-33), as do Currie and Willis.

[149] It could be that v.17 contains traditional material as well, or at least alludes to other well-known (catechetical) phrases (similar assumptions can be made for the context of the paradosis in 11:17-33; see Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 121; and Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 167). Here, the chiasm, the general kind of formulation with verbs in the first person plural and in the present tense, and the integrated composition around the idea of unity (εἷς/ἕν/εἷς) and diversity (πολύς/πάς/μετεχεῖν) could point to a traditional background.

[150] That Paul did not alter the order in v.16 (the cup before the bread) for the sake of a better transition to his considerations on bread and body and the church in v.17, follows from the observation of the parenthetical character of this verse. If the well known and authoritative tradition in v.16 actually was the basic argument of the parenesis in 1 Cor 10:14-22, as v.15 and the parallel formulations in vv.18 and 20 demonstrate, then the bread was not put second in order to emphasize an idea which is not really relevant for the issue of "flee from idolatry"! Still, this is what a good number of commentators apparently think: Neuenzeit for instance assumes that v.16a would be only "mit angefügt" (*Eucharistieauffassung*, 175) for the sake of completeness and that Paul was actually interested mainly in σῶμα and in the emphasis on Christian unity in the Eucharist (59-61, 175-180, 201-219); see also Barrett, 233; Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 162; Conzelmann, 203; Delling, "Abendmahlsgeschehen", 322; Fee, 466, 469; Hainz, *Kirche*, 24, 33; Käsemann, "Anliegen", 13; Klauck, "Eucharistie", 333; Murphy O'Connor, "Community", 63; Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 199; Walter, "Christusglaube", 433; cf. Willis, *Idol Meat*, 195. But again we must postpone consideration of the reasons for the unusual order in v.16, until we deal with the context of the Apostle's parenesis against idolatry.

- two substantival adjectives (οἱ πολλοί/οἱ πάντες) - in the centre and εἷς ἄρτος/τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου at the edges of v.17 correspond[151]. Thus the unity of the bread and the plurality of those who eat it, are particularly emphasized and set in contrast, and are eventually combined in a syllogistic manner whose conclusion is the unity of the partaking people - they are one body[152]. In order to understand the meaning and significance of that conclusion, it is essential to consider its dependence on v.16.

The verb forms in the present tense and in the first person plural in v.17 match with those of the relative clauses in v.16 and make this following verse appear to be a prolongation of the catechism. The verb μετέχομεν, the partaking of the eucharistic bread, could even be subsumed into κλῶμεν which refers to the whole ritual act at the Lord's Supper[153]; and the other verb, ἐσμέν, recalls the ἐστίν of the tradition. The subjects of the two verbs, however, "we οἱ πολλοί" and "we οἱ πάντες", are quite significant, and in a sense could be regarded as a deliberate Pauline specification and interpretation of the simple "we" in the traditional formulation of v.16. For πάς and πολύς allude - in the context of the Eucharist - not only to Mark 14:23-24 (ἔπιον ἐξ αὐτοῦ **πάντες** ... ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ **πολλῶν**), but generally occur often in the context of basic

---

[151] See Fee, 469.

[152] See Neuenzeit who describes the syllogism as follows: the bread is one - we all partake of the one bread - we the many are one body (*Eucharistieauffassung*, 202); cf. Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 25. Rather questionable, however, is therefore Roloff's suggestion which builds on the assumption that ὅτι is a causal connection to v.16. For him the syllogism starts with v.16b ("Heil", 190).

[153] The concept of μετέχειν is here in this instance certainly no synonym to κοινωνία - although this view is fairly common among commentators - and is not fitted to explain the meaning of the latter. But see Barrett, 233; Conzelmann, 203f; Grosheide, 233; Hahn, "Gefahr", 166; Schnackenburg, "Koinonia-Gedanke", 64; Walter, "Christusglaube", 433; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 196f; cf. Campbell, "Cognates", 376; Hainz, *Kirche*, 18f; Klauck, *Kult*, 224; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 179; and Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 43. If Paul wanted to express the same thing he could have used the same word. Still, there are serious differences. For the noun κοινωνία relates the eucharistic bread (and "our" breaking it) and the body of Christ, whereas the verb μετέχομεν relates the eucharistic bread and its consumer. As the distinct construction with the partitive ἐκ hints at (cf. 1 Cor 11:28!; and see Robertson, 508; Turner, 231; and Radermacher, 125) and as the other occurrences of μετέχειν in the immmediate context of the chapter show (vv.21 and 30; cf. 9:10, 12), the verb means simply the act of partaking and consuming food at a meal and can therefore help to elucidate the meaning of κλῶμεν but not of κοινωνία. Cf. Robertson/Plummer, 212; and Weiß, 258.

soteriological statements, even more so in their substantival form[154]. These little nuances are the greatest conceptual difference between v.17 and the preceding words and shed some light on what Paul regarded as most central in the Eucharist and in its catechetical tradition. For the Apostle did not just focus on the number and diversity of the participants at the Lord's Supper, but he emphasized ὅτι εἷς ὑπὲρ **πάντων** ἀπέθανεν (2 Cor 5:14), i.e. the soteriological significance of the Eucharist and its reference to Christ's death. And so these two distinct subjects, οἱ πολλοί and οἱ πάντες, demonstrate the universal validity of the statement of v.17, which is, like v.16, relevant for the whole Christian community rather than being exclusively restricted to the local (Corinthian) congregation[155]. This striking accentuation, however, of the soteriological and of a certain universal feature of the Lord's Supper have essential consequences for the interpretation of the other keywords of the verse, ἄρτος and σῶμα, which are common with, and presumably picked up from, the wording of the preceding tradition.

Εἷς ἄρτος is mentioned twice, at the beginning and at the end of v.17, as the ground for **the many** being one body and as the object of the partaking of **all**[156]. And if one considers the soteriological and universal/ecumenical aspects seriously, εἷς ἄρτος cannot, at least not in first instance, mean a **single** (loaf of) bread or generally the bread which was concretely used at the Corinthians' or

---

[154] See for instance Rom 5:15; 12:5; 1 Cor 10:33; Isa 53:11-12. Burchard assumes that οἱ πολλοί is a veiled reference to the Gentiles ("Importance", 130, n. 51). For οἱ πάντες cf. Rom 5:12; and 2 Cor 5:14!

[155] "**We** the many" and "**we** all" do not mean therefore Paul and the Corinthians - Paul is not present in Corinth, but refer to the universal church - a motif which we could already observe at the beginning of the letter in 1 Cor 1:2.

[156] Cf. the additional καὶ τοῦ ἑνὸς ποτηρίου in some MSS (D F G (629) it vg^{mss} and Ambrosiaster). The addition stresses the parallelism in v.16 and could point to the fact that these particular subjects, which in the catechism are connected to the bread, reminded the early church also of the wine word of the Markan tradition. And further the mention of the cup clearly indicates that the statement in v.17 about the Christian community is not essentially bound to the eucharistic **bread** alone, and that the same could be said in principal with the terminology of the cup. It appears that bread and body are preferred merely for the sake of the better metaphorical suitability, and not because the blood would point more to the "vertical" and the body to the "horizontal" significance of Christ (cf. Fee, 467).

any other congregation's celebration of the Lord's Supper[157]. In this general statement, as in the preceding catechism, (εἷς) ἄρτος rather principally means the bread over which the benedictions had been spoken as it was broken and distributed and consumed (μετεχεῖν), the **eucharistic** and consecrated bread which tangibly demonstrated the participants' communion (κοινωνία) with the body of Christ. And as such it is the **one** bread, the one bread which the believers received actually from the Lord at any Lord's Supper, actually the bread which he himself had broken and distributed as his body ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν (and ὑπὲρ πολλῶν). There is always only one eucharistic bread and so it is not the singularity of the bread loaf that makes the many a single body[158], but their communion with the body of Christ[159].

Because τὸ ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν is communion with τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ and because those who break and receive it as such are accordingly in **communion** with the body of Christ, the commonly assumed conclusion that the partakers therefore would themselves form the ecclesiological body of Christ or that the church would generally be established at the Lord's Supper, is a rather dubious

---

[157] The idea that the emphasis on the unity of the bread corresponds to the mention of the **breaking** of the bread in many κλάσματα in v.16 is merely another variation of this interpretation, according to which a single loaf of bread (Orr/Walther: "a flat, round, thick pancake" [250]) was used to express the unity of the partaking church. See for instance Robertson/Plummer's paraphrase :"Because the bread, although broken into many pieces, is yet one bread, we, although we are many, are one body" (214). Barrett ("Because there is one loaf"; 229, 233f) also refers to 1 Cor 5:7-8 as an analogy, but the stress in that piece is not on unity but on the purity of the congregation, and it further remains questionable what Barrett means with "they are ideally one and must become so in praxis" (234), for v.17 is not a parenesis (cf. ἐσμέν!). Other commentators who think εἷς would denote a **single** bread are: Banks, *Idea*, 86; Dunn, *Unity*, 165; Grosheide, 234; Hainz, *Kirche*, 19f; Klauck, "Eucharistie", 334f; Krause, "Frage", 36; Meeks, *Christians*, 159; Murphy O'Connor, "Community", 64; and Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 203. Orr/Walther refer to the prayer in *Did.* 9:4 as a parallel (250), but the εὐχαριστία in this later source does not mean the Lord's Supper which is the essential background for v.17, and further deals with the **eschatological** unity of the church (cf. *Did.* 10:5). See Roloff's consideration of the differences ("Heil", 196f).

[158] Εἷς should therefore be understood not numerically in the sense of "single", but more in the sense of "one and the same".

[159] See Walter: "Der Akzent liegt also auf dem Gespeistwerden aller von dem Einen, von Jesus Christus her (ἐκ τοῦ ἑνὸς ἄρτου); das Bild geht also nicht von der Vereinigung vieler Körner zu einem Brot aus" ("Christusglaube", 433); see also Delling, "Abendmahlsgeschehen", 333; Wolff, 54. And cf. Allo, 241f; and Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 203.

idea[160]. The communion of the Christians with the body of Christ is something completely different from their corporate identification with this body[161]. The fact that σῶμα occurs in vv.16 and 17 should not blind us to the significance of the different attributes with which the term is used in each case and which, we think, indicate an important difference and deliberate distinction: τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ is not the same as ἓν σῶμα, and the relation of the two σῶματα therefore requires further consideration. A brief survey of Paul's use of the concept in 1 Corinthians might be helpful for that purpose.

Excursus: Paul's Use of Σῶμα (Χριστοῦ)

In no other letter the concept of σῶμα occurs more often than in 1 Corinthians and we cannot, of course, look at all the various instances now[162]. We must restrict ourselves to those passages where Paul employs the term in a corporate sense, which is the case particularly in 1 Cor 12:12-13 and 12:27 where (ἓν)

---

[160] But see for instance Conzelmann: "Die Kirche ist nicht 'wie' ein Leib, sondern ist 'der' Leib Christi. Der sakramentale Anteil am **Leib** Christi macht uns zum Christus-Leib" (203); cf. Fee, although he objects to Conzelmann's idea that the sacred meal makes the Christians "the body of Christ" (470); see further Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 163f; Chrysostom, *Homilies on Corinthians*, 140; Goppelt, "Abendmahlsgemeinschaft", 24f; Hahn, "Gefahr", 167; Hainz, *Kirche*, 26-33,35-46; Käsemann, "Anliegen", 13f; Kertelge, "Kirchengemeinschaft", 102f; Klauck, "Eucharistie", 335f; id., *Kult*,264; Lang, 128,157; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 205-211,217f; Orr/Walther, 252; Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 25; Roloff, "Heil", 192; Schnackenburg, "Koinonia-Gedanke", 66; and Wendland, 73.

[161] See Murphy O'Connor who speaks of an "identification of the community of believers with Christ" ("Community", 66; cf. 63-69). For Percy the the ecclesiological body of Christ and the body of the crucified and resurrected Christ are "identisch" (*Σῶμα*, 44-46; cf. 6f). Hamer even stresses the point that "la théologie de corps de Christ [ecclesiological] doit s'expliquer ... suivant la ligne du **réalisme physique**" (*Église*, 60; bold type by G.H.). See further Käsemann, who holds the view that the church would be "der irdische Leib des auferstandenen Herrn" ("Motiv", 199; and passim). Cf. Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 212.

[162] Cf. n. 60. Among the other Pauline letters it is only Rom 12:3-5 where similar ideas of a corporate σῶμα are found. In the debated (deutero-) Pauline epistles to the Ephesians and to the Colossians the concept of a corporate σῶμα is much more developed and contains rather different notions of the relation of Christ as the head and of the church as his ecclesiastical body. Further, it is striking that the idea of a collective σῶμα appears there in a doxological, not in a parenetical context as is the case in Romans and 1 Corinthians. Cf. Banks, *Community*, 65-67; Berger, "Kirche", 205f; and Käsemann, "Motiv", 204-208.

σῶμα further is connected to a Christological (and "sacramental") statement[163]. These two, however, appear to be the closest comparable passages and might shed some light on the meaning of ἓν σῶμα in 1 Cor 10:17[164].

In the structure of chapter 12, vv.12 and 13 have a central position and function, for they give an explanation (γάρ) to the preceding argument (vv.4-11), and formulate the thesis which is developed in vv.14-26 and which is finally repeated in a pointed summary in v.27, before vv.28-31 concretely apply what was said to the Corinthians' use of the divine charisms[165]. The leading motif is apparently the idea of the unity among the many and variously gifted members of the congregation, a unity for which the ἓν καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πνεῦμα is essential as the authority which unites the variety of gifts and thus the gifted (v.11). This idea of unity is further developed and explained in v.12, in a comparison (καθάπερ ... οὕτως καὶ) of a body[166], consisting of many limbs, with Christ. It is important to note that the verse does not speak of **Christ's** body, but that "ἓν σῶμα" in relation to the πολλά and πάντα[167] μέλη remains a metaphor and an argumentative aid which intends to elucidate a certain feature of "ὁ Χριστος".

---

[163] In agreement with Wedderburn ("Body", 75) and Wolff (111, n. 225) we will not deal with 1 Cor 6:12-21, for σῶμα has no collective meaning there. The relation of the individual's σῶμα to Christ (and to the prostitute respectively) is at stake there, not the relation among the Christians. Nor do we think that σῶμα in 1 Cor 11:29 is a reference to the church (so Fee, 563f; cf. Banks, *Community*, 63; Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 169; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 38f; and Wedderburn, "Body", 77) or to the consecrated bread (so Weiß, 291; and Robertson/Plummer, 252), but to Christ's crucified body, like σῶμα in the preceding verses 24 and 27 (to which both *variae lectiones* in v.29 apparently point). Dishonoring the Christian brother (for whom the Lord died, cf. 1 Cor 8:11-12!) results from a false discerning of the Lord's body which he gave "**ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν**". See especially Klauck, *Kult*, 326f; and cf. Hofius, "Paradosis", 224, 240; and Schlatter, 328. Finally, there is also no reason to assert a corporate idea of "the body of Christ" in 1 Cor 1:13 (cf. for instance Klauck, *Kult*, 333; Friedrich, "Christus", 153), that would be rather eisegetical.

[164] On the whole issue see generally Banks, *Community*, 62-70; Gundry, *SŌMA*; Käsemann, "Motiv"; Klauck, *Kult*, 332-346; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 207-217; Percy, *Σῶμα*; Schweizer, "Leib Christi"; Wedderburn, "Body"; and Wolff's excursus "Die Gemeinde als 'Leib'" (110-114).

[165] Cf. Wolff, 106-110.

[166] Cf. Rom 12:4-5, although it is a slightly different argument: there is for instance no reference to baptism. But as in 1 Cor 10:17 Paul's statement "**we the many** are one body in Christ" (Rom 12:5) transcends local restrictions ("we" - i.e. including Paul) and apparently refers to the universal church.

[167] In comparison to v.17, it is striking that, apart from the concept of ἓν σῶμα we further find πολύ and πάν here, although not in their substantival emphatic form; cf. also the ἡμεῖς πάντες in 12:13.

So, just as a body is one, despite the fact of the variety and diversity of its limbs, so Christ is the one who constitutes unity among the many and diverse members of the Christian community[168]. The conjunction (καὶ) γὰρ in v.13 then indicates a further step of the explanation of the Christological principle of Christian unity[169], connecting it explicitly to a pneumatological statement (cf. v.11) on Christian baptism: "We were all baptized in one Spirit εἰς ἓν σῶμα ..."[170]! The aorist ἐβαπτίσθημεν refers to the baptism of **all**[171], Jews and Greeks, slaves and free men, and to the initial point of their being united through one Spirit[172] and in a common relation to one particular body, a relation which is described by the preposition εἰς. In connection with the verb βαπτίζειν this preposition occurs comparatively often in the NT (1 Cor 1:13, 15; 10:2; Gal 3:27; Rom 6:3-4; Acts 8:16; 19:5; Matt 28:19), so that one can even assume a fixed phrase which is behind the use here - 'to baptize in (the name of)' - and can quite surely exclude a spatial interpretation: it does not mean 'to baptize **into** (one body)'[173]. The most intelligible explanation, for us, is that Paul in his

---

[168] See Wolff's translation of v.12b: "... so (ist es) auch (mit) Christus" (106). His later paraphrase, however, "so steht es auch dort, wo Christus durch den Geist heilschaffend wirksam ist" (108), seems, to us, to go too far, for the admittedly close connection to v.11 still does not require us to introduce the πνεῦμα into v.12.

[169] V.13 should be understood as an explanation of the second part of v.12, of the οὕτως καὶ ὁ Χριστός, not of the whole comparison in the preceding verse.

[170] The last part of the verse is presumably also referring to baptism and not to the Eucharist (so for instance Klauck, *Kult*, 334f), as the verb form, also in the aorist, indicates. See for further discussion Wolff, 108f; and cf. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 63.

[171] The reference to the baptism of all indicates that the verb ἐβαπτίσθημεν depicts a general statement which points beyond the particular event(s) of the believers' individual baptism(s).

[172] The ἐν is instrumental here; see Wolff, 108.

[173] The frequent βαπτίζειν εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, which presumably derived from the Hebrew בְּשֵׁם (cf. BDR §206,2) or לְשֵׁם (cf. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 55-57), would suggest that one should render "baptize in" (the name of Christ; the Father the Son and the Holy Spirit; etc). Among the Pauline passages which apparently build on that language, 1 Cor 10:2 is particularly important for us, for obviously this passage cannot be explained in a spatial sense (see Wolff, 41; Wedderburn, ibid., 58f). Wedderburn also rejects an understanding of σῶμα as "a spatial entity" ("Body", 79); see generally his detailed considerations, although mainly dealing with Rom 6:3, in his *Baptism*, 54-63. See also Wolff's general arguments against spatial interpretations of εἰς (108). Yet in 1 Cor 12:13 he prefers a consecutive εἰς pointing to the aim and result of baptism, and accordingly he does not interpret σῶμα as Christ's body. But his references to parallels in Matt 3:11 and Acts 2:38 are dubious. For in the first passage the preposition does not occur and the latter has another rendering for the Hebrew בְּשֵׁם with an ἐπί with dative construction, before an attributive εἰς ἄφεσιν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν is added.

formulation with βαπτίζειν εἰς in 1 Cor 12:13, as likewise in Gal 3:27 and Rom 6:3-4, omitted, but still presupposed, the reference to the name of Christ, for the sake of emphasizing a certain aspect of baptism. The phrase describes an act of transfer of the neophyte to Christ, pointing to a "union between the baptized and Christ ...[who] is none other than the Christ who died"[174]. And so ἓν σῶμα in our passage refers to the body of the crucified and risen Lord, with whom the Jews and Greeks, the slaves and free men were united, who represented the sole basis of their living in unity and who connected them with one another just as inseparably as the limbs of a body[175]. So we have here the striking fact of a different meaning of ἓν σῶμα in the two parts of the comparison in vv.12-13. First, we have a reference to a common metaphor: the limbs of a body, although they are **πάντα**, still depict **ἓν** σῶμα, a single organism (v.12a)[176]. And then, in the corresponding part (vv.12b-13) which shall be elucidated by the comparison, we find the same terminology and a similar relation of (ἡμεῖς) **πάντες** (the Christian community) and **ἓν** σῶμα (Christ's crucified body), yet with a slightly

---

[174] Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 60. Cf. Hainz, *Kirche*, 40. Yet Wedderburn also warns against focussing one-sidedly either on the crucified or the exalted Christ, for "it is one Christ, crucified and risen, with whom we are united" ("Body", 80); cf. Schweizer, "Leib Christi", 286f.

[175] Wolff thinks rather of a metaphor also in v.13 (108, 110). But see Wedderburn who speaks of "the compelling focus of Christian unity in that one crucified and risen Lord to whom all Christians are committed" ("Body", 79). He also argues that the origins of the idea of the corporate σῶμα (Χριστοῦ) which received "more doctrinal development later" (79), may be found here in Paul's argument with the Corinthians, and that it might result "from a conflation of Jewish and early Christian ideas of solidarity with the Hellenistic metaphor of the body and its limbs, a conflation helped by the 'body' language of the Eucharist" (82; cf. 79).

[176] See Wolff: "Mit seiner Verwendung des Bildes vom Leib knüpft Paulus an einen in der Antike verbreiteten metaphorischen Gebrauch von 'Leib' für eine Einheit in der Vielheit an." (111); and see his references to ancient and contemporary sources (including Philo and Josephus) and his discussion of the possibilities of another derivation of this metaphor in Paul (111f). According to Wolff and Wedderburn ("Body", 82-86) the origin from a Gnostic background and from a Jewish or Hellenistic (Adam-) Anthropos myth (cf. Käsemann, "Motiv", 180-184; and id., "Anliegen", 12,17; Klauck, *Kult*, 337-345; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 213-217; and concerning the latter cf. also Schweizer, "Leib Christi", 272-285) can be excluded for the lack of adequate source material and of a sufficient conceptual basis. The especially Jewish idea of "corporate personality" is favoured by Schweizer (ibid.) and considered by Wedderburn (ibid., 83-85); yet Wolff objects that the textual evidence is fairly narrow (according to Banks there is no evidence of a metaphorical σῶμα in Jewish literature at all; *Community*, 69) and that the idea conflicts with Paul's belief in the presence of Christ and in his continuous work; cf. Berger, "Kirche", 205. Percy's suggestion, finally, to derive σῶμα Χριστοῦ from ἐν Χριστῷ (*Σῶμα*, 43f), is rather speculative (see Klauck's objections in *Kult*, 336).

different meaning - (ἡμεῖς) πάντες **are** not one body but we **were baptized** εἰς one body, that is, if we explicate the metonymy, baptized so as to be joined to Christ who died and rose and we with him. So, both the many limbs of an organism and the many and diverse members of the Christian community are united in one body, but the latter is not corporately identified with the uniting body. Even the final conclusion in v.27[177], ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους, must not be understood like that. And one should not render it: "you are the body of Christ"[178]! For σῶμα is not determined by an article or by ἕν and Χριστοῦ should be understood parallel to the corresponding ἐκ μέρους; and the use of μέλη finally shows that the statement still rests on the metaphorical level. So we could paraphrase: "as you belong to Christ, you Corinthians are a body and individually you are its limbs"[179], or, with Wolff: "Ihr seid als Gemeinde ein Organismus, der sich dem Heilswirken des Christus ... verdankt; jeder einzelne hat darin seine gottgewiesene Funktion, so daß ihr untereinander unentbehrlich seid"[180].

We can conclude that Paul does not use the concept of σῶμα in a collective Christo-ecclesiological sense in those passages of 1 Corinthians, where he deals with the relation of Christ and his church in the terminology of a body. His application of σῶμα to the community of the believers must be described throughout as metaphorical, although the members of the church derive their particular unity from the σῶμα Χριστοῦ, the body of Christ the crucified and resurrected Lord. But the two are not corporately or ecclesiologically identified.

Returning to 1 Cor 10:17 we find that these observations match well with our previous considerations. Τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ in v.16 and ἓν σῶμα in v.17 are

---

[177] Vv.14-26 return to the metaphorical language and apply it more concretely to the particular chaotic situation in Corinth. The concept of σῶμα, in its relation to its various μέλη, stays throughout this narrative passage on the metaphorical level. And the members of the Corinthian community in their relation to Christ are not directly addressed before v.27.

[178] But cf. nn. 18 and 19.

[179] Cf. also Wedderburn, "Body", 80.

[180] Wolff, 110.

not the same[181], just as ἓν σῶμα in 1 Cor 12:12 and 13 had to be differentiated[182]. The phrase ἓν σῶμα in v.17 must therefore be described as a metaphor stressing not the relation of the Christians to Christ but the relation among the members of the Christian community, as the subject "we the many" clearly indicates (cf.12:27 - ὑμεῖς ἐστε; cf.12:12)[183]. In the catechism on the other hand, the subject of the phrase τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ is undoubtedly Christ crucified (cf. 12:13), not the congregation. So we have two kinds of σώματα side by side with two different subjects. Yet, just as we found a certain connection of the body of Christ to the corporate unity of his church in 1 Cor 12-13, so 1 Cor 10:16-17 similarly shows a connection of the two bodies[184]. The line of thought in 1 Cor 10:16-17, however, goes as follows (starting with the conclusion): We the many are one body because the bread of which we all partake at the Lord's Supper is the one eucharistic bread; and this is one because it is the bread which to the participants in the Lord's Supper conveys communion with the body of Christ crucified. V.17 is therefore basically concerned with soteriology much more than it might seem at first glance. For it is not the (single loaf of) bread which makes the unity of the Christian community[185], but the individual and corporate communion with Christ's sacrificed body[186]. The unity of the community as one body derives therefore

---

[181] So also Delling, "Abendmahlsgeschehen", 324, 333; Grosheide, 233; Gundry, *SŌMA*, 238; Hofius, "Paradosis", 227, n. 135; Wedderburn, "Body", 76; and Wolff, 54, 110, 113. Cf. Walter, "Christusglaube", 433.

[182] It need not be confusing that the single phrase ἓν σῶμα can be used so differently, referring corporately to the unity of the limbs of an organism (12:12), figuratively to the unity of a group of people (10:17), and finally, in a pointed statement on Baptism, individually to the unity of the body of the crucified and resurrected Lord (12:13), from whom alone all collective unity can derive. Apparently Paul did not use a fixed formula, but in each case employed the phrase for argumentative reasons, so that the relevant context must decide the interpretation.

[183] In 1 Cor 10:17; 12:12 and 12:14-27 the Christians (or according to the metaphor, the μέλη) are the subject of the collective σῶμα. In 12:13 God is the logical subject of the baptizing εἰς ἓν σῶμα, the body of the crucified Christ.

[184] Interestingly enough we have in both cases a reference to a basic Christian rite, either to Baptism or to the Eucharist.

[185] But cf. Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 203.

[186] See Rom 12:5 which is nearly synonymous with 1 Cor 10:17: οἱ πολλοὶ ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν ἐν Χριστῷ. Cf. our excursus on ἐν Χριστῷ in chapter 2.2.2 above.

from the communion with Christ's body which constantly constitutes the Christians' individual and collective existence. And so soteriology remains the basis of ecclesiology, and the church roots in the body of Christ crucified which was given ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν[187] when once for all one died for all.

2.3.4 The Parenetical Context: Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων (1 Cor 8:1-11:1)

After paying so much attention to a pre-Pauline tradition and to the concept of κοινωνία therein (v.16), and after considering in some detail a brief and associative, yet weighty and instructive note which the Apostle attached to this catechetical statement of the Lord's Supper (v.17), we must now, of course, finally turn to the actual cause and context of this traditional reference. For Paul obviously did not intend to provide some kind of teaching on the issue of the Eucharist, but rather for argumentative reasons reminded them of this commonly held doctrine. Still, it was right to examine the initial meaning of the tradition first, as it existed prior to the letter and was a previously known and accepted authority for both the author and his addressees. And Paul's instructions on the issue of idol-meat, in the course of which this piece of catechism was employed, can only play a secondary role in explaining it.

In the context of the particular subject of this whole study - the concept of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians - we are mainly interested, of course, in the other κοινων-derivatives in vv.18 and 20 of chapter 10 which are constructed, as it seems, in parallel to v.16. Yet, before we can examine those, we have to

---

[187] Quite interesting are Bornkamm's considerations of this phrase in the paradosis of 1 Cor 11:24 ("Herrenmahl", 162f, 169). Christ's salvific gift ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν always implies, and appeals to, an appropriate existence and behaviour ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων on the part of the gifted. The conformity of the Christians to Christ is a fundamental pattern in Paul's theology, and in connection with the Eucharist seems to be the key to the interpretation of 1 Cor 11:17-33 (cf. Klauck, *Kult*, 327) and depicts also an essential notion of the Apostle's argument against the consumption of idol-meat as for instance 1 Cor 8:11-12 reveals. This topic of mutual obligation in the course of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 might also help to explain Paul's unexpected parenthesis of v.17 in the context of an argument against idolatry and might count as another argument in favour of the integrity of these three chapters in 1 Corinthians.

describe Paul's line of thought in the argument of the immediate context of 1 Cor 10:1-22 and actually of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1. None other of the many problems which the troubled community in Corinth had put on the Apostle's agenda was considered in such length and detail and seems to have been as urgent as the question περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων[188].

2.3.4.1 The Problem: Idol-Meat in Corinth

The Christians in Corinth had given up their former idols (1 Cor 12:2) and had been washed clean from their old depraved existence (1 Cor 6:11), but still they continued living in their former environment as members of the same unchanged society in which they had their families and friends, their tasks and duties just as before. They had become a new creation in Christ (2 Cor 5:17), clearly distinct from those "outside" (1 Cor 5:12-13), and still they were not about to leave this world, but kept on dwelling among πόρνοις, πλεονέκταις, ἅρπαξιν and even εἰδωλολάτραις (1 Cor 5:10). The task of how to relate these two spheres was laid before each Christian convert, although it was obviously solved in different ways. And particularly in a church as young as the Corinthian it bore a great potential for conflicts and confusion, as not only 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 demonstrates[189]. Apparently Corinthian Christians had participated in meals where meat was served which had been ritually offered in a pagan sacrifice before[190]. They felt free to do so, because of their conviction that the pagan

---

[188] Apart from the commentaries and some rather specific studies of particular aspects of these chapters, cf. generally the investigations of this topic by Barrett, "Things Sacrificed to Idols"; Hahn, "Teilhabe am Heil und Gefahr des Abfalls" (and cf. the whole volume to which Hahn contributes: *Freedom and Love. The Guide for Christian Life (1 Cor 8-10; Rom 14-15)*, Monographic Series of "Benedictina" 6); Klauck, *Kult*, 241-285; Soden, "Sakrament und Ethik bei Paulus"; Theißen, "Die Starken und die Schwachen in Korinth"; Walter, "Christusglaube und heidnische Religiösität"; and especially Willis' fundamental study on *Idol Meat in Corinth*.

[189] Cf. for instance 1 Cor 4:9-13; 5:1, 9-13; 6:1-11, 12-20; 7:12-16; 14:23-25; 2 Cor 6:14-18.

[190] It is not clear whether 1 Cor 8:10 and 10:20-21 refer to the same kind of meals (cf. Hahn, "Gefahr", 154), and whether Paul distinguishes between unofficial occasions, maybe in a temple dining room, and official participation in an obviously cultic sacrificial meal (cf. Walter, "Christusglaube", 427). Yet, as Willis showed, a strict separation of religious and non-religious meals in the Hellenistic society is hardly possible anyway, and the various kinds of meals with family members, friends or business partners presumably involved at least some element of formal

deities and idols did not exist and had no power anyway (1 Cor 8:4-6; cf. 10:19)[191]. But for other members of the congregation such a behaviour was highly offensive, presumably not so much because they could not afford to buy meat, but because they felt it involved them too much in their former paganism and in the idolatrous habits of the past (1 Cor 8:7)[192]. The question at stake in 1 Cor 8-10 is therefore not so much a conflict of different social status, particularly between Jewish and Gentile Christians[193] or between rich and poor, but it appears to be rather a personal matter of the individual's conscience and a theological matter of the Christian's relation to idolatry; that is where Paul at least lays the emphasis in his discussion of the topic. That does not exclude the

---

worship (cf. *Idol Meat*, 7-64; 165f).

[191] If Theißen's analysis is right, it was primarily the wealthy Christians, who could afford to buy meat and had a certain position in society which made it impossible for them not to attend official meals which were often held in a temple (cf. 1 Cor 8:10); Theißen, "Die Starken", 275, 279-282; but see his whole article; and cf. Riesner, "Korinth", 818. Yet Willis' observation should be considered here as well, that Paul nowhere explicitly refers to a faction of the "strong". Willis therefore further assumes, quite different from Theissen's position, that the more liberal Christians simply were the majority of the believers in Corinth (*Idol Meat*, 89, 118) and that "weak" implies also the notion of a minority status.

[192] This verse makes it difficult to believe that the picture which Theißen draws can show more than tendencies in the Corinthian congregation. Of course it was much easier for poorer people with less important positions to withdraw from their former relationships and responsibilities, and of course Christians of a lower status level and of lesser wealth did not and could not eat meat as often ("Die Starken", 279-286) - only after great festivals was more meat available for lower prices or even freely distributed among the people (cf. Murphy O'Connor, *Corinth*, 161-167), so that poorer people could have eaten meat in a more explicitly cultic context. But 1 Cor 8:7 assumes that the opponents of idol-meat were formerly used to it! Further, Theißen's social description of the congregation builds too much on the scanty information which the letters provide only for a few members of the Corinthian church, and therefore his conclusion of two groups fairly opposed in the range of social hierarchy, a small wealthy and influential upper-class patronizing a majority of lower-class people, is not fully convincing. See also Meeks' remarks on the significance of status inconsistencies in Corinth (*Christians*, 70-73, 79, 120, 191; cf. Hurd, *Origins*, 123-125). And cf. our considerations above in chapter 2.1 ("The Community in Corinth") where we found Hengel's presumption of a larger middle class (*Christianity*, 185) more appropriate and better fitting the evidence, also concerning the issue of the consumption or rejection of idol-meat.

[193] See Meeks, *Christians*, 98; and Theißen, "Die Starken", 273f. Barrett's suggestion, however, that the whole problem was imported to the Corinthian church by a kind of counter-mission of Jewish Christians from Jerusalem who wanted to spread the Apostolic Decree among the Gentiles and demanded that they obey it ("Idols", 53), is problematic, although Barrett's general thesis is surely right, that Paul can hardly be counted as a co-author of this decree (ibid., 46) which is so important in Luke-Acts (15:20, 29; 21:25). But Paul's mentioning of concrete situations of conflict (in the temple, on the market, at private invitations) for which the possibility of a consumption of idol-meat is considered, and the fact that the Apostle nowhere directly reacts to these Jewish Christian groups or explicitly objects to their false teaching, make Barrett's idea rather unlikely.

possibility that the problem had a social significance for the Corinthians as they "had many social obligations from family or business (marriages, funerals, puberty rites) which would have involved sacrificial meals normally in or near the temple"[194], yet Paul's concern for these social aspects is comparatively small (cf. 10:27-30)[195], so that one treads on a hypothetical terrain here, if one follows these tracks only.

In the course of the argument in 1 Cor 8-10 one can distinguish several parts which could be described more or less as follows: 1 Cor 8; 9; 10:1-22; and 10:23-11:1[196].

2.3.4.2 The Argument in 1 Cor 8 and 9

Chapter 8 takes up, and presumably even verbally builds on, the argumentation of the Corinthians as it had reached the Apostle in their letter, and in which the

---

[194] Willis, *Idol Meat*, 63. See generally Willis' investigations on the relation of "Sacrifice, Cultic Meals, and Associations in Hellenistic Life" (ibid., 7-64), where he points out that cultic meals generally were understood not as sacramental or communal meals stressing the relation to the relevant deity, but that they "were generally regarded fundamentally as occasions for social association and conviviality" (ibid., 49) and were as such "characteristic expressions of Greek public life" (ibid., 63). That he later wants to interpret the Lord's Supper and the concept of κοινωνία in these terms (ibid., 167-181, 182-209), however, is far less convincing and may result from an approach to his subject which did not necessarily have a starting point in the analysis of the relevant NT texts. Cf. also Klauck, who examines in much detail all kinds of sacred meals in the environment of early Christianity (*Kult*, 31-233), although for the sake of understanding the Lord's Supper in its cultural and historical context, not so much concerning the problem of idol-meat 1 Cor 8-10.

[195] Even in this passage which deals with (public) invitations of Christians to a meal with τις τῶν ἀπίστων, the major concern is not so much social matters, but the question of an official announcement of the idolatrous origin of the meat, and the instruction not to offend the other's conscience.

[196] Although recently questioned again by Klauck (*Kult*, 241, 250, 252, 283 - he assumes a compilation of two sources: 9:1-18; 10:1-22; and 8:1-13; 9:19-23; 10:23-11:1) the integrity is no more doubted by the majority of the commentators (cf. above chapter 2.1, n. 7). Willis for instance explains the different features of the basically similar argumentation in 8 and 10 as follows: "In chapter 8 Paul begins as he does because of the way the Corinthians had made their points. In chapter 10 Paul works more from his own agenda" (*Idol Meat*, 112); cf. Meeks, *Christians*, 98-100. Soden's interesting idea that 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 depicts a typical pattern of Pauline argumentation ("Sakrament", 20; cf. 8), an exposition (8-9) - a scriptural proof (10:1-22) - and a resolution (10:23-11:1), has the difficulty that 10:1-22 is not a scriptural proof, but a typological νουθεσία of the dangers of idolatry (1-11) and an argument for the incompatibility of Christians' attending the Lord's Supper and pagan rites (15-22). And there are statements of resolution also in 8:1-10:22.

Christians consuming idol-meat might have appealed to their γνῶσις as convicted monotheists[197]. Paul's discussion, however, concludes with a Christologically and soteriologically based statement and principle, that the Christian ἐξουσία, which admittedly allows the consumption of idol-meat, is actually limited by, and essentially fulfilled only in, mutual consideration of the weaker brother whose conscience may under no circumstances be offended (8:11-13)[198].

Chapter 9 has nothing to do with idol-meat or idolatry and appears to be a digression in the train of thought which returns to this topic explicitely in chapter 10[199]. However, this excursus is an integral part of the whole argument and reveals Paul's assessment of the debated problem, as it illustrates and thus emphasizes the antecedent fundamental principle of self-denial and of renunciation of one's ἐξουσία for the sake of another's welfare, according to the Apostle's own good example[200]. Above all vv.15-23 demonstrate and stress the

---

[197] Cf. Willis' detailed exegesis of this chapter, *Idol Meat*, 65-122. He stresses Paul's direct and immediate confrontation of the Corinthians' arguments taking up their slogans, but showing neither any intention to educate the "weak" nor explicitly favouring the position of the "strong". However, Willis' interpretation of εἰς Χριστόν in 8:12 as a reference to the church as the ecclesiastical "body of Christ" (ibid., 107) might be in line with the main thesis of his study, but has no basis in the text itself.

[198] Note the introduction and four-fold emphasis of the term ὁ ἀδελφός in 8:11-13 which is Paul's more precise and pointed identification of ὁ ἀσθενῶν! These verses are particularly sharp in their formulation - "destroying the brother for whom Christ died!" - even more so on the basis of all what Paul had previously said about the significance of Christ's death on the cross and of God's own "weakness" and his election of τὰ ἀσθενῆ (1:25, 27; cf. 2:3 and generally 1:17-2:5; see also 2 Cor 13:4, 9; and Rom 5:6; 8:3). The first person singular in v.13 is paradigmatic and does not explicitly mean the Apostle.

[199] There might be a relation between Klauck's nearly complete disregard of vv.11-13 in his discussion of chapter 8 (*Kult*, 241-249) and his judgement of 9:1-18 as a "harter Bruch" to the preceding chapter (249f). See Willis who calls the structure of the argument in 1 Cor 8-10 "a common Hellenistic rhetorical device" showing "skillful planning and placement" (*Idol Meat*, 272) and who points to 1 Cor 12-14 as another example of such a structuring with an excursus (chapter 13).

[200] Note the terminological and internal connections between the two chapters: the Apostle refers also to his right to eat certain food (although of another kind), cf. 9:7-14. Cf. also ἐξουσία in 8:9 and 9:4-5, 12, 18; and ἀσθεν- in 8:7, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 9:22 (ἐγενόμην τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν ἀσθενής, ἵνα τοὺς ἀσθενεῖς κερδήσω). It is essential to note that Paul does not say correspondingly that he became "strong" for the "strong". Cf also πρόσκομμα in 8:9 and ἐγκοπὴν δίδωμι in 9:12. 1 Cor 9 is no defence of Paul's apostleship (with Willis [*Idol Meat*, 272] contra Barrett ["Idols", 53]), although in the context of the preceding chapters (cf. 1:12; 3:5-6, 22; 4:6)

Christological and soteriological basis of Paul's preceding parenesis in their revealing the very same basis of the Apostle's own paradigmatic existence which he wants the Corinthians to imitate just as he himself imitates Christ (11:1)[201]. The gospel which Paul was commissioned - and even forced - to proclaim (9:16), and thus Christ himself as he became weak and died to save sinners, made the Apostle become all things to all men and therefore weak for the weak, in order to save some (9:22)[202]. Paul transcends the "must" of his office as Christ's messenger in the way that his whole life displays the character and essence of the message. Because of the gospel he, the ἐλεύθερος, gave up defending his personal rights and made himself everyone's servant (9:19)[203], aiming for a complete conformity to the gospel as a συγκοινωνός τοῦ εὐαγγελίου (9:23)[204].

Paul's statements imply yet another reference to his exclusive claim of the fatherhood of the Corinthian church (9:1-6; cf. 4:14-15).

[201] Cf. 1 Cor 4:16; and 1 Thess 1:6-7. See further Phil 3:17 (συμμιμεῖσθαι); and Gal 4:12. The distinct structure of 9:19-23 (Weiß: "ein Kabinettstück überlegtesten Aufbaues" [242]) is well explained in Eichholz's article, "Der missionarische Kanon des Paulus. 1.Kor.9,19-23". Cf. id., *Umriß*, 48-55.

[202] The "weak" of chapter 8 are different, though, referring to Christian brothers, not to unbelievers who are obviously meant here in v.22. Still, in line with Paul's soteriological deepening of the actual problem in 8:11-13, there is a close connection of both kinds of ἀσθενεῖς. For the "weak" of 9:22 are presumably not a particular group in the spectrum of the Apostle's missionary clientele (Ἰουδαῖοι and ἄνομοι), but in general (note the omission of ὡς which is used before in 9:20-21) mean the "weak" and "godless" for which Christ died (Rom 5:6) and to which the Apostle was sent; Eichholz's interpretation (*Umriß*, 50, 53-55) is doubtful therefore on this point. Concerning the topos of the Apostle's "kerygmatic" weakness and its Christological motivation (Weder calls it the "Kreuzförmigkeit der apostolischen Existenz"; *Kreuz*, 238) cf. especially 1 Cor 2:3, where Paul describes himself as weak just as God (1:25) and in accordance with the divine election of the weak (1:27); this feature is further explicit in 2 Cor 13:4, 9; and Gal 4:13. See also 1 Cor 4:10; and 2 Cor 11:30 (vv.21 and 29 are ironical); 12:5, 9-10. The various reports of Paul's suffering belong to this theme too (cf. for instance 1 Cor 4:9-13; 2 Cor 1:5-7; 6:4-10; or 1 Cor 15:31; 2 Cor 4:10; Rom 8:36; Phil 3:10 [κοινωνία παθημάτων αὐτοῦ]).

[203] It is essential to note that Paul does not renounce his ἐξουσία, but that he uses it properly - he is free to restrict himself. Hainz's interpretation is questionable therefore as he regards Paul's behaviour as a requirement of the Apostle's salvation and accordingly as a soteriological demand for the Corinthians (*Kirche*, 121f). It seems to be exactly the opposite: those who are saved and liberated no longer defend their own rights, but are free to give their lives for the salvation of others.

[204] That is how we understand the final clause of v.23, not as a reference to Paul's (eschatological) salvation. That Paul wants to become a συγκοινωνός of the gospel (actually of Christ, as the context reveals) must be understood as a consequence flowing from the cause of all his actions which Paul mentions at the beginning of the same sentence - διὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον; Phil 3:8 displays a similar idea with similar διὰ τὸ and ἵνα construction. See also Eichholz who renders: "Eben indem er [Paul] das Evangelium verkündigt, wird er selbst des Evangeliums

The last verses then (9:24-27) lead on from the paradigmatic part to a more parenetic conclusion which is concretely directed to the Corinthians again[205] and employs the common and at that time well known image of the sportsman's self-restriction and total dedication for the sake of winning his fight[206]. And thus the ground is prepared for the following passage, disturbing false security in those who are too sure about their safe and firm stand (cf. 10:12)[207].

2.3.4.3 The Argument in 1 Cor 10

Chapter 10 can be divided into two subsections again: in 10:1-22 Paul deals with the danger of idolatry, and in 10:23-11:1 he gives concrete advice on how to manage situations where idol-meat could be bought or consumed unintentionally, before he finally concludes the whole debate with a general résumé (10:31-11:1).

1 Cor 10:1-22 should be regarded as an argumentative unit, centered around Paul's warning to "take care not to fall"[208] and his command to "flee from

---

teilhaftig" ("Kanon", 120). He also emphasizes the normative function of the gospel: "Der *Inhalt* der Botschaft und die *Form*, in der es mitgeteilt wird, *entsprechen einander*" (ibid., 115). Συγκοινωνός must therefore describe more than a mere "sharing in", for it existentially involves the whole person and is also more than some kind of companionship (despite the emphasizing συν-; the few occurrences of συγκοινων- words in Paul seem to refer to particularly close relationships - see Phil 1:7; 4:14; Rom 11:17). The gospel determines its συγκοινων-relation to Paul rather in terms of a total claim on the entire existence of the Apostle.

[205] Yet the close relation to the preceding statements must be noted too, especially in vv.26-27 which finally point to the Apostle's example again. Cf. δουλαγωγεῖν with 9:19 and see the reference to Paul's κήρυγμα.

[206] See Murphy O'Connor who assumes that the Isthmian games might have been celebrated in Corinth also during the time of Paul's stay in the city (*Corinth*, 15-17).

[207] See Hahn, "Gefahr", 151f, cf. 162; Walter, "Christusglaube", 226; and Willis, *Idol Meat*, 161-163. 1 Cor 9:24-27 is therefore the crossing point where the two main lines of Paul's argument merge: the consideration of the weaker brother's conscience, and the personal danger for those who freely consume idol-meat in a cultic context, to be caught eventually in idolatry. Burchard's statement is right, however, that the general theme of chap. 10 is not so much "sacrament and ethics" (Soden) but "conversion and perseverance" ("Importance", 123; cf. Klauck, *Kult*, 252; and Walter, "Christusglaube", 431). The reference to the Lord's Supper (and to Baptism) has only argumentative reasons.

[208] Cf. Willis' interpretation of this verse (*Idol Meat*, 153, 155f) which is for him "the point of the entire pericope" (ibid., 155). Dubious, however, is his speaking of the **Corinthians'** "faithfulness to God" (ibid., 156), where the text mentions only **God's** faithfulness to the Corinthians (v.13).

idolatry" (10:12-14)[209]. These imperative phrases provide the basic message and the common parenetical intention of both the excursion into the typological and scriptural past of the Christian community (10:1-11) as well as of the comparison of pagan cult meals to the Lord's Supper (10:15-22) which turns more concretely to the actual situation of the Corinthians[210]. It is important, however, to note that the Apostle's urgent appeal to his "beloved" Corinthians, φεύγετε ἀπὸ τῆς εἰδωλολατρίας, **results** from the statement of God's faithfulness[211] which does not allow temptations beyond human strength and provides a way to escape them (v.13): **Therefore** you Corinthians - for whom the dealings with idol-meat

---

[209] That the break which most Greek editions (including Nestle-Aland) and translations have after v.13 is rather misleading and contradicts the grammatical evidence, has rightly been pointed out by Hahn ("Gefahr", 165; cf. Walter, "Christusglaube", 430; and Willis, *Idol Meat*, 162). The very rare διόπερ in v.14 (the only other occurrence in the NT is 1 Cor 8:13; cf. some Mss of 14:13) is an emphasized version (περ) of διό (from δι' ὅ) - a conjunction which introduces a subordinate relative clause: "just because of this" (Grosheide, 229); cf. Robertson/Plummer: "wherefore" (211). See also Moule: "διόπερ, with apparently much the same meaning as διό, but with perhaps a greater stress upon the logical connexion between the clauses it connects" (164; cf. BDR §451,5). V.14 is therefore tied much more to v.13 than to v.15 which follows asyndetically, and it does not introduce a new thought or step in the argument which could justify a break. It is further not correct to describe διόπερ as a conclusive reference back to all of vv.1-13 (so for instance Allo, 236; Fee even argues for a conclusion of 8:1-10:13 [464]; see also Klauck, *Kult*, 258; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 54; and Willis, *Idol Meat*, 165), for Paul did not choose this rare and distinctive conjunction without intention, and if he wanted to have expressed a more collective and summarizing "therefore", he had other and much more adequate possibilities (cf. for instance διὰ τοῦτο/ταῦτα; οὖν; or ἄρα). But διόπερ subordinates v.14 strictly to the preceding v.13 and maybe further to v.12, although vv.12 and 13 are not explicitly connected. And so, one can regard vv.12-14 as the centre of the argument of 1 Cor 10:1-22, the nucleus which provides the thesis which is carried out in vv.1-11 and 15-22. Conzelmann's strict separation of vv.1-13 from 14-22 (201) therefore has no reason at all in the text.

[210] Hahn notes the parallel structure of the two parts, where in each case the (typological) mention of the Lord's Supper (10:3-4 and 16-17) is contrasted with an inadequate behaviour of the recipients of the eucharistic gifts ("Gefahr", 153).

[211] Cf. 1 Cor 1:9! In both passages God's faithfulness is described as his present and future attitude towards the Corinthian Christians. The future tense here (ἐάσει and ποιήσει) does not refer particularly to an eschatological event of πειρασμός (but see Hahn, "Gefahr", 164), but on the basis of the preceding general statment it rather includes the Corinthians' actual conflict and temptation, too. Presumably the occurrence of κοινωνία after πιστὸς ὁ θεός in 1 Cor 10:16 is not a deliberate allusion to 1 Cor 1:9, although it generally displays the same order, and in the parenetic argument against idolatry the two topics are also closely related: God's faithfulness bridging the gap to the τέλος of times and - more fundamental - the κοινωνία with Christ('s atoning body and blood) as the constant constitutive condition of Christian existence, are the two basic principals on which Paul's argumentation and strict demands build (cf. the imperative forms in vv.14, 15, and 18; but also the conclusion in v.21). Klauck's reference to Deut 7:9 (*Kult*, 257) is quite revealing, because there the statement of God's covenant faithfulness follows a warning of idolatry (Deut 7:4-5; cf. Deut 4 and 6) and is then related to the first commandment (cf. Deut 5:9 and 7:10).

depict a situation of serious temptation[212], and for whom God opens up a way to escape being caught again by the sin of idolatry and all its malicious consequences, **therefore** flee from idolatry[213]! You are not as safe as you think you are (v.12), as you are still running the race (9:24-25), and so you should learn from your forefathers' failure on their journey to the promised land[214].

The interpretation of the exodus events in 1 Cor 10:1-11 is more than merely a negative example from the history of Israel, for it describes the typological relation[215], which God established between the Israel of the Old Covenant and the Christian community of the New Covenant at the end of times - according to scripture (vv.6 and 11; cf. 1 Cor 9:9-10; Rom 4:23-24; and 15:4)[216]. And it is only for that reason that Paul can talk so inclusively of οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν

---

[212] Not God is the initiator of the temptation (contra Weiß, 255), but presumably Satan or other evil forces (cf. 1 Cor 7:5; 2 Cor 2:11; 1 Thess 3:5); see Hahn, "Gefahr", 164; and Wolff, 49.

[213] More or less such an interpretation is also held by Grosheide, 229 (although it remains enigmatic why v.14 shall be directed to the "weak" in particular); Jeske, "Rock", 252; Robertson/Plummer, 211; Walter, "Christusglaube", 427; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 158f; and Wolff, 48-50.

[214] Note the γάρ in 10:1, which apparently indicates a link to the preceding argument. Οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν (BDR §495,2: "bitte bedenkt!") normally introduces an important statement which is fairly new to the addressees (cf. Rom 1:13; 11:25; 1 Cor 12:1; 2 Cor 1:8; 1 Thess 4:13); see Willis, *Idol Meat*, 126; and Wolff, 40. Jeske's conviction that Paul would refer to a well known tradition here (especially in 10:4) is therefore quite surprising ("Rock", 251, cf. 246f).

[215] The link between the type (here for instance the food and drink in the desert) and the antitype (the Lord's Supper) "ist weder eine bloße äußere Gleichartigkeit von Vorgängen bzw. Personen noch eine sie verbindende geschichtliche Kontinuität, sondern das Handeln Gottes in seiner Identität" (Roloff, *Neues Testament*, 172). The absolute and qualitative difference between the two parts is essential, however: "Das Herrenmahl ist gegenüber der Mannaspeise das Mahl des '**Neuen** Bundes' (1.Kor 11,25)" (see Goppelt, "Typologie", 250; bold type by G.H.). Hahn's thesis that "Exodus und Wüstenwanderung gewinnen soteriologisch dieselbe Qualität wie die Zeit seit Ostern" ("Gefahr", 159) is therefore fairly questionable. Yet he rightly points to the fact that the typological method is not the only way of referring to the OT in this passage: vv.6-11 are paradigmatic (158f). See generally also Goppelt's article on "Apokalyptik und Typologie bei Paulus" and cf. his "Paulus und die Heilsgeschichte. Schlußfolgerungen zu Röm 4 und 1.Kor 10,1-13" in *NTS* 13 (1966/67), 31-42.

[216] Apart from the accounts in the books of Exodus and Numbers, Paul's presentation of the exodus events seems to follow mainly Pss 77; 104; and 105 (LXX), at times even verbally. Concerning vv.1-4 for instance see Ps 77:12 (Fathers); Ps 77:13; 104:39; 105:7-9; Exod 13:21; 14:19-22 (the cloud and the miracle at the Red Sea); Ps 77:24-25; 104:40; Exod 16:4-35 (bread from heaven); Ps 77:15-16; 104:41; Exod 17:16; Num 20:7-11 (water from the rock). Or see concerning the issue of idolatry Ps 105:19; and Exod 32 (32:6!).

πάντες[217] and that this haggadic midrash[218] can have such a significance and authority for a Gentile Christian community in Corinth. The first part (vv.1-5) describes the people of Israel, the refugees from Egyptian slavery on their flight through the salvific waters of the Red Sea and on their wanderings in the desert, as receivers of the types of the two basic Christian rites, Baptism and Eucharist. Just as the Corinthians, the former captives of "dumb idols" (1 Cor 12:2)[219] and of various dreadful sins, had been liberated and washed clean (1 Cor 6:9-11), so had the Israelites in a sense been baptized "into" Moses (vv.1-2)[220]. And just as the Christian congregation in the course of their "race to glory" (cf. 9:24-27) received Christ's fortifying gifts of bread and wine as his body and blood when they celebrated his, the Lord's Supper, so had the "fathers" been fed[221] on their journey, by Christ (vv.3-4)[222]. Whether the adjective πνευματικός which

---

[217] Quite a few members of the congregation might really stem from a Jewish background, including former proselytes or Godfearers; as concerns their ethnic origin, however, most likely the majority were Gentile Christians (see above chapter 2.1).

[218] So Wolff who holds the view of a Pauline authorship of that passage (39). Hahn assumes that the Apostle picked up some kind of early Christian tradition in which Baptism and Eucharist had already been connected ("Gefahr", 154f); cf. Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 244. Meeks thinks of a midrashic homily which had been composed independently (*Christians*, 99).

[219] "Πρὸς τὰ εἰδωλα τὰ ἄφωνα ὡς ἂν ἤγεσθε ἀπαγόμενοι"; note the passive voice which describes the Corinthians as former subjects of the evil forces (cf. 1 Thess 1:9). But the terminology of slavery is also a general feature of Paul's referring to the old life under the dominion of sin (cf. for instance Rom 6:6-23), and liberation is connected to the idea of belonging to another Lord (cf. Baptism εἰς Moses/Christ).

[220] Concerning the phraseology of βαπτισθῆναι εἰς (τὸ ὄνομα ...) see our considerations above on 1 Cor 12:13 in the excursus on σῶμα. Cf. also 1 Pet 3:20-21 where Noah's salvation "through water" is interpreted typologically in terms of Baptism.

[221] The two different forms of πιεῖν side by side in v.4 are surprising. Yet the aorist (ἔπιον; cf. ἔφαγον in v.3) might refer to the singularity of the event which established the Eucharist (the Last Supper and actually the crucifixion and resurrection), while the imperfect form (ἔπινον) reflects the continuous and repeated celebration of the Lord's Supper (cf. ἀκολουθούσης).

[222] That need not mean identification of Christ and the rock (see Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 242f; and Wolff, 42f). But the pre-existence of Christ seems to be presupposed also in v.9; cf. Gal 4:4; Phil 2:6; and Rom 4 where Paul apparently argues from Abraham's and David's belief in Christ. Wolff notes the fundamental difference between type and antitype here, for the "sacramental" gifts of the pre-existent Christ are, of course, of another kind than those from the crucified and exalted Lord (ibid., 43). The tradition of the wandering rock, in allusion to Num 20:7-11 and 21:16, is also a rabbinic motif (see Str-B III, 406-408). Highly dubious, however, are Jeske's ideas about v.4: πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός means for him "a real identitiy" between Christ and the historical referent ("Rock", 247) and "refers to the pre-existence of the corporate body of Christ, the church" (ibid., 248). He completely neglects the allegory in v.4 and the typological character of the whole passage, thinking that v.11 (τυπικῶς!) would presuppose "the partnership of the Christian generation with

determines the special food and drink and the rock which conveyed it, reflects also a certain understanding of the Lord's Supper, is difficult to say[223]. Fairly clear, however, from what follows is that the divine gifts of Baptism and Eucharist are no guarantee for a holy future and do not function as an efficacious protection from all temptations, as the final destruction of the majority of Israel in the desert vividly illustrated (v.5)[224]. But it is important to note the qualitative nuance of the typology here, that Paul does not analogically say that the Corinthians might loose their salvation too (cf. v.13)[225]; rather to warn them and to make them stand up to the ἐπιθυμία which had caused their fathers' dramatic fall, had the narrated events become types for them (vv.6, 11). For ἐπιθυμία, the cardinal sin and powerful determination of man (cf. Rom 1:24; 6:12; 7:7-8; 1 Thess 4:5), although it had been overcome at the cross (Gal 5:24), remained the constant opponent of the πνεῦμα which had become the new determination of the Christian (Gal 5:16-26; Rom 8:9-17; cf. πνευματικός in vv.3-4). The following verses (7-10)[226] show examples and consequences of

---

the wilderness generation in one body" (ibid., 249). But οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν are not the same as οἱ ἀδελφοί (10:1).

[223] See Wedderburn's detailed considerations about the several possible meanings of πνευματικός in vv.3-4 (*Baptism*, 241-248). Although for him "the exact sense of 'spiritual' here ... must perhaps remain uncertain" (ibid., 247) he thinks it is likely that the Corinthians understood the eucharistic gifts as substantially imparting the Spirit (cf. Klauck who interprets the food and drink as "geisthaltig" [*Kult*, 255, cf. 257]) - a conviction which Paul wanted to correct (cf. Soden, "Sakrament", 26); yet surveying the use of the adjective elsewhere another possibility, which can be combined with the first, might be preferred, that the term indicates simply the spiritual origin (cf. Willis, *Idol Meat*, 141; Wolff, 41). But see also Hofius' careful assumption of an epicletic element in the liturgy of the Eucharist ("Paradosis", 236).

[224] The harsh contrast between God's gifts and the disobedience of the gifted is expressed by the position of οὐκ (a hyperbaton; cf. BDR §477,1) and the litotes in v.5.

[225] Contra Hahn, "Gefahr", 157. Considering Paul's decision in the case of the πορνός in 1 Cor 5 might be helpful here. According to the standards of 1 Cor 10:8, if taken analogically, the offender would have deserved death. Yet Paul demands his exclusion from the church, so that he might eventually be saved on the day of the Lord (5:5), and thus the Apostle in a remarkable way reinterprets the command of Deut 17:7 which he quotes in 5:13 and where the exclusion means the stoning of the guilty person (actually an idol worshipper). It could be for similar reasons that Paul did not mention a punishment for idolatry in 1 Cor 10:7 (cf. vv.8-10), in order to avoid being misunderstood in terms of an analogy.

[226] Willis notes the rhetorical concern of these 4 verses which display a chiastic structure (imperative - subjunctive - subjunctive - imperative) and where the stereotype μηδὲ ... καθώς (καθάπερ) τινες αὐτῶν seems to correspond to the repeated (καὶ) πάντες in vv.1-4 (*Idol Meat*, 147; cf. Hahn, "Gefahr", 160).

obeying the ἐπιθυμία, among which εἰδωλολατρία is the first (v.7), not so much because of the particular context here in 1 Cor 8-10, but traditionally and principally because idolatry violates the first commandment[227] and thus paves the way for all the other sins, such as πορνεία (v.8) and further incidences of rebellion against God (vv.9-10)[228]. Yet it is striking and revealing that the sin of idolatry is still specially made to stand out, by the only explicit quotation from the OT in this passage, Exod 32:6, which mentions Israel's sacrificial eating (of εἰδωλόθυτον) and drinking when they worshipped the Golden Calf at Mount Sinai[229]. This φαγεῖν and πιεῖν of idolatrous food and drink in v.7 is, of course, related to, and contrasting with, the eating and drinking of the spiritual food and drink in vv.3-4. And so the OT quotation indicates the special concern for sacrificial meals and the significance of the Eucharist in this context. But further it creates a prolepsis of the particular topic and structure of the following part (10:15-22) which intends to demonstrate the incompatibility of the Eucharist with idolatrous cult meals[230] and which develops the same argumentative contrast: Not only that the Lord's Supper does not guarantee absolute protection from the consequences of idolatry, in some sort of magical-substantial way as

---

[227] See Exod 20:2-6; Deut 5:6-10 and note how JHWH introduces himself there as the God who led Israel out of Egyptian slavery! And cf. Rom 1:22-24 where idolatry is the actual reason for God's giving men up to the ἐπιθυμία of their hearts.

[228] See the Pauline lists of vice (*Lasterkataloge*); cf. 1 Cor 5:10-11; 6:9; Gal 5:20; Rom 1:28-31; see also Eph 5:5; and Col 3:5. Generally, the four sins mentioned in vv.7-10 need not have occurred in Corinth as well; they are merely examples of the result of ἐπιθυμία. See Willis, *Idol Meat*, 145f; cf. 150-153; and generally Barrett's considerations on the traditional combination of idolatry and fornication ("Idols", 41-45).

[229] Παιζεῖν had been understood as indicating idolatry also in the rabbinic tradition (cf. Str-B III, 409f). Interestingly enough v.7 is the only one of the four examples of Israel's sin which does not mention the relevant punishment for committing such a crime. Did Paul want to indicate that the Corinthians who had already been somehow involved in idolatrous meals need not have to fear final destruction (v.13: πιστὸς ὁ θεός)?

[230] The example of idolatry among the elect people of Israel who had been liberated from slavery, led through the sea and fed in the desert, and who had thus seen and received God's gracious gifts - the example of idolatry among these privileged people certainly weighs more and fits the actual situation of the liberated, baptized and eucharistically fed Corinthian church much better than any general considerations about the wicked cults and meals of pagans could do. Cf. Hahn, "Gefahr", 152f.

some of the Corinthians might have believed[231] - it even excludes idolatry completely!

After the appeal to his audience's attention (v.15) for a well known catechetical tradition about the Lord's Supper (v.16), and after a brief excursion into some of the further aspects of this rite (v.17), the Apostle eventually turns to Israel again and in v.18 compares its sacrificial meal with the Christian meal of the Eucharist. For that purpose the second part of this verse is obviously formulated in parallel to v.16 and thus calls for the reader's comparing the two occasions and drawing his conclusions. Yet, before we can accept this invitation of the text to consider the agreements and differences, it seems essential to find out of what kind the Israel κατὰ σάρκα might be which the Corinthians are called to look at: whether it means still, theologically and typologically as in vv.1-11, the Israel of the wilderness committing idolatry at Mount Sinai, or rather generally the actual people of Israel as a religious and ethnic entity among others - Christians (vv.16-17) and pagans (vv.19-20), each with its own cultic meal tradition which involves some kind of κοινων-relation. A decision is not easy to make and is a matter of weighing up arguments which can be assessed quite differently concerning their significance. To us, however, the first option finally appeared to be the more likely for the following reasons which we briefly outline[232]:

---

[231] Wolff assumes that this sort of ideas might have derived from (mystery-) cults in the environment of the Corinthians (39). Cf. Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 143; Delling, "Abendmahlsgeschehen", 320; Käsemann, "Anliegen", 18-21; Klauck, *Kult*, 257; Lang, 122; and Wedderburn, *Baptism*, 241-248, 293f. Willis' strict objection to the idea that Paul would react to some kind of "sacramentalism" in chap. 10, is right in so far as the overall theme is still idolatry and idol-meat and not a correct understanding of the Eucharist (*Idol Meat*, 139-141).

[232] Unfortunately this question has only rarely been reflected in the relevant literature, although it has important consequences for the understanding of the whole passage; not that it would change the basic message - the exclusivity of the communion with Christ - but in the case of a reference to Israel's idolatrous sacrificial meal at the Golden Calf, the argument would be remarkably strengthened and quasi-archetypologically deepened in a most significant way. Advocates of this interpretation are Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl", 138, 164; Hahn, "Gefahr", 168; Meeks, *Christians*, 99f; Schattenmann, *TBLNT* I, 498; and Soden, "Sakrament", 9. Among the majority of commentators who interprete the passage in a different way only a few considered the other as well: only Burchard, the idea has at least "some truth" for him ["Importance", 124]; and Wolff (54f). But see Allo, 242; Barrett, 235; Calvin, 405; Conzelmann, 204; Dunn, *Unity*, 164f;

As regards the structure of 1 Cor 10:15-22, a particular connection of vv.16 and 18 is apparent and clearly indicated by the *inclusio* which v.15 (κρίνατε ὑμεῖς ὅ φημι) and v.19 (τί οὖν φημι) as a framework form[233], the latter phrase leading on to Paul's own considerations in vv.19-20[234] which are followed by an emphatic conclusion in vv.21-22. And according to formal agreements, not v.20b but only v.18b is really a parallel to v.16[235], and thus marks the actual comparison and counterpoint to the κοινωνία-relation which the Corinthians were asked to consider[236]. It is further striking that vv.16 and 18 in principal match with the structure of vv.1-11 where Israel's reception of spiritual food (vv.3-4) was contrasted with their later consumption of other, sacrificial, food (v.7), save that v.16 now explicitly refers to the Christian Eucharist, not to its type[237]. One can add that the concepts of ἐσθίειν (φαγεῖν), θυσία, and

---

Grosheide, 234; Hainz, *Kirche*, 27-29; Hauck, *TWNT* III, 805; Jourdan, "KOINΩNIA", 122f; Klauck, *Kult*, 264-266; Lang, 128; McDermott, "Doctrine", 220f; Murphy O'Connor, "Community", 58; Orr/Walther, 252; Panikulam, *Koinōnia in the NT*, 28; Robertson/Plummer, 215; Schlatter, 298; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 52f; Strobel, 159; Walter, "Christusgemeinschaft", 433-435; Weiß, 260; and Wendland, 73.

[233] Cf. Burchard, "Importance", 124; and Robertson/Plummer, 215.

[234] That would imply that the subject of θύουσιν in v.20 is also the Israel κατὰ σάρκα, as no other subject had been introduced (see Soden, "Sakrament", 9, n. 4). The *varia lectio* in a number of Mss might then result from the same (mis-)understanding of v.18 which the majority of modern commentators follows; see Barrett who notes that the subject of v.20 is "certainly ... not" 'the Jews' (236) although he does not really say why not; and especially Robertson/Plummer, 216.

[235] Contra Hainz who, for whatever reasons, thinks that vv.19-20 would be "eine vollere Analogie zu V.16f" (*Kirche*, 29). But compare in v.18: the question (οὐχ; cf. οὐχί in P^{46} ℵ² B Ψ and 𝔐), the reference to the consumption of some ritual food (οἱ ἐσθίοντες τὰς θυσίας), the predicate as a form of κοινων- + εἶναι, and the position of the parts of the sentence - none of these features can be observed in v.20, however. Barrett rightly stresses that v.18 depends on v.16, not *vice versa*.

[236] V.20b is not a question but clearly a statement formulated in an accusative with infinitive construction; and Paul's ultimate demand (οὐ θέλω δὲ ...!) attacks the possibility (γίνεσθαι; cf. ἐστίν in vv.16 and 18) of Corinthian idolatry and is not concerned with the features of the pagan cult (only v.20a could principally be understood as referring to pagans, but the *tertium comparationis*, the κοινων-relation, does not occur there).

[237] One could argue that after the typological interpretation of Israel's exodus in the first part (10:1-11) one would expect that the application to the actual problem in Corinth (10:15-22) would turn more explicitly to the sacrificial meals in paganism with which the believers were confronted. Yet maybe for Paul the basic problem were not so much the pagan sacrifices, but the participation of **Christians** in such occasions, and the serious consequences of such a behaviour could not be illustrated and considered more appropriately than by looking back to what happened (typologically) to the forefathers (v.11), to Ἰσραὴλ κατὰ σάρκα (the term contains no negative notion here; contra Flew, *Church*, 209f; see Rom 4:1, where Abraham is called προπάτωρ ἡμῶν

θυσιαστήριον in v.18 belong to the terminology of Exod 32:5-6 which was quoted in 1 Cor 10:7[238], and that v.20 - offering to demons and not God - verbally picks up a piece of Deut 32:17 which speaks of **Israel's** apostasy in the desert[239], not of pagan doings in general. And so, apparently, v.20 provides the interpretation of v.18[240] and contains Paul's conclusion from the contrast of the two κοινων-relations in vv.16 and 18[241], not another third (and in this case negative) example of a κοινων-relation in a cultic meal[242]. On the other hand, a reference to the sacrificial cult of the contemporary Israel would be quite surprising, because the temple in Jerusalem was far away (βλέπετε!)[243], and not Israel κατὰ σάρκα but actually just its priests participated in the sacrifices at the altar (cf. 1 Cor 9:13)[244]. Surprising further, because the positive reference to

---

κατὰ σάρκα [in a letter to a church in which the majority were also Gentile Christians!]; cf. Rom 1:3). And besides, the text still shows quite a few allusions and references to the kind of idolatry in Hellenistic paganism which the Corinthians were struggling with, most obviously in v.21.

[238] Burchard notes that the interpretation of Exod 32 as an example of eating εἰδωλόθυτον occurs also in the rabbinic literature (*Untersuchungen*, 132); cf. Str-B III, 409f. But θυσία and θυσιαστήριον certainly also belong to the customary terminology of Israel's cult (cf. for instance Lev 1-7; and 1 Cor 9:13).

[239] Cf. Bar 4:7 and concerning the topic of offering to demons, see generally Lev 17:7; and Ps 105:28, 36 (LXX). It might be that Paul had not only the Greek but also the Hebrew text of the Song of Moses in mind. For only in the MT does one find references to the "rock of his salvation" (Deut 32:15 - צוּר יִשְׁעָתוֹ) and the "rock who fathered you" (32:18 - צוּר יְלָדְךָ), which might help explain 1 Cor 10:4.

[240] Note Paul's picking up the concept of θυσία/θυσιαστήριον (v.18; cf. εἰδωλόθυτον in v.19) in the verb θύουσιν in v.20a.

[241] The subject of v.20b, ὑμᾶς, corresponds to the subject of the relative clauses in v.16 (cf. v.17), and the predicate, κοινωνοὺς τῶν δαιμονίων γίνεσθαι, refers to the κοινωνοὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου of v.18, who were identified as idol-worshippers in v.20a.

[242] That Paul wanted to discredit the sacrificial cult not only of Hellenistic paganism but similarly of Judaism, as Klauck thinks (*Kult*, 265), is fairly implausible. The Apostle, who in the preceding chapter referred neutrally or rather positively to the Jerusalem cult (9:13), does not suddenly employ the same example in a negative way. If v.18 would refer to the contemporary Israel, this could only be understood as another positive example of a κοινων-relation, which would then be confronted with the pagan sacrificial meal in v.20.

[243] "Βλέπετε ruft zum Reflektieren eines unmittelbar wahrnehmbaren Sachverhaltes auf", so Walter ("Christusglaube", 434, n. 56) who points to further examples in 1 Cor 1:26; 3:10; 8:9; 10:12; and 16:10. If the imperative βλέπετε can only have a figurative meaning - the majority of the Corinthians presumably had never even travelled to Jerusalem - there is no reason why it should not mean: consider the Israel of our fathers, i.e. the Israel of the wilderness (10:1); cf. n. 237.

[244] According to Fee's interpretation v.18 refers to the ancient Israel, but not to its idolatry at Mount Sinai nor to the priests' share in the sacrifices of the altar, but to the command of Deut 14:22-27, that Israel should sacrifice annually and consume the tenth part of its goods in the

cultic κοινων-relations in Israel would be pointless in the discussion of a conflict between Christianity and pagan idolatry and would be quite a big jump from the apostasy of the disobedient Israel of the wilderness which was broadly developed just a few verses above. And finally, concerning the most serious objection to our understanding of vv.18-20, the present tense in v.18 could be explained as a historic, dramatizing present[245] and could also - parallel to the ἐστίν of the catechism - indicate the actual relevance of the typological νουθεσία. And so Paul's argument in vv.15-22 is even sharper and stronger than it would be in the case of vv.18 and 20 referring to the contemporary cults of Israel and Hellenistic paganism. For, as the example of the fathers revealed, the danger of idolatry is not just coming from outside, but rather is a constant temptation emerging from "inside" the Christian community; and the basic horror of **Christians** committing such a crime is that they do it as God's chosen people who had formerly received God's gracious and saving gifts, just as the fathers did.

And so the argument in vv.18-20 can be described as follows: those who eat the sacrifices, the εἰδωλόθυτα, are κοινωνοί of the altar[246] of the εἴδωλον (vv.18-

---

temple (470f). This suggestion is problematic, however, because the concepts of θυσία and θυσιαστήριον do not occur in the torah passage, and it is doubtful whether the Jewish donation of the tithe could really be compared to the Christian eucharist or to pagan offerings.

[245] See BDR §321.

[246] If θυσιαστήριον does not mean the altar in Jerusalem where the customary Jewish sacrifices were offered, then a severe and long debated *crux interpretum* would be solved also, the question whether θυσιατήριον might be a circumlocution for the divine numen, for "ein persönliches Wesen [JHWH], dessen Genosse der Mensch werden kann" (so Greßmann in his "ἡ κοινωνία τῶν δαιμονίων", 225; among those who followed Greßmann see George, *Communion*, 177; Neuenzeit, *Eucharistieauffassung*, 63; Orr/Walther, 250; Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 52; and Soden, "Sakrament", 9 and 27). Such an idea of fellowship (*Genossenschaft*) between God and man, however, would be completely alien to Jewish thinking (Philo *Spec.Leg.* 1.221 is the only, hellenistically influenced, exception) as other commentators convincingly have pointed out (Campbell, "Cognates", 376f; Hainz, *Kirche*, 27; Jourdan, "KOINΩNIA", 123; McDermott, "Doctrine", 220; Willis, *Idol Meat*, 185f). And so, one could understand the phrase only as a deliberate allusion to the pagan idea that a cultic meal establishes some sort of fellowship with the relevant deity, although κοινωνία would then have to mean something else, not fellowship but merely Israel's exclusive belonging to JHWH (cf. Walter, "Christusgemeinschaft", 434f). It is much easier and less confusing, however, if v.18 speaks of Israel's idolatry. Θυσιαστήριον then can be understood as a metonymical reference to those who receive the sacrifices which are offered on the altar, the demons as v.20 reveals.

19). That means, however, that they are actually κοινωνοί of the demons[247], who are the true receivers of the sacrificed meat and who associate with those who eat it (v.20)[248]. In the Jewish tradition the concept of κοινωνός (or the semitic equivalent of the root חבר) usually describes relations between men, rarely the relation of men and idols (cf. the MT of Hos 4:17; and Isa 44:11), and never the relation of men and JHWH[249]. Quite interesting for the interpretation of our passage, however, is the use of κοινωνός in the context of table fellowships[250], a use which is also frequent in profane Greek sources, especially concerning cultic meals, although in the pagan sources the concept can be extended in terms of a table fellowship where men are invited "zum Tisch der Götter ... als ihre Mahlgenossen (κοινωνός)"[251]. A similar notion

---

[247] The singular εἴδωλον and the plural δαιμωνίοι show that idols and demons are not the same. According to ancient demonology the demons are rather mediating between the worshippers and the worshipped deity, the idol. And so the demons were participating in the sacrifices by which they joined with those who sacrificed and consumed them. In Judaism it is a frequent idea that the addressees of idolatry are actually the demons. See for further detail Klauck's excursus on this topic (*Kult*, 266-268). Paul does not say that the sacrifices would constitute the demons as gods and dominions (so Conzelmann, 205), he argues exactly the other way round and explains that the other gods actually conceal the demons.

[248] The two genitives which qualify the κοινωνοί in vv.18 and 20 (τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου and τῶν δαιμονίων) are certainly objective, just as κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος/σώματος in v.16. See BAGD, 439; Cremer/Kögel, 610f; Hauck, *TWNT* III, 798, 805; and Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 19; cf. also our considerations on the grammatical function of genitives τοῦ σώματος/ αἵματος in v.16 above (n. 96). For the same reasons we must again object to Willis' suggestion that κοινωνοί would mean a "religious fraternity" (*Idol Meat*, 187) and might describe the "communal relationship among the participants" (ibid., 191). Rather enigmatic and grammatically wrong is further Hainz's interpretation as he renders v.18 as: "Stehen nicht die Opfer Essenden in Gemeinschaft (durch gemeinsame Teilhabe) **am** Altar" (*Kirche*, 28; bold type by G.H.), and also that he wants to understand κοινωνοὶ δαιμονίων in v.20 as "Gemeinschaft ... mit denen, die teilhaben an den Götzenopfern und dadurch in Gemeinschaft stehen mit den Dämonen" (ibid., 29; cf. 102f). He might have been trapped in his presuppositions about the concept of κοινωνία again. Cf. also Campbell, "Cognates", 376-378.

[249] See Hauck, *TWNT* III, 800-803; and cf. Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 19-21.

[250] See for instance φίλος κοινωνὸς τραπεζῶν in Sir 6:10 (cf. Sir 41:19); in post-exilic Judaism בְּנֵי חֲבוּרָה was used for table fellowships at the Passover meal (bPesah.89ab) or other festival meals (see Hauck, *TWNT* III, 803; and cf. Willis, *Idol Meat*, 174-181).

[251] Hauck, *TWNT* III, 800. Cf. Endenburg, *Koinoonia*, 202; cf. Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 54f. Even Willis admits in his survey of the meaning of κοινωνία in Greek sources that "the use of κοινωνία [presumably he could have said the same for κοινωνός] in describing cultic meals was well known in Hellenistic society" (*Idol Meat*, 173). However, he does not think that such cultic aspects could help elucidate Paul's intention here. For him and, as he thinks, for Paul, the social aspects of sacrificial meals are the real problem at stake in 1 Cor 10:14-22, according to the Hellenistic understanding of cult meals "fundamentally as occasions of social association and conviviality"

might be intended here in 1 Cor 10:18 and 20 referring to the disastrous association of the Israel of the wilderness with the demons as they worshipped the idol of the Golden Calf and ate and drank of the sacrificial food. Here lies the main concern of Paul's discussion of the issue of idol-meat and of the relationship which participation in idolatrous meals established between those who attended them and the idol (the demons). And therefore the Apostle quoted the well known piece of catechism on the Eucharist as an unambigous and unbeatable argument[252]: The communion with Christ crucified which the Eucharist tangibly documented and which the participants experienced in a unique way when they celebrated the κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, such a communion is something totally different from the association with a pagan deity and with its underground demons respectively. And for those who had once for all received the gift of Christ's vicarious and sacrificial death and who confirmingly received this gift again as they broke the bread at his, the Lord's, Supper, for those it was completely unacceptable to go and eat sacrificial meat which had been offered to a pagan deity. How could the former enemies of God who had been reconciled by his Son's atoning death at the cross and by his resurrection still participate in sacrifices to the idols and thus return under the dominion of the former θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί which the εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς (1 Cor 8:5) had overcome and from which he had once for all liberated his people (1 Cor 12:2)[253]? Living in κοινωνία with **Christ** who gave his body and blood ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν has a fundamentally different quality than being a κοινωνός, a fellow and associate of the **demons**. For the communion with Christ is not a temporal

---

(ibid., 49; and see generally 7-64), and according to the mainly horizontal understanding of κοινωνία in Judaism (ibid., 174-181). But such a horizontal interpretation of κοινωνία and κοινωνός in 1 Cor 10:16-20 proved to be wrong for reasons of grammar alone. And even if the social aspect had been important in the Hellenistic society and for some of the Corinthians as well, it need not necessarily be Paul's way of judging and solving this problem. The Apostle, however, argues strictly theologically, and not sociologically with the exclusiveness of different cult alliances (but cf. ibid., 215-222).

[252] Cf. the emphasis on the eucharistic food in the formulation of the tradition. It is also obvious now from the context, that Paul understood the tradition as maintaining in particular the κοινωνία of the participants at the Lord's Supper with (the body of) Christ crucified.

[253] Cf. Walter, "Christusglaube", 435.

matter, established by a common (sacrificial) meal or by a certain kind of food (εἰδωλόθυτον) and need not be renewed or deepened in further meal fellowships, but it is rather a total determination - the constant constitutive condition of the believers' entire individual and collective existence. Any other relationships with any of the "so-called gods in heaven or on earth" (1 Cor 8:5), even if it were merely temporal or occasional associations with demons, are therefore completely irresponsible and absolutely unacceptable. The Lordship of the crucified and resurrected κύριος ultimately excludes any of such attempts.

The weighty words of v.21 even exceed the direct and sharp command of v.20b - not only because of the Apostle's declared will shall the Corinthians flee from idolatry, but rather because it in principle **impossible** to drink the cup of the Lord and then the demons' cup, to participate in the Lord's table and then in the demons'[254]. The verse applies concretely to the situation of the Corinthians and could confirm the previous assumption that Paul in 1 Cor 10:1-22 is arguing especially against attending such meals with pagans which are clearly and officially cultic events. For the concepts of ποτήριον κυρίου/δαιμονίων and τράπεζα κυρίου/δαιμονίων are presumably not Pauline or early Christian formulations but derive from Jewish apologetics[255]. And the emphasis on the cup before the general reference to the table - a metonymy for the whole meal of the Christians and of the pagans respectively (the bread is not mentioned)[256] - can be explained best by the distinctive ritual significance

---

[254] Seesemann's statement that the connection with the demons "eine so enge ist, daß sie die κοινωνία τοῦ αἵματος bzw. τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ gefährdet, ja unmöglich macht" (*Koinonia*, 55) is doubtful. Paul seems to intend exactly the reverse. Not the fellowship with demons is so close that it would make communion with Christ impossible - how could the former idol worshippers in Corinth (cf. 1 Cor 12:2) then had ever been saved? But the communion with Christ as it is expressed and confirmed in the Lord's Supper is so exclusive and indivisible that it makes any fellowship with the demons impossible. Therefore the Lord's Supper appears before the mention of idolatry in 10:3-4 and 7; 16 and 18-20; and 21.

[255] Cf. JosAs 8:5; 11:9; 12:5; and 21:14. See Burchard, "Importance", 123; id., *Untersuchungen*, 132; Wolff, 56; and Willis: "the τράπεζα δαιμονίων mentioned in 1 Cor 10:21 refers to a common feature of Greek sacrifice" (*Idol Meat*, 17; cf. 189). In Mal 1:7, 12 and Ezek 41:22; 44:16, τράπεζα κυρίου presumably means the table for the bread of the Presence or the altar of incense. A table of the demons occurs in Isa 65:11.

[256] Again Fee's exegesis of the cup as pointing out particularly the vertical (cf, v.16a) and the table the horizontal (cf. vv.16b-17) dimension (473; cf. the interpretation of v.16 on 467), must be rejected. The parallelism does not at all indicate such a division. And the reference to the table

which wine and wine-libations had in pagan meals[257] whereas bread had no particular function[258]. Here we may finally also find the reason for the peculiar order of the parallel statements in v.16, simply because the cup was more obviously a common feature of both the Lord's Supper and pagan (sacrificial) meals. Yet not only the wording, but also the form and the parallel structure of the verse are most striking and shape it as some kind of slogan which should be easy to remember[259]. One cannot serve two masters (cf. Matt 6:24; Rom 6:16[260]) and whoever tries it will provoke the Lord's jealousy[261] and might become a victim of his own megalomania (v.22)[262].

The last part of the chapter (10:23-11:1) sums up the whole debate of 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 and gives some concrete advice concerning situations in which idol meat

---

instead of the bread which occurs at the relevant position in v.16, might rather count as another argument against the thesis of a Pauline focus on the eucharistic bread and its eccelesiological significance. What the Apostle failed to mention in his urgent and powerful conclusion (v.21) can hardly have caused the alternative order of the basic argument (v.16).

[257] In Rabbinic Judaism the consumption of libation wine was a sign of apostasy; cf. Str-B III, 419. Concerning the important part which libations played in sacrificial meals, see Willis, *Idol Meat*, 9, 48; and Lampe's reconstruction of a Graeco-Roman δεῖπνον which shows that even in such ordinary meals a ceremonial cultic element was applied to the wine crater from which libations were poured accompained by some religious chanting ("Mahlpraxis", 187f; cf. 188-191).

[258] See Klauck, *Kult*, 269-271.

[259] The parallelism is synthetical (the reference to the table includes the cup), though, not synonymous as in v.16 (cf. BDR §490: a Greek-rhetorical parallelism). The symphloce and the homoioptoton stress the parallelism even more (BDR §491,1).

[260] Rom 6 in principle deals with the same topic and similarly employs a "sacrament", baptism, as an argument and document of the fundamental change in the believers' existence as they were freed from slavery under the dominion of sin, and became ἐλεύθεροι τῇ δικαιοσύῃ (6:20) and as such δουλωθέντες τῷ θεῷ (6:22) - a status which forbids turning back to obey the demands of sin and ἐπιθυμία. Cf. also 1 Cor 3:21-23.

[261] Cf. παραζηλῶν in Deut 32:21; cf. 32:16, - another allusion to the Song of Moses. See Fee, who assumes that the OT motif of God's jealousy reflects his self-revelation and prohibition of other gods in the first commandment (Exod 20:1-2).

[262] It is remarkable that Paul warns, not of the power of the demons, but of the attempt to compromise the incompatible. See Wolff, 57; and cf. Robertson/Plummer, 217. Ἰσχυρότεροι does not allude to a special group of "the strong" in Corinth; see Conzelmann, 206; Fee, 474; and Willis, *Idol Meat*, 215.

might be bought or consumed unintentionally[263]. The κύριος had ultimately freed the Corinthians from idols and demons, so that they needed to fear them or their influence on food no longer[264], for "the Lord's is the earth and everything in it" (v.26; Ps 24:1). But at the same time the new freedom certainly also excluded any kind of further involvement in an apparent occasion of idolatry. For this freedom was exemplified and determined by Christ himself as he had selflessly died ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν and had accordingly made all the members of his church brothers and sisters who were now responsible ὑπὲρ ἀλλήλων in mutual brotherly consideration - especially for the weak consciences. Another distinct reference to Paul's own evangelical existence as an entirely devoted Apostle of Christ (cf. 1 Cor 9; especially vv.19-23) finally concludes the lengthy discussion περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων.

---

[263] See generally Willis' interpretation of this passage (*Idol Meat*, 223-263), although we cannot agree with his conclusion that the ecclesiological theme of the "communal alliance of God's people" would bind this passage to 1 Cor 10:14-22 (ibid., 263).

[264] The different terminology (ἱερόθυτον instead of εἰδωλόθυτον) could indicate that Paul wants to mark the different case and that he does not mean an obvious occasion of idol-worship here; see Barrett, "Idols", 49-52; and Willis, *Idol Meat*, 259f.

2.3.5 Conclusion

The concept of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 10:16 occurs in a presumably catechetical tradition of the Lord's Supper which Paul employed as an argument against idolatry and participation in pagan cult meals in the context of his answer to the Corinthians' question how they should handle the issue of idol-meat with which they were occasionally confronted and which had split their congregation. It is important to note that v.16 is not a Pauline formulation, apart from some minor arrangements (cf. οὐχί; and the alternative order of the parallel statements), and that the Apostle chose a traditional and commonly accepted piece of catechism on the Eucharist in order to establish it as a counterpoint to the idolatrous cult meals. Such a powerful argument could hardly be rejected. Yet besides such a formal aspect and besides the general and material comparability of the different types of meals, especially concerning some kind of κοινων-relation of the participants either with Christ or with the demons, Paul's reference to the Lord's Supper also contains a strong theological argument which consequently qualifies the whole section and conveys an unambiguous soteriological message to the addressees of the letter: Your receiving Christ's body and blood, which Christ proleptically instituted in the night of his betrayal, which he realized and confirmed at his cross and resurrection, and which you confirmingly experience in every celebration of the Lord's Supper as your breaking the bread and blessing the cup is communion with his body and blood - this ultimate connection to Christ the crucified and resurrected Lord, is the constant constitutive condition of your entire existence and therefore ultimately excludes any fellowship with the demonic dominions which Christ had defeated once for all.

3 Summary and Conclusion

Paul's concept of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians has been the subject of this study. We examined and, in agreement with, and opposition to, the relevant literature, discussed the two occurrences of this term in the letter, and we considered the meaning of the word and its significance for the context in which it was used. On the basis of our results which shall be briefly summarized again, we will finally draw a few conclusions on the issue of communion with Christ and Christian community in 1 Corinthians.

1 Cor 1:9 contains an important and highly instructive statement at the beginning of the letter. According to the position of the verse as the summarizing climax of the letter-opening, the immediate context provides a fully sufficient basis for the explanation of v.9 and for the concept of κοινωνία therein. There is thus no justification for approaching this first occurrence of the term, not only in 1 Corinthians but generally in Paul, on the basis of an interpretation of the other passage in 1 Cor 10:16, although this is precisely what quite a number of scholars suggested in their works[1]. Following not only the customary thanksgiving (1 Cor 1:4-8+9) - its all over laudatory tone is

[1] See especially Hainz whose assertion that in 1 Cor 1:9 "nicht angedeutet ist, wodurch sie [κοινωνία] entsteht und worin sie besteht" (*Kirche*, 17) remained totally incomprehensible to us. We can only assume, as the brevity of his examination of the occurrence might confirm (just 3 pages, compared to 30 pages for 1 Cor 10:16), that his statement stems from a severe disregard of the context and its climactic structure. Hainz's subsequent explanations of 1 Cor 1:9 on the basis of his foregoing considerations on 1 Cor 10:16 (ibid., 33-35; cf. 18) are therefore highly questionable. And his conclusion that the κοινωνία to which we are called (1 Cor 1:9, however, has an aorist!) is based on the eucharistic participation in Christ's body and blood (ibid., 35), appears to us to result from a total ignorance of the textual and exegetical evidence. But see also Seesemann who included his brief investigation of 1 Cor 1:9 in the lengthy exegesis of 1 Cor 10:16 (*Koinonia*, 34-56), although he does not relate the two passages so much. But still, his dubious clinging to the "Tatsache" of two parallel *Heilswege* (ibid., 51) obviously emerged from an inappropriate mingling of the two passages. Cf. Campbell who also examines 1 Cor 10:16 before 1:9 ("Cognates", 375-380); and cf. George, *Communion*, 176f.

surprising enough in view of the Corinthian disasters which are to be addressed in the body of the letter - but following also the remarkably enlarged proemium (1 Cor 1:1-3), v.9 proclaims God's faithfulness and thus the continous and unaffected validity of his initial and salvific call. The Corinthians were called into the communion with God's Son Jesus Christ their Lord, that is, they were given all the sanctifying riches of God's grace in Christ according to the gospel which Christ's Apostle had once proclaimed among them, the gospel which had no other message than Christ crucified, as the beginning of the letter unmistakably makes clear (1 Cor 1:17-2:5). And so the communion with Christ, the crucified and resurrected Son of God and Lord, is proclaimed again and thus confirmed as the constant consitutive condition of the Corinthian believers' entire existence, including all possible individual and communal problems of which this particular church had plenty as the following chapters reveal. The significance of such a statement for a letter full of exhortation and at a point which one could well compare to Rom 1:16-17, can hardly be underestimated, taking into account also the epistolary function of the proemium passage. 1 Cor 1:9 hints at Paul's estimation of the social, moral and doctrinal problems as some kind of "soteriological disobedience", and at the same time programmatically demonstrates the Apostle's conviction as to how they might be solved, as he reminds this community of their being in communion with Christ.

This pattern of a soteriologically based argumentation can be observed also in Paul's handling of a question concerning the consumption of idol-meat which seems to have been a highly explosive subject in the Corinthian church, occupying three chapters of the letter (1 Cor 8-10). At several decisive points in his discussion of the issue and in various ways the Apostle returns to the event of salvation and reminds his "children", whom he had fathered through the gospel (cf. 1 Cor 4:15), of the normativity of Christ's death and of the absolute authority of the gospel as a total determination not only for the life of its Apostle but actually for all believers (most explicit in 1 Cor 8:11-13; 9:19-23; 10:31-11:1). Such ideas may have been a crucial factor motivating also Paul's reference to the Eucharist in 1 Cor 10:16 (cf. 10:3-4), although the original

intention of this piece of tradition was presumably not parenetical but rather to give some teaching on the meaning and significance of the Lord's Supper which the early church celebrated in consequence of the Last Supper of the Lord. And so our first task was not the analysis of the context[2] in which the catechism and therein the concept of κοινωνία with Christ's body and blood were employed, but to reconstruct the shape and meaning of the tradition itself, in order to understand how Paul could come to employ it as an accepted and authoritative argument against participation in idolatrous meals and other κοινων-relations. The argument is that, breaking the bread and "benedicting" the cup of benediction, is communion with Christ's body and blood, a tangible document and confirmation of the fundamental event of atonement and reconciliation in dying and rising with Christ. This is a communion, however, whi ch has been ever since so constantly and exclusively the constitutive condition of the believers' individual and community life that it allows no kind of even formal respect to another competing "religious" entity.

What is common to both incidences of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians, is, first of all, the strong soteriological significance of the term and its referring to the ultimate communion with Christ the crucified and resurrected Lord, which the Christians had once for all received when God had called them through the gospel and which they confirmingly received in every celebration of the Lord's Supper. We do not maintain, however, the idea of a uniform Pauline principle of the concept of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians (nor generally in Paul), which the majority of the studies surveyed initially suggested. We rather found our doubts about such a

---

[2] This was Willis' approach (see above). Similarly misleading and doubtful, however, are McDermott's and Panikulam's ways of explanation which build on their understanding of 1 Cor 1:9. McDermott presupposes a certain **development** of "the Pauline **doctrine** of κοινωνία" ("Doctrine", 232; bold type by G.H.) according to the chronological order of the occurrences (ibid., 70, 219-233). He also holds the view of an internal development starting from the baptismal "sacramental union" with Christ - 1 Cor 1:9 (ibid., 219) and experiencing "a further deepening in the Eucharist" where "the union with Christ grows" - 10:16 (ibid. 221; see our critique above). For Panikulam the essence of κοινωνία in Paul is rather described in a call-and-response scheme, which makes 1 Cor 1:9 the key for all the other incidences of the term which are merely different modes of responding to the initial call (*Koinōnia in the NT*, *passim*; but cf. especially 16 and 108; see also our critique above).

uniformity confirmed, considering only the non-Pauline origin of 1 Cor 10:16 which hardly had been taken into account by our predecessors. The concept of κοινωνία itself contains no single and specific idea of relation[3] but rather appears to be a multifunctional term, principally suitable for a wide range of relations between two or more parts. The particular kind and quality, however, of a κοινωνία relation largely depends on the relevant context and on the attributes with which the concept is connected and which in our case is (the body and blood of) Christ. And so, it is not the concept of κοινωνία which is uniform in the two passages in 1 Corinthians, but its distinct qualification through Christ, God's Son, the crucified and resurrected Lord - in Paul's own formulation (1:9) as well as in the tradition which he presumably quoted to a large extent because of the κοινωνία phrase (10:16; cf. vv.18 and 20). Further, what the mention of Christ's body and blood explicitly indicates concerning the meaning of κοινωνία as the communion with the Lord's atoning death and resurrection is implied also in the first occurrence, as we have demonstrated. The kind of relation which κοινωνία describes in both occurrences must therefore be identified as strictly soteriological, meaning the salvific communion[4] with Christ as a constant constitutive condition.

---

[3] See Seesemann's study which is entirely dominated by the "*ursprüngliche* Bedeutung des Wortes κοινωνία ...: 'die Teilhabe, das Anteilhaben'" (*Koinonia*, 47), which he extracted from the non-biblical Greek sources and found confirmed in Paul (ibid., 3-21, 100), although he thinks that the Apostle understood it differently and filled it uniquely (ibid., 99-103); cf. Campbell and Brown. But see also Hainz's "Gemeinschaft (mit jemand) durch Teilhabe (an etwas)" (*Kirche*, 34 and *passim*) which he regards as "einheitliches Grundmuster" of **all** κοινων-words, including (συγ-)κοινωνός and (συγ-)κοινωνεῖν (ibid., 173). It is fairly difficult to comprehend Hainz's objection to Seesemann's explanation of κοινωνία as too limited and too much focussed on a single rendering, and find him then establishing "das paulinische **Prinzip** κοινωνία, das Prinzip der kirchlichen Gemeinschaft" (ibid., 86; bold type by G.H.) which he derived from his interpretation of Gal 6:6 (cf. ibid., 85-124). His exegesis of this passage in Galatians was fairly convincing for us, yet we cannot imagine any reason why this particular verse should be the key to all of Paul's use of κοινων-words. So both major monographs on κοινωνία similarly appear to be occupied too much with confirming a single and principal explanation for the term and therefore seem to have failed to recognize the contextuality and relationality which the concept itself indicates. The neglect of detailed exegetical work is further particularly apparent in Hainz, and might be responsible for some of his dubious results. Cf. generally our survey in chapter 1 and the discussion above.

[4] Our decision to render κοινωνία in both cases with the same term "communion" is the result of similar considerations, of course, and does not represent a general suggestion for the concept of κοινωνία. The term can certainly mean "participation" or "fellowship" or the like in other contexts.

Whence Paul derived the term, is difficult, if not impossible, to say. Concerning the tradition in 1 Cor 10:16 we presumed a background in Hellenistic Judaism, maybe Antioch or Damascus. But the question, whether this piece of catechism generally initiated all of Paul's use of the concept, as some scholars think[5], remained rather speculative to us, even more so in the light of Paul's varied use of the concept in the comparatively few instances in his letters.

Finally, a word must be said about the striking feature of the exclusively "vertical" meaning of the concept of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians, denoting the communion with Christ and not the community of the (Corinthian) Christians. It is striking not only in view of the frequent "horizontal" understanding of the term in the Christian literature of the decades and centuries after Paul[6] and in view of a nearly exclusively ecclesiological use in today's writings, particularly in the inter-denominational dialogue[7]. But it is striking and surprising also in view of the many social and ecclesiological topics which are addressed in 1 Corinthians[8], so that one might have expected Paul to use and develop this concept as a key term for his ecclesiology. Yet, although a great number of scholars claimed to have detected ecclesiological connotations also in our two

---

[5] See Seesemann, *Koinonia*, 103; and McDermott, "Doctrine", 232, although they do not consider 1 Cor 10:16 as a tradition, but think of an origin of κοινωνία in particular in the cultic terminology of the Christian church (in Corinth).

[6] Cf. Currie's dissertation dealing with *KOINONIA in Christian Literature to 200 A.D.*, apart from his results on Paul. But see also Elert's investigation on the issue of "τῶν ἁγίων κοινωνία"/"sanctorum communio", as he shows that this particular phrase which occurs in various ancient Christian authors and which is part of the Apostolic creed, refers not to the *communio* of the saints but of the eucharistic gifts (*Kirchengemeinschaft*, see especially his excursus I-III on 166-181).

[7] Quite revealing, for instance, is the title *KOINONIA* for a compilation of *Arbeiten des Oekumenischen Ausschusses der Vereinigten Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands zur Frage der Kirchen - und Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*; or see Dunn's article on "Instruments of Koinonia" in an ecumenical magazine (*OiC*) dealing with the topic of church community and only briefly referring to the actual meaning of the NT concept. Cf. Kertelge's "Kerygma und Koinonia" which describes the early church as qualified by a "*Koinonia-Struktur*", i.e. "gemeinsame Erfahrungen und kommunikative Lebensvollzüge" (329); cf. also Schnackenburg's "Die Einheit der Kirche unter dem Koinonia-Gedanken". See further Fischer's article "Zum Koinonia-Charakter christlicher Gemeinde" (particularly 39f). Fischer also refers to P. L. Lehmann's *Ethik als Antwort*, München, 1966, for whom "koinonia" similarly means the "Gemeinschaft des Leibes Christi" (ibid., 51) or the "gemeinschaftsbildende Wirklichkeit der Gegenwart Christi in der Welt" (ibid., 42).

[8] The concept of ἐκκλησία occurs as often in 1 Corinthians as in all the other Pauline letters.

instances of κοινωνία, especially in the case of 1 Cor 10:16 which became the *locus classicus* for the issue of sacramental and church community[9] - partly because of an overestimation and misinterpretation of 1 Cor 10:17 - the exegetical evidence, however, did not confirm such ideas. We can rather conclude with Seesemann, at least for 1 Corinthians: "Der Begriff κοινωνία läßt sich daher zu dem Begriffe ἐκκλησία nicht in Parallele stellen"[10]. The concept of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians is therefore not at all "ein Schlüsselbegriff für die paulinische Christologie wie für die paulinische Ekklesiologie - und für die Beziehung beider zueinander" in the sense of "zwei Seiten ein und derselben Sache"[11]. According to Paul Christology and soteriology on the one hand and ecclesiology on the other are not the two parallel sides of a single coin, but are essentially related in a certain theological and material order, in which the church, the Christian community, derives itself from its members' individual and corporate communion with Christ the crucified and resurrected Lord. And so

---

[9] See the vast number of studies which explicitly deal with this subject, as for instance: Blank, "Eucharistie und Kirchengemeinschaft nach Paulus"; Bornkamm, "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus"; Brunner, "Koinonia. Grundlagen und Grundformen der Kirchengemeinschaft"; Elert, *Abendmahl und Kirchengemeinschaft in der Alten Kirche hauptsächlich des Ostens*; Goppelt, "Kirchengemeinschaft und Abendmahlsgemeinschaft nach dem Neuen Testamant"; Hahn, "Thesen zur Frage einheitsstiftender Elemente in Lehre und Praxis des Urchristlichen Herrenmahls"; Kertelge, "Abendmahlsgemeinschaft und Kirchengemeinschaft im Neuen Testament"; Klauck, "Eucharistie und Kirchengemeinschaft bei Paulus"; Krause, "Was sagt das Neue Testament zur Frage der Kirchen- und Abendmahlsgemeinschaft?"; Murphy O'Connor, "Eucharist and Community in First Corinthians"; and Roloff, "Heil als Gemeinschaft. Kommunikative Faktoren im urchristlichen Herrenmahl".

[10] *Koinonia*, 99; the second part of his conclusion, however, "die Kirchenidee des Paulus ist von ihm [the concept of κοινωνία] aus nicht zu beleuchten" (ibid.), cannot be accepted. For the ἐκκλησία τοῦ θεοῦ is the community of the κλητοὶ ἅγιοί, of those who were called into the communion with Christ (cf. 1 Cor 1:2 and 9), and their unity as a community derives essentially from their continuous communion with Christ as the Lord's Supper tangibly demonstrates (1 Cor 10:16-17). But cf. also Brown's statement that "the elaboration of *koinōnia ekklesiastikē* is a patristic development", and that κοινωνία "is used by Paul in an exclusively vertical sense" ("Ecclesiology", 165); and George, *Communion*, 160, 188.

[11] Contra Hainz, *Kirche*, 175. For him the community of the church is even sacramentally based in the Eucharist which is supposed to lie "logisch-theologisch ... all dem 'voraus', sogar in Bezug auf die Verkündigung und die daraus erwachsenden Gemeinschaftsverhältnisse" (ibid., 176). This position and the results of Hainz's *Habilitationsschrift* must be strongly opposed. Neither does the concept of κοινωνία allow such a conclusion as we have demonstrated concerning the occurrences in 1 Corinthians, nor could we generally think of any passage in Paul which could give evidence to such an idea of a church-creating sacrament or of the Eucharist being prior to the proclamation of Christ crucified.

Christology and soteriology are ultimately prior to ecclesiology. Paul's concept of κοινωνία in 1 Cor 1:9 and 10:16 with its strict and strong emphasis on the soteriological communion with Christ is rather a bright and clear example of a common principle of Paul's theology and ethics - of the distinct priority of what God has done in Christ to what men could do[12]. That means, as regards ecclesiology, that the church remains a **consequence** - though not merely a possible but certainly an essential, yet still not more than a consequence - of God's work of atonement in Christ, of his unconditionally reconciling the godless to his fatherly love. For it demonstrates how a deeply disturbed and disobedient church such as that in Corinth might be cured as it is told again about its origin in Christ who remains its only source and norm. And as such the concept of κοινωνία in 1 Corinthians is highly significant indeed for the Christian community, proclaiming the reality of its communion with Christ.

[12] Cf. E. Jüngel, "Erwägungen zur Grundlegung evangelischer Ethik im Anschluß an die Theologie des Paulus", in id., *Unterwegs zur Sache. Theologische Bemerkungen*, BEvT 61, München 1972, 234-245. See also Friedrich's article "Christus, Einheit und Norm der Christen"; and generally Eichholz's considerations on Paul's Christology and ethics (*Umriß*, 265-268).

Bibliography

1. Sources and Tools

Arndt W. F./Gingrich F. W., *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Revised and augmented by F. W. Gingrich and F. W. Danker from Bauer's fifth edition 1958, Chicago/London, ²1979. (BAGD).

Ars Graeca. Griechische Sprachlehre, revised by R. Mehrlein *et al.*, Paderborn, ⁵1981.

Bauer W., *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der frühchristlichen Literatur*, ed. K. Aland *et al.*, Berlin/New York, ⁶1988. (Bauer/Aland).

Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensia, ed. K. Elliger *et al.*, Stuttgart, ²1984.

[Strack H. L. and] Billerbeck P., *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch II*, München, ⁸1983. (Str-B II).

id., *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch III,* München, ⁸1985. (Str-B III).

id., *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch IV*, München, ⁸1986. (Str-B IV)

Blass F./Debrunner A./Rehkopf F., *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, Göttingen, ¹⁷1990. (BDR).

Cremer H., *Biblisch-Theologisches Wörterbuch des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. Identical with the tenth edition revised and augmented by J. Kögel, Stuttgart/Gotha, ¹¹1923. (Cremer/Kögel).

Didache (Apostellehre), ed. K. Wengst, in Schriften des Urchristentums II, Darmstadt, 1984, 3-100. (*Did.*).

Gemoll W., *Griechisch-Deutsches Schul- und Handwörterbuch*, München/Wien, 1979 (Identical with the ninth edition from 1965).

Hoffmann E. G./Siebenthal H. von, *Griechische Grammatik zum Neuen Testament*. Riehen/Schweiz, ²1990. (Hoffmann/Siebenthal).

Joseph und Aseneth, ed. C. Burchard, in JSHRZ II/4, Gütersloh, 1983. (JosAs)

Liddell H. G./Scott R., *A Greek-English Lexicon*, revised and augmented by H. S. Jones and R. McKenzie, Oxford, 1983 (reprint from ⁹1940). (LSJ).

Moule C. F. D., *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*, Cambridge, 1953. (Moule).

Moulton J. H./Milligan G., *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, London, 1914-1929. (Moulton/Milligan).

Moulton W. F./Geden A. S., *A Concordance to the Greek New Testament according to the Texts of Westcott/Hort, Tischendorf and the English Revisers*, Edinburgh, ⁵1978.

Novum Testamentum Graece, ed. K. Aland, M. Black *et al.*, Stuttgart, ²⁶1979.

Novum Testamentum Latine, Textus Novae Vulgatae, ed. K. Aland et B. Aland, Stuttgart 1979.

Preuschen E., *Griechisch-Deutsches Taschenwörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Berlin/New York, ⁶1976.

Robertson A. T., *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, London, 1914. (Robertson).

id., *A Short Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, London, 1908. (*Short Grammar*).

Septuaginta, ed. A. Rahlfs, Stuttgart, ⁸1965. (LXX).

The Holy Bible, Revised Standard Version, New York/Glasgow/London/Toronto/Sydney/Auckland, 1973. (RSV).

Turner N., *Syntax* (vol. III in *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, by J. H. Moulton), Edinburgh, 1963. (Turner).

Winer G. B., *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Sprachidioms als sichere Grundlage der neutestamentlichen Exegese*, sixth revised and augmented edition, Leipzig, 1855. (Winer).

2. Commentaries

Allo E.-B., *Saint Paul. Première épître aux Corinthiens*, Ebib, Paris, ²1956.

Bachmann P., *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, KNT, Leipzig, 1905.

Barrett C. K., *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, BNTC, London, 1968.

Barth K., *The Resurrection of the Dead* (E.T. by H.J.Stenning), London, 1933. (*Resurrection*).

Bengel J. A., *Gnomon of the New Testament* (E.T.), vol. III, Edinburgh, ⁷1873. (*Gnomon*).

Bruce F. F., *1 and 2 Corinthians*, NCB, London, 1971.

Burger D. C. H. A., *Der erste Brief Pauli an die Korinther*, Erlangen, 1859.

Butler P. T., *Studies in First Corinthians*, Bible Studies Textbook Series, Joplin, 1985.

Calvin J., *Pauli Apostoli, epistolas ad Romanos, Corinthios et Galatas*, in *In omnes Novi Testamenti epistolas*, Editio Altera Emendator, vol. I, ed. A. Tholuck, Halle, 1831.

Chrysostom J., *Homilies on the Epistles to the Corinthians*. The Oxford Translation, in A Select Library of the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church, vol. 12, New York, 1889. (*Homilies on Corinthians*).

Conzelmann H., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, KEK, Göttingen, ¹¹1969.

Craig C. T., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, IntB 10, New York/Nashville, 1953, 1-262.

Edwards T. C., *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, London, ²1885.

Fascher E., *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther.* Erster Teil: *Einführung und Auslegung der Kapitel 1-7*, THKNT, Berlin, ⁴1988.

Fee G. D., *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIC, Michigan, ²1988.

Furnish V. P., *II Corinthians. Translated with Introduction, Notes and Commentary*, AB, New York, ³1985. (*2 Cor*).

Godet F., *Commentary on St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians*. vol I, in: Clark's Foreign Theological Library, New Series vol. XXVII, Edinburgh, 1889.

Grosheide F. W., *Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIC, Michigan, ⁸1976.

Gutjahr F. S., *Die zwei Briefe an die Korinther*, Graz/Wien, ²1921.

Henrici G., *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den ersten Brief an die Korinther*, KEK, Göttingen, ⁶1881.

Héring J., *La première épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens*, CNT, Neuchatel, 1949.

Hughes P. E., *Paul's Second Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIC, Michigan, ²1988. (*2 Cor*).

Klauck H. -J., *1.Korintherbrief*, Die Neue Echter Bibel, Würzburg, 1984.

Kling C. F., *Die Korintherbriefe*, Bielefeld, ²1865.

Kuß O., *Die Briefe an die Römer, Korinther und Galater*, RNT, Regensburg, 1940.

Lang F., *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, NTD, first edition of this new adaptation, Göttingen, ¹⁶1986.

Lietzmann H., *An die Korinther I u. II*, HNT, augmented by W. G. Kümmel, Tübingen, ⁵1969.

Lightfoot J. B., *Notes on the Epistles of St Paul from Unpublished Commentaries*, London, ²1904. (*Notes*).

Luther M., *Die Korintherbriefe*, in D. Martin Luthers Epistel-Auslegung, vol. 2, ed. E. Ellwein, Göttingen, 1968. (*Korintherbriefe*).

id., *First Lectures on the Psalms*, in Luther's Works, vol. 11 (First Lectures on Psalms II, Psalm 76-126, E.T. by H. J. A. Bouman, ed. H. C. Oswald), Saint Louis, 1976. (*Lectures on Psalms*).

id., *Lectures on Galatians 1535*, in Luther's Works, vol. 26 (Lectures on Galatians 1535, Chapters 1-4, E.T. by J. Pelikan, ed. J. Pelikan et W. A. Hansen), Saint Louis, 1963. (*Lectures on Galatians*).

id., *Sermons on the Second Epistle of St. Peter*, in Luther's Works, vol. 30 (The Catholic Epistles, E.T. by M. H. Bertram, ed. J. Pelikan et W. A. Hansen), Saint Louis, 1967. (*Sermons on 2 Peter*).

Meyer H. A. W., *Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Ersten Brief an die Korinther*, KEK, Göttingen, ⁴1861.

Michel O., *Der Brief an die Römer*, KEK, Göttingen, ¹⁴1978. (*Röm*).

Moffatt J., *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, MNTC, London, ⁹1959.

Orr W. F./Walther J. A., *1 Corinthians. A New Translation. Introduction with a Study of the Life of Paul, Notes, and Commentary*, AB, New York, ⁴1981.

Photius of Constantinople, in Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 544-583.

Robertson A./Plummer A., *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, ICC, Edinburgh, 1911.

Schlatter A., *Paulus der Bote Jesu. Eine Deutung seiner Briefe an die Korinther*, Stuttgart, ⁴1969.

Schrage W., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther. 1.Teilband, 1 Kor 1,1-6,11*, EKK, Braunschweig/Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1991.

Senft C., *La première épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens*, CNT, second revised and augmented edition, Genève, 1990.

Severian of Gabala, in Staab, *Pauluskommentare*, 225-277.

Sickenberger J., *Die Briefe des Heiligen Paulus an die Korinther und Römer*, HSNT, Bonn, ⁴1932.

Staab K., *Pauluskommentare aus der Griechischen Kirche*, NTAbh 15, Münster, 1933. (*Pauluskommentare*).

Stuhlmacher P., *Der Brief an die Römer*, NTD, Göttingen/Zürich, ¹⁴1989. (*Röm*).

Strobel A., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, ZBK, Zürich, 1989.

Talbert C. H., *Reading Corinthians. A Literary and Theological Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, New York, 1987.

Walter E., *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Geistliche Schriftlesung, Düsseldorf, 1969.

Weiß J., *Der erste Korintherbrief*, KEK, Göttingen, [10]1925.

Wendland H.-D., *Die Briefe an die Korinther*, NTD, Göttingen, [11]1965.

Wolff C., *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*. Zweiter Teil: *Auslegung der Kapitel 8-16*, THKNT, Berlin, [3]1990.

id., *Der Zweite Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, THKNT, Berlin, 1989. (*2 Kor*).

All commentaries on 1 Corinthians appear simply with reference to the name of the author. Other commentaries are referred to with the common appropriate short form of the biblical book in English and German respectively.

3. Monographs and Articles

Barrett C. K., "Things Sacrificed to Idols", in id., *Essays on Paul*, London, 1982, 40-59. ("Idols").

Banks R., *Paul's Idea of Community. The Early House Churches in their Historical Setting*, Exeter, 1980. (*Community*).

Baumann R., *Mitte und Norm des Christlichen. Eine Auslegung von 1 Korinther 1,1-3,4*, NTAbh New series 5, Münster, 1968.

Berger K., "Kirche II. Neues Testament", in *TRE* XVIII, 201-218. ("Kirche").

Betz O., "Die Übersetzungen von Jes 53 (LXX, Targum) und die Theologia Crucis des Paulus", in id., *Jesus, der Herr der Kirche. Aufsätze zur Biblischen Theologie* II, WUNT 52, Tübingen, 1990, 197-216. ("Jes 53").

Blank J., "Eucharistie und Kirchengemeinschaft nach Paulus", in *US* 23 (1968), 172-183. ("Eucharistie").

Bornkamm G., "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus", in id., *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze II*, BEvT 28, München, 1959, 138-176. ("Herrenmahl").

Brown S., "Koinonia as the Basis of New Testament Ecclesiology?", in *OiC* 12 (1976), 157-167. ("Ecclesiology").

Brunner P., "Koinonia. Grundlagen und Grundformen der Kirchengemeinschaft", in id., *Pro Ecclesia* II, Fürth, [2]1990, 305-322.

Burchard C., "The Importance of Joseph and Aseneth for the Study of the New Testament: A General Survey and a Fresh Look at the Lord's Supper", in *NTS* 33 (1987), 102-134. ("Importance").

id., *Untersuchungen zu Joseph und Aseneth. Überlieferung - Ortsbestimmung*, WUNT 8, Tübingen, 1965. (*Untersuchungen*).

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

Coenen L., "Berufung/καλέω", in *TBLNT* I (Studienausgabe), Wuppertal, ⁷1986, 86-92.

id., "Kirche/ἐκκλησία", in *TBLNT* II (Studienausgabe), Wuppertal, ⁷1986, 784-799.

Conzelmann H., *Grundriß der Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, München ²1967. (*Theologie*).

Currie S. D., *Koinonia in Christian Literature to 200 A.D.*, Dissertation Emory University, 1962. (*Literature*)

Deissmann A., *Paul. A Study in Social and Religious History* (E.T. by W. E. Wilson), London, ²1926. (*Paul*).

Delling G., "Abendmahl II. Urchristliches Mahlverständnis", in *TRE* I, Berlin/New York, 1977, 47-58. ("Mahlverständnis").

id., "Das Abendmahlsgeschehen nach Paulus", in id., *Studien zum Neuen Testament und zum hellenistischen Judentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze 1950-1968*, ed. F. Hahn *et al.*, Göttingen, 1970, 281-287. ("Abendmahlsgeschehen").

id., "Nun aber sind sie heilig", in id., *Studien zum Neuen Testament und zum hellenistischen Judentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze 1950-1968*, ed. F. Hahn *et al.*, Göttingen, 1970, 257-269.

id., "Zur Exegese von 1 Kor 7,14", in id., *Studien zum Neuen Testament und zum hellenistischen Judentum. Gesammelte Aufsätze 1950-1968*, ed. F. Hahn *et al.*, Göttingen, 1970, 281-287.

Dobbeler A. von, *Glaube als Teilhabe. Historische und semantische Grundlagen der paulinischen Theologie und Ekklesiologie des Glaubens*, WUNT II/22, Tübingen, 1987. (*Teilhabe*).

Dunn J. D. G., "'Instruments of Koinonia' in the Early Church", in *OiC* 25 (1989), 204-216. ("Instruments").

id., *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament. An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, London, 1977. (*Unity*).

Eichholz G., "Der missionarische Kanon des Paulus. 1.Kor.9,19-23", in id., *Tradition und Interpretation. Studien zum Neuen Testament und zur Hermeneutik*, München, 1965, 114-120. ("Kanon").

id., *Die Theologie des Paulus im Umriss*, Neukirchen-Vluyn, ⁶1988. (*Umriss*).

Elert W., *Abendmahl und Kirchengemeinschaft in der Alten Kirche hauptsächlich des Ostens*, Berlin, 1954. (*Kirchengemeinschaft*).

Ellis E. E., "Traditions in 1 Corinthians", in *NTS* 32 (1986), 481-502. ("Traditions").

Endenburg P. J. T., *Koinoonia. En Gemeenschap van Zaken bij de Grieken in den Klassieken Tijd*, Amsterdam, 1937. (*Koinoonia*).

Eßer H. -H., "Gnade/χάρις", in *TBLNT* I (Studienausgabe), Wuppertal, ⁷1986, 590-596.

Fischer G. -D.. "Zum Koinonia-Charakter christlicher Gemeinde", in *ThGl* 61 (1971), 39-44. ("Koinonia-Charakter").

Flew R. N., *Jesus and His Church. A Study of the Idea of the Ecclesia in the New Testament*, London, ²1939. (*Church*)

Friedrich G., "Christus, Einheit und Norm der Christen", in id., *Auf das Wort kommt es an. Gesammelte Aufsätze zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. J. H. Friedrich, Göttingen, 1978, 147-170. ("Christus").

George A. R., *Communion with God in the New Testament*, London, 1953. (*Communion*).

Goppelt L., "Apokalyptik und Typologie bei Paulus", in id., *Christologie und Ethik. Aufsätze zum Neuen Testament*, Göttingen, 1968, 234-267. ("Typologie").

id., "Kirchengemeinschaft und Abendmahlsgemeinschaft nach dem Neuen Testament", in *KOINONIA. Arbeiten des Oekumenischen Ausschusses der Vereinigten Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands zur Frage der Kirchen- und Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*, Berlin, 1957, 24-33. ("Abendmahlsgemeinschaft").

id., *Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, ed. J. Roloff, reprint of the third edition, Göttingen, 1985. (*Theologie*).

Greßmann H., "Ἡ κοινωνία τῶν δαιμονίων", in *ZNW* 20 (1921), 224-230.

Gundry R. H., *SŌMA in Biblical Theology with Emphasis on Pauline Anthropology*, in SNTSMS 29, Cambridge/London/New York/Melburne, 1976. (*SŌMA*).

Guthrie D., *New Testament Introduction. The Pauline Epistles*, London, ²1964. (*Introduction*).

Hahn F., "Teilhabe am Heil und Gefahr des Abfalls. Eine Auslegung von 1 Ko 10,1-22", in *Freedom and Love. The Guide for Christian Life (1 Co 8-10; Rm 14-15)*, Monographic Series of "Benedictina" 6, Bibilical-Ecumenical Section, ed. L. de Lorenzi, Rome, 1981, 149-171. ("Heil").

id., "Thesen zur Frage einheitsstiftender Elemente in Lehre und Praxis des urchristlichen Herrenmahls", in id., *Exegetische Beträge zum ökumenischen Gespräch. Gesammelte Aufsätze* 1, Göttingen, 1986, 232-241. ("Thesen").

Hainz J., "Κοινωνία κτλ.", in *EWNT* II, Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/Mainz, 1981, 749-755.

id., *Koinonia. "Kirche" als Gemeinschaft bei Paulus*, BU 16, Regenburg, 1982. (*Kirche*).

Hamer J., *L' Église est une communion*, Unam Sanctam 40, Paris, 1962. (*Église*).

Hauck F., "Κοινωνός κτλ.", in *TWNT* III, Stuttgart, 1938, 798-810.

Hengel M., *Earliest Christianity* (E.T. by J. Bowden), London, 1986. (*Christianity*).

Hofius O., "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlparadosis. Erwägungen zu 1 Kor 11,23b-25", in id., *Paulusstudien*, WUNT 51, Tübingen, 1989, 203-240. ("Paradosis").

id., "Sühne und Versöhnung. Zum paulinischen Verständnis des Kreuzestodes Jesu", in id., *Paulusstudien*, WUNT 51, Tübingen, 1989, 33-49. ("Sühne und Versöhnung").

id., "Τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν 1 Kor 11,24", in *ZNW* 80 (1989), 80-88. ("ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν").

id., "Wort Gottes und Glaube bei Paulus" in id., *Paulusstudien*, WUNT 51, Tübingen, 1989, 148-174. ("Wort Gottes").

Hurd J. C., *The Origins of 1 Corinthians*, London, 1965. (*Origins*).

Jeremias J., *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, Göttingen, ⁴1967. (*Abendmahlsworte*).

id., *Neutestamentliche Theologie I*, Gütersloh, ⁴1988.

Jeske R. L., "The Rock was Christ: The Ecclesiology of 1 Corinthians", in *Kirche*. FS für G. Bornkamm zum 75. Geburtstag, ed. D. Lührmann *et al*, Tübingen, 1980, 245-255. ("Rock").

Jourdan G. V., "KOINΩNIA in 1 Corinthians 10₁₆", in *JBL* 67 (1948), 111-124. ("KOINΩNIA").

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

Käsemann E., "Anliegen und Eigenart der paulinischen Abendmahlslehre", in id., *Exegetische Versuche und Besinnungen I*, Göttingen, ⁶1970, 11-34. ("Anliegen").

id., "Das theologische Problem des Motivs vom Leibe Christi", in *Paulinische Perspektiven*, Tübingen, 1969, 178-210. ("Motiv").

Kertelge K., "Abendmahlsgemeinschaft und Kirchengemeinschaft im Neuen Testament und in der Alten Kirche", in F. Hahn/K. Kertelge/ R. Schnackenburg, *Einheit der Kirche. Grundlegung im Neuen Testament*, QD 84, Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1979, 94-132. ("Kirchengemeinschaft").

id., "Kerygma und Koinonia. Zur theologischen Bestimmung der Kirche des Urchristentums", in *Kontinuität und Einheit*. FS für F. Mußner, ed. P. -G. Müller *et al.*, Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1981, 327-339. ("Kerygma").

Klauck H. -J., "Eucharistie und Kirchengemeinschaft bei Paulus", in id. *Gemeinde·Amt·Sakrament: Neutestamentliche Perspektiven*, Würzburg, 1989, 331-347. ("Eucharistie").

id., *Herrenmahl und hellenistischer Kult. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zum ersten Korintherbrief*, NTAbh New Series 15, Münster, ²1982. (*Kult*).

Kramer W., *Christ, Lord, Son of God* (E.T. by B. Hardy), SBT 50, London, 1966. (*Christ*).

Krause W. von, "Was sagt uns das Neue Testament zur Frage der Kirchen- und Abendmahlsgemeinschaft?", in *KOINONIA. Arbeiten des Oekumenischen Ausschusses der Evangelisch-Lutherischen Kirche Deutschlands zur Frage der Kirchen- und Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*, Berlin, 1957, 34-41. ("Frage").

Kümmel W. G., *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Heidelberg, ²¹1983. (*Einleitung*).

Lampe P., "Das Korinthische Herrenmahl im Schnittpunkt hellenistisch-römischer Mahlpraxis und paulinischer Theologia Crucis (1 Kor 11,17-34)", in *ZNW* 82 (1991), 183-213. ("Mahlpraxis").

Lohse E., *Die Entstehung des Neuen Testaments*, Theologische Wissenschaft 4, fourth revised and augmented edition, Stuttgart/Berlin/Köln/Mainz, 1983. (*Entstehung*).

McDermott J. M., "The Bibilical Doctrine of KOINΩNIA", in *BZ* NF 19 (1975), 64-77, 219-233. ("Doctrine").

Meeks W. A., *The First Urban Christians. The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, New Haven/London, 1983. (*Christians*).

Murphy-O'Connor J., "Eucharist and Community in First Corinthians", in *Worship* 51 (1977), 56-69. ("Community").

id., *St. Paul's Corinth. Texts and Archeology*, GNS 6, Wilmington, 1983. (*Corinth*).

Neuenzeit P., *Das Herrenmahl. Studien zur paulinischen Eucharistieauffassung*, SANT 1, München, 1960. (*Studien*).

Neugebauer F., "Das paulinische 'In Christo'", in *NTS* 4 (1957/58), 124-139. ("In Christo").

O'Brien P. T., *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*, NovTSup 49, Leiden, 1977. (*Thanksgivings*).

id., "Thanksgiving and the Gospel in Paul", in *NTS* 21 (1974/75), 144-155. ("Gospel").

Oepke A., "Ἐν", in *TDNT* II, Michigan, ²1983, 537-543.

Osten-Sacken P. von der, *Römer 8 als Beispiel paulinischer Soteriologie*, FRLANT 112, Göttingen, 1975. (*Römer 8*).

Panikulam G., *Koinōnia in the New Testament. A Dynamic Expresssion of Christian Life*, AnBib 85, Rome, 1979. (*Koinōnia in the NT*).

Percy E., *Der Leib Christi (Σῶμα Χριστοῦ) in den paulinischen Homologumena und Antilegomena*, Lunds Universitets Årsskrift New Series 38,1, Lund/Leipzig, 1942. (*Σῶμα*).

Riesner R., *Jesus als Lehrer. Eine Untersuchung zum Ursprung der Evangelienüberlieferung*, WUNT II/7, Tübingen, ³1988.

id., "Korinth", in *Das Große Bibellexikon* II, Wuppertal/Zürich, 1988, 815-819. ("Korinth").

Roloff J., "Heil als Gemeinschaft. Kommunikative Faktoren im urchristlichen Herrenmahl", in id., *Exegetische Verantwortung in der Kirche. Aufsätze*, ed. M. Karrer, Göttingen, 1990, 171-200. ("Heil").

id., *Neues Testament*, fourth revised and augmented edition, Neukirchen-Vluyn, 1985. (*Neues Testament*).

Sampley J. P., *Pauline Partnership in Christ. Christian Community and Commitment in Light of Roman Law*, Philadelphia, 1980. (*Partnership*).

Schattenmann J., "Gemeinschaft/κοινωνία" , in *TBLNT* I (Studienausgabe), Wuppertal, ⁷1986, 495-499.

Schlatter A., *Die Theologie der Apostel*, Stuttgart, 1922. (Theologie).

Schmitz O., *Die Christus-Gemeinschaft des Paulus im Lichte seines Genitivgebrauchs*, NTF I/2, Gütersloh, 1924. (*Christus-Gemeinschaft*).

Schnackenburg R., "Die Einheit der Kirche unter dem Koinonia-Gedanken", in F. Hahn/K. Kertelge/R. Schnackenburg, *Einheit der Kirche. Grundlegung im Neuen Testament*, QD 84, Freiburg/Basel/Wien, 1979, 54-93. ("Einheit").

Schnider F./Stenger W., *Studien zum neutestamentlichen Briefformular*, NTTS 11, Leiden/NewYork/København/Köln, 1987. (*Briefformular*).

Schubert P., *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings*, BZNW 20, Berlin, 1939. (*Form*).

Schweizer E., "Die Kirche als Leib Christi in den paulinischen Homologumena", in *Neotestamentica. German and English Essays 1951-1963*, Zürich, 1963, 272-292. ("Leib Christi").

id., *Theologische Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, GNT 2, Göttingen, 1989. (*Theologische Einleitung*).

Scott C. A. A., "The 'Fellowship', or κοινωνία", in *ET* 35 (1923/24), 567.

Seesemann H., *Der Begriff KOINΩNIA im Neuen Testament*, BZNW 14, Gießen, 1933. (*Koinonia*).

Sellin G., "1 Kor 5-6 und der 'Vorbrief' nach Korinth: Indizien für eine Mehrschichtigkeit von Kommunikationsakten im ersten Korintherbrief" in *NTS* 37 (1991), 545-558. ("Vorbrief").

Smalley S. S., "The Christ-Christian Relationship in Paul and John", in *Pauline Studies. Essays Presented to Professor F. F. Bruce on his 70th Birthday*, ed. D. A. Hagner et M. J. Harris, Exeter, 1980, 95-105. ("Relationship").

Soden H. von, "Sakrament und Ethik bei Paulus. Zur Frage der literarischen und Theologischen Einheitlichkeit von 1 Kor 8-10", in Marburger Theologische Studien 1, ed. H. Frick, *Rudolf Otto-Festgruß*, Gotha, 1931, 1-40. ("Sakrament").

Tannehill R. C., *Dying and Rising with Christ. A Study in Pauline Theology*, BZNW 32, Berlin, 1967. (*Dying and Rising*).

Theißen G., "Die Starken und die Schwachen in Korinth. Soziologische Analyse eines theologischen Streites", in id., *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums*, WUNT 19, Tübingen, 1979, 272-289. ("Die Starken").

id., "Soziale Integration und sakramentales Handeln. Eine Analyse von 1 Cor.XI 17-34", in id., *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums*, WUNT 19, Tübingen, 1979, 290-217. ("Integration").

id., "Soziale Schichtung in der korinthischen Gemeinde. Ein Beitrag zur Soziologie des hellenistischen Urchristentums", in id., *Studien zur Soziologie des Urchristentums*, WUNT 19, Tübingen, 1979, 231-271. ("Schichtung").

Troeltsch E., *Die Soziallehren der christlichen Kirchen und Gruppen*, *Gesammelte Schriften* 1, Tübingen, ³1923. (*Soziallehren*).

Walter N., "Christusglaube und heidnische Religiosität in paulinischen Gemeinden", in *NTS* 25 (1979), 422-442. ("Christusglaube").

Weder H., *Das Kreuz Jesu bei Paulus. Ein Versuch, über den Geschichtsbezug des christlichen Glaubens Nachzudenken*, FRLANT 125, Göttingen, 1981.

Wedderburn A. J. M., *Baptism and Resurrection. Studies in Pauline Theology against its Graeco-Roman Background*, WUNT 44, Tübingen, 1987. (*Baptism*).

id., "Some Observations on Paul's Use of the Phrases 'in Christ' and 'with Christ'", *JSNT* 25 (1985), 83-97. ("Observations").

id., "The Body of Christ and Related Concepts in 1 Corinthians", in *SJT* 24 (1971), 74-96. ("Body").

Wickert U., "Einheit und Eintracht der Kirche im Präscript des ersten Korintherbriefes", in *ZNW* 50 (1959), 73-82.

Willis W. L., *Idol Meat in Corinth. The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*, Chico, 1985. (*Idol Meat*).

Wischmeyer O., "Das Adjektiv ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ in den paulinischen Briefen. Eine traditionsgeschichtliche Miszelle", in *NTS* 32 (1986), 476-480. ("ΑΓΑΠΗΤΟΣ").

Wood W. S., "Fellowship", in *Expositor* 8.Ser. 21 (1921), 23-40. ("Fellowship").

All Abbreviations which are not specially explained mainly follow the "Instructions For Contributors" of the *JBL* 107 (1985), 579-596, or - if not listed there - S. Schwertner's *Internationales Abkürzungsverzeichnis für Theologie und Grenzgebiete*, Berlin/New York, 1976.