

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Master of Sacred Theology Thesis

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

11-1-2000

Discerning the body - An Exegetical Examination of 1 Co. 11:17-34

Mark Surburg

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/stm>



Part of the [Biblical Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Surburg, Mark, "Discerning the body - An Exegetical Examination of 1 Co. 11:17-34" (2000). *Master of Sacred Theology Thesis*. 480.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/stm/480>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Sacred Theology Thesis by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

**Discerning the body - An Exegetical
Examination of 1Co. 11:17-34**

A thesis presented to the Faculty
of Concordia Seminary, St. Louis
Department of Exegetical Theology
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Master of Sacred Theology

by

Mark P. Surburg

November 2000

Chapter 1

1Co. 11:17-19

1 Corinthians 11:17-34 exhibits a four part structure. In 11:17-22 Paul assesses the problems that currently plague the Corinthian celebration of the Lord's Supper. He responds in 11:23-26 by citing the Lord's Supper tradition/liturgy (11:23-25) and adding an explanatory gloss (11:26). Next Paul returns to the situation and applies the significance of the Lord's Supper tradition to the current problems in Corinth (11:27-32). Finally he provides brief, practical instructions to address the situation (11:33-34).

The following study will provide a detailed treatment of 1Co. 11:17-34 with an emphasis on lexical meaning and structural analysis. It will examine Paul's treatment in five major sections: 1) Exegesis of 11:17-19 2) Exegesis of 11:20-22, 33-34 3) Analysis and Critique of scholarly reconstructions of the Corinthian Eucharistic setting 4) Exegesis of 11:23-26 5) Exegesis of 11:27-32. Within each section the study will focus on certain important issues.¹

¹ In considering 11:17-34, primary emphasis will not fall on defending and supporting the presence of Christ's true body and blood under bread and wine in the sacrament. The present author accepts this as axiomatic (A.C. X, S.C. VI, L.C. VI etc.) and in agreement with the earliest church. Ignatius of Antioch bears witness to this same exegesis and understanding when a mere 50 years after Paul's letter to Corinth this bishop of Antioch condemns Docetists who stay away from the eucharist "because they do not confess that the eucharist is the flesh of Christ" (Smyr. 7:1; cf. Phd. 4:1; Eph. 20:2). On several occasions we will refer to Ignatius. He provides an important source of corroborating evidence since he served as bishop 50 years later of the same church from which Paul operated on his missionary journeys (cf. Acts 11:25-26; 13:2-4; 15:35-41).

The exegesis of 11:17-22, 33-34 will focus special attention on the relationship between 11:18-19's σχίσματα and αἵρέσεις. Additionally it will examine the specific Corinthian eucharistic setting and problem in the light of the ambiguous προλαμβάνει in 11:21 and ἐκδέχεσθε in 11:33, while weighing the opposing theories offered by Bornkamm/Jeremias,² and Theissen/Hofius.³ The consideration of 11:23-26 will focus on the role that the passage plays in the thought progression of 11:17-34 and the import of the phrase "you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (11:26). Finally, on the basis of structural and lexical features it will examine 11:27-32 to determine the referent of 11:29's τὸ σῶμα and the manner in which Paul uses the κριν- root paronomasia.

1Co 11:17-19

Beginning in 1Co. 7:1, Paul addresses a series of issues which the Corinthians had raised in an earlier letter to him (Περὶ δὲ ὧν ἐγράψατε).⁴ However, not all the material in 1Co. 7-16 derives from this letter. The content in chapter 11 on head covering of women at worship (11:2-16) and the Lord's Supper (11:17-34) along with chapter 15's treatment of the resurrection derive from Paul himself. In particular the material in chapter

² Gunther Bornkamm, "Lord's Supper and Church in Paul," tr. Paul L. Hammer. *Early Christian Experience*. 123-160. (New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969); Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. tr. Norman Perrin. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966).

³ Gerd Theissen, "Social Integration and Sacramental Activity," *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* ed. & tr. John H. Schutz. 145-174. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982); Otfried Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis: Erwägungen zu 1Kor 11,23b-25," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 85 (1988): 371-408.

11 coheres well with the following material in ch. 12-14 since all of these chapters touch upon the public worship setting.⁵ Thus, Paul has arranged into a single unit both the worship related questions the Corinthians had asked and his own concerns about their worship.

This fact explains the close ties in phrasing that 11:17-34 shares with 11:2-16 and chapter 14. In 11:2 Paul says that he praises them (Ἐπαινῶ δὲ ὑμᾶς) because they hold on to the traditions (τὰς παραδόσεις κατέχετε) which he handed over to them (παρέδωκα ὑμῖν). Then in 11:17-34 Paul says that he does not praise them (11:17 and 11:22 οὐκ ἐπαινῶ) and responds by citing the tradition he had passed on to them (11:23 παρέλαβον and παρέδωκα). In a similar fashion, all of the Pauline uses of συνέρχομαι and the unusual anarthrous ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ occur in 1Co. 11 and 14. Additionally, two of the three Pauline uses of ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ occur in these chapters as well (11:20; 14:23).⁶

The existence of 1Co. 11:17-34 as a unit will help inform our understanding of 11:17-34 on several occasions. Paul uses the preposition εἰς to link 11:17 and 11:34, and in turn to bracket 11:17-22 and also 11:33-34. He begins in 11:17 by

⁴ Further examples are all introduced by Περί δέ: 7:25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1, 12.

⁵ Chapter 12 begins the discussion on τὰ πνευματικά and ch. 14 completes its application to the worship setting. Chapter 13 then serves as a digression (*egressio*) in which Paul inserts "an epideitic excursus or digression focusing on presentation, not argumentation" (Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth - A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. [Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995], 264).

⁶ The third involves his instruction on marriage and sexual intercourse in 7:5.

complaining that the Corinthians are gathering (συνέρχασθε) for the worse (εἰς τὸ ἥσσον). He concludes 11:17-34 in 11:34 with instructions so that they will not gather for judgment (ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα συνέρχησθε) - the result of "gathering for the worse."⁷

Just as 11:17-22 begins with εἰς τὸ in 11:17 so also it concludes with εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν in 11:22. Paul complains in 11:17 that they are gathering for the worse and provides the content of this complaint in 11:22, "What! You have houses for eating and drinking, don't you?" In a similar manner 11:33-34 begins in 11:33 with an instruction about how they are to act when they gather to eat (εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν) - they are to receive one another.⁸ Paul gives this instruction so that when they gather to eat they won't gather with the result of judgment ((ἵνα μὴ εἰς κρίμα συνέρχησθε; 11:34).⁹ These uses of εἰς and εἰς τὸ provide a nice rhetorical flourish to 11:17-34 as whole.¹⁰

As we turn to 11:17 we encounter questions in establishing the text as well as in determining the referent. The manuscript tradition indicates every possible permutation of indicative and

⁷ Johannes Weiss, *Der Erste Korintherbrief* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1910), 278, has also noted this correspondence.

⁸ "Wait for" is another possible translation of 11:33's ἐκδέξασθε. We will examine this issue in conjunction with 11:21.

⁹ Εἰς in this use indicates result (Walter Bauer, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Fredrick Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979], 229.4e) (hereafter referred to as BAGD).

¹⁰ The only other use of εἰς in the whole of 11:17-34 occurs in the repeated εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν of 11:24-25 within the tradition. Here, however, Paul quotes another source and does not engage in independent composition.

participle forms for the verbs παραγγέλλω and ἐπαίνω.¹¹ It seems best to remain with the NA27th and read, "But as I instruct [on] this matter I am not praising [you]."¹²

The referent of τοῦτο also presents difficulties. Although τοῦτο can operate either retrospectively or prospectively the introduction of a new topic here demands for τοῦτο a prospective reference, and one expects instruction in what follows.¹³ Paul, however, does not seem to indicate clearly the instruction between 11:17 and 11:22 where we encounter what must be a retrospective use (ἐν τούτῳ οὐκ ἐπαίνῳ). We also note that 11:17's τοῦτο does not conform to Paul's normal construction for prospective τοῦτο.¹⁴ Perhaps 11:17's τοῦτο refers to Paul's instruction in the tradition (11:23-26) and its application (11:27-32) as a whole, while 11:22's τοῦτο refers to the behavior

¹¹ παραγγέλλων και επαίνω κ D² F G Ψ 1881 a d NA27th; παραγγέλλω και επαίνων A C 6 33 104 326 365 1175 1739 pc f vg Ambst; παραγγέλλων και επαίνων B; παραγγέλλω και επαίνω D⁸¹ b

¹² The external evidence seems evenly divided between παραγγέλλων και επαίνω and παραγγέλλω και επαίνων (the other two are obvious attempts to solve the difficulty). We choose the NA27th's reading on the basis of internal evidence. The content of 11:17ff fits better with rebuke ("I am not praising because"; οὐκ ἐπαίνῳ ὅτι) than command (a fact noted by both Weiss and Lietzmann who prefer this reading; Weiss, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 278; Hans D. Lietzmann, *An Die Korinther I, II*, rev. W.G. Kümmel, HNT 9. [Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Peter Siebeck), 1949], 55). Additionally, 11:2's ἐπαίνῳ and 11:22's bracketing οὐκ ἐπαίνῳ strongly support it. Fee argues for παραγγέλλω και επαίνων since in light of 11:2 and 11:22 it is more awkward and hence the *lectio difficilior* (Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. [Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmanns Publishing Company, 1987], 535). However, it seems more likely that the uncertain referent of τοῦτο caused the change. Either way, as Fee notes, the general sense remains clear (536).

¹³ Wallace writes with reference to τοῦτο, "The singular is used to refer both to an antecedent and a postcedent on a regular basis" (Daniel B. Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. [Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996], 333).

¹⁴ When "it refers to what follows, Paul tends either to add an epexegetic ὅτι clause (15:50; cf. 2 Thess. 3:10) or to express the content of the 'this' (7:29; cf. Gal. 3:2, 17)" (Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle*, 536 ftnt 23).

in 11:17-22 that he won't praise.¹⁵ The referent problem is unusual, but then so is the situation. Paul does not praise the Corinthians because they do not "regularly gather" (συνέρχεσθε)¹⁶ for the better (εἰς τὸ κρεῖσσον) but for the worse (εἰς τὸ ἥσσον).¹⁷

Paul proceeds in 11:18 to explain (γάρ) his statement about the Corinthians gathering "for the worse."¹⁸ Paul says, "I have heard that when you regularly come together in church there really are (ὑπάρχειν) divisions among you, and I believe it in part."

Paul's statement derives from a report which he has heard. The verse reminds the reader of 1:11 where after exhorting the Corinthians in 1:10 that there be no σχίσματα among them Paul indicates that there are in fact quarrels (ἔριδες) among them. Chloe's "people" (τῶν Χλόης) have informed Paul that the

¹⁵ Engberg-Pedersen has made the helpful observation that, "Paul deals in 11:3-16 with a problem under the rubric of praise; his remarks about the Eucharist in 11:17ff are placed under blame" (Troels Engberg-Pedersen, "Proclaiming the Lord's Death: 1 Corinthians 11:17-34 and the Forms of Paul's Theological Argument" *Society of Biblical Literature 1991 Seminar Papers*. ed. Eugene H. Lovering. 592-617. [Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991], 594). Engberg-Pedersen goes on to argue that this indicates that Paul is much more concerned and upset about the situation in 11:17-22 than the one in 11:2-16 (Ibid.). The "rubric of blame" exhibits a strong stance in opposition to what he perceives to be a dangerous problem. This observation fits well with the content of the Lord's Supper (the body and blood of Christ) and what it does - both positively (makes Christians one body; 10:16-17) and negatively (brings illness and death on those who eat and drink unworthily; 11:27, 30) - as a central element in the life of the church.

¹⁶ Note the heavy use of present stem verbs throughout 11:17-22. The aspectual "focus on connection" emphasizes the habitual and continuing nature of the problem in Corinth (James W. Voelz, *Fundamental Greek Grammar*. [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1993], 67-8, 70).

¹⁷ Blass et al. suggest the translation "in a good way - bad way" for these phrases (F. Blass, A. Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. [Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961], 244.2; hereafter referred to as *BDF*).

Corinthians are divided over issues of "allegiance" to Paul, Apollo, Cephas or Christ (1:11). These "people from Chloe" "could be either family, slaves, or freedmen; there is no way to tell, although slaves or freedmen is more likely."¹⁹ Since as we will see the report in 11:17ff is on behalf of the poor (τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας 11:22) - the rich are hardly reporting themselves! - both Fee and Theissen have made the plausible suggestion the "ones of Chloe" have also reported the situation addressed in 11:17-34.²⁰

Although 1Co. 11:18-19 and 1:10ff exhibit some superficial similarities (a report which involves the matter of *σχίσματα*), there is no reason to equate the *σχίσματα* of chapter 11 with those of chapter 1.²¹ As mentioned above, the problems in 1:10ff revolve around allegiance to individual "leaders" such as Paul, Apollo, Cephas and Christ (1:12). 1Co. 11:17ff addresses divisions along sociological lines as the rich offend the poor (11:22).²² If there is a relation between 1:10 and 11:18 it exists in that both verses show the divided and combative nature of the Corinthian congregation.

¹⁸ He introduces the statement with *πρῶτον μὲν* as if to enumerate a series of reasons, but never actually provides the second item. This merely presents an example of anacoluthon which he often commits with this phrase (BAGD726.2b).

¹⁹ Fee, *Epistle to Corinthians*, 54 ftnt. 32.

²⁰ Ibid., 537; Theissen, "Social Integration," 163.

²¹ Surprisingly, both Lietzmann (*An Die Korinther*, 55-56) and Witherington (*Conflict and Community*, 248) make this identification.

²² Pfitzner (V.C. Pfitzner, *First Corinthians*. [Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1982], 174), Barrett (C.K. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Peabody, [Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1968], 261), Engberg-Pedersen ("Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 595), Fee (*The First Epistle*, 537) and Hofius ("Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlparadosis," 374) arrive at the same conclusion.

Paul says that these divisions regularly occur when they gather ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ. This anarthrous use of ἐκκλησία stands out because it runs counter to Paul's normal arthrous use of the word.²³ Although anarthrous nouns which serve as the object of a preposition can be definite,²⁴ we should translate ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ as "in church" and not "in the church." Paul indicates a setting/location, not the church as an entity.²⁵ Three pieces of evidence support this understanding.

First, all four examples of ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ occur in chapters 11 and 14 where Paul discusses specific behavior in the public worship setting (11:18; 14:19; 14:28; 14:35). Elsewhere he uses the arthrous ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ when referring to the church as an entity in non-worship settings (1Co. 6:4, 12:28; Eph. 3:21).

Second, ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ stands parallel to ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό in 11:20. Paul resumes his argument in 11:20 with an identical genitive absolute construction (Συνερχομένων οὖν ὑμῶν) and then appends ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό instead of ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ for stylistic variation. The phrase ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό emphasizes the locatedness of the gathering (1Co. 14:23; cf. Acts 1:15; 2:1).²⁶ In a similar manner, 1Co. 14:23 indicates how the

²³ In Paul's 62 uses of the term, only 11 are anarthrous: 1Co. 4:17, 11:18, 14:4, 14:19, 14:28, 14:35; 2Co. 8:23, 11:8; Ph. 4:15; 1Ti. 3:5, 3:15. Four of these are ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ: 1Co. 11:18, 14:19, 14:28, 14:35.

²⁴ Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 247; A.T. Robertson, *A Grammar of the New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. (Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934), 791.

²⁵ This seems to fit Wallace's qualitative anarthrous use of the noun which "emphasizes class traits" (emphasis his) and "often has in view one individual rather than a class as a whole" (*Greek Grammar*, 244).

²⁶ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό indicates place - "at the same place, together" (BAGD 123.4b).

whole church (the church as an entity) gathers together ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (together in a place) where unbelievers can see and hear them.

Finally, Paul's use in 1Co. 14:35 arranges ἐν οἴκῳ and ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ in parallel. If women have questions deriving from the worship service they are to ask their husbands "at home" ἐν οἴκῳ (the location) and not "at church" (ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ) (the location where the worship service takes place).²⁷ This evidence supports the translation "in church" rather than "in the church."

Paul emphasizes the concrete nature of the offense posed to the church by the σχίσματα. He does so by piling up "ecclesiastical terms" in 11:17-22 such as συνέρχομαι (11:17, 18, 20), ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ (11:18), and ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (11:20).²⁸ The repeated ἐν ὑμῖν in 11:18 and 11:19 (twice)²⁹ further emphasize this fact.³⁰ Paul will contend in 12:25 that there should be no σχίσμα in the body, the church. These σχίσματα (particularly in the context of

²⁷ Paul Neuenzeit comes to much the same conclusion when he writes, "Eigenartig ist der Gebrauch von ἐκκλησίᾳ ohne Artikel. Es scheint immer dann ohne Artikel gebraucht zu werden, wenn der Aspekt einer örtlichen Versammlung der Gemeindemitglieder im Vordergrund steht" (*Das Herrenmahl - Studien zur paulinischen Eucharistieauffassung*. [München: Kösel-Verlag, 1960]), 27; emphasis his).

²⁸ Ibid., 26.

²⁹ 11:19 includes some minor variants for these two: D⁸ F G lat Cyp Ambst omit the first; P⁴⁶ C 2464 omits the second. Zuntz concludes that all three are genuine. He judges, "Its threefold recurrence in this and the preceding verse was bound to cause trouble. Its omission, however (attested exclusively in the West), spoils the rhythm of the passage" (G. Zuntz, *The Text of the Epistles - A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum*. [London: Oxford University Press, 1953], 141).

³⁰ Henning Paulsen, "Schisma und Haresie - Untersuchungen zu 1 Kor 11, 18.19" *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 79 (1982): 180-211, 195.

the Lord's Supper where Christians are concretely one body, cf. 10:16-17) are the "irreconcilable antithesis" of the church.³¹

Paul says that he "believes in part" (μέρος τι πιστεύω) this report. Fee has suggested that this is "Paul's way of crediting his informants with veracity, but also of bridging the sociological gap between them and the wealthy who are guilty of misdeeds."³² This is certainly possible. Witherington, however, has offered another explanation based on Greco-Roman rhetoric:

It was not an uncommon rhetorical move to express incredulity in this fashion, knowing very well the particular charge was true. For example, Demosthenes says, "I am at a loss to know whether I should believe or disbelieve the news Menocrates brings me" (*Ep.* 4.1), using almost the exact same Greek formulation as Paul. The function of such a statement is to shame the audience, since it implies that the behavior in question is so inappropriate that the report of its occurrence should not be true and that a charitable person would hardly credit such a report.³³

Both of these explanations might be at work here.

After verses 17 and 18, Paul proceeds in 11:19 to add a parenthetical comment. We should take this to be a grounding statement about *why* he considers this report believable: "For also (γὰρ καὶ) it is necessary (δεῖ) that there be factions (αἱρέσεις) among you in order that the approved (οἱ δόκιμοι)³⁴ might be made

³¹ Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 26.

³² *The First Epistle*, 537. Theissen offers a similar interpretation, "Social Integration," 163.

³³ *Conflict and Community*, 247.

³⁴ A number of manuscripts (P⁴⁶ B D' 6 33 630 1175 1739 1881 pc vg bo^{mss} Or Ambst) place a καὶ before οἱ δόκιμοι while others (⌘ A C D² F G Ψ M lat b vg^{mss} sy bo Cyp) omit it. The NA 27th places it in brackets. Given the strong evidence for omission and the greater likelihood of copyists adding it in order to match the prior καὶ in the verse, it is best to regard the καὶ as a later

manifest (φανερὸν).” This verse along with 11:18 which preceded it present three issues to which we must turn our attention: 1) The translation of the phrase γὰρ καὶ 2) The possible source of the statement in 11:19 3) The meaning and relationship between 11:18’s σχίσματα and 11:19’s αἱρέσεις.

First, with regard to the phrase γὰρ καὶ we can observe that the combination γὰρ καὶ is far less common (8 times)³⁵ than καὶ γὰρ (19 times) in Paul. Both can mean “for also, for even” where γὰρ serves as a conjunction and καὶ as an adverb.³⁶ The difficulty arises in that καὶ γὰρ has become a formula which can also mean “and in fact, and indeed” where καὶ serves as a conjunction and γὰρ as an adverb in introducing “a new and important thought” which provides explanation.³⁷ The formulaic character makes it difficult to distinguish the two.³⁸ Additionally, the formula can mean “for” where it serves as the equivalent of the Latin *etenim* introducing a reason or explanation.³⁹ In this use the καὶ’s force is not felt.⁴⁰ If γὰρ καὶ is taken to be the equivalent of καὶ γὰρ then “for also/even,” “and indeed” and “for” are all possible translations.

addition (Zuntz concludes that in view of the evidence “it can hardly be the original wording”; *The Text of the Epistles*, 211).

³⁵ Rom. 13:6; 15:27; 1Co. 11:19; 15:52; 2Co. 2:9; 10:14; Col. 2:5; 3:3.

³⁶ Herbert Weir Smyth, *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1984), 2815; BAGD 151.1b; BDF 452.3; καὶ γὰρ “for also/even” Ro. 11:1; 15:3; 16:2; 2Co. 2:10; γὰρ καὶ “for also/even” Ro. 13:6; 2Co. 2:9; 2Co. 10:14.

³⁷ Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 2814.

³⁸ Ibid., 2813.

³⁹ BAGD 151.1b citing 1Co. 5:7.

⁴⁰ BDF 452.3 argues that many passages classified in this way (including 1Co. 5:7; 11:9; 12:13) are in fact examples of καὶ meaning “also.”

Three kinds of evidence, however, indicate that *γὰρ καὶ* in 11:19 is *not* the equivalent of *καὶ γάρ*. Rather, the phrase here means "for also, for even" (in fact it means specifically "for also" - argumentation for this choice on the basis of contextual vocabulary evidence will be provided later). First, without exception, Paul places *καὶ γὰρ* in first position in its clause (cf. 1Co. 5:7; 11:9; Phil 2:27). By contrast, he uses *γὰρ καὶ* following some other word or phrase at the beginning of the clause (cf. Rom. 13:6; 2Co. 2:9; 2Co. 10:14). This consistent difference in placement helps to indicate a distinction between the two.

Second, in all the other Pauline uses of *γὰρ καὶ* (see note 35), the *γὰρ* functions as a conjunction ("for"). This eliminates the likelihood that, as at times in *καὶ γάρ*, the *γὰρ* in 11:19 is functioning as an adverb. In doing so it also removes the translation possibility "and indeed, and in fact."

Third, in these other Pauline uses of *γὰρ καὶ*, the *καὶ* has its own force and is translated, whether as the conjunction "and" introducing the next phrase (Rom. 15:27; 1Co. 15:52; Col. 3:3), as part of the concessive phrase *εἰ καὶ* (Col. 2:5),⁴¹ as the ascensive "even" (2Co. 10:14) or the adjunctive "also" (Rom. 13:6; 2Co. 2:9). This fact eliminates *γὰρ καὶ* as "for" (like *etenim*) since in this use the *καὶ* is not felt.⁴² The closest examples to 1Co. 11:19 are Rom. 13:6, 2Co. 2:9 and 2Co. 10:14

⁴¹ BAGD 220.4.

⁴² BDF 452.3.

where the phrase translates as "for even/for also." We should therefore translate it in the same manner in 1Co. 11:19.

These data indicate that γὰρ is a conjunction and καὶ is an adverb meaning "also" or "even." Paul here is providing another reason why he believes the report that there are σχίσματα in their midst.⁴³ He began in 11:17 by stating that the Corinthians are regularly coming together "for the worse." Verse 11:18 stated a reason (γὰρ) for this judgment - Paul had heard (ἀκούω) that there were divisions when they were coming together in church and he believed this in part (μέρος τι πιστεύω). 1Co. 11:19 now states an additional reason why Paul finds this believable.

Before turning to the specific content of 11:18-19 (most importantly the meaning of σχίσματα and αἵρέσεις, and the relationship between these two terms) we may address the second issue (cf. pg. 11): the possible source of Paul's thought. He cites 11:19 as a reason for believing the report about the σχίσματα. Whence did Paul obtain this? How does Paul know that αἵρέσεις are necessary for the purpose of manifesting those who are approved? Is this an example of his own apostolic insight (something along the lines of his insight into the illness and death at Corinth in 11:30)? Or does it derive from some other

⁴³ Fee comes to the same conclusion on γὰρ καὶ (*The First Epistle*, 538). Cf. also NASB, NKJV. It does not seem immediately apparent whether "also" modifies the whole sentence ("For it is also necessary...") or αἵρέσεις in particular "It is necessary that there also be factions..." since the καὶ can modify "a single word, several words, or the whole sentence" (Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 2815). This writer is inclined to the former, but ultimately the choice does not seem to affect the general sense of the passage.

source, which Paul expects the Corinthians also to recognize as a valid basis for the explanation in v.18? A number of early Christian texts require us to take a closer look at this second possibility.

Alfred Resch has argued that five texts that place a statement about σχίσματα and αἵρέσεις on the lips of Jesus preserve a genuine dominical statement (*Herrenwort*).⁴⁴ These texts bear a striking resemblance to 1Co. 11:18-19 and merit citation here:

Justin Martyr, *Dialogue with Trypho* 35.3: Εἶπε γὰρ ... "Ἔσονται σχίσματα καὶ αἵρέσεις."⁴⁵

(For he said, ... "There will be divisions and factions.")

Syrian *Didascalia* 6.5.2: wie auch unser Herr und Heiland Jesus gesagt hat, "Es werden Häresien und Spaltungen entstehen... ." ⁴⁶
(As also our Lord and Savior Jesus has said, "Factions and divisions will arise.")

***Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* 16.21:** ἔσονται γὰρ, ὡς ὁ κύριος εἶπεν, ψευδαπόστολοι, ψευδεῖς προφῆται, αἵρέσεις, καὶ φιλαρχίαι.⁴⁷

⁴⁴ Alfred Resch, *Agrapha - Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, n.s., 15, pt. 3.4 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906), 100.

⁴⁵ Text cited from, Justin Martyr, *Iustini Martyrij Dialogus Cum Tryphone*. ed. Miroslav Marcovich. (Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1997), 128. Justin wrote ca. 150 A.D. in Rome (R.J. De Simone, "Justin" *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*. ed. Angelo Di Berardino. tr. Adrian Walford. 462-464. [New York: Oxford University Press, 1992], 463).

⁴⁶ Originally written in Greek in Northern Syria, ca. 230 A.D., the Greek text has not survived. We know of the *Didascalia's* text from a complete Syriac translation and a Latin translation which has preserved two-fifths of the text (Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*. [New York: Oxford University Press, 1992], 87-88). The translation from the Syriac cited is found in Hans Achelis, and Johs. Flemming. *Die Alttesten Quellen des Orientalischen Kirchenrechts*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, n.s., 10, pt. 2 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1904), 118.

⁴⁷ Text cited in Resch, *Agrapha* 100. The *Pseudo-Clementine Homilies* purport to derive from Clement of Rome. They are generally dated with some caution to Syria ca. 220-300 A.D. (Johannes Irschmer and Georg Strecker "The Pseudo-Clementines" *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2, *Writings Relating to the Apostles, Apocalypses and Related Subjects*. Rev. ed. ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher. tr. R. McL. Wilson. 483-581. [Louisville: John Knox Press, 1992], 485, 492-493).

(For there will be, as the Lord said, false apostles, false prophets, factions and lusts for power.)

Lactantius, *Divinae institutiones* 4.30.2 (manuscripts H and M):

*Ante omnia scire nos conuenit et ipsum et legatos eius
praedixisse quod plurimae sectae et hereses haberent existere
quae concordiam sancti corporis rumperent...⁴⁸*

(Before all things it is fitting that we know that he himself and his ambassadors foretold that many sects and heresies would have to exist which would breach the union of the holy body...)

Didymus the Blind, *De Trinitate*, 3.22: ὁ ἀποδεχθεὶς ἔχειν θησαυροὺς σοφίας καὶ γνώσεως, καὶ προμηνύσας- ἔσονται ἐν ὑμῖν αἵρέσεις καὶ σχίσματα.⁴⁹

(The one acknowledged to have the treasures of wisdom and knowledge and having predicted, "There will be among you factions and divisions.")

The New Testament never attributes to Jesus the use of αἵρέσεις, or σχίσματα in the extended sense of "division between people."⁵⁰ Outside of 1Co. 11:18-19, the New Testament never brings these two terms into close proximity. How then do we explain the striking resemblance between these early Christian texts and 1Co. 11:18-19?

Three possibilities present themselves. First, the texts could be completely independent of 1Co. 11:18-19. Second, Paul could be relying on an unrecorded saying of Jesus or an apostolic statement which summarized a particular truth included in Jesus'

⁴⁸ The text cited employs Monat's text along with variant readings for H and M indicated in the apparatus. Monat does not include "hereses" in the text and considers it a scribal addition (Lactantius, *Divine Institutions*. Bk. 4, ed. Pierre Monat. Sources Chretiennes, no. 377. [Paris: Les Editions Du Cerf, 1992], 244.). Lactantius wrote in Trier during the early 300's (died 330) (V. Loi, "Lactantius" *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*. vol. 1. ed. Angelo Di Berardino. tr. Adrian Walford. 469-470. [New York: Oxford University Press, 1992], 469).

⁴⁹ Text cited in Resch, *Agrapha* 100. Didymus wrote in Alexandria during the second half of the 4th century (P. Nautin, "Didymus the Blind, of Alexandria" *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*. vol. 1. ed. Angelo Di Berardino. tr. Adrian Walford. 235-236. [New York: Oxford University Press, 1992], 235).

teaching.⁵¹ Finally, the canonical statement in 1Co. 11:18-19 may have influenced the ancient church texts cited above.

We must weigh two other factors in considering the issue. The first is the general shift in meaning and emphasis which occurs in the term *αἵρεσις* during the second century. While in the New Testament only 2Pt. 2:1 uses this term in the sense of "false teaching," during the course of the second century the term comes to mean primarily "false teaching" - "heresy." As Schoedel writes with regard to Ignatius of Antioch:

In Tr. 6.1 there is stronger emphasis on the false teaching that gives rise to "faction," and it seems fair to say that, "from the time of Ignatius the sense of the term is defined and the first treatise on heresy will appear in the not too distant future."⁵²

The later church's concern about false teaching, "heresy," produced a shift in the meaning of the term *αἵρεσις*. Since heresy presented such an important issue for the church, theologians would have wanted to be able to "quote" "Jesus' statements" about heresy. This process would have attracted statements about heresy into Jesus' mouth in the quotations of the church fathers.

Second, we must use caution because of the relatively free procedure used by early church writers in quoting scripture and

⁵⁰ Jesus does use the literal *σχίσμα* in describing a new patch on an old garment in Mt. 9:16 and Mk. 2:21.

⁵¹ This argument does not require that Paul is *directly* using a saying of Jesus - rather it might simply be an "apostolic truth."

⁵² William R. Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch - A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. ed. Helmut Koester. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 58. Schoedel quotes Marcel Simon, "From Greek Haeresis to Christian Heresy," in William R. Schoedel and Robert L. Wilken, eds., *Early Christian Literature*

texts in general. Funk has emphasized this point and the very texts quoted above bear this out.⁵³ In the context of the Justine passage he quotes three other sayings from Jesus. None of them exactly match the canonical Gospels. In the first he appears to combine Mt. 24:5 and 7:15 while in the fourth he combines Mt. 24:14 and 24:11.⁵⁴ In a similar manner, immediately after the saying quoted above, the *Syrian Didascalia* quotes Mt. 18:7/ Lk. 17:1 about the necessity of τὰ σκάνδαλα. Yet in quoting this the *Didascalia* reads, "es müssen Ärgernisse und Spaltungen kommen," and thereby adds the σχίσματα emphasis from the prior quotation.⁵⁵

Keeping these two factors in mind, we can assess the possible relation between 1Co. 11:18-19 and the early Christian texts cited. The first suggestion is that they are completely independent. While possible, this seems unlikely given the broad geographical distribution of sources and relatively unique combination of terms placed on Jesus' lips. Most likely the

and the Classical Intellectual Tradition (Theologie historique 53; Paris: Beauchesne, 1979), 110.

⁵³ Franz Xavier Funk, *Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen - Eine Litterar-Historische Untersuchung*. 1891. Reprint (Frankfurt/Main: Minerva GmbH, 1970), 73.

⁵⁴ Paulsen, "Schisma und Häresie," 186.

⁵⁵ The Nicene (325) and Niceo-Constantinopolitan (381) creeds demonstrate the same principle. While on the surface the latter would seem to be an expansion of the former (a document already accepted by the church), in fact, "statistical comparison makes certain that, whatever else C [Niceo-Constantinopolitan] may be, it cannot be accurately described as a modified version of N [Nicene]" (J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd ed., [Essex: Longman Group, 1972], 304). This could transpire because, "at this stage importance is attached to the Nicene teaching rather than to the literal wording of N" (ibid., 325).

answer to our question about 11:18-19 and these texts lies somewhere in between the second and third possibilities.

We have little difficulty in showing that 11:18-19 has had an influence on some of the texts. The Lactantius manuscripts H and M overtly mention "apostles" (*legatos*) along with "he himself" (*ipsum*) and the *haberent existere* matches 11:19's *δεῖ*. Didymus the Blind's *ἐν ὑμῖν* appears to show the influence of the threefold *ἐν ὑμῖν* in 11:18-19.⁵⁶ The Pseudo-Clementine homilies text doesn't contain the term *σχίσματα* and thus it need not receive as strong consideration as the others. Yet here again it appears to be a combination of Mt. 24:11, 24:14 and 1Co. 11:19.⁵⁷

However, Justin and the *Didascalia* present a different situation. These texts do not bear any traces of influence from 1Co. 11:18-19. They both firmly ascribe the words to Jesus and present the future tense of "to be" rather than using *δεῖ*. The geographical spread and independence of these two texts "affords a presumption of very early tradition."⁵⁸ They strongly resemble 1Co. 11:18-19,⁵⁹ yet also exhibit their own uniqueness.

Paulsen has also emphasized the similar eschatological context that the Justin passage and 1Co. 11:18-19 share.⁶⁰ Justin's writing on the whole emphasizes eschatology. Justin

⁵⁶ Paulsen, "Schisma und Häresie," 190.

⁵⁷ Funk, *Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen*, 73, comes to the same conclusion.

⁵⁸ Joachim Jeremias, *The Unknown Sayings of Jesus*. tr. Reginald H. Fuller. [New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957], 101.

⁵⁹ Paulsen has rightly stated with regard to the Justin passage the "Nähe zu 1Kor 11,19a schwerlich bestritten werden kann" ("Schisma und Häresie," 184).

⁶⁰ Paulsen, "Schisma und Häresie," 186.

coined the expression 'the second parousia: τὴν δευτέραν παρουσίαν (1Apol. 52,3; 14,8; 51:2) and in his writing, "Human history is oriented toward the parousia."⁶¹ The context of *Dialogue with Trypho* 35.3 quotes the eschatological Mt. 24, speaks of "the hope having been promised by him" (35.2) and "his second glorious advent" (35.8) and about "not being condemned into his fire" (35.8).⁶²

In the same way Paul's statements about the Lord's Supper in 11:17-34 occur in an eschatological context. The prior discussion in chapter 10 typologically described the sacraments and Israel's experiences and addressed them to those "upon whom the ends of the age has come" (εἰς οὓς τὰ τέλη τῶν αἰώνων κατήντηκεν). Paul uses δεῖ which several times elsewhere in the Corinthian correspondence bears an eschatological connotation (1Co. 15:25; 15:53; 2Co. 5:10). The tradition quoted speaks of the eschatological new covenant (11:24; cf. Jer. 31:31). Paul's commentary on the tradition in 11:26 places the Lord's Supper in the eschatological context of the proclaiming the Lord's death "until he comes" (ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ).

Paul speaks of the "approved" (οἱ δόκιμοι; 11:19) just as later he will speak of the need for each man to test/examine himself (δοκιμαζέτω; 11:28). This testing needs to go on - in its absence God is judging (κρινόμενοι; 11:32) and disciplining them

⁶¹ De Simone, "Justin," 463.

⁶² ἐν τῇ ἐλπίδι τῇ καταγγελημένῃ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (35.2); ἐν τῇ πάλιν γενησομένη ἐνδόξῳ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ σωθῆτε καὶ μὴ καταδικασθῆτε εἰς τὸ πῦρ ὑπ' αὐτοῦ (35.8).

(παιδευόμεθα; 11:32) so that they won't be condemned with the world (κατακριθώμεν; 11:32). Finally he says there must be αἵρέσεις so that the approved become manifest (φανεροὶ; 11:19). This adjective and its verbal root also occur in eschatological contexts (1Co. 3:13; 1Co. 4:5; Col. 3:4).

This data raises real questions about the relation between Justin and 1Co. 11:18-19. As Paulsen has noted, while the strong similarity exists we cannot ignore that Justin specifies the tradition as coming from Jesus and lacks the δεῖ.⁶³ At the same time Paul does not indicate that the saying comes from Jesus and *"ist schwer verständlich warum Paulus den Charakter des Logions als Herrenwort unterdrückt haben sollte."*⁶⁴

Paulsen presents the most likely answer when he proposes that the eschatological saying originally stood independently when Paul used it.⁶⁵ By the time Justin received it, the saying had been ascribed to Jesus, and Justin then collected it with other apocalyptic sayings.⁶⁶ As noted earlier we must use caution when dealing with this material. However, the balance of available evidence indicates that Paul has drawn upon an "apostolic saying" (one not directly ascribed to Jesus) stating the expectation and necessity of divisions and factions in the

⁶³ Paulsen, "Schisma und Häresie," 187.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 200.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 187. Paulsen allows the possibility that both forms (an independent saying and one directly ascribed to Jesus) might have existed side by side (Ibid., 200, ftnt. 127).

eschatological period. This saying helps confirm the report of *σχίσματα* which Paul has heard.

We can now turn to the third major issue (cf. pg. 11) in interpreting 11:18-19: the meaning and relationship of 11:18's *σχίσματα* and 11:19's *αἵρέσεις*. These terms have received very different treatments. Some take them to be virtual synonyms with few if any distinguishing components of meaning. Others consider *αἵρέσεις* to be worse than *σχίσματα* and so see an increase in threat as we move from vs. 18 to vs. 19. However, as we will see, *σχίσμα* and *αἵρεσις* each have their own unique features and they are not mutually interchangeable. The term *σχίσμα* emphasizes the semantic domain of strife while *αἵρεσις* refers primarily to a group. Paul's shift from one term to the other corresponds to the shift from conflict and strife in 11:17-18 to the group, the "approved" (*οἱ δόκιμοι*) of 11:19.

The noun *σχίσμα* and its verbal counterpart *σχίζω* indicate first, a literal/physical "dividing" or "splitting" (cf. *σχίσμα* Mt. 9:16; Mk. 2:21; *σχίζω* Mt. 27:51; Mk. 15:38).⁶⁷ The terms are then applied in an extended sense to a group of people when an issue arises and they divide in opinion (cf. Jn 7:43; 9:16; 10:19; Acts 14:4; 23:7; Xenophon, *Symp.* 4,49).⁶⁸

⁶⁷ BAGD 797.1; Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996), 1746.I (hereafter referred to as *LSJ*).

⁶⁸ "fig. division, dissension, schism" (BAGD, 797.2); "division of opinion" *LSJ*, 1746.II.

It is important to note that these terms are placed within the semantic domain of "hostility and strife" and occur in these contexts almost without fail.⁶⁹ Conflict about Jesus' person (Jn. 7:40-42; 10:20-21), signs (9:16) and words (10:19) accompany the σχίσμα of Jn. 7:43, 9:16 and 10:19. Strife/dissension (στάσις)⁷⁰ occurs between the Sadducees and the Pharisees in Acts 23:7 as the assembly divides (έκείσθη; cf. 23:8-10 and the κραυγή μεγάλη of 23:9).

Paul exhorts the Corinthians in 1:10 that there be no σχίσματα among them. He explains this statement (γάρ) by stating the content of the report from Chloe's "people" - there are quarrels (έριδες) among them. In a similar fashion, 11:18's use of the word occurs in a context where the rich are offending the poor (11:21-22).⁷¹

⁶⁹ Louw and Nida place the word in this domain (domain 39) and the sub-domain of "Division" (sub-domain B) (Johannes P. Louw and Eugene A. Nida, *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament - Based on Semantic Domains*. vol. 1. 2ed. [New York: United Bible Societies, 1989], 494.). The work does not appear to address the extended sense of σχίζω since the verses quoted in the two domains its assigns (19 Physical impact; C Split, tear; 225; 63 Whole, unite, part, divide; F Divide; 616) are all literal and physical (Mk. 1:10; 225; Mt. 27:51; Lk. 23:45; 616). However the two New Testament extended verbal uses (Acts 14:4; 23:7) hardly differ from the L&N definition of σχίσμα, "a division into opposing groups, generally two" (494; emphasis added).

⁷⁰ BAGD 764.3; James Hope Moulton and George Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1930), 586 (hereafter referred to as *MM*).

⁷¹ In a similar context, the "Gild" of Zeus Hypsistos (Egypt, 1st B.C.) states that members are not to make divisions (μηδέ σχίσματα συνίστασ[θαι]) (text found in Colin Roberts and Theodore C. Skeat, "The Guild of Hypsistos" *Harvard Theological Review* 29 (1936): 39-88. Roberts and Skeat think σχίσματα is "probably and error for σχίσματα" (51). Strangely, they translate it as "factions," a translation supported by no major lexicon. 1Co. 12:25, when Paul says that there should be no σχίσμα in the body, presents his only other use of the term. The verb σχίζω does not appear in the Pauline corpus.

This same emphasis continues into the Apostolic Fathers. 1 Clement pairs στάσις (2:6; 46:9; 54:2), διχοστασία ("dissension"⁷²; 46:5) and ἔρις (46:5; 54:2) with σχίσμα. Love does not have σχίσμα and does not cause rebellion (οὐ στασιάζει) (1Cl. 49:5). Both Barnabas 19:12 and Didache 4:3 state that Christians will not make (οὐ ποιήσεις)⁷³ σχίσμα and instead will reconcile those who quarrel (εἰρηνεύσεις δὲ μαχομένους). These writings emphasize σχίσμα as the opposite of peace.⁷⁴

It should also be noted that in these uses σχίσμα does not identify a specific group. Instead it indicates a state of affairs when strife and conflict have resulted in "division/s" among a group of people. By contrast 11:19's αἵρεσις does indicate a group.⁷⁵ The verbal root αἰρέω adds little to our examination, other than to note that in its earlier use αἵρεσις indicated a group who had chosen a particular teaching as their own. The term can indicate a school of philosophy (Diod. Sic. 2.29.6)⁷⁶ or by analogy be applied by Josephus to the Pharisees (Jos. Vi. 10;

⁷² BAGD 200.

⁷³ The Bryennios manuscript (H) reads "you will not desire" (ποθήσεις). However, as Niederwimmer writes, "H has mistakenly written ποθήσεις. The correct version is ποιήσεις as the parallels show" (cf. Barn. 19:12) (Kurt Niederwimmer, *The Didache - A Commentary*. tr. Linda M. Maloney. ed. Harold W. Attridge. [Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998], 106).

⁷⁴ Max Meinertz, "σχίσμα und αἵρεσις im Neuen Testament" *Biblische Zeitschrift* NF 1 (1957): 114-118; 115.

⁷⁵ Louw and Nida place the term within domain 11 ("Groups and Classes of Persons and Members of Such Groups and Classes"), sub-domain B ("Socio-Religious") (129) and domain 63 ("Whole, Unite, Part, Divide"), sub-domain F ("Divide") where the term indicates "a division of people into different and opposing sets." Notice that both classifications involve "groups" and "sets" of people.

⁷⁶ LSJ 41.II.2; BAGD 23.1.

12; 191) and Sadducees as a group (Jos. Ant. 13.171; 20.199).⁷⁷ These examples present a neutral use of the term.

Within the New Testament, Acts applies the term to the Sadducees (5:17) and Pharisees (15:5; 26:5) in the same neutral manner as Josephus. However a negative connotation appears as opponents of the church apply the term to Christianity (24:5; 24:14; 28:12 "spoken against everywhere").⁷⁸ In these uses αἵρεσις also refers to a group of people.

Paul uses the term twice, in Gal 5:20 and our present verse 1Co. 11:19. In Gal. 5:20 Paul places αἵρέσεις amongst a long and diverse list of sinful items ("works of the flesh"). The specific content of the list does not modify αἵρέσεις as a term referring to a group. At the same time, Gal. 5:20 unequivocally shows that Paul considers it to be a bad thing (not just mildly negative).

As noted earlier 2Pt. 2:1 contains the first clear reference to αἵρεσις as "false teaching, heresy." Later uses in Ignatius of Antioch (Eph. 6:2; Tr. 6:1) begin to move in this direction but the emphasis remains on αἵρεσις as a group and "false teaching emerges here as a fundamental ingredient in faction."⁷⁹

If we ask about the relation between σχίσμα and αἵρεσις we come to several important conclusions on the basis of the previous

⁷⁷ BAGD 23.1a.

⁷⁸ A small group separated from the rest, can easily become the group to which one shouldn't belong.

investigation. Each term has its own unique characteristics and emphasis. The term *σχίσμα* refers to divisions in a group and operates specifically within the semantic domain of strife and conflict. The term *αἵρεσις* refers primarily to a group.⁸⁰ Paul views both as negative items which should not exist in the church (*σχίσμα* 1Co. 1:10; 11:18; 12:25; *αἵρεσις* Gal. 5:20).

The two terms can easily operate hand in hand. Conflict and strife produce division/s (*σχίσμα/σχίσματα*) in a group. Division/s leaves two or more *groups*, entities to which we can apply the term "factions" (*αἱρέσεις*). Diodorus Siculus 12.66.2 provides an excellent illustration of this.⁸¹ During the Peloponnesian war the city of Megara (located on the Corinthian isthmus) sided with the Spartans and was garrisoned by Spartan troops. In addition to fighting the Athenians, the Megarans also fought a group of exiles from Megara who had opposed a revolution by the democratic party.

Fearing the exiles more than the Athenians, a group of Megaran leaders plotted an intrigue by which they would allow Athenian soldiers into the city in order to surprise the Spartans. The betrayal became known and the general populace (τὸ

⁷⁹ Schoedel, *Ignatius of Antioch* 58, commenting on Eph. 6:2. He observes with regard to Tr. 6:1, "Ignatius is mainly concerned about the false teachers themselves rather than their teaching" (147).

⁸⁰ The fact that Justin, *Dialog.* 35.3 places the terms side by side does not indicate that they are synonymous, any more than Paul's placement of a number of different terms side by side in Gal. 5:19-21. In both passages the terms bear similarities, even though they are not all synonymous.

⁸¹ Passage cited by BAGD 797. Diodorus wrote ca. 60-30 B.C. (William David Ross, "Diodorus Siculus" *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 2ed. ed. N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard. 347. [London: Oxford University Press, 1970], 347).

πλήθος) became divided as to which side they should support - the Athenians or Spartans.⁸² Diodorus describes this with the words τοῦ πλήθους σχιζομένου κατὰ τὴν αἵρεσιν, καὶ τῶν μὲν συμμαχοῦντων τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις, τῶν δὲ βοηθοῦντων τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις ("while they were divided according to party, some being for fighting with the Athenians, and others for helping the Lacedaemonians"). Note that prior to the moment of conflict the people had been united behind the Spartans. Yet in the moment of crisis they divide κατὰ τὴν αἵρεσιν and form two groups, some supporting the Athenians and others the Spartans. As a result of a σχίσμα, two αἵρέσεις emerge.

Past exegesis of the relation between 11:18 and 11:19 has fallen into two basic approaches. Some, such as Barrett,⁸³ Fee⁸⁴ and Conzelmann⁸⁵ have taken σχίσματα and αἵρέσεις to be virtual synonyms. Barrett writes, "Paul uses a fresh word, αἵρέσεις, without any significant change of meaning - if there were such a change the connection of thought would break down."⁸⁶ Fee describes them as "roughly synonymous" and says that "they must mean something similar" as he approvingly cites Barrett.⁸⁷ Conzelmann thinks the καὶ indicates that "Paul makes no distinction."⁸⁸

⁸² Thucydides describes this same event in *History of the Peloponnesian War* 4.66-68.

⁸³ *The First Epistle*, 261.

⁸⁴ *The First Epistle*, 538.

⁸⁵ *1 Corinthians*, 194.

⁸⁶ *The First Epistle*, 64.

⁸⁷ *The First Epistle*, 538 ftnt. 34.

⁸⁸ *1 Corinthians*, 194 ftnt. 13.

This position does not do justice to the lexical data. The two words are not synonyms and we cannot ignore their own particular emphasis (conflict vs. group).⁸⁹ At the same time they are related words, words that function well together, and therefore the connection between the two verses does not break down as Paul introduces a second word (αἱρέσεις) which has its own distinct meaning and emphasis. In response to Conzelmann we must observe that the καὶ in the explanatory statement of 11:19 does not necessitate synonymous meaning. One can explain 11:18 by using a *different, yet related* term in 11:19.

A second approach has sensed the difference between σχίσματα and αἱρέσεις, but in doing so has committed the opposite error of the first position. Much of German exegesis has identified αἱρέσεις as a stronger and more serious term and has seen an increase (usually described as a "Steigerung") in strength and threat from σχίσματα to αἱρέσεις.⁹⁰ Schlier has elevated this position in his article in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* where he writes, "In this respect it [αἱρέσεις] is distinguished from σχίσμα, and obviously indicates something more

⁸⁹ One could argue that this meets Barrett's no "significant change" and Fee's "roughly synonymous." However this approach is far too general and does not do justice to the differing semantic domains in which the terms operate.

⁹⁰ Heinrich Schlier, "αἱρέσμαι, κ.τ.λ." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* vol. I. ed. Gerhard Kittel. Trans. Geoffery W. Bromiley. 180-185. (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1964), 183.; Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 27.; Hofius, *Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlparadosis*, 117.; Paulsen, "Schisma und Häresie," 198.; Meinertz, "σχίσμα und αἱρέσεις im Neuen Testament," 116-117; Resch, *Agrapha*, 100.

serious."⁹¹ This position translates 11:19's καὶ as an ascensive use "even."⁹²

Again, this position does not do justice to the lexical data. We have no evidence that Paul considers αἱρέσεις to be a worse thing than σχίσματα. We only know that he considers both to be unacceptable in the church (1Co. 1:10; Gal. 5:20). This approach makes an arbitrary decision about the terms (αἱρέσεις is worse than σχίσμα) and then uses this to make an ill-founded decision on the καὶ.

In 11:18 Paul states that he has heard of the σχίσματα among them and he believes it in part. He then appears to draw upon an apostolic saying about the presence of αἱρέσεις along with σχίσματα in the eschatological time which makes the report all the more believable. 11:18 spoke of divisions, now in 11:19 Paul adds an additional reason and hence the καὶ should be translated "also." We have no evidence that one is worse than the other, therefore the vocabulary does not justify the ascensive translation "even."

The two terms describe the same problem from different perspectives. The term σχίσματα focuses on the conflict amongst them while αἱρέσεις emphasizes the concrete groups in their midst. Paul can very naturally place them side by side since both are

⁹¹ "αἱρέομαι, κ.τ.λ.," 183.

⁹² Meinertz, "σχίσμα und αἵρεσις im Neuen Testament," 117; Hofius, *Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlparadosis*, 117. In addition, Paulsen has argued that ὑπάρχειν in 11:18 and εἶναι 11:19 help indicate a difference. 11:18 deals with the present while 11:19 deals with a future axiom ("Schisma und Häresie," 194-5, 198). It is true that 11:18 discusses what is "really the situation" in Corinth and 11:19 states a principle which explains 11:18. However this does not indicate

negative things which do not belong in the church and "divisions" inherently involve "groups" or "factions." Lietzmann has come closest to ascertaining this relationship when he wrote the terse sentence, "αἰρέσεις sind Ergebnisse der σχίσματα."⁹³

However, Paul doesn't add 11:19 in order to explain some kind of causal relationship between the two terms. Instead the shift in terms indicates a shift in *emphasis*. 11:18 emphasizes conflict and divisions. 11:19 emphasizes the *people* involved (and *not* involved) in this situation. The statement moves toward the "approved" (οἱ δόκιμοι) in 11:19 who are becoming "manifest" (φανερῶν) as a result of the situation at the Lord's Supper.

The οἱ δόκιμοι are those who have "passed the test."⁹⁴ In introducing the term, Paul foreshadows the discussion in 11:27ff where in 11:28 he will exhort them to test/examine themselves (δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτὸν). The approved must be those who are not part of 11:19's αἰρέσεις.⁹⁵ They partake of the Lord's Supper and in doing so do not foster divisions (11:18) or offend other Christians with their insensitive behavior.⁹⁶

As mentioned earlier Paul's statements about the Lord's Supper occur in an eschatological context. These events occur in

an increase in seriousness - it only indicates that 11:18 discusses the actual situation while 11:19 states a principle.

⁹³ *An Die Korinther* 56.

⁹⁴ *BAGD*, 203.1.

⁹⁵ Since Paul places αἰρέσεις among the "works of the flesh" in Gal. 5:20, there seems to be no way that he would think of the οἱ δόκιμοι as being in a particular αἰρέσεις.

⁹⁶ Dennis E. Smith comes to much the same conclusion (Dennis E. Smith, "Meals and Morality in Paul and His World" *Society of Biblical Literature* 1981

order that the approved might become "manifest" or "evident, visible, plainly to be seen" (φανερῶν).⁹⁷ Paul uses this adjective and its verbal root φανερώω elsewhere to indicate eschatological revelation (1Co. 3:13; 4:5; Col. 3:4). The events at Corinth partake of the "eschatological drama" which encompasses those "upon whom the end of the ages has come" (1Co. 10:11) as they live in the "now time" (ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ; Rom. 3:26; 11:15; cf. 8:18).⁹⁸

Paul says that in this process factions and testing are "necessary" (δεῖ). In what sense does Paul mean this? Some scholars have suggested irony⁹⁹ or resignation.¹⁰⁰ These seem to miss the force of the statement. Neither should we accept "determinism" on God's part, as if God *intended* that some enter into factions and thus end up unapproved. Rather, it seems best to take the δεῖ as expressing the inevitable course of events in the end time. If Paul has drawn upon an "apostolic saying" (cf. Justin, *Didascalia*) then he reiterates an aspect of the early church's thought about the end times - it will be one of

Seminar Papers. ed. Kent Harold Richards. 319-339. [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981], 329).

⁹⁷ BAGD, 852.1.

⁹⁸ As Theissen writes, "For him, the Corinthian conflicts are part of the eschatological testing of the congregation (11:19). The social tensions between rich and poor Christians have been transposed to a symbolic world transcending the everyday reality. They become part of an eschatological drama and belong to the separation of the righteous from the unrighteous in a world which is coming to an end" ("Social Integration," 164).

⁹⁹ Lietzmann, *An Die Korinther*, 56.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*; Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 27.

divisions and factions.¹⁰¹ Paul expresses what will also arise out of this situation - the "approved" will become manifest.

In summary, within 1Co. 11:17-19 Paul begins to address the problem which is occurring at the Corinthian eucharistic celebration. After stating that they are coming together for the worse (11:17), Paul provides the basis for his assessment in 11:18. He has received a report that there are *σχίσματα* among them and he believes it in part. Verse 19 then provides a reason why Paul believes the report - it is necessary that there be factions in order that the approved might become manifest.

Parallel early Christian texts (especially Justin's *Dialogue with Trypho*) help to indicate that Paul draws upon an "apostolic" saying which associates *σχίσματα* and *αἵρέσεις* with the eschatological end times. Thus Paul can speak of the necessity (δεῖ) of the *αἵρέσεις* without further explanation as he speaks in this eschatologically charged context.

After mentioning the presence of *σχίσματα* on the basis of the report, Paul says that he believes it in part. 1Co. 11:19 adds a reason for this belief using the phrase *γὰρ καί* meaning "for also." Paul's use of *αἵρέσεις* in 11:19 corresponds to the verse's movement towards the group, the "approved" (*οἱ δόκιμοι*), who are becoming manifest. The terms *σχίσμα* and *αἵρεσις* are not interchangeable synonyms nor does *αἵρεσις* indicate an increase over *σχίσμα*. Rather, *σχίσμα* emphasizes hostility and strife while *αἵρεσις*

¹⁰¹ Fee, *The First Epistle*, 538 and Paulsen, "Schisma und Häresie," 194, 197).

emphasizes a group. The words function well together since strife often leads to separate groups and the joining of these terms in 11:18-19 moves the focus from strife that divides to the groups that result.

Chapter 2

11:20-22, 33-34

After the parenthetical remark in 11:19, Paul returns to the topic at hand in 11:20. He indicates this through the use of a resumptive οὖν¹ and a repetition of the genitive absolute phrase *συνερχομένων ὑμῶν* with which he began 11:18. As mentioned earlier, Paul also repeats the equivalent of 11:18's ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ by using ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ in 11:20. Verse 17 had stated that they regularly came together for the word. 1Co. 11:18 then provided the basis for this assessment by mentioning the *σχίσματα*. Next, 11:19 provided a parenthetical comment which further supported Paul's belief in the report. Now in 11:20 Paul returns to the specific problem at Corinth (*σχίσματα*) and proceeds to explicate further the situation that produces these *σχίσματα*.

He writes, "Therefore when² you are regularly coming together, it is not in order to eat the Lord's Supper." The infinitive φαγεῖν has received three quite different treatments by translators. Some have translated it, (1) "it is not the Lord's Supper that you eat."³ Others have rendered it, (2) "it is not

¹ "After parenthetical remarks οὖν indicates a return to the main theme" (BDF 451.1).

² The adverbial genitive absolute *συνερχομένων ὑμῶν* could also be translated concessively ("although you are regularly gathering together").

³ RSV; NIV; Fee, *The First Epistle*, 535; Xavier Leon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread - The Witness of the New Testament*. tr. Matthew J. O'Connell. (New York: Paulist Press, 1987), 214; Theissen, "Sacramental Integration," 147; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 192); V.C. Pfitzner, *First Corinthians*. (Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1982), 176;

Luther, "Wenn ihr nun zusammenkommt, so hält man da nicht des HERRN Abendmahl."

to eat" or "not in order to eat the Lord's Supper."⁴ Finally, still others have offered, (3) "it is not possible to eat the Lord's Supper."⁵ We must turn to the syntax and the context of 11:20 in order to choose.

All three options are grammatically possible. We may note first the syntactical evidence. In the choice between the first two translations one structural pattern makes "in order" the more likely choice. We can classify 11:20's *συνερχομένων ὑμῶν* as a genitive absolute, but in truth it is not *absolute*. The subject of the infinitive *φαγεῖν* is "you" (pl.) just as it is also the subject of the participle *συνερχομένων*. The adverbial genitive absolute modifies the following *οὐκ ἔστιν κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν*.

Here a simple infinitive (*φαγεῖν*) occurs in conjunction with an intransitive verb of motion (*συνερχομένων*) as they both share the same subject (you plural). Wallace has noted that the simple infinitive following an intransitive verb of motion is normally a purpose infinitive.⁶ He probably assumes an indicative verb, but a similar structure occurs here, modified by the presence of *ἔστιν*: "When you come together (*συνερχομένων ὑμῶν*) it is not (*οὐκ ἔστιν*) in order that you might eat the Lord's Supper (*κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*)

⁴ "Not to eat" - KJV; NKJV; NASB; NRSV; Barrett, *The First Epistle*, 259; "Not in order to eat" - Jeffrey Gibbs, "An Exegetical Case for Close(d) Communion: 1 Corinthians 10:14-22; 11:17-34" *Concordia Journal* 21 (1995): 148-163; 153; A. Andrew Das, "1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited" *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 62 (1998): 187-208; 202.

⁵ BAGD 223.7; Lietzmann, *An Die Korinther*, 56; Weiss, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*; Hofius "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 374; apparently also Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 29).

φαγεῖν).” Paul could have just as easily written, “συνέρχεσθε μὴ φαγεῖν” or “συνέρχεσθε εἰς τὸ μὴ φαγεῖν” (cf. 11:33 *συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν*), but he is resuming 11:18 and wants to use the genitive absolute construction again. This repetition of the genitive absolute has then forced the somewhat awkward construction in 11:20 as Paul makes his point.

We should also prefer “in order to eat” over the third translation, “it is not possible” for two reasons. First, the parallel with 11:33 supports the purpose translation. The only other time in 11:17-34 that *συνέρχομαι* occurs with *φαγεῖν* (or for that matter any form of *ἐσθίω*) is 11:33. There in the concluding comments the infinitive is certainly purpose. Since 11:20 can easily be taken as purpose as well, we should do so here.

This leads into the second reason. The purpose translation provides a very natural Pauline translation of the infinitive that is also commensurate with his other use of *φαγεῖν* in 11:33. On the other hand, if *οὐκ ἔστιν* means “it is not possible” then it is the only time Paul uses the phrase with this meaning. In fact, the only sure use in the entire New Testament is apparently Heb. 9:5.⁷ Probability strongly favors the purpose translation over “it is possible.”

The context also strongly favors a purpose translation. The other two translations state that the Corinthians do not actually

⁶ *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 591.

⁷ *BAGD* 223.7; *BDF* 393.6.

eat the Lord's Supper. This flies in the face of the obvious sense of Paul's entire discussion. In 11:27 Paul discusses being guilty of Jesus' body and blood and in 11:30 he describes how unworthy (*ἀναξίως*; 11:27) eating and drinking when the Corinthians do not discern the *body* (*μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα*; 11:29) has resulted in sickness and death.⁸ Paul's discussion in 11:27-32 revolves around the negative and minatory effects among the Corinthians as they celebrate the Lord's Supper in an inappropriate fashion.

Weiss attempts to counter the purpose translation by pointing out that the Corinthians want to celebrate the Lord's Supper.⁹ In this he is correct. Everything in 1 Corinthians indicates that they have a high view of the Lord's Supper. However, Paul's statement doesn't describe their *subjective* attitude but rather the *objective* facts and implications of how they celebrate the Lord's Supper. Das has pointed out the contrast of 11:20's "Lord's Supper" (*κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*)¹⁰ with 11:21's "own supper" (*τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον*) in regard to this issue.¹¹ The Corinthians have become too concerned about "their own meal" and "by their divisions and sins against one another, they indicate

⁸ Gibbs, "An Exegetical Case," 155, and Das, "1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited," 202, arrive at the same conclusion.

⁹ *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 280.

¹⁰ This adjective occurs only here and in Rev. 1:10.

¹¹ "1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited," 202. Adolf Deissmann has shown that the term was drawn from "the official vocabulary of Imperial law" and "was common in Egypt and Asia Minor during the Imperial period in certain definite phrases, e.g., 'the lord's treasury' = 'imperial treasury, 'the lord's service' = imperial service" (Adolf Deissmann, *Light From the Ancient East - The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*. 1927. tr. Lionel R. M. Strachan. [Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995], 357).

that their 'true intention' is really anything but 'to eat the Lord's Supper.'" ¹² The verse doesn't address their intentions (subjectively speaking) but rather what, in Paul's estimation, their actions *really* say about their values and emphasis.

In 11:21-22 we receive our only real description of the specific problem which troubles the Corinthian celebration of the Lord's Supper (11:21-22; 11:33-34 provides the only other information). We find the matter to be both clear and enigmatic on the basis of the available data. On the one hand we have no difficulty ascertaining that in the context of a communal meal celebrated in conjunction with the Lord's Supper the rich are offending the poor (11:21-22). However the specific details prove tough to pin down, owing to the limited description and ambiguous vocabulary.

Paul states in 11:21 that each one (ἕκαστος) "takes beforehand" (or "takes," ultimately this study will choose the former) (προλαμβάνει) his own supper (τὸ ἴδιον δείπνον) while eating (ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν) and as a result some go hungry and others have excess to the point of drunkenness (11:21). He then asks indignantly in 11:22, "What! You have houses for eating and drinking don't you? Or are you despising the church of God and shaming those who don't have (τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας) ¹³?" As noted above, Paul concludes by

¹² Gibbs, "An Exegetical Case," 155.

¹³ Note the chiastic arrangement: A. τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ θεοῦ B. καταφρονεῖτε B.' καταισχύετε A.' τοὺς μὴ ἔχοντας

again speaking in terms of "praise" (cf. 11:17), "What should I say? Should I praise you?¹⁴ In this I am not praising you."

How did the Corinthians celebrate the Lord's Supper? Two reconstructions have been offered. Some have suggested that a communal meal¹⁵ preceded the sacramental portion.¹⁶ We will refer to this as M/LS order for the sake of easy reference. Others have more recently advocated a bread - meal - cup order.¹⁷ We will refer to this as B/M/C order. The study will now consider Greco-Roman social and cultural factors which help to inform exegesis of the text. Next it will focus on evaluating the M/LS and B/M/C reconstructions of Corinthian eucharistic practice.

Recent study has highlighted the Greco-Roman social and cultural setting and the ways this can help to flesh out the problem at Corinth.¹⁸ Much of this work has occurred after the primary works supporting M/LS order and so earlier writers such as Bornkamm and Jeremias don't interact with it. However the data presented in the following treatment coheres with the

¹⁴ Morphologically, ἐπαινέσω could be future indicative or aorist subjunctive. Given the parallel with τὶ εἴπω it should be taken as a second deliberative subjunctive (so also Robertson, *A Greek Grammar*, 935).

¹⁵ Where possible this study will avoid the term "agape" as a description of this meal since agape is an anachronistic term for this period: "Beginning in the second century this word designated meals, shared by Christians, which were not cultic as the Eucharist was, but which nonetheless had a certain liturgical cast" (Leon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 367 ftnt. 42).

¹⁶ A position most associated with Gunther Bornkamm, "Lord's Supper and Church in Paul," and Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*.

¹⁷ A position most associated with Gerd Theissen, "Social Integration and Sacramental Activity," and Otfried Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis: Erwägungen zu 1Kor 11,23b-25."

¹⁸ Theissen, "Social Integration"; Smith, "Meals and Morality"; Peter Lampe, "The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party: Exegesis of a Cultural Context (1 Cor. 11:17-34)" *Affirmation* 4, 2 (1991): 1-15; Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St.*

meal/LS order and scholars such as Leon-Dufour, Murphy-O'Connor and Witherington have integrated it with M/LS.¹⁹

Some of the problem at Corinth probably involved *what* was eaten, *how much* was eaten and *where* it was. Paul describes the meal eaten in 11:21 as "their own" (τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον). Theissen has suggested that the adjective ἴδιος describes both the source and manner in which the food was eaten.²⁰ The term ἴδιος can mean "private" such as the "stereotyped inscriptional phrase ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων (cf. Frey, *CIJ*, nos. 548, 766), indicating that the object furnished with this inscription was paid for by a donor."²¹ The ἴδιον δεῖπνον would then describe the food brought by individual Christians and "If some Christians have no ἴδιον δεῖπνον, that suggests that not all contributed to the Lord's Supper but that the wealthier Christians provided for all ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων."²²

The ἴδιον δεῖπνον might also have described how the rich viewed the food they ate ("their own") instead of its source. Greco-Roman meal etiquette regularly provided better food for the wealthier diners and those of higher social status. Martial (*Epig.* 3.60) complains:

Since I am no longer invited to dinner at a price as

Paul's Corinth - Texts and Archaeology. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1983.; Witherington, "Conflict and Community."

¹⁹ Leon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 217; Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth*, 153-161; Witherington does not actually choose between meal/LS and BMC, but he uses the social/cultural data with both.

²⁰ "Social Integration," 148-9.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 148.

²² *Ibid.* Lampe has offered a similar explanation using the custom of ἔρανος in which "each participant eats his or her own food that he or she brought in a basket, or all the meals are put on a common table as is done at a potluck dinner" ("The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party," 3-4).

formerly, why don't I get the same dinner as you? You take oysters fattened in the Lucrine pool, I cut my mouth sucking a mussel. You have mushrooms, I take pig fungi. You set to with turbot, I with bream. A golden turtle dove fills you up with its outsize rump, I am served a magpie that died in its cage. Why do I dine without you, Ponticus, when I'm dining with you? Let the disappearance of the dole count for something; let's eat the same meal.²³

Similar sentiments occur in *Epig.* 1.85; 6.11; 10.49, Juvenal *Satire* #5 and Pliny *Ep.* 2.6.²⁴ They ate "their own" food, the food they were accustomed to in such a setting, even though the poorer Christians ate lesser fare.

The richer Christians may have also shamed the poor by *how much* they received to eat. Just as the wealthier might have received better food, so they also probably received more of it. As the collegium in Lanuvium (136 A.D.) shows, in Greco-Roman society "nobody was in the least offended if certain deserving members of the community received larger allotments than others. Such discrepancies were, in fact, considered fair and proper."²⁵

Theissen has also suggested that ἴδιον bears the nuance of how they ate the food - that is privately rather than in a communal fashion. This in turn brings to our attention the issue of *where* the Corinthians ate. The wealthier Corinthians could probably think of it as ἴδιον δεῖπνον because they ate it in a different place. Murphy-O'Connor's investigation of the

²³ Martial, *Epigrams*. Vol. 1. Loeb Classical Library. ed. and tr. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993, 245. Text cited by Fee, *The First Epistle*, 542.

²⁴ Texts cited by Fee, *The First Epistle*, 542.

archaeological data regarding houses in Corinth has revealed that on the average the triclinium (dining room) held 9 people while the atrium (an open courtyard within the house which adjoined the triclinium) could handle 30 to 40 others.²⁶ The atrium provided a far less comfortable setting than the triclinium.²⁷

Simple logistics would often not have allowed all the Christians to dine together. Murphy-O'Connor concludes:

It became imperative for the host to divide his guests into two categories; the first-class believers were invited into the triclinium while the rest stayed outside. Even a slight knowledge of human nature indicates the criterion used. The host must have been a wealthy member of the congregation and so he invited his closest friends among the believers, who would have been of the same social class.²⁸

This process would not have seemed strange in any way to the average member of Greco-Roman society. The seating of guests usually involved a kind of "ranking system," and very likely the wealthy Christians thought that the meal celebrated in conjunction with the Lord's Supper shouldn't be any different in this regard.²⁹ All of these factors probably came into play as the rich shamed the poor.³⁰

²⁵ Smith, "Meals and Morality," 154; Lanuvium text available in Lietzmann, *An der Korinther*, 91.

²⁶ *St. Paul's Corinth*, 156.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 159.

²⁸ *Ibid.*

²⁹ Smith, "Meals and Morality," 321; Witherington, "Conflict and Community," 241.

³⁰ Smith has questioned whether it really is a case of rich vs. poor. He notes that, "the conflict between rich and poor at a meal appears to have become a literary *topos* in the Greco-Roman world - meal customs provided for distinctions in status. But these levels of status could all be within the same basic economic and cultural level, and often were" ("Meals and Morality," 328). This approach reads too much external data into 1 Corinthians. Paul explicitly deals with how slaves should approach their status in 7:20-23 and

As we turn to an evaluation of the M/LS and B/M/C reconstructions, a brief look at the recent history of exegesis will prove helpful. By the late 1950's and early 1960's, New Testament scholarship generally accepted the meal/LS order understanding of the events at Corinth.³¹ Hofius could describe this position as "*ein consensus plurimum*."³²

However, in 1974 Theissen published his "Soziale Integration und sakramentales Handeln. Eine Analyse von 1 Cor. XI 17-34."³³ There he argued forcefully that the "after dinner" (μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνῆσαι) reference of 11:25 necessitated a B/M/C order. Theissen's article has proven very influential and authors such as Smith,³⁴ Burchard,³⁵ and Lampe³⁶ have all supported M/LS on the basis of his argumentation. In 1988, Hofius further advanced the argument with his "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis: Erwägungen zu 1Kor 11,23b-25." This in turn has further

yet can address the rich who have homes in which to eat (11:22, 34). He has to remind them in 1:23 that not many were wise, mighty or noble (but apparently some are). The letter explicitly indicates disparate social elements and we cannot write off all of these places as examples of literary *topoi*.

³¹ Bornkamm's "Lord's Supper and Church in Paul" first appeared as "Herrenmahl und Kirche bei Paulus," in *Studien zu Antike und Urchristentum* (Munich: Kaiser, 1959). Jeremias' *Die Abendmahls Worte Jesus* was published in its 3rd edition in 1960. Neuenzeit published his *Das Herrenmahl - Studien zur paulinischen Eucharistieauffassung* in 1960 (technically he stated that no definitive argument was possible (70), but all of Neuenzeit's argumentation supports or assumes meal/LS).

³² "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 375.

³³ *Novum Testamentum* 24 (1974): 179-205.

³⁴ "Meals and Morality," 337 ftnt. 19.

³⁵ Christoph Burchard, "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" *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 102-134; 127.

³⁶ "The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party," 2.

influenced scholars such as Engberg-Pedersen³⁷ and Das³⁸ during the 1990's.

Some scholars have continued to allow the possibility of M/LS. Witherington leaves the question open and ultimately Fee does the same.³⁹ Leon-Dufour also leaves the question open in his 1982 *Le Parage Du Pain Eucharistique*.⁴⁰ However, he questions the likelihood of B/M/C order on the basis of 11:21's *προλαμβάνει*.⁴¹ Although M/LS remains an accepted approach, this study's research indicates that on the whole current biblical scholarship is more likely to support B/M/C than M/LS.

In the following investigation, we will first set forth the position and argumentation employed by M/LS and B/M/C. Next we will consider the lexical data and evidence surrounding the crucial *προλαμβάνει* in 11:21. Then, we will complete the exegesis of 11:33-34. In conclusion we will weigh the two reconstructions, noting their strengths and weaknesses in relation to one another.

Proponents of meal/LS have looked at 11:21's *προλαμβάνει* and 11:33's *ἐκδέχεσθε* and translated these as "take beforehand" and

³⁷ "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 596. Engberg-Pedersen says that the issue has, "been settled, to my mind conclusively, by Otfried Hofius in a paper from 1988" (596).

³⁸ "1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited," 192-197.

³⁹ *Conflict and Community*, 248-249; Fee's 1987 commentary thinks that B/M/C "is highly likely" but concludes that "one simply cannot be certain" (*The First Epistle*, 541 ftnt. 52).

⁴⁰ *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 216.

⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 367 ftnt. 41.

"wait!"⁴² Hofius overstates the case when he says that these scholars ground their translation of 11:21 in 11:33.⁴³ Instead, these scholars see the translations as very natural renderings of the terms,⁴⁴ which then mutually support one another.

Generally these scholars have conceived of a situation in which the rich start eating before the poor have arrived.⁴⁵ This suggests to them that the eating of a regular meal has already started. They have pointed to Mk. 14:22ff (and for that matter Mt. 26:26ff) and the Didache as corroborating evidence.⁴⁶ Both Mk. 14:23-24 and Mt. 26:27-28 move directly from the word over the bread to the word over the cup without even the slightest hint of a meal in between (contrast Lk. 22:19ff and 1Co. 11:25). It is often supposed that this indicates that the liturgy which influenced these accounts had already ceased to celebrate a meal in between.⁴⁷

⁴² Bornkamm, "Lord's Supper and Church," 126, 128, 156 ftnt. 12; Barrett, *The First Epistle* 262, 276; Pfitzner, 176, 187.

⁴³ "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 389.

⁴⁴ προλαμβάνω - *LSJ* I.1,2; ἐκδέχομαι - *BAGD* 238.

⁴⁵ Bornkamm, "Lord's Supper and Church," 156 ftnt. 12; Leon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 217.

⁴⁶ Bornkamm, "Lord's Supper and Church," 128; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 121.

⁴⁷ "The new redaction is perhaps to be explained in part by the evolution of liturgical practice. At a very early date, it seems, Christians ceased to celebrate the Eucharist within the framework of a meal (even if they ate together before or after the Eucharist). If this was already the case (as is probable) at the period, and in the churches in which Mark and Matthew wrote down their accounts, it is understandable that they should have passed over the details of Jewish table ritual and should have presented the Lord's actions with bread and wine as an uninterrupted sequence, since that was how they now occurred in Christian assemblies" (Robert Cabie, "Vol. II - The Eucharist" *The Church At Prayer - An Introduction to the Liturgy*. ed. Aime Georges Martimort. tr. Matthew J. O'Connell. [Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1986], 9).

The Didache also seems to present a communal meal in Did. 9 that is followed by the Lord's Supper in 10:6.⁴⁸ The permissibility of connecting the practice of the Didache with the practice in Corinth has then been strengthened by pointing out that both 1 Corinthians and the Didache contain the *μαραναθά* phrase (1Co. 16:22; Did. 10:6).⁴⁹

These scholars have realized that 11:25's *μετά τὸ δειπνήσαι* indicates a taking and giving thanks over the cup which comes after the meal. They have argued that this phrase contains "only an ancient liturgical formula" which no longer described the actual practice at Corinth and among other early Christians.⁵⁰ In addition both Neuenzeit and Leon-Dufour have contended that since 11:21 says "take beforehand," the B/M/C order described by *μετά τὸ δειπνήσαι* could not actually be taking place. If it were, the poor latecomers would have missed out on the sacramental bread and Paul surely would have been more upset about this problem than the issue he actually addresses.⁵¹

In summary, M/LS usually translates 11:21's *προλαμβάνει* as "take beforehand" and 11:33's *ἐκδέχεσθε* as "wait." The translation

⁴⁸ Did. 10:6 *ἐλθέτω χάρις καὶ παρελθέτω ὁ κόσμος οὔτος. ὡσαννὰ τῷ θεῷ Δαυεὶδ. εἴ τις ἅγιος ἐστίν, ἐρχέσθω· εἴ οὐκ ἔστι, μετανοεῖτω· μαραναθά· ἀμήν.* Niederwimmer, *The Didache - A Commentary*, 142; Willy Rordorf who also cites Audet for this position, "The Didache" *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*. tr. Matthew J. O'Connell. 1-23. (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1978), 8; Jeremias, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 118.

⁴⁹ Bornkamm, *Lord's Supper and Church*, 147-148. As Niederwimmer says of Did. 10:6, "The formula appears to be ancient liturgical material, and to underlie 1 Cor. 16:22 in a similar form" (*The Didache - A Commentary*, 163).

⁵⁰ Bornkamm, *Lord's Supper and Church*, 137; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 121.

⁵¹ Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 71; Leon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 367 ftnt. 41. We will see later that this argument does not hold.

suggests a setting in which a regular meal has begun before the celebration of the Lord's Supper. The poor arrive later during the communal meal but before the sacramental portion has begun. This seems to reflect the same situation evidenced in Mk. 14:22ff and Mt. 26:26ff in which a meal had ceased to be celebrated *in between* the sacramental bread and cup. More specifically, the Didache appears to reflect a M/LS order in chapters 9-10. The presence of the *μαρναναθά* phrase in 1Co. 16:22 and Did. 10:6 suggests a common liturgical background for these texts and strengthens the possibility that the two texts bear witness to an identical M/LS order. M/LS proponents realize that 11:25's "after dinner" refers to a taking of the cup after a meal (hence an original bread/meal/cup order), but they regard this as an ancient liturgical formula that remains in use but no longer actually describes the order of events at the Lord's Supper.

While meal/LS focuses on 11:21's *προλαμβάνει* and 11:33's *ἐκδέχσθε*, the B/M/C position emphasizes 11:25's *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι*. Hofius has correctly shown that this phrase and the other terms in 11:23-25 cannot be taken as specific *termini technici* for a Passover meal and that syntactically *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι* can only function adverbially in describing a taking of the cup and giving thanks which come after a meal.⁵²

⁵² "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 376-384. Theissen comes to the same conclusion ("Social Integration," 152). Hofius seems to overstate his case when he says that, "Nimmt man den Text der Paradosis 1Kor 11,23b-25 so, wie der dasteht, so läßt sich keinerlei Hinweis auf ein Passamahl wahrnehmen" (379). While this holds true for the terms themselves, 11:23b introduces the

Paul introduces the content of 11:23-25 as a piece of tradition (παρέλαβον; παρέδωκα; 11:23). The vocabulary and syntax indicate that Paul has not composed it but rather quotes a liturgical tradition.⁵³ For B/M/C scholars, this fact clinches the issue about the order used. 1 Co. 11:25 can *only* describe a taking of the cup and giving thanks over it *after* the meal. 1 Co. 11:23 describes this report as a liturgical tradition. Therefore as Theissen states it: "In my opinion it is unthinkable that Paul would quote a sacred, cultic formula, expressly state that he received it in just this and no other form, yet at the same time tacitly suppose that its order is not to be followed."⁵⁴ Hofius says, "so **muß** ihr in der ältesten Kirche die liturgische Abfolge der Mahlfeier entsprochen haben."⁵⁵

Jewish and Greco-Roman meal practice also support the BMC order. Hofius has amply demonstrated that the BMC order itself and the terms used correspond exactly to typical Jewish meal practice and so it would make perfect sense for Christians to celebrate the Lord's Supper in this manner.⁵⁶

events as ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο. This phrase seems to summarize the tradition about the broader context, a context which the rest of the tradition recorded in the Gospels places in the context of the Passover (there is of course the question of whether the Last Supper was in fact a Passover meal). Paul does give evidence of the Passover connection in 1Co. 5:7 and we should not be too quick in assuming that 11:23b doesn't include some allusion or reference this context as well.

⁵³ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 101-105. Hofius agrees with Jeremias' conclusions ("Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 372).

⁵⁴ "Social Integration," 152.

⁵⁵ "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 384. Hofius places *muß* in italics for emphasis. I have placed it in bold to indicate the same within the italicized German quotation.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 376-384. So also Lampe, "The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party," 7).

The typical Greco-Roman meal fell into two parts: a *deipnon* (δειπνον) followed by a *symposium* (συμπόσιον).⁵⁷ The *deipnon* itself might at times take place in two "courses," First Tables and Second Tables.⁵⁸ The Second Tables began with a sacrifice and "invocation of the house gods and of the geniuses of the host and of the emperor."⁵⁹ A wine ceremony in which wine was poured out to the gods (along with other religious rituals and hymns) ended Second Tables and the *deipnon* as a whole and marked the transition to the *symposium*.⁶⁰ A suitable *symposium* then involved drinking and philosophical discussion (Plato's *Symposium* stands out as a noble example) though it could also degenerate into drunkenness and sexual excess with "the ever present flute girl."⁶¹

Lampe has suggested that the Corinthians may have viewed the Lord's Supper in light of this Greco-Roman meal practice. They would then have seen 11:24's blessing over the bread to be like the ceremony at the beginning of First Tables.⁶² Next they would have viewed 11:25's blessing of the cup to be just like the wine ceremony at the end of the *deipnon* which marked the transition to

⁵⁷ Smith, "Meals and Morality," 319.

⁵⁸ Lampe, "The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party," 2.

⁵⁹ Ibid.

⁶⁰ Smith, "Meals and Morality," 319-320.

⁶¹ Ibid., 320. Smith presents the intriguing hypothesis that the meal - symposium model finds itself reflected in early Christian worship and the ordering of items in 1Co. 11-14. 1Co. 11 presents the meal while the material in 12-14 describes the Christian *symposium* - a time of exposition and prophecy (325-326).

⁶² "The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party," 2.

the *symposium*.⁶³ A B/M/C order would have fit very well with contemporary Greco-Roman meal practice.

Proponents of B/M/C have exhibited very different treatments of 11:21's *προλαμβάνει* and 11:33's *ἐκδέχσθε*. Theissen and Lampe have both translated them temporally ("take before" ... "wait for").⁶⁴ Theissen thinks this occurred as the rich ate their own private meal before the B/M/C meal began.⁶⁵ Lampe surmises that it took place during First Tables.⁶⁶ Since new guests often arrived after First Tables, this eating before the arrival of poor Christians for "Second Tables" would not have seemed offensive.⁶⁷

Hofius, however, has argued strongly for a non-temporal translation of *προλαμβάνω* ("take"). He has offered this possible meaning on the basis of the non-temporal use in Gal. 6:1, the parallels in Sib. Or. 3.569/3.211/3.741 and an inscription at the temple of Asclepius in Eidaurus.⁶⁸ There a man is told by the god to "take [?] cheese and bread" (*τυρὸν καὶ ἄρτον προλαβεῖν*) (1170.7) along with other foods (we will consider these lexical matters in depth momentarily).⁶⁹ The verb *ἐκδέχσθε* in 11:33 then receives the common translation, "welcome" or "receive."⁷⁰ Hofius has produced several arguments which he believes preclude the

⁶³ Ibid.; So also Smith, "Meals and Morality," 325.

⁶⁴ Theissen, "Social Integration," 153; Lampe "The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party," 3, 7.

⁶⁵ "Social Integration," 152.

⁶⁶ "The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party," 3, 5.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 5.

⁶⁸ "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 386.

⁶⁹ So also BAGD 708.2a; Text found in *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*. vol. 3. ed. Wilhelm Dittenberger. (Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1960), 327-331.

⁷⁰ "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 389; *MM* 192; *LSJ* 503.I.1.

temporal translation of προλαμβάνω (see the following for a discussion).⁷¹ Engberg-Pedersen thinks the B/M/C order presumed in 11:25's μετά τὸ δειπνῆσαι precludes a temporal translation of the προλαμβάνω.⁷²

In summary, B/M/C points to 11:25's μετά τὸ δειπνῆσαι, an adverbial phrase which describes the taking and blessing of a cup after a meal. Since Paul introduces 11:23-25 as a (liturgical) tradition, proponents of B/M/C consider it impossible that the Corinthian eucharistic practice could have followed any order other than the one described by the tradition itself. The B/M/C order corresponds to both typical Jewish and Greco-Roman meal practice. Thus a B/M/C order in celebration of the Lord's Supper would have fit very well with the expectations of both Jewish and Greco-Roman Christians. B/M/C proponents differ in their treatment of 11:21's προλαμβάνει and 11:33's ἐκδέχεσθε. Some, such as Theissen and Lampe, translate them temporally ("take before" ... "wait for") while others such as Hofius and Engberg-Pedersen think that they must be non-temporal.

⁷¹ Ibid., 384-385.

⁷² "But then, since it is (again) inconceivable that anybody should have begun eating the meal proper as preceded by the blessing and distribution of the bread (the order of the Eucharist presupposed by Paul) before everybody had turned up (on the usual interpretation of προλαμβάνειν), we can conclude that προλαμβάνειν must mean something else" (emphasis his) ("Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 596-597). Interestingly this presents the same argument as Neuenzeit and Leon-Dufour (pg. 42, ftnt. 53) only turned to make the opposite point about order. Neuenzeit/Leon-Dufour assume a temporal translation of 11:21 and so believe it to preclude BMC order. Engberg-Pedersen assumes BMC order and so believes it to preclude a temporal translation of 11:21. However, as we shall see, both sides have failed to consider a third possibility.

We will now consider the specific lexical evidence which can inform our understanding about 11:21's *προλαμβάνει* and 11:33's *ἐκδέχεσθε*. The verb *ἐκδέχομαι* proves to be the easier of the two and so we will treat it first. It can mean "wait for" such as Paul waiting for his companions in Athens (Acts 17:16) or the farmer waiting for his crops (James 5:7).⁷³ It can also mean "receive" or "welcome" such as the king receiving courtiers in 3Ma. 5:26 or a guest receiving a question (Letter of Aristeas 205).⁷⁴ Both "wait for" and "receive/welcome" prove to be equally possible translations and the lexical data does not afford a decision between them.

However, 11:21's *προλαμβάνω* proves to be a different matter. This compound verb combines the preposition *πρό* ("before in time")⁷⁵ with the verb *λαμβάνω* ("take" or "receive").⁷⁶ The compound verb then comes to indicate a "taking or receiving before."⁷⁷ By extension the temporal use then is applied to actions and mental activity in the sense of "anticipate" (i.e. to perform an activity prior to something or someone, or to mentally grasp something ahead of time).⁷⁸ This use occurs in Mk. 14:8 when the woman anoints Jesus before his death. By extension it can even mean "prefer," in the sense that a person "takes it

⁷³ BAGD 238; LSJ 503.I.3 where LSJ lists 1Co. 11:33 as a citation; MM 192.

⁷⁴ Das, "1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited," 190-191; LSJ 503.I.1 take or receive; 503.I.6 entertain; MM lists "receive" as the primary meaning (192).

⁷⁵ BAGD 701.2.

⁷⁶ BAGD 464.1; 464.2.

⁷⁷ LSJ 1488.I.1 take or receive before; I.2 take or seize beforehand; MM 542 receive before.

before" something else.⁷⁹ In the vast majority of instances, the temporal force of πρό impacts the meaning.

BAGD, Hofius, Das and others have pointed to Gal. 6:1 as an example of a non-temporal use.⁸⁰ Das writes, "To begin with, προλαμβάνω is often used without any temporal sense at all."⁸¹ However, this statement glosses over the fact that non-temporal προλαμβάνω occurs only in one specific type of construction. The term can mean "overtake, surprise"⁸² only when placed in the passive voice (usually an aorist tense) and accompanied by some threatening element in the context.

All three citations in *BAGD* fall into this pattern (Gal. 6:1; Wisd. 17:16; POxy 928,8). A person can be overtaken (Gal. 6:1 προλημφθῆ; Wisd. 17:16 προλημφθεῖς; POxy 928,8 προλημφθῆναι) by transgression (Gal. 6:1), fear (Wisd. 17:12) or a plot (POxy 928, 3-5). Longenecker reports that the same situation exists in Josephus such as when the Roman Tenth Legion is "surprised/overtaken" (προληφθέντες) by the disorderly method of Jewish attack (*Jewish War*, 5.79).⁸³ This evidence only shows that in principle προλαμβάνω can have a non-temporal meaning. However, ultimately it serves to support a temporal translation of the verb in 11:21 since all of the non-temporal uses of

⁷⁸ *BAGD* 708.1a, 708.1b; *LSJ* 1488.II to be beforehand with, anticipate; *MM* 542.

⁷⁹ *LSJ* 1488.I.3.

⁸⁰ *BAGD* 708.2b; Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 386; Das, "1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited," 190.

⁸¹ "1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited," 190.

⁸² *BAGD* 708.2b.

προλαμβάνω occur in a *specific* construction - a construction which we do not find in 11:21.

The strongest evidence which advocates of a non-temporal translation have produced is the Asclepius inscription⁸⁴ in Epidaurus (2nd century A.D.).⁸⁵ In the text of the inscription a man describes how the god healed him after he had been plagued by diseases and indigestion (1170, 3-4). The god tells him to do a number of activities such as exercise by running (1170, 9), soak in water (1170, 10), walk barefoot (1170, 12) and pour wine on himself before going into a warm bath (1170, 12-13).

The god includes three instructions which use προλαμβάνω. In 1170, 7 the man is told to προλαβεῖν cheese and bread, and celery with lettuce.⁸⁶ Next the god tells the man to προλαμβάνειν the ends

⁸³ Richard N. Longenecker, *Galatians*. (Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1990), 272.

⁸⁴ Asclepius was a god of healing around whom a cult formed. Centered in Epidaurus it spread throughout Greece, Italy and the Mediterranean islands (Francis Redding Walton, "Asclepius." *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 2ed. ed. N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard. 129-130. [London: Oxford University Press, 1970], 129). The shrines of Asclepius emphasized healing and "in a sense the great sanctuaries were sanatoria, equipped with theatres, gymnasia and baths" (129).

⁸⁵ BAGD 708.2a; Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 386; Engberg-Pedersen, "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 597; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 195; Das, "1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited," 190. Theissen acknowledges this data/translation and while using a temporal translation (152) seems to also include a non-temporal (153) ("Social Integration"). Engberg-Pedersen takes Theissen to task for this (597 ftnt. 16), but then commits the exact same error. He advocates a non-temporal translation but then adds, "I suggest, however, that in the present passage the προ- has the additional connotation of signifying taking (or consuming) "in preference" or "for oneself" (597). Engberg-Pedersen seems oblivious to the fact that one cannot argue for a non-temporal translation in which the preposition is not felt and then also advocate a connotation of "in preference" (a *temporal* force for πρό!) or "for oneself" in which the preposition is felt.

⁸⁶ τυρόν καὶ ἄρτον προλαβεῖν, σέλινα μετὰ θρίδακος.

of the citron tree (1170, 9-10).⁸⁷ Finally, in 1170, 15 he tells the man to *προλαβεῖν* milk with honey.⁸⁸

At first glance it appears as if the "the temporal sense of *προ-* is felt very little, if at all" and that here *προλαμβάνω* serves as a synonym for the uncompounded *λαμβάνω*.⁸⁹ The phrase would then mean "take" in the sense of "eat."⁹⁰ This assessment coheres with the general trend in the Greek of this period in which there is a "free use of compound and diminutive vocables, with loss of specifically compounded or diminutive meaning."⁹¹

Yet the data in the inscription has led scholars to other conclusions as well. *LSJ* lists this text under "take or receive before," that is, "in advance."⁹² In this understanding the man was to take these various food items prior to healing and relief.

Immediately after reporting the instruction *γάλα μετὰ μέλιτος προλαβεῖν* (1170, 15), the man adds, "But on the first day after I had drunk only my milk, he said [the god], 'Put honey into the milk, in order that it might be able to have the desired effect'" (1170, 16-17).⁹³ Did the man disobey the god by not putting honey in the milk? Or did he misunderstand the god because he took the god's instruction to mean "prefer," rather than an

⁸⁷ κιτρίου προλαμβάνειν τὰ ἄκρα (in his line numbering Dittenberger miscounts and provides only three lines between 5 and 10).

⁸⁸ γάλα μετὰ μέλιτος προλαβεῖν.

⁸⁹ *BAGD* 708. So also Wilamowitz as cited by Dittenberger who reports that, "Wil. vim praepositionis temporalem quidem fuisse, sed labente tempore plane evanuisse ... iudicat" (*Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 328).

⁹⁰ Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 328.

⁹¹ James W. Voelz, "The Language of the New Testament." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 25/2. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984), 893-977, 933.

⁹² *LSJ* 1488.I.1.

absolute command? Baunack comes to this conclusion ("praeferre").⁹⁴

Dittenberger himself comes to yet another conclusion. He thinks that the prepositions *πρός* and *πρό* have been confused. The text should then read *προσλαβεῖν/προσλαμβάνειν*. He reports that *προσλαμβάνειν* is sometimes used in later Greek for the taking of food in place of *προφέρεισθαι*.⁹⁵ We should conclude then, that while a non-temporal use in this text seems very possible (and the context of food certainly brings to mind 1Co. 11:21), the evidence does not move beyond reasonable doubt. The data are patient of other explanations that do not require the unusual non-temporal translation.⁹⁶

The only other piece of evidence offered in support of a non-temporal sense of *προλαμβάνω* is *Sib. Or.* 3.211, 3.569 and 3.741.⁹⁷ In 3.211 and 3.741 the idiom *τέλος λαβεῖν* ("be completed, attain maturity") occurs.⁹⁸ In 3.569 (a statement parallel to 3.741) we have *προλάβη τέλος*.⁹⁹ Here the two verbs are interchangeable.

⁹³ *μιᾶ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ πίνοντος μου γάλα μόνον, εἶπεν μέλι ἔμβαλλε εἰς τὸ γάλα, ἵνα δύνηται διακόπτειν.*

⁹⁴ Dittenberger cites Baunack, "*Baun. praeferendi notionem inesse iudicat*" (Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, 328).

⁹⁵ "*At nescio an praepositiones πρὸς et πρό confusae sint; nam pro προσφέρεισθαι, quod per frequens et de cibo, inferiore aetate nonnunquam προσλαμβάνειν quoque occurrit*" (Ibid).

⁹⁶ Lampe agrees, citing the evidence from Dittenberger ("The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party," 14 ftnt. 12).

⁹⁷ Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 386.

⁹⁸ *LSJ* 1773.II.2; 3.211 *τέλος λάβη*; 3.741 *λάβη τέλος*.

⁹⁹ 3.569 *Ὅπότε κεν τοῦτο προλάβη τέλος αἴσιμον ἡμαρ*; 3.741 *Ὅπότε [δὴ] καὶ τοῦτο προλάβη τέλος αἴσιμον ἡμαρ*. Text cited from *Die Sibyllinischen Weissagungen*. ed. and tr. J.H. Friedlieb. Leipzig: T.O. Weigel, 1852.

The non-temporal approach assumes that προλαμβάνω follows the general trend of Greek during this period in which prepositions in compound verbs lose their force and the compounded versions become virtual synonyms for the uncompounded verb. However, one cannot assume that this valid general principle holds true for every verb. One must demonstrate from the evidence that this occurs specifically with προλαμβάνω. The evidence does not bear this out. Lampe's *A Patristic Lexicon* does not list simple "take" as a possible meaning for προλαμβάνω. In fact every meaning he offers involves some kind of temporal force for πρό.¹⁰⁰

On the basis of the available lexical evidence, a temporal translation of 1Co. 11:21 seems far more probable.¹⁰¹ Non-temporal proponents have only been able to produce two passages in the whole of Greek literature which support a non-temporal translation of προλαμβάνω when it does not involve a passive voice + threatening element construction - that is, when its use parallels what we find in 11:21.¹⁰² The first of these, the Asclepius inscription, should only be used with caution since the data there afford a number of plausible explanations in addition

¹⁰⁰ 1. Prefer, take by preference 2. Anticipate 3. Take initiative in 4. Prevent, forestall 5. Arrive before time 6. pass., be preoccupied 7. Take for granted, assume 8. Precede 9. ptcl., of time "past" (G.W.H. Lampe, *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961], 1155).

¹⁰¹ Witherington also believes the lexical evidence favors a temporal translation (*Conflict and Community*, 249).

¹⁰² Fee (who favors non-temporal but remains open to temporal) has countered the temporal translation by stating that "there is no clear evidence of the verb *prolambano's* being used in this way in the context of eating" (*The First Epistle*, 542). This observation seems to be true, but it does not overturn the overwhelming prominence of a temporal translation and the exceedingly sparse evidence for a non-temporal active voice translation.

to the non-temporal translation. *Sib. Or.* 3.569 does seem to show synonymous use between λαμβάνω and προλαμβάνω. Here again, some caution must be used since the passage involves an idiom (τέλος λαβεῖν) which does not match the use we have in 11:21. When a 1st century A.D. writer used προλαμβάνω, the evidence indicates that he would have been *far* more likely to mean, "take before, anticipate."

Lexical evidence leaves the non-temporal "take" as a *possibility* (the least likely of the two). Does anything in 11:21 or the context require such a translation? Hofius and Engberg-Pedersen incorrectly believe that it does.¹⁰³ Hofius points to ἕκαστος and ἴδιον as one proof for his position. He argues that ἕκαστος usually operates inclusively (applying to each and every one) and that where "bei Paulus selbst und auch sonst im Neuen Testament neben ἕκαστος ein ἴδιος erscheint (wie in 11,21!), da ist ἕκαστος stets wörtlich und also ganz präzise in umfassenden Sinn gemeint."¹⁰⁴ Since "each" would have to include the rich and the poor, 11:21 could not then mean "take before" - a translation which can only apply to the rich.

This position ignores the inherent tension within 11:17-22. Paul addresses every verse to "you" plural. However, his words do not really address the *whole* church. Instead, he addresses the ones who are shaming the poor (11:22) - namely *the rich*.

¹⁰³ "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 384-386; "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 596-597.

¹⁰⁴ "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 385.

Paul chastises *one* group within the whole. In 11:21 Paul uses ἕκαστος to address this one group and so his words don't apply to each and every member of the church at Corinth.¹⁰⁵ Theissen has pointed to 1Co. 1:12 and 14:26 as examples of this "imprecise" use of ἕκαστος.¹⁰⁶

Hofius will grant this "exaggerated" use on these occasions, but as mentioned above he thinks the combination of ἕκαστος and ἴδιος necessitates an inclusive sense.¹⁰⁷ Usually this point does hold (cf. Mt. 25:15; Act. 2:6; Rom. 14:5; 1 Co. 3:8). However, Hofius has overlooked another Pauline exception found in this same letter. In 1Co. 7:2 Paul instructs the Corinthians to "let each [man] have his own wife and each [woman] her own husband."¹⁰⁸ Paul makes it evident in 7:7 that he does *not* mean that each and every Corinthian should marry, because he wishes they were like himself - able to remain unmarried (cf. 7:1 "It is good not to touch a woman"). However, Paul realizes that *not all* will be able to do this and so he addresses 7:2 to the *group* that can't abstain *within* the congregation. This illustrates the same use as 11:21.

¹⁰⁵ The following scholars all share this position: Weiss, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 281; Fee, *The First Epistle*, 541; Theissen, "Social Integration," 148; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 249.

¹⁰⁶ "Social Integration," 148. Most likely Paul does not literally mean that each and every Corinthian belongs to one of these groups or that each and every Corinthian brings a psalm, teaching or revelation. We can add Lk. 13:15 to this list if we move to the broader context of the New Testament - Jesus does not mean that each and every person listening waters his ox or donkey on the Sabbath.

¹⁰⁷ "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 385. Both Engberg-Pedersen ("Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 597 ftnt. 16) and Das ("1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited," 192 ftnt. 12) cite Hofius approvingly on this point.

Hofius's second argument against a temporal translation points to the ὅς μὲν ... ὅς δὲ in 11:21 linked to the prior statement by a consecutive καί. Hofius concludes, "Vom Sprachlichen her kann ἕκαστος nur übergeordneter Sammelbegriff für ὅς μὲν und ὅς δὲ sein."¹⁰⁹ The imprecise use already demonstrated for ἕκαστος and ἴδιος negates the force of this argument. 1Co. 11:21a states the actions by one group (the rich), and 11:21b then expresses the result this has for that group (the rich get drunk) and another group (the poor who hunger) which together comprise the whole.

Finally, Hofius thinks that the adverbial phrase ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν prohibits a translation of "take ahead of time" for προλαμβάνω and Engberg-Pedersen has further sharpened this argumentation.¹¹⁰ The articular infinitive phrase must indicate action contemporaneous with the main verb προλαμβάνει (the taking beforehand/taking occurs "while eating").¹¹¹ Hofius has argued that if the rich have started before the poor arrive (as often assumed in M/LS order) then the phrase ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν can't be translated correctly since the poor aren't there and the phrase can't apply to the common meal. Engberg-Pedersen has clarified this by correctly observing that

¹⁰⁸ ἕκαστος τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γυναῖκα ἔχεται καὶ ἕκαστη τὸν ἴδιον ἄνδρα ἔχεται.

¹⁰⁹ "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 385. Hofius cites Rom. 14:5 (386).

¹¹⁰ Ibid., 385; "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 596-597.

¹¹¹ Ernest De Witt Burton, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek*. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1893), 109; Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 595.

the phrase ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν "certainly means ἐν τῷ τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν."¹¹²

This data rules out the specific reconstruction that Theissen and Lampe envision, namely a temporal προλαμβάνω in conjunction with B/M/C order. It does not, however, completely eliminate a temporal translation of προλαμβάνω when used with either M/LS or B/M/C order. In the first case, if M/LS is the correct reconstruction then the adverbial phrase ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν still accurately describes a setting where at first the poor haven't arrived for the common meal. It can do so because while the Christians distinguish in importance the sacramental part of the meal (cf. 1Co. 10:16-17; 11:23-26) they have not yet applied a *terminological* distinction to the two parts.¹¹³

The rich take beforehand while eating "the Lord's Supper," i.e., the meal followed by a sacramental eating as a unit.¹¹⁴ The poor arrive "during the Lord's Supper," i.e., during the communal meal and before the sacramental eating. This lack of a terminological distinction differs in no way from the position in which Hofius and Engberg-Pedersen find themselves. They assume

¹¹² "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 596. 1Co. 11:21 follows immediately after 11:20 which speaks of gathering together (Συνερχομένων σὺν ὑμῶν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ) and eating the Lord's Supper (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον φαγεῖν). Similar phrasing occurs in 11:33 and must also refer to the Lord's Supper (συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν). This stands in contrast to 11:22 which speaks of homes for eating and drinking (μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐκ ἔχετε εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν) and 11:34 which also mentions home (ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω) when referring to an ordinary food setting.

¹¹³ Jasper and Cuming conclude that, "in the first century or even later, the dividing line between agape and eucharist must have been very fine" (R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and reformed*. [Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1990], 21).

B/M/C order and take the sentence to mean that each takes his own food while eating the Lord's Supper. They use the term "Lord's Supper" but the true site of the problem occurs *in the common meal* in between the bread and cup.¹¹⁵ Thus they, too, apply the term "Lord's Supper" broadly to refer to the communal meal in between bread and cup.

In the second scenario, few scholars have realized that a temporal translation of προλαμβάνω is also possible with the B/M/C order. On the one hand, many have realized that "take before" won't work with B/M/C when the reference point of "before" is the arrival of the poor. The above observations about ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν eliminate both Theissen's contention that the events of 11:21 occur prior to the sacramental bread of B/M/C¹¹⁶ and Lampe's hypothesis that it occurred during First Tables and prior to the sacramental bread that began Second Tables.¹¹⁷ These can not work because the events don't occur *while* eating (ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν) the Lord's Supper (i.e., bread - meal - cup).

Neuenzeit, Leon-Dufour and Engberg-Pedersen have also correctly observed that the rich can not "take before" the poor

¹¹⁴ As we have noted, ἕκαστος focuses on the rich and so the verb and adverbial phrase do as well.

¹¹⁵ "Die Worte ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν finden nur dann eine ungezwungene Erklärung, wenn man mit ihnen das 'gemeinsame' Essen bezeichnet sieht," (Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 385; "But some (who had brought much) took for themselves what they had brought of their own and consumed it as a private meal (ἴδιον δεῖπνον) in the middle of Eucharist, the result being that whereas the δεῖπνον was obviously meant to be a *shared* meal with everybody having the same amount of food and drink, some (the have-nots, who had brought little or nothing) would be hungry while others would be drunk" (Engberg-Pedersen, "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 597-598).

¹¹⁶ "Social Integration," 152.

(i.e., before they arrive) in BMC order when the sacramental bread begins the Lord's Supper.¹¹⁸ If this were so they would miss out on the sacramental bread. However, none of these scholars realize that the *arrival* of the poor does not provide the only reference point for "before." "Before" could also refer to *when* the *eating* begins for each group.¹¹⁹ Rich and poor could gather at the same time. The sacramental bread would be blessed and eaten. Then the communal meal in between begins. The rich who sit in the *triclinium*, get the best food and largest quantities - and they get it *first* while the poor have to wait.¹²⁰ In the material surveyed for this study, only Witherington has also perceived this possibility.¹²¹

In summary, 11:33's ἐκδέχομαι can be translated either with the temporal "wait for" or non-temporal "receive/welcome" with equal ease. However, in the case of 11:21's προλαμβάνω lexical evidence strongly suggests that this word should be given a *temporal* translation ("take before"). That being said, the non-temporal "take" remains a *possibility*.

¹¹⁷ "The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party," 2, 5.

¹¹⁸ Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 71; Leon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 367, ftnt. 41; Engberg-Pedersen, "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 596-597.

¹¹⁹ The same could be said of προλαμβάνω in meal/LS order, but as we will see the situation proves more complicated there.

¹²⁰ We may use the modern analogy of a wedding reception to illustrate this. If one sits at a table in the opposite end of the room from where the serving begins, we can say that while eating the meal (ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν) others take before (προλαμβάνω) you.

¹²¹ "Much depends on how we take the verb *prolambanei*. Does it mean "go before" or "anticipate," in which case the wealthy are eating before others, or does it mean simply "take," that is, "eat"? Lexical evidence favors the former, *but even so the point may not be that some poor people are arriving late, but that while all are already present the wealthy are being served*

1Co. 11:21 and its context do not necessitate a non-temporal translation of προλαμβάνω. The language of 11:21 (ἕκαστος; ἴδιος; ὅς μὲν ... ὅς δὲ) functions within the tension of 11:20-22 in which Paul addresses the Corinthian congregation as "you" (plural), yet *specifically* addresses the rich who mistreat the poor (11:22). Context will not allow the language to be applied inclusively to each and every Christian (thus eliminating a temporal translation in which the *rich* take before).

We can conclude that one can not translate προλαμβάνω temporally in conjunction with B/M/C order when the reference point of "before" is the arrival of the poor. If the rich started before the poor in B/M/C order, the poor would miss out on the sacramental bread and Paul mentions nothing of this problem. More importantly, 11:21's adverbial phrase ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν states that the action described by προλαμβάνω occurs "while eating the Lord's Supper." This too eliminates a temporal translation of προλαμβάνω in conjunction with B/M/C order when the reference point of "before" is the arrival of the poor. Within B/M/C order we have no time when the rich could eat before the arrival of the poor, yet still describe their eating as "the Lord's Supper."

The phrase ἐν τῷ φαγεῖν does not, however, eliminate a temporal translation of προλαμβάνω in conjunction with M/LS order when the reference point of "before" is the arrival of the poor. It can

first and are receiving the better portions, and then the poor in the atrium get what is left over" (Conflict and Community, 249; emphasis added).

do so because while the Christians know the unique significance of the sacramental bread and cup, they have not yet applied a *terminological* distinction to the common meal and the sacramental bread/cup. The "Lord's Supper" describes the communal meal plus sacramental bread/cup as a unit. Thus a rich Christian who begins eating before the poor arrive does so "while eating the Lord's Supper," yet the later arriving poor do not miss out on the sacramental bread/cup.

Finally, a temporal translation of *προλαμβάνω* does work in conjunction with B/M/C order if the reference point of "before" is when the Christians begin eating. The rich might have taken their food before the poor even as all were gathered together "while eating" the Lord's Supper.

Within 11:23-33 Paul provides his answer to the problems at Corinth on a theological level (we will examine these texts in chapters 3 and 4). In 11:33-34, Paul returns to the practical issues of eucharistic practice which dominated 11:17-22. Since 11:33-34 deals with "horizontal issues" just as 11:17-22, we will treat this text now. At 11:33, Paul pulls together the results of what has just been said with the same particle (*ὥστε*, "for this reason, therefore") as he began 11:27-32.¹²² He addresses the Corinthians as "my brothers" (*ἀδελφοί μου*) a term of address which he last used at 10:1. After the stern words of 11:17-32 he

¹²² BAGD 899.1.

uses this strengthened term of address to reassure his readers in Corinth.¹²³

He says that when they come together to eat (συνερχόμενοι εἰς τὸ φαγεῖν) they are to “wait for/welcome one another” (ἀλλήλους ἐκδέχεσθε). Paul describes how they are to act when they come together to eat the Lord’s Supper (cf. the same terminology in 11:17-18, 20-21). No decision seems possible between “wait for” and “welcome.” Waiting for other Christians would be the same thing as welcoming them (i.e. treating them as fellow Christians) and welcoming them would involve waiting for them. Either way the emphasis falls on treating other Christians at the Lord’s Supper in a way that does not sin against them and that discerns the body (11:29).

If someone hungers they should eat at home (εἴ τις πεινᾷ, ἐν οἴκῳ ἐσθιέτω) and satisfy their hunger there so that they won’t eat unworthily (11:27) and incur judgment (11:34). Finally Paul says that he will direct (διατάξομαι) them with respect to the rest (τὰ λοιπὰ) whenever he comes. We have no indication as to what this τὰ λοιπὰ might have been, but apparently Paul thinks the instruction in 11:17-34a sufficiently covers the matter for the time being.

Having completed the examination of 11:17-22 and 33-34 and before moving on to evaluate the M/LS and B/M/C reconstructions,

¹²³ Paul uses the term ἀδελφοί in addressing his readers 69 times. He only uses the phrase ἀδελφοί μου 8 times (including an uncertain textual reading at 1Co. 14:39).

we can now briefly summarize the various translation options available for 11:21's *προλαμβάνει* and 11:33's *ἐκδέχασθε*. Strictly speaking, eight possibilities exist:

M/LS order

#1	11:21 take before ¹²⁴	11:33 wait
#2	11:21 take before	11:33 welcome
#3	11:21 take	11:33 wait
#4	11:21 take	11:33 welcome

B/M/C order

#5	11:21 take before ¹²⁵	11:33 wait
#6	11:21 take before	11:33 welcome
#7	11:21 take	11:33 wait
#8	11:21 take	11:33 welcome

Of these, #3 and #7 ("take/wait") appear least likely. The "taking" in 11:21 could assume that the rich (as the rich) go first and therefore the instruction in 11:33 tells them to wait. This remains possible, but it leaves too much unstated and assumed.

Technically, option #4 works. However, this translation removes all that data that would suggest M/LS order in the first place and should not be considered a true option for M/LS. Options #1 and #2 both work well with M/LS. That being said, the reference point of "before" really must be the arrival of the poor or else the translation does not inherently suggest M/LS order and only external evidence provides the reconstruction. We

¹²⁴ "Take before" in meal/LS could have the arrival of the poor or the start of the eating as its point of reference.

¹²⁵ "Take before" in BMC can *only* have the start of eating as its point of reference.

have just seen that "take before" works with B/M/C when the eating serves as the reference point of "before."

Within the BMC options, #5, #6 and #8 all work well. Options #5 and #6 work only when the eating provides the reference point of "before." Ultimately, the following translations provide the truly viable options:

M/LS

#1 11:21 take before	11:33 wait
#2 11:21 take before	11:33 welcome

B/M/C

#3 11:21 take before	11:33 wait
#4 11:21 take before	11:33 welcome
#5 11:21 take	11:33 welcome

However, as we have seen, the lexical evidence strongly suggests a temporal translation. We should therefore prefer #1, #2, #3 and #4.

Analysis and Assessment of meal/LS and BMC order

Since Theissen's "Soziale Integration und sakramentales Handeln. Eine Analyse von 1 Cor. XI 17-34," appeared in 1974 the majority of scholarly writing on 1Co. 11:17-34 has adopted the bread - meal - cup order for Corinthian practice of the Lord's Supper. Hofius' 1988 "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis: Erwägungen zu 1Kor 11,23b-25" served to further accelerate this trend. In many ways "scholarly inertia" has taken over and little if any active critique of this reconstruction has appeared.

In this final portion of the chapter we will assess both B/M/C and M/LS in order to determine their strengths and weaknesses. The format will first consider the strengths of B/M/C. Next the study will assess the weaknesses of B/M/C along with the strengths of M/LS (they tend to be the inverse analogues of one another). Then, a critique of M/LS's weaknesses will follow. Finally, the study will provide a conclusion based on the available data.

B/M/C order provides a highly plausible reconstruction of the Lord's Supper at Corinth. It possesses some notable strengths, particularly the strong textual basis of its *internal* evidence. Support of this position points to the undeniably adverbial *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι* of 11:25 and the tradition vocabulary of 11:23 (*παρέλαβον; παρέδωκα*). The pre-Pauline character of 11:23-25 as a liturgical tradition also seems firmly grounded.¹²⁶

B/M/C order then operates with the defensible and common sense principle that if Paul quotes a liturgical tradition which he expects them to recognize (cf. 11:23's *γὰρ*), the practice in Corinth *must* correspond to the wording of that text.¹²⁷ The

¹²⁶ Jeremias has demonstrated this point for *both* tradition texts in 1 Corinthians - 11:23-25 and 15:3-7 (*Eucharistic Words*, 101-105).

¹²⁷ Theissen describes this in terms of it being "unthinkable" that Paul would quote a liturgical tradition and suppose that its order isn't followed ("Social Integration," 152). Hofius says that the practice "*must*" ("*muß*"; emphasis his) have corresponded to the order stated in the liturgical tradition ("Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 384). Engberg-Pedersen says "it is in fact 'unthinkable' (as claimed, again rightly to my mind, by Gerd Theissen) that Paul should have quoted a holy, cultic formula with the express claim that that and no other way is how he had received it, but then gone on to presuppose tacitly a *different* order of the Eucharist as celebrated in Corinth - then we may also conclude that the order presupposed in Paul's

external evidence from both Jewish and Greco-Roman meal practice serves to further buttress the B/M/C order. Finally, we have seen in the previous chapter that B/M/C order can work with *both* translations of 11:21 ("take before"/"take") and 11:33 ("wait for"/"welcome").

Despite these strengths, additional evidence exists that calls into question the very foundational principle on which B/M/C operates. This principle states that the text of a liturgical tradition *must* describe the *actual* order of events. Since linguistically 11:25's *μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι* can only describe a taking and giving thanks over a cup *after* a meal, the exact same order of events must have taken place at Corinth.

However, this principle ignores an obvious and telling fact: the majority of Christian liturgies have retained the phrase "after dinner" *and yet have not followed B/M/C order*. The phrase occurs in the liturgies of St. Mark, St. John Chrysostom, and St. James, the Egyptian Anaphora of St. Basil, the Prayers of Serapion, the Euchology of *Der Balyzeh*, the Anaphora of the Twelve Apostles, the Anaphora of Epiphanius of Salamis, Ambrose *On the Sacraments*, the Gallican Rite, the Mozarabic Rite and the Mass of the Roman Rite where a meal did *not* stand in between the sacramental bread and cup.¹²⁸

rendering of Jesus' words is the very order in the Eucharist was in fact celebrated in Corinth" ("Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 596).

¹²⁸ Translations available in Jasper and Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and reformed*.

While these liturgical materials date from later periods, their heritage reaches far back. More importantly they illustrate that the presence of the phrase "after dinner" in a liturgical tradition *does not necessitate that the community using that liturgical tradition celebrate the Lords' Supper as bread - meal - cup*. At some point in the church's history the principle utilized by the B/M/C order *fails*. The "unthinkable" (to quote Theissen) apparently became quite thinkable - and in fact normal.¹²⁹ It becomes a question not of *whether* the principle fails, but *when* it fails. This fact alone should cause proponents of B/M/C order to speak in far less dogmatic terms.¹³⁰

These scholars have failed to take into consideration the nature of liturgical texts and how they function in a community. As Deiss concludes:

The key to a full understanding of the text must be sought elsewhere than in the exegesis, namely, in the hands of the community. The community is bent on celebrating the Eucharist rather than on describing it in writing; it lives the Eucharist and only secondarily turns to analyzing the structure of the celebration. The community is first, not the text, while the text is entirely at the service of the community.¹³¹

¹²⁹ Deiss says of 1Co. 11:23-25, "This is the text that the primitive community used for its celebration and that would be taken over by all the anaphoras; it was to form the nucleus of the Eucharistic celebration of all latter Christian generations" (Lucien Deiss, *Springtime of the Liturgy - Liturgical Texts of the First Four Centuries*. tr. Matthew J. O'Connell. [Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1979], 22).

¹³⁰ Bradshaw writes, "Too often in the past over-confident assertions have been made about the nature of Christian worship in the first century on the basis of false assumptions and methods or of dogmatic rather than historical criteria" (*The Search for Early Christian Worship*, 55).

¹³¹ *Springtime of the Liturgy*, 22-23.

The adverbial phrase "after dinner" which in its original context indicated the taking and giving thanks over a cup after a meal need not continue to function literally in that fashion in the worship of the church.

The received language could have easily been retained (and in fact was in many places) as it began to function in a new manner.¹³² What had once described the actual order now began to function has a historical comment which ties the actions to the setting of the Last Supper. In this way it behaves much like 11:23's "on the night in which he was betrayed."

The other early liturgical evidence which we possess supports the hypothesis that at Corinth they may no longer have celebrated a meal in between the sacramental bread and cup. We have mentioned earlier (pg. 41-42) the evidence from Mk. 14:22-23/Mt. 26:26-27 and Did. 9-10. All three of these seem to indicate that other communities celebrated the Lord's Supper without an intervening meal between sacramental bread and cup.

Robert Cabie has offered the additional suggestion that in fact the texts of 1Co. 11:23-25 and Lk. 22:19-20 indicate the *same thing*, only in a different way. Mk 14:22-23/Mt. 26:26-27 both omit any reference to a meal in between. However, both retain a statement about the words spoken over the bread and the cup (Mk. 14:22/Mt. 26:26 bread: *εὐλογήσας*; Mk. 14:23/Mt. 26:27 cup: *εὐχαριστήσας*).

On the other hand 1Co. 11:24/Lk. 22:19 contain a statement about the words spoken over the bread (εὐχαριστήσας) while 1Co. 11:25/Lk. 22:20 provide no explicit statement about the words spoken over the cup and summarize its content with the phrase ὡσαύτως. Cabie thinks that this data also bears witness to the fact that the Christians represented by the Corinthian/Lukan texts no longer celebrated the Lord' Supper in BMC order. He writes:

Paul and Luke, on the other hand, remained faithful to the earlier testimonies; however, the new practice, which involved only a single thanksgiving spoken over the bread and wine, would explain why they did not emphasize the formula for blessing the cup, although this was the most important part of the Jewish ceremonial.¹³³

It is quite possible then, that in fact 1Co. 11:25 provides proof for the position opposite of the one proposed by BMC order.

Ignatius of Antioch's statements in *Smy.* 8:1-2 also raise doubts about BMC order. Ignatius appears to make a terminological distinction between the agape and eucharist, while his statement seems to assume that the two are still linked together. In 8:1 he says that the eucharist (εὐχαριστία) celebrated by the bishop or the one he has appointed should be considered a valid eucharist. Then he adds in 8:2, "It is not permissible

¹³² Bornkamm ("Lord's Supper and Church," 137) and Jeremias (*Eucharistic Words*, 121) both argue in this manner with regard to the phrase "after dinner."

¹³³ "Vol. II - The Eucharist" *The Church At Prayer*, 9. Cabie says later, "The earliest celebrations of the Eucharist must have followed the ritual which Jesus used at the Supper and which contained different "blessings" for the bread and wine. At a very early date, however, this schema was replaced by a single prayer based on the long berakah over the final cup; this change

apart from bishop either to baptize or celebrate the love-feast (ἀγάπην ποιεῖν).” Both Dix and Schoedel contend that here the phrase ἀγάπην ποιεῖν indicates the agape.¹³⁴

At the same time, the agape and eucharist do not seem to have been separated yet. Schoedel concludes that there can not be much doubt that the love-feast was thought of as including the eucharist since baptism and love-feast are juxtaposed as the two cardinal liturgical acts of the church. Ignatius probably chose to speak of the love-feast rather than the eucharist (as he regularly does; cf. *Eph.* 13.1; *Phd.* 4; *Sm.* 7.1) because he wanted his regulation to cover events that he himself could not regard as true eucharists (as defined in 7.1) and that others may have been tempted to regard as harmless communal meals.¹³⁵

Only with great difficulty can one posit a bread - meal - cup integrated whole in which those celebrating refer to the bread and cup as a “eucharist” and the meal in between as an “agape.” Ignatius’ language which indicates a terminological distinction between agape and eucharist, without separation of the two fits better with a M/LS order than B/M/C. Ignatius’ origin (Antioch, where Paul probably received the tradition) and temporal proximity to Paul (ca. 50 years) makes this information all the more relevant to 1 Corinthians.¹³⁶

probably came when the Eucharist ceased to be celebrated within the framework of a meal” (34).

¹³⁴ Dix writes, “‘agape’ no less than ‘eucharist’ is here a technical term, as it also appears to be in Jude 12” (Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*. [London: A & C Black, 1945], 101). Schoedel says, “There can be little doubt that there is in fact a reference here to the love-feast since the expression ἀγάπην ποιεῖν is used elsewhere of the celebration of the meal (*Con. Gang. can.* 11; *Con. Laod. can.* 28) (*Ignatius of Antioch*, 244).

¹³⁵ *Ignatius of Antioch*, 244.

¹³⁶ One could argue that Ignatius’ practice represents a later development during the 50 intervening years. Nonetheless, *Smy.* 8:1-2 appears to move a

The proponents of B/M/C have often cited the Greco-Roman parallels as support for B/M/C order.¹³⁷ In this they align the sacramental bread with the beginning of the *deipnon*/Second Tables and the sacramental cup with the wine ceremony which marked the shift from the *deipnon* to the *symposium*. However, this same evidence can just as easily support M/LS order. Witherington has observed:

It may be significant that at Roman banquets, the religious ceremonies were regularly reserved to the end of the dinner proper (or even after the *symposium*, if it was to follow). If the Christian meal was in any way analogous, the Lord's Supper may have come at the end of the agape meal.¹³⁸

Finally, we have shown in this study that neither the lexical data nor the context of 11:21 and 11:33 necessitates a B/M/C order. One can not use this data to "prove" B/M/C order as many of its proponents seem to believe.

As we turn to M/LS order we find that it has a less firm textual basis for its internal evidence. Ultimately only 11:21's *προλαμβάνει* and 11:33's *ἐκδέχεσθε* provide internal support. This proves more tenuous since we have seen that M/LS requires a "take before" translation and the lexical evidence at least admits the possibility that *προλαμβάνει* could be translated "take."¹³⁹ In addition both terms can work in their various translation possibilities with B/M/C order as well - even the classic M/LS

meal/LS celebration using an Antiochian liturgy ("after dinner") to within 50 years of Paul.

¹³⁷ Lampe, "The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party," 2, 5; Smith, "Meals and Morality," 325-326.

¹³⁸ *Conflict and Community*, 242 ftnt. 4.

translation of 11:21 and 11:33, "take before" ... "wait," works well with B/M/C order.

The M/LS order, however, receives strong support from external liturgical evidence (Mk/Mt/Did/Ignatius). It coheres far better than B/M/C with what we know about early Christian Lord's Supper practice elsewhere. It also receives support from Greco-Roman meal practice (see above).

However, the liturgical evidence itself can be challenged. While the most common interpretation of the *Didache* takes 9:1-10:5 to be an agape and 10:6 to begin the Lord's Supper,¹⁴⁰ scholars have applied other explanations to this difficult material as well.¹⁴¹ One can argue that it does not indicate an agape followed by the Lord's Supper and then the main parallel for M/LS order in 1Co. 11:17-34 disappears.¹⁴² The evidence from *Smy. 8* can also receive different interpretations.¹⁴³

Theissen has acknowledged the parallel of Mark 14 (and thereby also Matthew 26) and responded that conclusions about the practice at *Corinth* can not be drawn from this material.¹⁴⁴ The

¹³⁹ Strictly speaking meal/LS works with a "take" translation, but in that case no internal evidence indicates meal/LS order.

¹⁴⁰ Niederwimmer, *The Didache - A Commentary*, 142; "The Didache" *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*, 8; Jeremias, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 118.

¹⁴¹ The question revolves around how to take *περὶ τῆς εὐχαριστίας* in 9:1 and *εὐχαριστήσατε* in 10:1. Niederwimmer lists different scholars and their solutions and his own response in *The Didache - A Commentary*, 139-143

¹⁴² Additionally, the connections between the *Didache* and 1 Corinthians on the basis of Did. 10:6/1Co. 16:22's *maranatha* may be more remote than some would like to think (cf. Fee, *The First Epistle*, 837-839; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 323).

¹⁴³ Dix thinks agape and eucharist have already been separated in *Smy. 8* (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, 101).

¹⁴⁴ "Social Integration," 153.

absence of a meal in between the sacramental bread and cup in the liturgies reflected in Mark and Matthew does not necessitate the same in Corinth. Additionally, even if later liturgies included "after dinner" without a meal in between, in no way does this conclusively prove that the same situation existed in Corinth, ca. 50 A.D. There is no reason that the adverbial "after dinner" phrase could not have described the actual course of events in *Corinth*.

In the final analysis this study has revealed that no sure choice seems possible between M/LS and B/M/C order.¹⁴⁵ Both sides have important evidence and both sides suffer from significant weaknesses. Fortunately we have enough information to understand the general contours of the problem (the rich offend the poor) and we can hypothesize about many of the issues with some degree of confidence.

Theissen and Hofius are to be commended for challenging the status quo and bringing new data to light. They have presented a significant and highly plausible reconstruction of the Lord's Supper practice at Corinth. In the same fashion, Das is to be praised for seeking to keep the Missouri Synod abreast of these developments.

¹⁴⁵ Though favoring meal/LS both Neuenzeit (*Das Herrenmahl*, 70) and Leon-Dufour (*Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 216) come to this conclusion. Fee leans toward BMC but ultimately also concludes, "one simply cannot be certain" (*The First Epistle*, 541 ftnt. 52). Witherington leaves the question completely open (*Conflict and Community*, 248-249).

The task of challenging a scholarly consensus will always necessitate some degree of rhetorical excess such as "unthinkable" and "must." However, in that process a scholar should not make dogmatic and categorical assertions that outstrip the available data. Nor can he cover his eyes to data which raises serious questions about his own hypothesis. The proponents of B/M/C order have often been guilty of this. They have failed to consider all the data (such as in denying a temporal translation for *προλαμβάνω* and failing to see that it works with their own reconstruction) and have spoken with certainty where the data allows only probability.

A final assessment that concludes that we can not make a firm decision on the basis of the available evidence does not amount to capitulation. An informed analysis will be able to state *why* neither position outstrips the other. The decision not to choose presents in itself a firm decision when based upon a careful analysis of all the available data. The data related to the Lord's Supper setting at Corinth does not show either M/LS or B/M/C to be superior. The matter should be left open and both reconstructions considered. Neither position should serve as the foundation upon which further analysis depends.

Chapter 3

11:23-26

During the course of 11:17-22, Paul has chastised the Corinthians for their conduct at the Lord's Supper which has produced divisions as the rich offend the poor. He concludes the section with the statement in 11:22, "What should I say to you? Should I praise you? In this I am not praising you."

Paul's next statement in 11:23 begins with an explanatory *γὰρ*. We would expect him to offer specific reasons and argumentation from a theological perspective as to why their current actions prove offensive and detrimental. However instead, Paul quotes the words of institution in 11:23-25 and adds an explanatory statement in 11:26.

Jeremias has demonstrated that both this text and the tradition text in 15:3ff involve idioms and constructions foreign to Paul.¹ Paul quotes a liturgical tradition to the Corinthians - one which he expects them (without comment on his part) to recognize and accept. In essence, Paul brings them back to their own liturgy.²

Paul's rhetorical strategy is instructive. He does not immediately correct the sordid particular details of the current events at the Lord's Supper in Corinth. Instead, "For Paul, the root problem is connected with the very nature of the Sacrament

¹ *Eucharistic Words*, 101-105.; Hofius accepts Jeremias' analysis ("Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 372).

² Bornkamm, "Lord's Supper and Church," 147.

itself. Accordingly, Paul drives to the heart of the matter by citing the words of institution."³ He cites the words of institution which will serve as the ground of his specific response to 11:17-22 in 11:27-32. The real issue is the Lord's Supper.

Paul says that he received from the Lord (παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ κυρίου) that which he has handed over to them (παρέδωκα). This language of receiving and handing over matches what we find elsewhere in Paul (1Co. 11:2; 15:1; 15:3; Gal. 1:9; 1:12; Phil 4:9; Col. 2:6; 1 Thess. 2:13; 4:1; 2 Thess. 3:6). The terminology of receiving and handing over provides an instance of *termini technici*. As Jeremias writes, "There should never have been any doubt that 'to receive' (παραλαμβάνειν) and 'to deliver' (παραδιδόναι) represent the rabbinical technical terms *kibbel min* and *masar le* (P.Ab. 1:1ff., etc.)."⁴

However, 11:23 contains one unique feature in that it uses ἀπὸ with παραλαμβάνω. Elsewhere Paul uses παρά with this verb (Gal. 1:12; 1Thess. 2:13; 4:1; 2Thess. 3:6).⁵ In particular Gal. 1:12 provides an interesting parallel where Paul says that he didn't receive the Gospel "from man" (παρὰ ἀνθρώπου) nor was he taught it, but instead he received it through a revelation of Jesus Christ (δι' ἀποκαλύψεως).

³ Gibbs, "An Exegetical Case," 156.

⁴ *Eucharistic Words*, 101.; So also Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 371; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians* 195.

⁵ D lat and Ambst substituted παρά according to the more common Pauline usage.

The two prepositions emphasize different aspects in the tradition process. The preposition "παρά indicates those who hand on the tradition; ἀπό, on the contrary, the originator of the tradition."⁶ Thus in 1Thess. 2:13, 4:1 and 2Thess. 3:6 Paul uses παρά since he handed the tradition on to the readers. In Gal. 1:12 he denies receiving the Gospel itself from men, because this occurred on the road to Damascus (Acts 9, 22, 26) through a revelation of Jesus Christ. 1Co. 11:23 does not deny human instrumentality in the process (the Gospel itself does not stand at risk as in Galatians), but rather emphasizes Jesus as the ultimate source of the words of institution.⁷

The tradition begins by speaking of the Lord Jesus "on the night in which he was being betrayed (ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο)." Most likely the term παραδίδομι presents an instance of deliberate ambiguity.⁸ On the surface level it points most obviously to the events perpetuated by Judas and the Jewish leaders. The broader tradition represented by the Gospels uses the term to describe

⁶ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 202; So also BAGD 88.V.4; Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 371.

⁷ This runs contrary to the exegesis of the Lutheran fathers who believed that Paul received the tradition directly from Jesus after the ascension. For example Chemnitz writes, "But the highest authority of Paul's testimony lies in the fact that he did not receive his description of the institution from the other apostles, so that by his own apostolic authority he might change, transpose, or interpret certain of the words. Rather the Son of God Himself after his ascension in glory so repeated and taught the institution of His Supper to Paul" (Martin Chemnitz, *The Lord's Supper*. tr. J.A.O. Preus [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1979], 120).

⁸ Along the lines of that suggested by Paul Raabe, "Deliberate Ambiguity in the Psalms," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 213-227. Conzelmann also cautions against taking the term "too narrowly in the present passage" (*1 Corinthians*, 197).

both the event (cf. Mt. 17:22; 20:18; 26:2) and Judas himself (ὁ παραδιδούς/παραδούς (cf. Mt. 10:4, 26:48).

At the same time it probably indicates God's action in "delivering up" Jesus over into death.⁹ In both Rom. 4:25 and 8:32 Paul also uses the same term to describe God's action in "delivering up" Jesus into death. Additionally, he uses the term to describe how Jesus delivered *himself* on behalf of Christians (Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:2; 5:25). This proposal finds additional support in that 11:24 will speak of "the body which is on behalf of you" (τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν). Rom. 8:32, Gal. 2:20, Eph. 5:2 and Eph. 5:25 also all use ὑπὲρ plus a genitive pronoun referring to Christians in connection with the verb παραδίδωμι.¹⁰ Most likely the Old Testament background of Isaiah 53 stands behind this passage where LXX 53:6 states that "the Lord give him up for our sins" and LXX 53:12 which says that "his soul was delivered into death."¹¹

We have seen earlier (pg. 46, note 52) that Hofius denies reference of any kind to a Passover meal within the tradition cited by Paul.¹² This statement holds true for most of the brief text 11:23-25. However, 11:23's "the night in which he was being

⁹ Jeremias argues for this as the primary meaning in 11:23 (*Eucharistic Words*, 112-113).

¹⁰ In a similar manner, Rom. 4:25 says that Jesus was handed over "because of transgressions" (διὰ τὰ παραπτώματα).

¹¹ LXX 53:6 κύριος παρέδωκεν αὐτὸν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ἡμῶν; LXX 53:12 παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ.

¹² "Nimmt man den Text der Paradosis 1Kor 11,23b-25 so, wie der dasteht, so läßt sich keinerlei Hinweis auf ein Passamahl wahrnehmen" ("Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 379). Conzelmann presents a similar approach (*1 Corinthians*, 197).

betrayed" links the tradition to a broader context. Elsewhere the tradition represented by the gospels universally sets the Last Supper within the context of the Passover.¹³ 1Co. 5:7 indicates that Paul himself knows of the Passover connection of Jesus' death. It therefore seems rash to eliminate all Passover allusions and overtones from our consideration of 11:23-25. The text doesn't focus on the Passover (its is after all very brief and used in the liturgy), but neither does it deny its influence.

1Co. 11:23-24 continues by stating that Jesus took bread and after he had given thanks (εὐχαριστήσας) he broke it and spoke. The verb "bless" (εὐλογέω) would more accurately describe the words normally spoken over the bread and wine (cf. 1Co. 10:17; Mk. 14:22; Mt. 26:26). In the substitution of εὐχαριστέω for εὐλογέω "we have the first example in the New Testament of the Graecizing which caused the Lord's Supper to come to be known as the Eucharist."¹⁴

Jesus states, "This is my body which is on behalf of you." The neuter τοῦτο must stand for οὗτος ὁ ἄρτος where the demonstrative pronoun has been attracted to the gender of the predicate nominative (σῶμα) (cf. τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον).¹⁵ This sentence indicates nothing other than what Paul stated earlier in 10:17, i.e., the

¹³ This holds true whether the Last Supper was an actual Passover meal or not. Jeremias contends that it was (*Eucharistic Words*, 15-88) while Leon-Dufour proves less certain on this point (*Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 306-308). However, Leon-Dufour goes on to write, "No one denies the Passover atmosphere in the account of the Supper" (307).

¹⁴ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 113.

¹⁵ Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 392.

bread is a participation in the body of Christ (κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος). In the Lord's Supper Jesus gives his "wahre Leib ... unter dem Brot."¹⁶

The adjectival phrase τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν presents complications (along with the rest of the tradition) because we have here a Pauline quotation of a pre-Pauline tradition stemming from Jesus. Since Paul quotes this liturgical tradition as something he received and passed on (and hence must have also used it himself on a regular basis in worship), it seems safe to suppose that it influenced his own theological language. We need to examine Paul's use elsewhere of related ὑπὲρ statements in order to see how he understood the phrase. As an apostolic witness, we can then also accept as axiomatic that his understanding of ὑπὲρ coheres with the Lord's own intention.

At times the preposition ὑπὲρ can operate as the equivalent of περί, meaning "about, concerning" (cf. 2Co. 1:8).¹⁷ However, here it seems to have its normal force, "for, in behalf of, for the sake of someone."¹⁸ When used with people it operates within the semantic domain of benefaction and it serves as "a marker of a participant who is benefited by an event or on whose behalf an event takes place."¹⁹ When used with a thing it operates within the semantic domain of cause or reason as "a marker of

¹⁶ SC VI.2.

¹⁷ BAGD, 839.1f.

¹⁸ Ibid., 838.1.

¹⁹ L&N, 802-3.

cause or reason, often with the implication of something which has been beneficial."²⁰

On occasion, Paul uses ὑπέρ in the second of these two ways such as when he says that Christ died on behalf of our sins (1Co. 15:3) or that he gave himself for our sins (Gal. 1:4). More often than not he places Christians as the object of the preposition, just as we have in 11:24.²¹ Doing something on behalf of another need not always have the vicarious nuance of "in their place," but in 2Co. 5:15 and Gal. 3:13 this idea comes to the fore.²² The substitutionary idea also dominates the probable Old Testament background of this passage, Isa. 53:6 and 53:12 where the Servant is handed over because of the sins of others (cf. 53:4-5).

On the basis of this evidence we should see τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν in connection with 11:23's παραδιδῶμι statement as a reference to the body of Jesus given into death on behalf of others. Most likely this death should be understood in a substitutionary manner just as in Isa. 53. Along with the bread Jesus gives his true body, and in doing so he gives Christians a tangible assurance of his death on their behalf and in their place. Other

²⁰ Ibid., 781.

²¹ Rom. 4:25; 5:6; 5:8; 8:32; 14:15; 2Co. 4:11; 5:14; 5:15; Gal. 2:20; Eph. 5:2; 5:25; 1Thess. 5:10.

²² Paul uses ὑπὲρ this a substitutionary way as well in Rom. 9:3 when referring to the Jews.

New Testament passages demonstrate a similar substitutionary use of ὑπέρ.²³

The tradition then concludes the word over the bread with the command, "Do this in remembrance of me" (εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν) (11:24).²⁴ The verb ποιέω, as commonly in the Old Testament, indicates a ritual procedure.²⁵ To what does "this" (τοῦτο) refer when Jesus says, "Do this"? It can't be the whole meal since in 11:25 he will command the same thing concerning the cup and drinking, nor can it be the table prayer since "that would need no special instruction."²⁶ "Do this" refers "specifically to the actions and words over the bread and cup."²⁷ The distinctive and never before stated, "This is my body which is on behalf of you," should be repeated at future celebrations. As Just comments on the same phrase in Luke:

Jesus intends his disciples to remember him specifically by recounting the Words of Institution over the bread and wine, and by believing those words, as well as by eating the bread and drinking from the cup.²⁸

²³ Jn. 6:51; 10:11; 10:15; 11:50-52; Heb. 2:9.

²⁴ 1Co. 11:24 and Lk. 22:18 differ from Mt. 26:26/Mk. 14:22 in that Matthew and Mark do not contain a remembrance command.

²⁵ LXX Ex. 12:17; 12:47-48; Num. 9:2-6; Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 396-397.

²⁶ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 250.

²⁷ Leon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 109; Similarly also in Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 250; Fee, *The First Epistle*, 551; Lietzmann, *An Die Korinther*, 57-58.

²⁸ Arthur A. Just, Jr., *Luke 9:51-24:53*. (St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1997), 832.

We will note that in the phrase, "in remembrance of me (εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν)," the preposition εἰς indicates purpose²⁹ and that the possessive pronoun can serve in the same manner as an objective genitive.³⁰

Prior to Jeremias this phrase was understood as an action by the church in remembering Jesus at the Lord's Supper. In his *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, Jeremias proposed on the basis of "Palestinian memorial formulae," that "εἰς ἀνάμνησιν is for the most part in reference to God" (that is, for God to remember) and that "it then designates, always and without exception, a presentation before God intended to induce God to act."³¹ He then took the phrase in its setting at the Passover (a place where he finds a strong emphasis on God remembering the Messiah) to mean, "God remembers the Messiah in that he causes the kingdom to break in by the parousia."³²

Jeremias' position produced an immediate reaction from Douglas Jones.³³ Leon-Dufour concludes that he joins "the majority of critics in rejecting this hypothesis."³⁴ Chenderlin has tried to modify Jeremias' approach by proposing the

²⁹ BAGD 229.4f; Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 595. Clancy makes the intriguing suggestion that it equals an adverbial use of ἵ, denoting manner (Robert A.D. Clancy, "The Old Testament Roots of Remembrance in the Lord's Supper" *Concordia Journal* ?? (1993): 35-50, 46). However, his citations (*BDF* 206.1 and Moulton II, 463) do not prove very convincing. Purpose remains by far the more likely choice.

³⁰ Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 685.

³¹ *Eucharistic Words*, 249 (emphasis his).

³² *Ibid.*, 252 (emphasis his).

³³ Douglas Jones, "ἀνάμνησιν in the LXX and the Interpretation of 1 Cor. XI. 25" *Journal of Theological Studies* 6 (1955): 183-191.

³⁴ *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 344-345 ftnt. 33.

translation, "Do this as my memorial," which he believes can accommodate both God's and man's remembering.³⁵

Investigation of the data reveals that the term ἀνάμνησις and the more common Greek words for remembrance and remembering, along with the Hebrew words they translate, all can refer to either God's remembering or man's remembering. The typical form of the remembrance statement (two parties), the Passover context and Paul's own use of the phrase all indicate that Jeremias has misconstrued the situation and that here ἀνάμνησις refers to Christ's disciples remembering him.

The term ἀνάμνησις occurs only four times in the canonical portion of the LXX.³⁶ In Lev. 24:7 it translates אֶזְכָּרָה ("memorial offering")³⁷ while in Num. 10:10 it translates לְזִכְרוֹן ("for memorial, for remembrance").³⁸ Finally, in LXX Ps. 37:1 (MT 38:1) and LXX Ps. 69:1 (MT 70:1) it translates the hiphil infinitive construct of זָכַר (לְהִזְכִּיר).

When we consider these Hebrew words we find that elsewhere in the LXX only μνημόσυνον ("remembrance, memorial")³⁹ translates

³⁵ Fritz Chenderlin, "Do This as My Memorial" - *The Semantic and Conceptual Background and Value of 'Ανάμνησις in 1 Corinthians 11:24-25*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982.

³⁶ The word occurs a fifth time in Wis. 16:6 where we have no Hebrew text with which to compare it. For an in depth examination of the Old Testament and related data see Chenderlin (Ibid.): OT data - 88-122; Intertestamental data - 123-127, 148-161; Greek background - 128-147.

³⁷ Francis Brown, S.R. Driver and Charles A. Briggs. *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*. (Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1979), 272 (hereafter referred to as BDB).

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ LSJ, 1139.

אִזְכְּרָה,⁴⁰ while several related words translate זָכַר.⁴¹ In addition, the LXX uses a large number of different verbs to translate the verb זָכַר in the qal, niphil and hiphil.⁴²

There is nothing inherently unique about the word ἀνάμνησις. It simply provides a minor translation variant for μνημόσυνον and the other terms which translate "remember, memorial and remembrance." The term אִזְכְּרָה occurs seven times (Lev. 2:2, 2:9, 2:16, 5:12, 6:8, 24:7 and Num. 5:26), six times translated by μνημόσυνον and only once by ἀνάμνησις (Lev. 24:7) with no distinction in meaning. Likewise only Num. 10:10 uses ἀνάμνησις to translate with no change in meaning from other words used to translate זָכַר.

The term ἀνάμνησις presents the same use found in the other remembering terms - it can indicate both God's active remembering and man's active remembering. It indicates man's remembering in Wis. 16:6 and Heb. 10:3 (the only other use in the New Testament outside of the eucharistic Lk. 22:19 and 1Co. 11:24-25). It indicates God's remembering in Num. 10:10.

⁴⁰ Takamitsu Muraoka, *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint - Keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance*. (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998), 15 (hereafter referred to as H/A I).

⁴¹ ἀγαυρία ("insolence"; LSJ, 6); μνήμη ("remembrance, memory, memorial"; LSJ, 1139); μνημοσύνη ("remembrance, memory"; LSJ, 1139); μνημόσυνον; μνημόσυνος; ψαλμός (H/A I, 44).

⁴² Qal: ἀναμιμήσκειν ("remind, remember"; LSJ, 113); μιμήσκεισθαι ("remind, remember"; LSJ, 1135); μνεία ("remembrance"; LSJ, 1139); μνείαν ποιεῖν; μνημονεύειν ("call to mind, remember"; LSJ, 1139); ὀνομάζειν ("name, call"; LSJ, 1233); Niphil: ἀναμιμήσκειν; μιμήσκεισθαι; μνεία γίνεσθαι; ἐστὶ μνεία; μνημόσυνον; μνημόσυνος; Hiphil: ἀναμιμήσκειν; ἀναφωνεῖν ("call aloud, proclaim"; LSJ, 126); ἐπονομάζειν ("call by name, name"; LSJ, 676); καλεῖν; μιμήσκεισθαι; μνημόσυνον; διδόναι εἰς μνημόσυνον;

Lev. 24:7, LXX Ps. 37:1 (MT 38:1) and LXX Ps. 69:1 (MT 70:1) all prove difficult to pin down. The Hebrew word אָזְכֶּרָה has been interpreted both as moving man to remember and God to remember.⁴³ Wevers comments on the LXX text, "The meaning of the Hebrew is no clearer than is that of the Greek."⁴⁴ Likewise as Jones concludes regarding the Psalm passages that occur in titles, "The notorious difficulty of interpreting many of the psalm titles ought to warn anyone against using them as the foundation or even as the buttress of argument."⁴⁵ These two cryptic statements afford several interpretations and can provide only weak support for a "God remembering" translation.⁴⁶

Jeremias' over-confident assertion that the term in Lev. 24:7 indicates "that God may remember" typifies the weakness of his methodology which occurs in considering other data as well.⁴⁷ Jeremias frequently finds "proof" in evidence which can only at best be considered ambiguous. He even tries to say that μνημόσυνον

ὀνομάζειν; ὑπομνήσκειν ("remind, remember"; *LSJ*, 1889); ἐπὶ τῶν ὑπόμνημα ("reminder, memorial"; *LSJ*, 1889); ὑπομνηματογράφος ("recorder"; *LSJ*, 1889) (*H/A I*, 44).

⁴³ For a brief summary of the options see John E. Hartley, *Leviticus*. (Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1992), 30; also Clancy, "Old Testament Roots of Remembrance," 38-39). Gordon J. Wenham agrees with Driver that it reminds the worshipper (*The Book of Leviticus*. [Grand Rapids, MI:, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979], 68 ftnt. 3).

⁴⁴ Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997, 14.

⁴⁵ "ἀνάμνησις in the LXX," 187.

⁴⁶ Kraus takes it in a cultic sense and says, "We could therefore easily think of לְהִזְכִּיר as a reference to the 'offering of frankincense,'" (Hans-Joachim Kraus, *Psalms 1-59 - A Commentary*. tr. Hilton C. Oswald. [Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988], 29). A "God remembering" translation seems more appropriate in Ps. 70; see also Peter C. Craigie, *Psalms 1-50*. (Waco: Word Books, Publisher, 1983), 303; Marvin E. Tate, *Psalms 51-100*. (Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1990), 203.

⁴⁷ *Eucharistic Words*, 248.

in Mk. 14:9 and Mt. 26:13 "in all probability relates to the merciful remembrance of God."⁴⁸ He does this in spite of the fact that both verses explicitly state that what the woman has done will be spoken about by *people*. It seems far more likely that the *people* speaking about the action are the ones who will remember her.

The term ἀνάμνησις must be seen against the broader background of the Hebrew terms (and corresponding Greek translation words) in the Old Testament which refer to remembering. Many uses of זָכַר emphasize Israel's remembering (Ex. 12:14; 13:9; 17:14; Num. 5:15; Num. 17:5; Jos. 4:7) while others describe Yahweh's remembering (Ex. 28:12; 30:16; Num. 10:10; Num. 31:54).⁴⁹ The verb זָכַר can apply to Yahweh remembering his covenant (Ex. 2:24; 6:5; Lev. 26:42) or to Israel remembering Yahweh's saving action (Deu. 7:18; 8:2; 16:3). Jeremias' statement that εἰς ἀνάμνησις "is said for the most part in reference to God" simply does not correspond to the data.⁵⁰ The term can refer to either man's remembering or God's remembering.

Four factors argue strongly that in the specific instance of 1Co. 11:24's εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν, the disciples are the ones remembering Jesus. In the first place, typically the remembering formula revolves around a thing/action and involves *two* parties.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 251.

⁴⁹ We have already seen the difficult ambiguity posed by אִזְכָּרָה.

⁵⁰ *Eucharistic Words*, 249 (emphasis his). If anything the "man remembering" references seem to outnumber the "God remembering."

For example, Israel (party 1) blows horns in Num. 10:10 and God (party 2) remembers them. Jeremias' Passover example does not prove to be an exception to this. Israel (party 1) prays that God (party 2) remember the Messiah.⁵¹ However, in this instance the Messiah does not represent a third party. The prayers don't specifically ask God to remember the Messiah as an individual but instead to remember his promise *about* the Messiah (i.e., to bring it to fulfillment by sending the Messiah).

Jeremias' suggestion requires that Christians (party 1) celebrate the Lord's Supper in order/with the result that God (party 2) remembers Jesus (party 3). This conception strains the normal parameters of the remembering formula and should be considered unlikely.

The second and third pieces of evidence deal with the Passover context of the Last Supper. The first time the term זָכְרוֹן occurs in the Old Testament is Ex. 12:14 where we have זָכְרוֹן (translated by $\mu\eta\mu\sigma\iota\sigma\mu\epsilon\tau\alpha$ in the LXX) applied to the day of the Passover - something which the Israelites were to celebrate as a feast to the Lord throughout all generations as a permanent ordinance. This day and its meal served to remind *Israel* that God had rescued them (Ex. 12:17, 26-27). Since the words of institution occur at a *Passover* meal (or at the very least in a *Passover* setting), Ex. 12:14 provides the most likely parallel by

⁵¹ *Eucharistic Words*, 252.

which we are to understand εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν - i.e., a remembering which God's people do.

A third and related point has been offered by Jones. The Passover emphasized Yahweh's saving act in the exodus (Ex. 12:26-27) as the people yearly looked back and remembered his action. Jones concludes:

And if the Passover context is as dominating as Jeremias so persuasively argues - a memorial feast, a memorial meal - then every association would conspire to make the remembrance which Jesus commanded comparable to the remembrance inherent in the Passover rites, not the contrast of it as Jeremias' thesis requires. In the Eucharist, the Christian would, in the first instance, look back and remember. The very economy of our Lord's words suggests that he was relying on the associations of that solemn hour to clarify his meaning.⁵²

Finally, Paul's contextual use of the phrase indicates that man does the remembering. As we will see, Paul shapes his commentary in 11:26 on the basis of the second remembrance command in 11:25 (he picks up the *δοσάκις*). Paul says in 11:26 that as often as you eat this bread and you drink the cup, you are proclaiming the Lord's death. These statements deal with what the Corinthians do at the Lord's Supper, and rightly it should since he addresses *their* offenses from 11:17-22. If 11:24-25's εἰς τὴν ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν means that God remembers Jesus, then either Paul has misunderstood it or completely ignored God's remembering by making his point in this fashion (linking 11:26 to

⁵² "ἀνάμνησις in the LXX," 190.

the second remembrance command in 11:25).⁵³ This seems highly unlikely and Christians doing the remembering presents the best choice for both remembrance statements in 11:24-25.

"In remembrance of me" then means that when Christians eat the Lord's Supper they remember Jesus and his saving death on their behalf (cf. 11:23 ἐν τῇ νυκτὶ ἣ παρεδίδοτο; 11:24 τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν; 11:25 ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι). This remembrance does not involve only simple mental activity - reflection on past history. Rather it remembers Jesus who is present in the Lord's Supper in his true body and blood by which he won their salvation.

1Co. 11:25 doesn't repeat the statements about taking and giving thanks which we found in 11:23-24. Instead it summarizes them with the adverbial phrase, "in this way also" (ὡσαύτως) and adds the adverbial phrase "after dinner" (μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι). As mentioned earlier, Hofius has conclusively shown these statements about a cup refer to the taking and giving thanks over it after dinner.⁵⁴ Jesus states, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood."

This statement about the cup (along with Lk. 20) differs from that found in Mk. 14:24/Mt. 26:28 in several ways. Instead of simply stating "this" (τοῦτο; cf. 11:24) it adds "cup" (τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον). It also seems unbalanced. Matthew and Mark both have: "bread [this] is body"; "wine [this] is blood." 1Co. 11:23-25

⁵³ Fee comes to the same conclusion in *The First Epistle*, 553-554.

⁵⁴ "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 376-384.

begins, "bread [this] is body", but the second half has "cup is new covenant."⁵⁵ While Matthew and Mark pair body/blood, Paul's text seems to pair body/covenant.

We can state with confidence from the outset that the statements in Matthew/Mark and 1 Corinthians promote that same theology, even if they are stated in a different manner. First, Paul's brief statement on the Lord's Supper in 1Co. 10:16 directly pairs bread/body and cup/blood exactly as we have them in Matthew and Mark. The bread is a participation in his body and the cup a participation in his blood just as Matthew and Mark state, "This is my body," and "This is my blood."⁵⁶

Both Matthew/Mark and Paul share references to covenant and blood, although in slightly different manners. Matthew and Mark speak of "my blood of the covenant" (τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης; Mt. 26:28; Mk. 14:24), the dynamic equivalent of which is "my covenant blood."⁵⁷ 1Co. 11:25 speaks of the new covenant (ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη) and then adds "in my blood" (ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι). The two version state substantially the same thing.⁵⁸

⁵⁵ "Cup" presents a typical case of metonymy as "cup" really indicates its content, i.e., the wine.

⁵⁶ If we ask why Paul and Luke contain the rather obtuse statement about the cup, Jeremias' explanation seems to be the most likely one: "It is a likely assumption that the strangely complicated formulation of the word over the wine in Paul/Luke ('this cup is the new covenant') was occasioned by the intention of warding off the misunderstanding that the Lord's Supper was a Thyestian meal where blood was drunk" (*Eucharistic Words*, 170).

⁵⁷ A semantically influenced genitive of quality in which the genitive serves as the equivalent of an adjective (*BDF* 165).

⁵⁸ "Also the predicate agrees substantially in both formulations. Just like Mark/Matthew (the wine 'is my blood of the covenant'), so also Paul/Luke (the wine 'is the new covenant by virtue of [causal ἐν] my blood') compare the wine with the blood, through whose outpouring the new covenant is established. The

Weiss asks, "Der unbefangene Hörer wird, namentlich nachdem er die Gleichung Brot = Leib aufgefaßt hat, doch geneigt sein, die Worte irgendwie mit ποτήριον zu verbinden. Aber wie?".⁵⁹ The answer must be found in the predicate position of the phrase ἐν τῷ ἑμῷ αἵματι. This phrase does not modify ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη in the way that the attributive position τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν modifies τὸ σῶμα in 11:24. Instead it functions adverbially and modifies ἐστίν. It describes how or in what manner the wine in the cup "is" the new covenant. The cup is the new covenant because of my blood (ἐν τῷ ἑμῷ αἵματι), that is, because it contains my blood.⁶⁰ The ἐν functions causally ("because of")⁶¹ or perhaps instrumentally ("by means of").⁶²

Matthew and Mark state "this is my covenant blood." In the Lord's Supper one receives the blood of Jesus which has founded the (new) covenant and includes people in the benefits of the covenant. 1Co. 11:25 states "this cup [i.e., the wine] is the new covenant because [it contains] my blood." One drinks the wine in the cup which is the blood of Jesus and in this way the

common text is therefore: 'This (wine) (is) my blood (shed for the concluding of the covenant)' (Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 169).

⁵⁹ *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 287.

⁶⁰ Betz (Johannes Betz, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter - Band II/1*. [Freiburg: Herder, 1961], 106) and Weiss (*Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 287) arrive at the same conclusion. However Betz thinks it really is Christ's blood while Weiss takes it as "repräsentativ" (Ibid.).

⁶¹ *BDF* 219.2; *BAGD* 261.III.3; Nigel Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. III Syntax*. (Edinburgh, Scotland: T&T Clark, 1963), 253.

⁶² *BDF* 219; *BAGD* 260.III.1; Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 252.

cup can be called "the new covenant" - it holds the blood which founded the new covenant and includes people in its benefits.⁶³

In contrast to Matthew and Mark's text which only speaks of "covenant," 1Co. 11 and Luke 24 text add "new" ((ἡ καινὴ διαθήκη). This statement places the Lord's Supper firmly in an eschatological context, for the only place where the Old Testament speaks of a "new covenant" is Jer. 31:31 (LXX 38:31) ("I will make with the house of Israel and the house of Judah a new covenant"; διαθήσομαι ... διαθήκην καινήν).

Elsewhere, Paul's makes use of new covenant in 2Co. 3:6 where he speaks of the apostles as servants of a new covenant (διακόνους καινῆς διαθήκης). Paul contrasts this new covenant with the old one overtly in 2Co. 3:14 (τῆς παλαιᾶς διαθήκης) and implicitly in Gal.4:24-26 when he speaks of the "two covenants" (δύο διαθήκαι).

However, the original covenant context of Ex. 24 made explicit in Matthew and Mark by the phrase τὸ αἷμα μου τῆς διαθήκης (cf. Ex. 24:8 τὸ αἷμα τῆς διαθήκης ἧς διέθετο κύριος πρὸς ὑμᾶς) remains in the background as well. 1Co. 11:25 also pairs covenant and blood "a phenomenon found elsewhere only in the text in Exodus 24."⁶⁴ God included the people in the old covenant at its founding by having Moses sprinkle them with the blood (Ex. 24:8). He includes his

⁶³ Chemnitz writes, "And just as when the blood of Christ was poured out in His passion it was correct to say that this is the new covenant in Christ's blood (for by the shedding of His blood the new covenant or treaty was established between God and the human race in order to obtain the covenant blessings) so, when the same blood of Christ is given to us in the cup of the supper, it is correct to say that it is the new covenant in the blood of Christ" (*The Lord's Supper*, 116).

⁶⁴ Leon-Dufour, *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 151.

people in the new covenant by giving them to drink of the very blood shed to establish the covenant.

Immediately after the word over the cup, 11:25 places a second command to repeat in a modified form: "Do this, "as often as you drink [it], in remembrance of me." Only 1Co. 11:25 contains this *second* remembrance command (Luke has only one after the bread, 22:19). However this second command differs from the first in 11:24 since 11:25 has the phrase "as often as you drink [it]" (ὡσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε) inserted in between τοῦτο ποιεῖτε and εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

The particle ὡσάκις presents an unusual piece of vocabulary. In the New Testament it occurs only in 1Co. 11:25-26 and Rev. 11:6 and it doesn't occur at all in the apostolic fathers.⁶⁵ It usually indicates the same time as the main verb⁶⁶ and is "only used with the notion of indefinite repetition."⁶⁷ Thus "do this" and the drinking occur at the same time and the verse explicitly enunciates the expectation of repeated and ongoing practice of the Lord's Supper.

The unbalanced nature of the remembrance commands in 11:24 and 11:25, along with Paul's use of ὡσάκις in his commentary in 11:26 has led Fee to conclude that, "a good case can be made that Paul is now beginning to move from the citation back to his own argument, and has adjusted the institutional words

⁶⁵ *Index Patristicus sive Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum Operum*. ed. Edgar J. Goodspeed. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1993, 173.

⁶⁶ Smyth, *Greek Grammar*, 2383.A.

accordingly."⁶⁸ In fact we have two questions here, whether Paul has added the entire remembrance command or whether he has just added the *δοῶκις* phrase.

Fee thinks that Paul has added the whole remembrance command. He does so on the basis of a comparison with Luke (surmising that it would be more likely for Paul to add it than for Luke to omit it).⁶⁹ However, since we don't know anything about the relation between the traditions quoted in Luke and in Paul, this can only be viewed as a very tenuous presupposition. It also runs directly counter to Paul's explicit statement in 11:23 concerning how that which he had received from the Lord he also (*καὶ*) had handed on to them. The *καὶ* makes explicit the correspondence between what he had received and what he had passed on to them the first time. His citation of the tradition in the argument also presumes that he now repeats the *same thing* as what he had given them originally.

For this reason it seems unlikely that Paul has created the entire second remembrance command. As Neuenzeit observed, one can just as easily assume that Paul received a form with two commands to repeat.⁷⁰ He goes on to correctly add:

Daß der Befehl Jesu zur sinnentsprechenden Wiederholung der Eucharistie gut in die paulinische Argumentationsweise von Kapitel 11 hineinpaßt, besagt weniger etwas gegen den zweiten Wiederholungsbefehl als

⁶⁷ Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 973.

⁶⁸ *The First Epistle*, 555.

⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

⁷⁰ Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 113.

*vielmehr für den guten Griff des Apostels bei seinen Argumenten.*⁷¹

A second variant holds that Paul had inserted only the *δοῶκις* phrase. Fee and Engberg-Pedersen both believe that these words "are in fact a Pauline insertion into the words of command to bring out his own special emphasis" which he will unpack in 11:26.⁷² Neuenzeit remains open to the possibility that Paul inherited the *δοῶκις* phrase, but thinks that it is more probable that Paul has created it as an insertion with which to anchor his explanation in 11:26.⁷³

Again, Paul's manner of citation in 11:23 militates against this view.⁷⁴ The *δοῶκις* phrase in 11:25 wouldn't serve as much of an anchor for Paul's explanation in 11:26 if the Corinthians had never heard it that way before! In addition, these two verses provide the only times *δοῶκις* ever occurs in Paul. It does not seem to represent his normal vocabulary and since a source already lies at hand (cf. 11:23), we need look no further than the tradition in order to find the source from which he obtained it for 11:26. For these reasons then, we can conclude that the tradition contained the *δοῶκις* phrase and Paul takes advantage of it in 11:26 to anchor and further emphasize his explanation.

⁷¹ Ibid., 114.

⁷² Fee, *The First Epistle*, 556; Engberg-Pedersen, "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 602 ftnt. 40 where he cites Fee approvingly.

⁷³ *Das Herrenmahl*, 115.

⁷⁴ It is surprising to see Engberg-Pedersen take this position, given how vigorously he has argued that 11:25's "after dinner" *must* describe the actual order of events at Corinth based on its character as a liturgical tradition. Apparently no change is allowed (in practice, not in wording) there but here change (in wording!) is allowed.

At 11:26 Paul adds an explanatory statement introduced by γάρ. He says, "For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you are regularly proclaiming⁷⁵ the Lord's death until he comes."

In one sense, Paul makes an "unmarked transition" from the tradition in 11:23-25 to his comment in 11:26 in that he doesn't explicitly indicate a shift.⁷⁶ However, the mention of "the Lord" (τοῦ κυρίου) instead of "my" (ἐμοῦ) indicates that he has moved from Jesus' words to his own comment.⁷⁷

Both Gaventa and Engberg-Pedersen have rightly emphasized the importance of 11:26 in that "verse 26 serves not simply as the recapitulation of the tradition."⁷⁸ It serves its own role within the thought progression of 11:17-34. We will first examine the specific content of 11:26, and conclude by considering the role which 11:26 plays in the thought flow.

In 11:26, Paul builds upon the remembrance commands of 11:24-25 (note the repetition of the δόξακις phrase in 11:25-26). 1Co. 11:24 stated Christians are to "do this" - that is give thanks over bread in this unique fashion ("This is my body") and eat it - "in remembrance of me." The next verse states that as

⁷⁵ The presence of γάρ indicates that καταγγέλλετε should be taken as an indicative and not an imperative. This represents the usual position taken by exegetes (cf. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 106; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 201).

⁷⁶ Weiss, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 288.

⁷⁷ Ibid.; Lietzmann notes that *Apost. Const.* VIII.12.37 makes the change to "my" in order to place these words on Jesus' lips (*An Die Korinther*, 58).

⁷⁸ Beverly R. Gaventa, "'You Proclaim the Lord's Death': 1 Corinthians 11:26 and Paul's Understanding of Worship" *Review and Expositor* 80 (1983): 377-87, 378; Engberg-Pedersen, "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 602.

often as they drink it (ὁσάκις πίνητε) they are to "do this" - that is give thanks over the wine in this unique way ("This cup is the new covenant in my blood"; cf. 10:16) and drink it in that fashion - "in remembrance of me."

We have seen that when Christians "do this in remembrance of me" they remember Jesus and his saving death as Jesus is present at his Supper in the very body and blood involved in that death and as Christians *eat and drink* that body and blood under bread and wine (cf. 11:23 "night in which he was betrayed"; 11:24 τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν; 11:25 ἐν τῷ ἐμῷ αἵματι; 10:16). Now in 11:26 Paul says that "as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup you are proclaiming the Lord's death." The remembering of Jesus and his death, and the proclaiming of his death⁷⁹ occur in the same way - at the Lord's Supper as Christians eat and drink Christ's body and blood (i.e., 11:26's "this bread and the cup").⁸⁰

Paul says that in any instance of eating this bread and drinking the cup, a proclaiming (καταγγέλλετε) of the Lord's death takes place.⁸¹ To what does this "proclaiming" refer? Elsewhere in Paul, the verb καταγγέλλω always indicates a verbal action.⁸² This fact has prompted many scholars to view the proclamation as

⁷⁹ Gaventa has pointed out that the fronted position of τὸν θάνατον within its clause emphasizes "death" ("You Proclaim the Lord's Death," 380).

⁸⁰ Neuenzeit states, "Logisch bezieht sich Vers 26 auf das ποιείτε des Wiederholungsbefehles, sachlich also auf die ganze eucharistische Tat- und Worthandlung" (Das Herrenmahl, 127).

⁸¹ The verse presents a present general supposition in which, "The relative clause refers to any occurrence of a class of acts in the general present, and the principal clause states what is wont to take place in any instance of the act referred to in the relative clause" (Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 312).

⁸² Rom. 1:8; 1Co. 2:1; 9:14; Phil. 1:17-18; Col. 1:28.

exclusively a verbal event - a proclamation which accompanies the Lord's Supper.⁸³ Some have specified this as a eucharistic prayer⁸⁴ or drawing upon the Passover context of the Last Supper, as a Christian analogy to the Passover *haggadah*.⁸⁵ This interpretation takes καταγγέλλω as the equivalent of the hiphil קנן.

The *haggadah* suggestion receives no linguistic support on the basis of the verb καταγγέλλω. This verb only occurs twice in the entire LXX (2Ma. 8:36 and 2Ma. 9:17) and in neither case can we be sure that it translates קנן since we do not have a Hebrew original. In these uses it has the normal verbal meaning.

It also occurs in three LXX variants: Pro. 17:5 (A); Ps. 2:7 (Sexta); Ps. 39:6 (MT 40:6) (Symmachus). However in none of these does it translate קנן. Prov. 17:5 A reads ὁ καταγγέλων⁸⁶ which in the context is an obvious error for the LXX's ὁ καταγελῶν ("he laughs scornfully at the poor")⁸⁷ where the Greek translates נבּל ("mock, deride").⁸⁸ Psa. 2:7 Sexta reads καταγγέλλον (it also adds

⁸³ Julius Schniewind, "ἀγγελια, κ.τ.λ." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* vol. I. ed. Gerhard Kittel. Trans. Geoffery W. Bromiley. 56-73. (Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1964), 72; Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 253; Fee, *The First Epistle*, 557; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 201; Barrett, *The First Epistle*, 270; Bornkamm, "Lord's Supper and Church," 141. Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 402; Neuenzeit emphasizes the verbal aspect (*Das Herrenmahl*, 132) but as we will see also acknowledges the action (133-134).

⁸⁴ Hofius, "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 403; Neuenzeit suggests both this and Passover *haggadah* as options (*Das Herrenmahl*, 132).

⁸⁵ Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words*, 106-107; Pfitzner, *First Corinthians*, 182; Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 132; ; Clancy, "The Old Testament Roots of Remembrance," 48

⁸⁶ Edwin Hatch and Henry A. Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek versions of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. (Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck - u. Verlagsanstalt, 1975), vol. 2, 729 (hereafter referred to as *H & R*).

⁸⁷ *LSJ*, 886.1.

⁸⁸ *BDB*, 541.

εἰς θεὸν διαθήκην ἰσχυροῦ)⁸⁹ instead of the LXX's διαγγέλλων where the Greek translates פּרַס.

Jeremias has said of Ps. 39:6 (MT 40:6): "An indication of how this 'proclamation of the death of Jesus' was carried out is gained when one observes that in Symmachus (Ps. 39[40].6) καταγγέλλειν represents the Hebrew *higgid*."⁹⁰ However, the evidence does not support Jeremias' claim.

MT Psa. 40:6 says the psalmist will declare and speak (הַרְבֵּי וְהִגִּיד) the wonders of God. The LXX has translated this as ἀπήγγειλα καὶ ἐλάλησα failing to recognize the Hebrew conditional construction.⁹¹ This provides a very typical LXX translation of the hiphil of נָגַד, for the LXX most commonly uses ἀπαγγέλλω⁹² and ἀναγγέλλω⁹³ in order to translate it. Symmachus' text reads, εἰάν ἀπαγγέλλων καταγγέλλω πλείω ἔστι τοῦ διηγηθῆναι.⁹⁴ Symmachus has translated the conditional and converted the first Hebrew cohortative into a Greek participle. The corresponding word order and choice of vocabulary strongly suggest that Symmachus has used ἀπαγγέλλω for the hiphil of נָגַד and καταγγέλλω for the piel of נָדַד.

Therefore, we have no examples of the hiphil of נָגַד translated by καταγγέλλω. If the proclamation in 11:26 corresponds

⁸⁹ *Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt sive Verterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. Vol. II. ed. F. Field. 1875. (Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964), 89.

⁹⁰ *Eucharistic Words*, 106.

⁹¹ Jöüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew*. 2 vols. trans. & rev. T. Muraoka. (Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico, 1996), Vol. 2, 167a.

⁹² *H & R*, 113-115; Julius Schniewind, "ἀγγελια, κ.τ.λ.," 65.

⁹³ *H & R*, 74-75; Julius Schniewind, "ἀγγελια, κ.τ.λ.," 62.

to the *haggadah* then it only does so on the basis of a general analogy to the first Lord's Supper and of general similarity in the ἀγγέλλω root used by other compound verbs to translate נגן in the LXX. As we will see, the text itself presents a more likely solution.

Other scholars have taken the proclamation to be the action of eating and drinking. Both Weiss and Lietzmann thought that the proclamation took place in this fashion like the δρώμενον of the mystery cults.⁹⁵ This suggestion finds little favor among most exegetes today. However, Engberg-Pedersen and Gaventa have both argued that the Supper itself is the proclamation on a different basis. Gaventa has produced evidence which shows that on occasion, καταγγέλλω need not have an absolutely verbal meaning.⁹⁶ While admitting that these are the exceptions to the normal use of καταγγέλλω, Gaventa has correctly observed that they, "should make us wary of the notion that *kataggellein* in 1 Corinthians 11:26 must imply a sermon that accompanies the Lord's Supper."⁹⁷

Engberg-Pedersen has pointed to the emphasis on *eating* and *drinking* which dominates 11:20-29 as evidence that the proclamation takes place in eating and drinking the Lord's

⁹⁴ *Origenis Hexaplorum*, 150.

⁹⁵ Weiss, *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 288; Lietzmann, *An Die Korinther*, 58.

⁹⁶ Philo *On Creation*, 106; *The Eternity of the World*, 68; Jospheus *Antiquities*, 2.15; 2.85. Her reference to 2Ma. 8:36 does not work as the parallel statement in the next chapter (9:17) makes evident when it articulates the content of the proclamation by Antiochus; "You Proclaim the Lord's Death," 382.

Supper.⁹⁸ In ten verses we have *nine* references to eating and drinking (only 11:23 lacks any).⁹⁹ 1Co. 11:26 itself has been built off of 11:24-25 with its command to "do this" - a command which involves speaking *and* eating. An interpretation of *καταγγέλλω* can not ignore this fact.

In 11:26 we have a verb (*καταγγέλλω*) which overwhelmingly refers to verbal proclamation. At the same time the context and the verse itself overwhelmingly emphasize the eating and drinking. We have no need to turn this into an "either/or" choice. As Ridderbos writes:

In our view the one need not exclude the other. While *katangellete* makes one think of a proclamation with words, the sentence structure of v. 26, as well as the repeated *touto poieite* in vv. 24 and 25 certainly appears to include eating and drinking in the proclamation.¹⁰⁰

Proclamation occurs in *both* the eating/drinking of Christ's body and blood *and* in the words which accompany this eating and

⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁹⁸ "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 603; Gaventa also notes the context ("You Proclaim the Lord's Death," 383).

⁹⁹ 11:24-25 do not explicitly mention "eat" or "drink" but they take place in the context of a meal (11:25 *δειπνήσαι*) and Jesus gives the bread and wine to eat and drink. These verses also include the command to "do this," that is to eat and drink again in a similar fashion. While supporting a verbal interpretation of *καταγγέλλω*, Fee notes, "Clearly Paul is wanting to concentrate all the weight he has attributed to the Eucharist on those very acts that each individual participant in the Eucharist will personally (and rather intimately) do" (*The First Epistle*, 607).

¹⁰⁰ Herman Ridderbos, *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*. tr. John Richard De Witt. (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975), 422. In a similar vein Leon-Dufour comments, "The event reaches the hearers through the act of speaking that is normally part of a cultic act. In this particular cultic act, however, the action itself is an official 'word'" (*Sharing the Eucharistic Bread*, 225).

drinking.¹⁰¹ If we ask about the content of this verbal proclamation then "v 26 itself suggests that it will be the one implied in (τὸν ἄρτον) τοῦτον, thus referring us back to the sayings of vv 24-25."¹⁰²

Most likely, the "you" (plural) of καταγγέλλετε refers to the group collectively just as the ποιεῖτε of 11:24-25. Each Christian does not individually take bread, give thanks over it etc., but rather this occurs when they are gathered as a group ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό (cf. 11:20). In the same fashion the words of institution, the eating/drinking and hence also the proclamation take place when gathered as a group. The group of Christians also provide the indirect object of the proclaiming.¹⁰³

Finally, Paul says that this proclaiming goes on "until he comes" (ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ). The phrase ἄχρι οὗ used with the subjunctive means "until."¹⁰⁴ Jeremias has attempted to argue that the phrase ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ "has a certain affinity with the final clause and may

¹⁰¹ Neuenzeit writes, "Die beiden Funktionstermini ποιεῖν (11,24.25) und καταγγέλλειν (V. 26), die sich gegenseitig ergänzen und interpretieren, erlauben weder die Annahme einer reinen Tatverkündigung noch einer ausschließlichen Wortverkündigung (etwa im Sinne der Gleichnisdeutung des Einsetzungberichts). So ist es naheliegend, das mit der Verkündigung des Herrentodes 1 Kor 11,26 gegebene 'objective Gedächtniswort sich als Wort - **und** Tatverkündigung, als Gedächtnishandlung mit eingebauten Gedächtniswort zu denken. Die Handlung als solche ist eine Verkündigung, sie ist es aber vor allem und zunächst wegen der sie formierenden liturgischen Worte'" (Das Herrenmahl, 134-135; emphasis his).

¹⁰² Engberg-Pedersen, "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 603.

¹⁰³ "In the present context, however, it seems most likely that the proclamation is going on among members of the congregation. That is to say, when one participates in the Lord's Supper one is proclaiming the Lord's death to one's fellow communicants. If this is so, then 'you are proclaiming the Lord's death' (11:26) is perhaps parallel in meaning to 'for my remembrance' (11:24, 25) (Commission on Theology and Church Relations of The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod. *Admission to the Lord's Supper - Basics of Biblical and Confessional Teaching*. [St. Louis: Commission on Theology and Church Relations of The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, 1999], 13 ftnt. 19).

therefore be freely translated 'until (matters have developed to the point at which) he comes,' 'until (the goal is reached, that) he comes.'"¹⁰⁵ Jeremias uses this in conjunction with his unique interpretation of the remembrance command (God remembers Jesus) as a call for God to bring about the parousia. Jeremias cites *BDF* 383.2 as proof, but the citation does not support his position.¹⁰⁶

Gaventa has argued that the phrase does not indicate a "mere deadline," or "the point at which the Lord's Supper terminates."¹⁰⁷ She says that "it is, instead, a reminder to the assembled believers at Corinth that the Lord will return and that worship must be understood in light of that expectation."¹⁰⁸ While we can agree with her general point, it seems difficult to see how this differs from a "deadline" or "the point at which the Lord's Supper terminates."

To say that the Lord's Supper goes on "until he comes" states the *terminus ad quem* of the Lord's Supper. In this regard it does state a deadline or finishing point. However, by the very act of mentioning this finishing point, the verse places the

¹⁰⁴ *BDF* 383.2; Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 479.

¹⁰⁵ *Eucharistic Words*, 253; Hofius agrees with this reading ("Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis," 405. He attempts to support it with further arguments from Isa. 62:1 and 62:6-7 and elsewhere (405 ftnt. 211). A statement of "until" will often look forward to that future event, but in no way does it necessitate that "until" inherently indicates purpose or result nor does the context of 11:26 require it here.

¹⁰⁶ Engberg-Pedersen comes to the same conclusion: "I cannot, however, find any indication whatever that $\alpha\chi\rho\iota\ \omicron\upsilon$ should have a final as opposed to purely temporal meaning here" ("Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 603 ftnt. 45).

¹⁰⁷ "You Proclaim the Lord's Death," 383.

¹⁰⁸ *Ibid.*

Lord's Supper into an eschatological context and reminds the reader of this fact. It thus speaks in the same way as 11:19 and also 11:25's "new covenant," and prepares the way for the eschatological discussion of 11:30-31.

We can now examine the role which 11:26 plays in the thought progression of the passage. 1Co. 11:17-22 sets forth the problem at Corinth - a problem which occurs on the horizontal plane as Christians (the rich) offend Christians (the poor). By their eating and drinking (cf. 11:21-22) they show that their true focus rests on something other than eating the *Lord's Supper* (κυριακὸν δεῖπνον 11:20; cf. τὸ ἴδιον δεῖπνον 11:21). They have ignored what the Lord's Supper is about and instead care more about culturally conditioned eating and drinking - the kind you can just as easily do at home (μὴ γὰρ οἰκίας οὐκ εἰς τὸ ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν;; 11:22).

Paul says that in this he will not praise them (11:22). He then states in 11:23ff the reason *why* he won't praise them (γὰρ). His answer deals not with a critique of their behavior based on Christian love. Instead he quotes the words of institution which state *what* the *Lord's Supper* is about, namely, Jesus' *body* and *blood* for Christians to eat and drink (cf. 10:16). This body and blood bears witness to Jesus' death (11:23 "on the night in which he was betrayed"; 11:24 τὸ σῶμα τὸ ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν; 11:25 ἐν τῷ ἑμῷ αἵματι). As Christians eat his *body* and drink his *blood* they remember Jesus and his saving death (11:24-25). The Corinthians should be

concerned about eating and drinking Christ's body and blood and this should be informing their behavior instead of the common, socially stratified eating and drinking at the communal meal.

At 11:26 Paul leaves the tradition and adds an explanatory comment (γὰρ). The verse picks up on the tradition and highlights its significance.¹⁰⁹ Paul writes 11:26 in order to explain and rivet attention on the very point 11:23-25 has made: Jesus' body and blood and their witness to Jesus' death. He speaks of eating *this* bread and drinking *this* cup¹¹⁰ which proclaim Jesus' death. *Body and blood* go hand in hand with Jesus' *death* at the Lord's Supper.

Paul makes sure in 11:26 that the reader has moved to the heart of his argument - the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper. The Corinthians want to focus on an eating and drinking which they can just as easily do at home (11:22). Paul wants to focus on an eating and drinking which only occurs at the *Lord's* Supper - an eating and drinking that when done unworthily (as the Corinthians currently are) makes participants guilty of Jesus' *body* and *blood* (11:27). His argument emphasizes not eating and drinking *per se*, but *what* Christians eat at the Lord's Supper - i.e., the body and blood of Christ which enables Christians to remember Jesus and proclaim his death. *This* body

¹⁰⁹ Gaventa has noted that "with the exception of 'you eat' every word in this expression repeats a word in the earlier tradition" ("You Proclaim the Lord's Death," 379).

and blood (cf. "this bread" and "this cup" in 11:26), should occupy the Corinthians' attention, and provide the rationale for changed behavior toward one another.

Because Gaventa and Engberg-Pedersen operate with a view which denies the true body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, their exegesis cannot arrive at the heart of the matter.¹¹¹

Gaventa correctly identifies 11:26 "as the basis for the connection between the tradition and the difficulties in the Corinthian practice of the Lord's Supper."¹¹²

On the other hand, Gaventa identifies Jesus' death in a *general* sense as the basis for the connection instead of *specifically the body and blood of Christ* in the Supper by which Christians remember Jesus and proclaim his death.¹¹³ Gaventa is right when she writes:

That death, in Paul's view, stands diametrically opposed to the claims of social status that were at work in the Corinthian community. To proclaim the death of the Lord is, to say the least, not to proclaim one's own rights or prerogatives.¹¹⁴

However, she fails to recognize the specific *locus* which proclaims this death in the Lord's Supper and the heart of Paul's

¹¹⁰ The article in 11:26's τὸ ποτήριον should be taken as anaphoric, referring back to "this cup" (τοῦτο τὸ ποτήριον) in 11:25. A number of scribes sensed this and proceeded to add the τοῦτο (P⁴⁶ N² C³ D¹ Ψ 1739^{mg} M a t sy bo).

¹¹¹ For example, Engberg-Pedersen states, "The verb 'is' in 'This (bread) is my body' similarly means just 'signifies,' 'stands for,' 'represents,' 'pictures,' 'images,' or the like" ("Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 605).

¹¹² "You Proclaim the Lord's Death," 378.

¹¹³ Ibid., 383-384.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 383.

argument about behavior at the *Lord's Supper*, namely Jesus' body and blood in the sacrament.

In 11:26 Paul is not providing an additional point that serves as the basis to connect the tradition (11:23-25) to the specific problem at the Lord's Supper (11:17-22). Rather, 11:26 emphasizes and explains the very heart of the tradition already presented in 11:23-25 - the body and blood of Jesus which Christians partake of together and by which they proclaim Jesus' death. The body and blood *itself is the basis for connection* between the tradition (11:23-25) and the horizontal dimension of the problem (11:17-22). We will examine this very point in the next chapter.

Engberg-Pedersen presents a similar error as he describes Paul's actions in 11:23-26 as "re-ritualizing the Eucharist."¹¹⁵ He has correctly perceived Paul's emphasis on the unique eating and drinking which occurs at the Lord's Supper.¹¹⁶ However, the his use of the term "re-ritualize" denies any significance for the "'elements' *independently of* the whole ritualized setting to which the bread and cup belong."¹¹⁷ Engberg-Pedersen has it reversed: it's not the setting that makes the bread and wine significant, but rather the body and blood of Christ under bread and wine that makes the Lord's Supper significant and a proclamation of Jesus' death.

¹¹⁵ "Proclaiming the Lord's Death," 605 (emphasis his).

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 602-604.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 605.

Paul's statement in 11:26 leaves no doubt after 11:23-25 that the Lord's Supper is about the death of the Lord proclaimed through the *body and blood* of Christ in the sacrament whereby Christians remember and proclaim Jesus' death. He faults the Corinthians for failing to attend to this. After focusing on Jesus' body and blood in 11:23-26, he is now prepared to respond to their behavior (11:27ff) on the basis of the Lord's Supper's essence - the body and blood of Christ. The body and blood *itself*, not the more general death *it* serves to remember and proclaim, functions as the connection between the horizontal element of 11:17-22 and the vertical in 11:23-26. As we will see in our exegesis of 11:27-32, the very character of the body and blood of Christ that makes Christians one body (10:17) serves as the "logical hinge" in Paul's argumentation. Paul has already set forth this truth in 10:17 and he will apply it in 11:27ff.

Chapter 4

11:27-32

Our analysis of 11:27-32 will emphasize the structural and lexical features which inform the understanding of these verses. As we will see, the structure provides a great deal of guidance in the interpretation of the passage. For this reason we will first attend to an overview of the structure in 11:27-32. After doing this we will pursue the detailed exegesis of 11:27-29 and 11:30-32.

I. Structural overview of 11:29-32

The section falls into two halves: 11:27-29 and 11:30-32. In 11:27-29 Paul uses general language to describe "how things work" at the Lord's Supper.¹ He describes what happens when people receive the Lord's Supper in an unacceptable manner. At 11:30, *διὰ τοῦτο* serves as a textual marker of a shift which occurs. In 11:30-32, Paul now uses specific language and applies the general truths of 11:27-29 to the situation at Corinth.²

Paul has arranged the general discussion of 11:27-29 in a chiasmic fashion:

¹ 11:27 Indefinite relative clause (*ὃς ἂν* + subj.); 11:28 3rd person imperatives *δοκιμαζέτω, ἐσθιέτω, πινέτω*; 11:29 substantive *ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων καὶ πίνων*.

² 11:30 2nd pl *ἐν ὑμῖν*; 11:31-32 1st pl verbs *διεκρίνομεν* (used with reflexive pronoun *ἑαυτοὺς* = "ourselves"), *ἐκρινόμεθα, παιδευόμεθα, κατακριθώμεν*.

- 11:27a **A.** Therefore whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily
 11:27b **B.** will be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.
 11:28 **C.** But let a man examine himself and in this way let him eat from the bread and drink from the cup.
 11:29a **B.'** For the one eating and drinking eats and drinks judgment to himself
 11:29b **A.'** if he does not discern the body.³

The vocabulary in 11:27 and 11:29 correspond chiastically (11:27a ἀναξίως "unworthily" and 11:29b μὴ διακρίνων "if not discerning"; 11:27b ἔνοχος "guilty" and 11:29a κρίμα "judgment"). The correspondence does not occur merely on the level of vocabulary but rather these words cause the half verses to correspond.⁴ Eating and drinking unworthily occurs if people don't discern the body (11:27a and 11:29b). People who are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord eat and drink to judgment (11:27b and 11:29a).

We are justified in seeing a chiastic structure since Paul makes extensive use of paronomasia throughout this text.⁵ He has expended great intentionality on the wording of the text and we

³ 11:29b's μὴ διακρίνων functions as a conditional participle which is equivalent to a conditional clause (Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 463; Robertson, *A Grammar of the Greek New Testament*, 1023; Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 633).

⁴ As Voelz emphasizes, "Therefore, the meaning of the larger whole is the meaning of a matrix of signifiers with interrelated meanings, with the meanings of all signifiers being understood in every respect in relation to the meanings of all other signifiers (James W. Voelz, *What Does This Mean? Principles of Biblical Interpretation in the Post-Modern World*. [St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1995], 102; emphasis his)."

⁵ κρίμα, διακρίνων, διεκρίνομεν, ἐκρινόμεθα, κρινόμενοι, κατακριθῶμεν are all based on the κριν- root. In addition we should note that 11:27's ἀναξίως

need to be alert for similar "word plays" in the form of chiasms. In addition, the chiasm fits perfectly with the general language which begins at 11:27 and ends at 11:29. It also nicely contains the repeated "eat and drink" refrain in 11:27-29 (twice in 11:29) which abruptly ends at 11:29.⁶

The two halves of 11:27-32 share a common element in 11:28 and 11:31. Verse 11:28, the C member in 11:27-29's chiasm, provides a solution using an adversative δὲ plus an examining verb (δοκιμαζέτω) and a reflexive pronoun (ἑαυτόν). As such it stands parallel to 11:31 in the second half which also uses an adversative δὲ with an examining verb (διακρίνομεν) and a reflexive pronoun (ἑαυτούς) in providing a solution.

Finally, Paul has used a second and interlocking chiasm to help tie the general discussion (11:27-29) to the specific discussion (11:30-32). This chiasm exists between 11:29 and 11:31 (A 11:29 κρίμα; B 11:29 διακρίνων; B' 11:31 διακρίνομεν; A' 11:31 ἐκρινόμεθα).⁷ As such it interlocks with the first chiasm.⁸ In addition to vocabulary, the B/B' members in this second chiasm correspond nicely since they both present conditional

and ἔνοχος share a close affinity to the juridical and evaluative semantic domains which these words occupy.

⁶ This refrain also serves to thematically connect 11:27-29 back to 11:23-26.

⁷ James Voelz (personal communication) has called my attention to the presence of this second chiasm. However, the application and interpretation advocated here are entirely the work of the author.

⁸ 11:29a and 11:29b which serve as the B' and A' members in the first chiasm also function as the A and B members in the second chiasm.

constructions (11:29b "if not discerning," *μὴ διακρίνων*; 11:31a "if we were examining ourselves," *εἰ δὲ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν*).⁹

II. Detailed analysis of 11:27-29

With the inferential particle *ὥστε* ("for this reason, therefore"; 11:27), Paul makes the bold theological move of this section.¹⁰ He has described the problem of their behavior on the horizontal plane at the Lord's Supper (11:17-22) and cited what the Lord's Supper is (the body and blood of the Lord whereby Christians remember the Lord and proclaim his death) on the basis of the tradition/liturgy (11:23-26). Now he brings them together: Whoever eats the bread and drinks the cup unworthily (*ἀναξίως*; cf. 11:17-22) will be guilty (*ἔνοχος*) of the body and blood of the Lord (cf. 11:23-26).¹¹

Paul describes their conduct towards one another in the Lord's Supper setting with the adverb *ἀναξίως*. The adjective *ἄξιος* is used "of things, in relation to other things" with the translation "corresponding, comparable, worthy."¹² It can operate within the semantic domain of value (Louw and Nida place it in domain 65 "Value" and assign it to sub-domain 65B "Worthy/not worthy")¹³ in which case it is usually translated

⁹ We will momentarily address the translation of *διακρίνω* in these two verses.

¹⁰ BAGD, 899.1a.

¹¹ Note that these articles can again be taken as anaphoric referring to 11:25-26 - "this bread and this cup."

¹² Ibid., 78.1

¹³ L&N, 622.

“worthy.”¹⁴ In this sense it usually means that one item has equal value and worth in comparison to another.¹⁵

By extension the word can be used within the semantic domain of proper/improper (*L&N* domain 66) when something is “worthy” in the sense that it is “fitting or proper in corresponding to what should be expected.”¹⁶ For example, the Pharisees and Sadducees are told to bring forth fruit worthy of repentance (Mt. 3:8). The idiom ἄξιόν ἐστι “it is fitting/proper” (cf. 1Co. 16:4) often functions in a similar manner. The adverb ἀναξίως is simply the alpha privative form indicating the absence of the trait being described.

The adverbial form ἀξίως occurs 9 times in the LXX and NT¹⁷ while ἀναξίως occurs only twice (2Ma. 14:42; 1Co. 11:27).¹⁸ In these twelve usages the adverb stands absolutely only in Wis. 16:1, Sir. 14:11 and 1Co. 11:27. In the other nine times it is modified by a genitive. We should therefore probably understand 1Co. 11:27a to implicitly be modified by the phrase τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου as seen in the parallel 11:27b.

Of the two options open for ἀναξίως it seems best to choose the second (“not corresponding to, not in keeping with”). Paul uses the positive ἀξίως four times in instructing Christians to

¹⁴ BAGD, 78; LSJ, 171.

¹⁵ A laborer is worthy of his wages (Lk. 10:7); a centurion is worthy of having his request granted (Lk. 7:4); sinners are worthy of death (Rom. 1:32).

¹⁶ *L&N*, 628.

¹⁷ Wis. 7:15; 16:1; Sir. 14:11; Rom. 16:2; Eph. 4:1; Phi. 1:27 Col. 1:10; 1Th. 2:12; 3Jo. 1:6.

¹⁸ 2Ma. 14:42; 1Co. 11:27.

live/walk ἀξίως of their calling (τῆς κλήσεως; Eph. 4:1), the Gospel of Christ (τοῦ εὐαγγελίου τοῦ Χριστοῦ; Phil. 1:27), the Lord (τοῦ κυρίου; Col. 1:10) and the God who calls (τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ καλοῦντος; 1Th. 2:12). It doesn't appear that in any of these "worthy" in the sense of "equal to" in value can apply. The slightly different sense "corresponding to" fits better. So also here the negative ἀναξίως stands in relation to τοῦ σώματος καὶ τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ κυρίου and "equal to" in value doesn't apply very well. "Corresponding to" works much better. They should treat each other at the Lord's Supper in a manner which corresponds to what they are eating and drinking - the body and blood of Christ.

Thus in 11:27 ἀναξίως means "unworthily" - not in keeping with and corresponding to the character and nature of something. When the Corinthians do this, Paul says they become guilty (ἔνοχος) of the body and blood of the Lord.¹⁹ The word ἔνοχος is a forensic/juridical term. One can be guilty to the point of a particular punishment (Mk. 14:64 οἱ δὲ πάντες κατέκριναν αὐτὸν ἔνοχον εἶναι θανάτου).²⁰ A person can be guilty of a particular crime (2Ma. 13:6 ἱεροσυλίας ἔνοχον).²¹ The term can also be used in conjunction with some good thing such as Israel (Is. 54:17 ἔνοχοί σου), the law (James 2:10) or in this case of the body and blood of the Lord (since Jesus gives it to believers there seems no way we can take it to be in the first place a bad thing). When paired with some

¹⁹ BAGD, 267.2.

²⁰ Ibid., 267.2ba.

positive item it means "sin against."²² Christians who eat this bread and drink this cup unworthily sin against the body and blood of the Lord.

How can Paul make this connection? How can actions on the horizontal plane against one another (11:17-22) bring such dire consequences? Gibbs and Das both correctly pointed to 1Co. 10:16-17 as the answer.²³ There in making a point about food sacrificed to idols and idolatry, Paul uses evidence from the Lord's Supper in the rhetorical question: "The cup of blessing which we bless, isn't it the participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, isn't it the participation in the body of Christ?"²⁴

Paul can assume a positive answer (he introduces his question with *ὁὐχι*) as he uses the Lord's Supper in an illustration to make his point about idolatry.²⁵ He then adds the comment (10:17), "Because there is one bread, we many are one body, for we all partake from the one bread." With this statement:

Paul is teaching that the Lord's Supper sustains and renews the believers in their identity as the one body

²¹ Ibid., 267.2bβ.

²² Ibid., 267.2by.

²³ Gibbs, "An Exegetical Case," 160; Das, "1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited," 204.

²⁴ This translation follows Gibbs' judgment, "Rather, following the probabilities offered by Colwell's rule (cf. E.C. Colwell, "A Definite Rule for the Use of the Article in the Greek New Testament." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 52 (1933): 12-21), I take 'participation' as a definite noun, 'the participation.' For Paul, the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper are the participation in Christ's body and blood. He could say this of no other act" ("An Exegetical Case," 149).

²⁵ BDF, 427.

of Christ. One of the effects and purposes of the Eucharist is the preserving of the unity of the church. The grammar here is inescapable. There is not one clause with a causal sense, but *two* - "Because (ὅτι) there is one bread, for (causal γὰρ) all share from the one bread, we many are one body."²⁶

In the Lord's Supper Christians eat the body of Christ (*corpus verum*) and so become one body (*corpus mysticum*).²⁷

Das has tightened the connection between 10:16-17 and 11:17-34 by noting that in 10:17 Paul anticipates his argument in 1Co. 11. He states:

In fact, he was getting ahead of himself. This verse could easily be omitted from 1 Corinthians 10 without affecting the structure of Paul's argument. It is a *prolepsis*. In other words, it would be a mistake to read 1 Corinthians 10 apart from 1 Corinthians 10:17."²⁸

With this background in mind we can discern the connection between 11:27a (cf. 11:17-22) and 11:27b (cf. 11:23-26). It rests on what the Lord's Supper is (the body and blood of the Lord) and what it does (makes them one body). The Corinthians

²⁶ Gibbs, "An Exegetical Case," 152.

²⁷ Sasse states, "As this one bread binds Christians to the unity of the church, so the true body of the Lord, which is received in the Lord's Supper, makes the church to be the body of Christ. We must recall that according to the view of the apostolic age the church above all comes into view in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. When the heavenly food of the body of Christ goes into us, we at the same time go into this body" (Hermann Sasse, "The Lord's Supper in the New Testament" *We Confess the Sacraments*. tr. Norman Nagel. 49-97. [St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1985], 95).

At the same time we do not want to give the impression that Christians are made a part of the body of Christ *only* in the Lord's Supper. It also (and quite often in the first place) occurs in baptism (1Co. 12:13). The Lord's Supper then re-confirms this fact and provides a uniquely concrete and located manifestation of a Christian's membership in the body of Christ.

²⁸ Das, "1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited," 204; Fee agrees that "it is certainly arguable that it was also intended to anticipate both this argument and that of chap. 12" (*The First Epistle*, 564).

partake of the Lord's Supper even as they wrong one another and divisions (11:18) exist among them. In doing so they ignore that it is the **Lord's** Supper which they are eating and drinking. Their actions effectively deny, "are not in keeping with" the Lord's body and blood which make them one body. For this reason their actions on the horizontal plane (11:17-22) make them guilty of the body and blood of the Lord (the horizontal and vertical meet at the Lord's Supper).²⁹

Having stated the dire consequences of 11:27b, Paul now reacts in 11:28 (he uses the adversative *δὲ* just as he will in the parallel 11:31) with an instructional statement meant to guide them away from such misfortune. Christians must test/examine themselves (*δοκιμαζέτω*) and thus (*οὕτως*) eat from the bread and drink from the cup.³⁰ They must begin to examine themselves to make sure that they do not go on partaking unworthily such as currently is the case (11:17-22).³¹

²⁹ Theissen has captured the sense of this section with the statement, "The sacrament is treated as being in a taboo zone, where violating the norm brings with it incalculable disaster ... The elements are, for Paul, more than graphic representations. Bread and wine become something special in the Lord's Supper. They must be distinguished from other food. They have a numinous quality. If it is ignored, illness and death threaten" ("Social Integration," 164-165). While Theissen uses different nomenclature from that usually employed in Lutheran discussions on the Lord's Supper (and we probably would question the freight of some of his terms), he has vividly stated the significance of Jesus' body and blood in the Sacrament for those partaking unworthily.

³⁰ The verb *δοκιμάζω* means "to test or examine" (*BAGD*, 202, 1.; *LSJ*, 442; *MM*, 167; cf. 2Co. 13:5; Gal. 6:4; 1Th. 5:21). The verb also applies to something which has past the test and so is "approved" (*BAGD*, 202.2.). We have already seen Paul use the adjectival form of this root in 11:19.

³¹ Bornkamm has quite plausibly suggested that Paul's discussion derives from the *μαρναθά* element of the church's liturgy (cf. 1Co. 16:22 *ἀνάθεμα*; *Did.* 10:6 "If anyone is holy let him come. If anyone is not, let him repent.") ("Lord's Supper and Church," 169, 171..)

In 11:29 Paul provides a further explanation (γάρ) of what this means by laying out the implications of being guilty (ἔνοχος) of Christ's body and blood, and by further defining ἀναξίως. He says that the one who eats and drinks, eats and drinks judgment to himself (κρίμα ἑαυτῷ) if he does not discern the body (μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα). As we noted when first looking at the overall structure of the 11:27-32 (pg. 108-109), Paul organizes 11:27-29 via the use of a chiasm. He provides a further explanation to 11:28 on the basis of the general principle stated in 11:27 (hence the chiasm). The explanation in 11:29 "restates" 11:27 while also sharpening the focus further.

The noun κρίμα stands as a natural chiastic pair to 11:27b's ἔνοχος. Those partaking unworthily are not only guilty, but they also receive judgment.³² Paul will provide more details on this when he moves to the specific discussion in 11:32-34.

³² This noun, like its verbal cognate κρίνω, can be used in a variety of contexts. It can occur within the semantic domain of thought/decision (*L&N* place it in domain 30 "Think" and sub-domain 30G "To distinguish, to evaluate, to judge"; 363-4; *BAGD*, 450.2; cf. κρίμα Rom. 11:33). In the forensic/juridical domain (*L&N* place it in domain 56 "Courts and legal procedures" and sub-domain 56E "Judge, condemn, acquit"; 555-556) it can indicate the verdict (Rom. 5:16; *BAGD*, 450.4a; *LSJ*, 995.I.3) or the verdict with emphasis on the punishment which follows the verdict (2Pt. 2:3; *BAGD*, 450.4b). Paul's analysis in 11:17-22 left little doubt as to whether the Corinthians were in the wrong or not. In addition, 11:30 quite obviously describes the punishment being inflicted. For this reason we should take κρίμα here as the punishment which follows the verdict.

The verb κρίνω which will occur in 11:31-32 also occurs in these same semantic domains. In the semantic domain of thought it can mean "judge, consider" (1Co. 11:13; *BAGD*, 451.2; *LSJ*, 996. II.9; *L&N* sub-domain 30G; 363-4). In the forensic/juridical domain (*L&N* sub-domain 56E; 555-6) it can indicate the process of coming to a guilty verdict (Act 23:3; *BAGD*, 451.4a) or the verdict and punishment which follows (Rom. 2:12 - note the parallel ἀπολούνται; *BAGD*, 452.4b).

He indicates that those eating and drinking will eat and drink to judgment if they do not discern the body (μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα). Weiss questioned the placement of the participle and so denied that it was conditional (he instead opted for causal).³³ However, in doing so he missed the crucial role which μὴ διακρίνων plays in 11:27-32. The participle stands at the very heart of the passage in both structure and theology.

The phrase μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα stands at the center of the structure in 11:27-32. It provides the A' member of the first chiasm, thereby ending 11:27-29 and standing in the middle of 11:27-32. In addition, along with 11:31's διακρίνομεν it stands at the center of the second chiasm in 11:29 and 11:31. Its placement at the end of 11:29 also accentuates the phrase. As Neuenzeit has noticed it grammatically and stylistically lags behind and thereby receives added emphasis.³⁴ The textual tradition bears witness to this tension in that some manuscripts insert an ἀναξίως after πίνων.³⁵ One must wait until the end in order to understand the sentence.

The verb διακρίνω itself, and two of its contextually shaded meanings play a vital role in 11:29 and 11:31. The verb can mean to "render a decision" in a legal case.³⁶ It can also function within the semantic domain of "Thought" (L&N place it in domain

³³ *Der Erste Korintherbrief*, 291.

³⁴ *Das Herrenmahl*, 37.

³⁵ \aleph^2 C³ D F G Ψ 1881 Maj. latt sy

³⁶ BAGD, 185.1d; MM, 150; LSJ, 399.III; cf. 1Co. 6:5.

30 and sub-domain 30G "To distinguish, to evaluate, to judge").³⁷ Within this usage it carries two slightly different nuances. In classical Greek it often means "to separate or part."³⁸ By extension it can be used meaning "to judge that there is a difference or distinction."³⁹ It can also function in the more general sense of "to judge carefully, to evaluate carefully."⁴⁰

In its present setting, "discern, distinguish, differentiate" provides the best translation for διακρίνων.⁴¹ Paul chiastically pairs it with ἀναξίως ("corresponding to, in keeping with"). Christians must differentiate and distinguish (recognize) Christ's body eaten in the Sacrament in order to eat it in a manner which corresponds to and is in keeping with what it is (the true body of Christ) and what it does (makes them one body). In this emphasis the verse makes the same point as its chiastic pair, 11:27.⁴²

³⁷ *L&N*, 364.

³⁸ *LSJ*, 399.I.

³⁹ *L&N*, 364, 30.113; *BAGD*, 185.1b; *MM*, 150; *LSJ*, 399.II. This distinguishing occurs between various things or people - LXX Ez. 34:17, 20; Act. 15:9; Ja. 2:4.

⁴⁰ *L&N*, 364, 30.109; *BAGD*, 185.1β - However *BAGD* errs when it places 11:29 along with 11:31 under this meaning (see discussion on pp. 129-131); *MM*, 150. It is used this way in LXX Job 12:11, 23:10 (in both places it translates פָּחַח - "to test, examine, try"; *BDB*, 103), Mt. 16:3.

⁴¹ This analysis independently arrives at the same conclusion reached by Ernst Käsemann, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord's Supper" *Essays on New Testament Themes*. 108-135. tr. W.J. Montague. (Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, Inc. 1964), 127; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 202; Fee, *The First Epistle*, 564; Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 37; Gibbs, "An Exegetical Case," 159.

⁴² Gibbs, "An Exegetical Case," 158, judged that "verse 29 repeats the message of verse 27." In this statement he has captured the chiastic parallelism. However, the assessment is not entirely accurate. 11:29 repeats the basic thought, but it also advances and sharpens it. As Neuenzeit has observed, 11:29 repeats 11:27 in that both speak about the condition of those partaking at the Lord's Supper (*Das Herrenmahl*, 38). However while 11:27 speaks about being guilty, 11:29 says that it leads to judgment (Neuenzeit's,

The word *σῶμα* has as its primary referent the *corpus verum* of Christ which Christians eat in the Lord's Supper.⁴³ Nothing in the context serves as a textual marker to indicate that *σῶμα*'s primary referent shifts from the sacramental to ecclesiastical body.⁴⁴ We can expect that Paul's resolution of the problem (cf. 11:17-22) in 11:27ff. to pick up and carry on the preceding piece of evidence (11:23-26) - and this is exactly what Paul does.⁴⁵

In his analysis, Das drew attention to the rhetorical structure of 11:27-29. As he said:

With regard to the rhetorical structure of the text, Paul begins verse 29 with a *γὰρ* demanding that this verse be understood in the light of what immediately preceded. So also, verse 28 is linked to verse 27 by the connective *δέ*. When Paul uses "body" in this verse, he is building on an already developed argument, which he has introduced in the immediately preceding verses. The key is his consistent use of the term "body." Thus the meaning of the word must be the same, since it is all of the same argument.⁴⁶

We can build on this observation and further strengthen its force by noting that the rhetorical structure occurs in a chiasmic pattern. In its very structure 11:27-29 sees 11:27 and 11:29 bound together. Just as 11:27 deals with the body and blood of the Lord which Christians can become guilty of by eating

"Verdammungsurteil" is too strong - Paul doesn't speak of condemnation until 11:32) (Ibid.).

⁴³ Gibbs, "An Exegetical Case," 159; Das, "1 Corinthians 11:17-34," 198-200; Betz, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter*, 106-7; I. Howard Marshall, *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*. (Somerset: The Paternoster Press, 1980), 114; Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 38; Barrett, *The First Epistle*, 275; Pfitzner, *First Corinthians*, 185) come to this same conclusion.

⁴⁴ Gibbs, "An Exegetical Case," 159.

⁴⁵ Betz, *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit*, 107.

⁴⁶ Das, "1 Corinthians 11:17-34," 199.

unworthily, so also 11:29 deals with the body of the Lord which Christians eat in the supper.⁴⁷ The text provides no warrant for denying the *corpus verum* as the primary referent of σῶμα.

That being said, we should not miss the "ecclesiastical undertone" of the passage.⁴⁸ The very logic of Paul's argumentation leads us to see that in σῶμα we have a double entendre. However, it is a double entendre which moves in **one** direction - from *corpus verum* to *corpus mysticum*. Paul's argumentation in 11:27-29 operates on the basis of 10:16-17.

The Corinthians come together at the Lord' Supper with divisions and sin on the horizontal plane, yet in such eating and drinking they are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord (11:27). They eat and drink to judgment if they do not discern the body (11:29). As we observed in 11:27 Paul makes these statements because it is the Lord's body (*corpus verum*) which makes them one body (*corpus mysticum*). The horizontal and vertical intersect at the body and blood of Christ in the

⁴⁷ Paul probably omits "and the blood" in 11:29 for stylistic reasons (Ibid., 200). "Body" then simply functions as a synecdoche (Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 38). In 10:16 Paul reverses the order of cup and bread in order to place the bread closer to the point he will make in 10:17. The bread is the body of Christ and Paul uses this one loaf to uniquely show how the *corpus verum* makes the partakers *corpus mysticum*. One remains unsure whether Paul also includes the Lord's blood in this understanding. Ignatius of Antioch expresses a very similar thought but does so on the basis of Christ's blood. He instructs the Philadelphians to, "Be eager to celebrate the one eucharist, for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ and one cup for being made one by his blood (ἕνωσιν τοῦ αἵματος αὐτοῦ)" (Phild. 4:1). Elert comments "that for both Ignatius and Paul the fellowship of the Sacrament did not derive from the coming together of the participants but from the fact that the Eucharist is "the one flesh of our Lord ... the one cup for being made one by His blood" (Werner Elert, *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries*. tr. N.E. Nagel. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966], 26.

⁴⁸ Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 38.

Sacrament. People do not discern the sacramental body (what it is and does) when they commune with divisions and sin in the ecclesiastical body.⁴⁹

We can now summarize the argument in 11:27-29. The Corinthians must make sure that they are not eating and drinking unworthily (*ἀναξίως*; 11:27). To this end they should examine themselves (*δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτόν*; 11:28) to see if they are discerning the body since unworthy eating and drinking occurs when Christians do not discern the body (*μὴ διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα*; 11:29). They must distinguish what it is and what it does. It is the body and blood of the Lord (*corpus verum*) which makes them one body (*corpus mysticum*) (10:16-17).

In this particular instance the Corinthians apparently *know* (intellectually) that in the Sacrament they eat and drink the true body and blood of Christ (cf. 10:1-11; 10:16; 11:23-26). However, by their actions on the horizontal plane (11:17-22) they blatantly ignore and reject what the Lord's Supper is and what it does. They ignore the theological reality inherent in the Lord's

⁴⁹ Das ("1 Corinthians 11:17-34," 200-1 and personal communication) indicates that 11:29's τὸ σῶμα has no secondary ecclesiastical referent or double entendre. This position seems difficult to understand in the light of how 10:16-17 serves as the "logical hinge" in 11:17-34. The Lord's sacramental body inherently involves the ecclesiastical body and so interacts with the horizontal plane. The situation which has produced this discussion is a problem on the *horizontal* plane (11:17-22) and we therefore still have the church in the background of 11:27-32's discussion. Das' position appears to stem from a fear that any sort of ecclesiastical reference weakens the primary sacramental one. In fact, the double entendre *magnifies* the importance of the primary sacramental reference. *Only* the Lord's *sacramental body* makes them one body, and makes the argument work.

Supper. Eating and drinking the Lord's body and blood has implications which no other eating and drinking ever does.

Eating and drinking the Lord's body and blood makes them one body (10:16-17). Yet this blessed result also works in the reverse direction with destructive consequences. Division and sin in the ecclesiastical body have no place at the Lord's Supper. According to Paul, one cannot bring these things along and then eat and drink the Lord's body and blood - the very thing which makes Christians one body. This action indicates callous disregard for the Sacrament. It occurs when people do not discern the body and blood of the Lord - what it is (10:16; 11:23-26) and what it does (10:17). Thus διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα theologially stands at the heart of Paul's instruction.

III. Detailed analysis of 11:30-32

At 11:30 Paul moves to the second half of the structure. With διὰ τοῦτο, he draws a conclusion. Up until this point he has discussed in general terms "how things work" in the Lord's Supper. Now he shifts and addresses the specific circumstances which are unfolding in Corinth. Because of their unworthy eating and drinking (11:17-22) many among them are sick and ill, and a number have died (ἐν ὑμῖν πολλοὶ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἄρρωστοὶ καὶ κοιμῶνται ἱκανοί).⁵⁰

⁵⁰ Paul normally uses ἀσθενής to indicate weakness in faith or morals (1Co. 8:9; BAGD, 115.2b). ἄρρωστος is a Pauline hapax which elsewhere indicates "sick, ill" (BAGD, 109). κοιμάω means sleep, but was also a common euphemism for death (BAGD, 437.2; MM, 349-350). All the other occurrences in Paul indicate death and we should take it in that manner here as well. Paired with death, we should then take the two adjectives to indicate physical illness as they commonly do in the Gospels (cf. Lk. 10:9; Mk. 6:5). The two should probably be taken as a hendiadys. Betz has noted that ἐν ὑμῖν πολλοὶ...ἱκανοί brackets the

Verse 11:30 stands as the specific parallel to the general statement in 11:27. The general "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" (and its chiastic pair, "eating and drinking to judgment" (11:29) find their concrete and located manifestation in 11:30's illness and death. The form which the κρίμα takes emphasizes that the issue revolves around the body and blood of Christ. As Betz observes:

Die Art des Gerichtes aber, wie es der Apostel in V. 30 beschreibt, enthüllt nochmals die somatische Realpräsenz des Leibes und Blutes Jesu als den Angelpunkt des Abschnittes. Denn das Gericht über die unangemessene Kommunion wirkt sich im Bereich des Leibes aus.⁵¹

After expressing these dreadful consequences (cf. 11:27), Paul reacts in the same manner as 11:28 - he expresses the need for self-examination.⁵² Verse 11:31 introduces διακρίνω for the

sentence in the positions of emphasis (first and last) - "this is occurring among **you**" (*Die Eucharistie in der Zeit*, 108).

⁵¹ Ibid. Sasse states in a similar manner, "In place of this characteristic formulation one could scarcely put a statement like: 'That is why many have not had success in their work, and some have become quite poor.' The Lord punishes *physically* those who by unworthy participation in the Lord's Supper are guilty of profaning the body and blood of the Lord" ("The Lord's Supper in the New Testament" 76).

⁵² Unfortunately in this case it is not going on. Paul expresses this by means of a present contrary to fact conditional statement. They are not presently examining themselves and so they are currently being judged. Note the consistent use of present stem (present and imperfect) verb forms indicating the ongoing nature of this activity (cf. Burton, *Moods and Tenses*, 9; 21; Voelz, *Fundamental Greek Grammar*, 66-70).

second time.⁵³ It provides the B' member of the second chiasm and continues the paronomasia.⁵⁴

The structure and context in 11:27-32 compel us to translate *διακρίνω* differently in 11:29 and 11:31. We must note that 11:28 (*δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτόν*) and 11:31 (*εἰ δὲ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν*) stand parallel to one another.⁵⁵ On the other hand, *διακρίνω* in 11:29 stands within the chiasm of 11:27 and 11:29. In 11:31 the verb takes a reflexive pronoun as its object (just as *δοκιμάζω* does in 11:28) while in 11:29 it takes *σῶμα* (*corpus verum*) as the object.⁵⁶

It has been mentioned earlier that in addition to "discern, differentiate, distinguish," *διακρίνω* can also mean to "judge carefully, evaluate carefully" (pg. 118). The verb *δοκιμάζω* has this meaning in 11:28 ("judge, examine, test").

⁵³ Paul shifts from 2nd plural to 1st plural in 11:31-32. Fee states, "He also reverts once more to the first person plural - in this case, as often elsewhere, as a means of identifying with them in these theological statements, even if he has had nothing to do with their behavioral aberration. Cf., e.g., 2:7, 5:7-8, 6:3, 8:8, 10:16" (*The First Epistle*, 566).

⁵⁴ A 11:29 *κρίμα*; B 11:29 *διακρίνων*; B' 11:31 *διεκρίνομεν*; A' 11:31 *ἐκρινόμεθα*. The paronomasia based on *κριν-* (cf. 11:28's "guilty," *ἔνοχος*) carries the theme of judgment from the general discussion in 11:27-29 into the specific discussion in 11:30-32.

⁵⁵ In both cases Paul has just reported a statement about judgment. 11:27 (in the general half) talks about being guilty of the Lord's body and blood while 11:30 (in the particular half) talks about the present state of that guilt among them - some are sick and have died. In both 11:28 and 11:31 Paul reacts with *δὲ* + examining verb *δοκιμαζέτω/διεκρίνομεν* + reflexive pronoun *ἑαυτόν/ἑαυτοὺς*. He expresses the action to be taken in order to avoid this trouble. Thus we see that the verbs in 11:28 and 11:31 stand parallel in both logic and structure. Gibbs, 159, observed that, "The sense of verse 31 ('If we examined ourselves') it [sic] is directly parallel in meaning to verse 28, *δοκιμαζέτω*, 'Let a person examine himself...,' and not to verse 29" but did not address the specifics of why they are parallel.

⁵⁶ The prior discussion has removed the possibility that *σῶμα* has the ecclesiastical body as its primary referent. Gibbs observed that *διακρίνω* in 11:29 and 11:31 cannot be used to "overturn the view that 'body' in 11:29

Since 11:31's διακρίνω is parallel to δοκιμάζω in 11:28, we should translate διακρίνω here as "judge" in the sense of "evaluate, test."⁵⁷ Both verses react to judgment with a call to self-evaluation.⁵⁸

In essence, Paul says the same thing in 11:31 as he did in 11:28 and so we should translate 11:31 like 11:28. This analysis has independently arrived at the same conclusion offered by Conzelmann, Käsemann, Neuenzeit and Gibbs (1995, 159).⁵⁹

Paul could have just as easily written ἐδοκιμάζομεν in 11:31. He does not do so because he is using the κριν- paronomasia which he began in 11:29 and will carry through to 11:34. Within the second chiasm διακρίνω evokes the recognition that the content of self-examination (11:31 εἰ δὲ ἑαυτοὺς διεκρίνομεν; cf. 11:28 δοκιμαζέτω δὲ ἄνθρωπος ἑαυτόν) is discerning the body (11:29 διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα). The chiasmic word play shows the link between these two items (self

refers to the sacramental body of Christ" ("An Exegetical Case," 159). The structural evidence provided here simply makes this more certain.

⁵⁷ By the same token we must also be careful not to overdraw the distinction. "Examining and testing" obviously involve "distinguishing and differentiating" (and vice versa). This shading makes the chiasmic play on words in 11:31 very effective. However, the objects taken in 11:29 and 11:28/31 lead us to make a differentiation. 1Co. 11:29 deals with an item which has no parallel and which must be eaten in a manner corresponding to it (cf. 11:27's chiasmic ἀναξίως). The emphasis falls on the need to distinguish/differentiate what it is and what it does (10:16-17). On the other hand since 11:31 parallels 11:28, we translate διακρίνω in a manner like δοκιμάζω (a meaning which διακρίνω can easily bear).

⁵⁸ This alternation of διακρίνω and δοκιμάζω is not without precedent. In Job 12:11 Job says, "Does not the ear test words as the mouth tastes its food?" (הֲלֹא-אֵזְנוֹן מְלִין תִּבְחַן וְחָךְ אֹכֵל יִשְׁעֵם-לֵי:). The LXX translates this as οὐς μὲν γὰρ ῥήματα διακρίνει λάρυγξ δὲ σίτα γεύεται. Again in Job 34:3 we find כִּי-אֵזְנוֹן מְלִין תִּבְחַן וְחָךְ יִשְׁעֵם לְאֹכֵל: δοκιμάζει καὶ λάρυγξ γεύεται βρώσιν.

⁵⁹ Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 203; Käsemann, "The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord's Supper," 127; Neuenzeit, *Das Herrenmahl*, 37; Gibbs, "An Exegetical Case," 159.

examination is about discerning the body), while 11:27-32's structure (the parallelism of 11:28 and 11:31, and the second chiasm) links this specific discussion (11:30-32) back to the general one in 11:27-29.

Paul says in 11:31 that if they were examining themselves (and so discerning the body), they would not be judged (ἐκρινόμεθα). Like κρίμα in 11:29 this refers to the physical distress which they are currently experiencing (mentioned in 11:30). Now in 11:32, Paul provides a striking qualification. When they are judged/punished (κρινόμενοι) in the manner of 11:30, it is done by the Lord as chastening and disciplining (παιδευόμεθα) in order that Corinthians might not be condemned with the world (ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν).⁶⁰

Paul plays on the words κρίνω and κατακρίνω in 11:31-2. The verb κατακρίνω and its cognate κατάκριμα provide an intensified version of κρίνω. It indicates a guilty verdict and especially the punishment which follows the verdict.⁶¹

Fortunately the contextual elements in 1 Co. 11:32 make interpretation quite easy. Paul says that he doesn't want them to be condemned "with the world" (σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ). Paul's use elsewhere (especially in 1 Corinthians; cf. 1:20-28) identifies

⁶⁰ Note that 11:32 provides a parallel to 11:30 (11:32's κρινόμενοι δὲ ὑπὸ [τοῦ] κυρίου παιδευόμεθα = 11:30's διὰ τοῦτο ἐν ἡμῖν πολλοὶ ἀσθενεῖς καὶ ἄρρωστοὶ καὶ κοιμῶνται ἱκανοί). In 11:30 Paul mentions sickness and death. Here in 11:32 he states the same thing from a theological perspective.

⁶¹ BAGD, 412. As noted earlier, κρίνω/ κρίμα can function in this manner (in addition to others). However, κατακρίνω/κατάκριμα places emphasis exclusively on the guilty verdict and particularly on the punishment which follows.

the world as that fallen sphere where sin is at work and man is under *κατάκριμα* because of Adam's sin (Rom. 5:16,18).⁶² On the Last Day God will determine this with utter finality (Rom. 2:5).

Through this juxtaposition of terms Paul indicates that God currently deals with them as *Christians* in the hopes of bringing them to repentance and a change in behavior (*παιδευόμεθα, ἵνα μὴ σὺν τῷ κόσμῳ κατακριθῶμεν*). If they continue on this course of action, they could end up classed with the world and its judgment on the Last Day. We have already examined Paul's concluding practical instructions (11:33-34) in chapter 2. There Paul told the Corinthians to eat at home if they are hungry and need to satisfy that hunger at home instead of arriving at the Lord's Supper (i.e., communal meal and sacramental eating) with that on their mind. The *Lord's Supper* is about Jesus' body and blood, and their behavior at the Supper must reflect that fact.

Summary

In conclusion we will summarize the more noteworthy contributions which this study has made to the understanding of 1Co. 11:17-34. Chapter 1 demonstrated that in 11:19 with the words "for also" (*γὰρ καί*) Paul adds a second reason for his believing the report about *σχίσματα* amongst the Corinthians (11:18). He states that it is necessary that there be divisions in order that the approved might become manifest. The evidence

⁶² Hermann Sasse, "κοσμέω, κόσμος κ.τ.λ." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* vol. II. ed. Gerhard Kittel. trans. Geffery W. Bromiley. 867-898.

strongly indicates that in doing so he draws upon an accepted apostolic truth which associated *σχίσματα* and *αἵρέσεις* with the end times.

The two terms are neither synonyms nor is one a stronger term than the other. Instead *σχίσματα* emphasizes hostility and strife while *αἵρέσεις* emphasizes a group. The shift in terms corresponds to the shift toward the group, "the approved" (*οἱ δόκιμοι*) in 11:19.

Chapter 2 considered the opposing reconstructions offered by scholars in which some suggest a common meal - sacramental bread and cup order (M/LS) while others opt for a sacramental bread - common meal - sacramental cup order (B/M/C). The study showed that both positions have strengths and weaknesses and that neither proves superior on the basis of the available information.

With regard to 11:21's *προλάβανω* the study demonstrated that the lexical evidence strongly suggests a temporal translation ("take before"). The contextual factors surrounding 11:21 do not in any way contradict this decision. The most likely translations for both M/LS and B/M/C supply "take before" in 11:21 and "wait" or "welcome" for *ἐκδέχεσθε* in 11:33. "Take before" in M/LS employs the arrival of the poor as its point of reference while in B/M/C it utilizes the commencement of eating as the point of reference.

Chapter 3 concluded that the proclamation of 11:26 (καταγγέλλετε) involves both the words spoken in 11:23-25 and the body and blood of Christ eaten in the Lord's Supper. Verse 26 functions rhetorically to rivet attention on the very point 11:23-25 have made: Jesus' body and blood and their witness to Jesus' death. As Christians eat *this* bread and *this* cup, i.e., this body and this blood, they proclaim the Lord's death. The body and blood of Christ and its significance should guide the Corinthians' behavior, not their desire to eat a common meal.

Finally, chapter 4 illustrated Paul's craftsmanship as a writer in using careful structure and paranomasia in order to make his point. The chiasm noted in 11:27-29 shows that referent of body in 11:29's διακρίνων τὸ σῶμα remains the same sacramental body described in 11:27. A second chiasm in 11:29-31 and paranomasia based on the κριν- root uses διακρίνω a second time after the verb's first appearance in 11:29. The structure and logic of 11:31 demonstrate that the second instance should be translated just like 11:28's δοκιμαζέτω - "examine oneself." However, the second use of διακρίνω to expresses "examine" artfully evokes the content of that examination from the first time the verb appeared in 11:29 - "discerning the body."

Naturally this text has tremendous importance for communion practice in the church. We need recognize the corporate nature of the Lord's Supper which Paul emphasizes as he interlocks the horizontal dimension of 11:17-22/33-34 with the vertical

dimension of 11:23-32. Christians must recognize what the Lord's Supper is (the true body and blood of Christ) and what it does (makes them one body), and so διακρίνω the body. They need to repent and resolve divisions before coming together in the Lord's Supper. On the personal level this will at times involve abstaining from communing together until reconciliation has been achieved.

At a confessional level it will mean that Christians often will not commune together in order to avoid bringing their divisions to the altar (the place according to Paul where, above all, divisions *do not* belong; 1Co. 10:16-17; 11:27-29).⁶³ They will at the same time work mightily to resolve divisions so that the day arrives when all can come together at the Lord's Supper. Where this has not happened, they will honestly acknowledge this fact and not commune together - even as they encourage and recognize each other as fellow Christians.⁶⁴

⁶³ Elert's *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries* remains the classic work on how the church has historically taken this seriously and practiced it.

⁶⁴ If this applies to Christians in general, then how much more it must be the concern of called and ordained servants of the Word who "when they administer the sacraments, do so in the stead and place of Christ" (*cum sacramenta porrigunt, Christi vice et loco porrigunt*; Apology 7.28).

Bibliography

- Achelis, Hans and Johs. Flemming. *Die Ältesten Quellen des Orientalischen Kirchenrechts*, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, n.s., 10, pt. 2 (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1904).
- Barrett, C.K. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1968.
- Bauer, Walter, William F. Arndt, F. Wilbur Gingrich, and Fredrick Danker. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1979.
- Betz, Johannes. *Die Eucharistie in der Zeit der griechischen Väter - Band II/1*. Freiburg: Herder, 1961
- Blass, F., A Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1961.
- Bornkamm, Gunther. "Lord's Supper and Church in Paul" tr. Paul L. Hammer. *Early Christian Experience*. 123-160. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969.
- Bornkamm, Gunther. "On the Understanding of Worship" tr. Paul L. Hammer. *Early Christian Experience*. 161-179. New York: Harper & Row, Publishers, 1969.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Brown, Francis, S.R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. *The New Brown-Driver-Briggs-Gesenius Hebrew and English Lexicon*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1979.
- Burchard, Christoph. "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" *New Testament Studies* 33 (1987): 102-134.
- Cabie, Robert. "Vol. II - The Eucharist" *The Church At Prayer - An Introduction to the Liturgy*. ed. Aime Georges Martimort. tr. Matthew J. O'Connel. Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1986.
- Chemnitz, Martin. *The Lord's Supper*. tr. J.A.O. Preus. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1979.

- Chenderlin, Fritz. "Do This as My Memorial" - The Semantic and Conceptual Background and Value of *Ἀνάμνησις* in 1 Corinthians 11:24-25. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982.
- Clancy, Robert A.D. "The Old Testament Roots of Remembrance in the Lord's Supper," *Concordia Journal* ?? (1993): 35-50.
- Commission on Theology and Church Relations of The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod. *Admission to the Lord's Supper - Basics of Biblical and Confessional Teaching*. St. Louis: Commission on Theology and Church Relations of The Lutheran Church - Missouri Synod, 1999.
- Conzelmann, Hans. *1 Corinthians*. tr. James W. Leitch. ed. George W. MacRae. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1975.
- Craigie, Peter C. *Psalms 1-50*. Waco: Word Books, Publisher, 1983.
- Das, A. Andrew. "1 Corinthians 11:17-34 Revisited," *Concordia Theological Quarterly* 62 (1998): 187-208.
- Deiss, Lucien. *Springtime of the Liturgy - Liturgical Texts of the First Four Centuries*. tr. Matthew J. O'Connell. Colleagueville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1979.
- Deissmann, Adolf. *Light From the Ancient East - The New Testament Illustrated by Recently Discovered Texts of the Graeco-Roman World*. 1927. tr. Lionel R. M. Strachan. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson Publishers, 1995.
- De Simone, R.J. "Justin" *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*. vol. 1. ed. Angelo Di Berardino. tr. Adrian Walford. 462-464. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Die Sibyllinischen Weissagungen*. ed. and tr. J.H. Friedlieb. Leipzig: T.O. Weigel, 1852.
- Dix, Dom Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. London: A & C Black, 1945.
- Elert, Werner. *Eucharist and Church Fellowship in the First Four Centuries*. tr. N.E. Nagel. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1966.
- Elert, Werner. *The Lord's Supper Today*. tr. Werner Bertram. St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1973.

- Elze, Martin. "Häresie und Einheit der Kirche im 2. Jh.," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 71 (1974): 389-409.
- Engberg-Pedersen, Troels. "Proclaiming the Lord's Death: 1 Corinthians 11:17-34 and the Forms of Paul's Theological Argument," *Society of Biblical Literature 1991 Seminar Papers*. ed. Eugene H. Lovering. 592-617. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1991.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1987.
- Funk, Franz Xaver. *Die Apostolischen Konstitutionen - Eine Litterar-Historische Untersuchung*. 1891. Reprint, Frankfurt/Main: Minerva GmbH, 1970.
- Gaventa, Beverly R. "'You Proclaim the Lord's Death': 1 Corinthians 11:26 and Paul's Understanding of Worship" *Review and Expositor* 80 (1983) 377-87.
- Gibbs, Jeffrey A. "An Exegetical Case for Close(d) Communion: 1 Corinthians 10:14-22; 11:17-34," *Concordia Journal* 21 (1995): 148-163.
- Gill, David. "Trapezomata: A Neglected Aspect of Greek Sacrifice," *Harvard Theological Review* 67 (1974): 117-137.
- Gooch, Peter D. *Dangerous Food - 1 Corinthians 8-10 in Its Context*. Waterloo, Ontario: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993.
- Hartley, John E. *Leviticus*. Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1992.
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the other Greek versions of the Old Testament*. 2 vols. Graz, Austria: Akademische Druck - u. Verlagsanstalt, 1975.
- Hofius, Otfried. "Herrenmahl und Herrenmahlsparadosis: Erwägungen zu 1Kor 11,23b-25," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 85 (1988): 371-408.
- Horsley, G.H.R. "Invitations to the kline of Sarapis" *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity Vol. 1 - A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1976*. Macquarie University, 1981.

Index Patristicus sive Clavis Patrum Apostolicorum Operum.
ed. Edgar J. Goodspeed. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson
Publishers, 1993.

Irschmer, Johannes and Georg Strecker. "The Pseudo-
Clementines" *New Testament Apocrypha*, vol. 2, *Writings
Relating to the Apostles, Apocalypses and Related Subjects.*
Rev. ed. ed. Wilhelm Schneemelcher. tr. R. McL. Wilson. 483-
581. Louisville: John Knox Press, 1992.

Jasper, R.C.D. and G.J. Cuming. *Prayers of the Eucharist:
Early and reformed.* Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press,
1990.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus.* tr.
Norman Perrin. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1966.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Unknown Sayings of Jesus.* tr.
Reginald H. Fuller. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957.

Johanny, Raymond. "Ignatius of Antioch" *The Eucharist of the
Early Christians.* tr. Matthew J. O'Connell. 48-70. New York:
Pueblo Publishing Company, 1978.

Jones, Douglas. "ἀναμνησις in the LXX and the Interpretation
of 1 Cor. XI. 25," *Journal of Theological Studies* 6 (1955):
183-191.

Joüon, Paul. *A Grammar of Biblical Hebrew.* 2 vols. trans. &
rev. T. Muraoka. Rome: Editrice Pontificio Istituto Biblico,
1996.

Just, Arthur A. *Luke 9:51-24:53.* St. Louis: Concordia
Publishing House, 1997.

Justin Martyr, *Iustini Martyrij Dialogus Cum Tryphone.* ed.
Miroslav Marcovich. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter, 1997.

Käsemann, Ernst. "The Pauline Doctrine of the Lord's Supper"
Essays on New Testament Themes. 108-135. tr. W.J. Montague.
Naperville, IL: Alec R. Allenson, Inc. 1964.

Kelly, J.N.D. *Early Christian Creeds.* 3rd ed. Essex: Longman
Group, 1972.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. *Psalms 1-59 - A Commentary.* tr. Hilton
C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1988.

- Lactantius. *Divine Institutions*. Bk. 4, ed. Pierre Monat. Sources Chretiennes, no. 377. Paris: Les Editions Du Cerf, 1992.
- Lampe, G.W.H. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961.
- Lampe, Peter. "The Corinthian Eucharistic Dinner Party: Exegesis of a Cultural Context (1 Cor. 11:17-34)," *Affirmation* 4, 2 (1991): 1-15.
- Leon-Dufour, Xavier. *Sharing the Eucharistic Bread - The Witness of the New Testament*. tr. Matthew J. O'Connell. New York: Paulist Press, 1987.
- Liddell, Henry George and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.
- Lietzmann, D. Hans. *An Die Korinther I, II*. rev. W.G. Kümmel. HNT 9. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Peter Siebeck), 1949.
- Lietzmann, Hans. *Mass and Lord's Supper - A Study in the History of the Liturgy with Introduction and Further Inquiry by Robert Douglas Richardson*. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979.
- Loi, V. "Lactantius" *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*. vol. 1. ed. Angelo Di Berardino. tr. Adrian Walford. 4469-470. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Longenecker, Richard N. *Galatians*. Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1990.
- Louw, Johannes P. and Eugene A. Nida. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament - Based on Semantic Domains*. vol. 1. 2ed. New York: United Bible Societies, 1989.
- MacMullen, Ramsay. *Paganism in the Roman Empire*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1981.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *Last Supper and Lord's Supper*. Somerset, Eng.: The Paternoster Press, 1980.
- Martial, *Epigrams*. Vol. 1. Loeb Classical Library. ed. and tr. D.R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1993.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians - The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.

- Meinertz, Max. "σχίσμα und αἵρεσις im Neuen Testament," *Biblische Zeitschrift* NF 1 (1957): 114-118.
- Moule, C.F.D. "A Reconsideration of the context of *Maranatha*," *New Testament Studies* 8 (1959-1960): 307-310.
- Moulton, James Hope and George Milligan. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1930.
- Muraoka, Takamitsu. *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint - Keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books, 1998.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *St. Paul's Corinth - Texts and Archaeology*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1983.
- Nautin, P. "Didymus the Blind, of Alexandria" *Encyclopedia of the Early Church*. vol. 1. ed. Angelo Di Berardino. tr. Adrian Walford. 235-236. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Neuenzeit, Paul. *Das Herrenmahl - Studien zur paulinischen Eucharistieauffassung*. München: Kösel-Verlag, 1960.
- Niederwimmer, Kurt. *The Didache - A Commentary*. tr. Linda M. Maloney. ed. Harold W. Attridge. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1998.
- Origenis Hexaplorum Quae Supersunt sive Verterum Interpretum Graecorum in Totum Vetus Testamentum Fragmenta*. Vol. II. ed. F. Field. 1875. Reprint, Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1964.
- Paulsen, Henning. "Schisma und Haresie - Untersuchungen zu 1 Kor 11, 18.19," *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche* 79 (1982): 180-211.
- Pfitzner, V.C. *First Corinthians*. Adelaide: Lutheran Publishing House, 1982.
- Pfitzner, Victor C. "Proclaiming the Name: Cultic Narrative and Eucharistic Proclamation in First Corinthians," *Lutheran Theological Journal* 25 (1991): 15-25.
- Raabe, P. R., "Deliberate Ambiguity in the Psalms," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 110 (1991): 213-227.

- Resch, Alferd. *Agrapha - Aussercanonische Schriftfragmente, Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, n.s., 15, pt. 3.4* (Leipzig: J.C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1906).
- Ridderbos, Herman. *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*. tr. John Richard De Witt. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1975.
- Roberts, Colin and Theodore C. Skeat. "The Guild of Hypsistos," *Harvard Theological Review* 29 (1936): 39-88.
- Robertson, A.T. *A Grammar of the New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*. Nashville: Broadman Press, 1934.
- Rordorf, Willy. "The Didache" *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*. tr. Matthew J. O'Connell. 1-23. New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1978.
- Ross, William David. "Diodorus Siculus" *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 2ed. ed. N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard. 347. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Sasse, Hermann. *This is my body - Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar*. Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959.
- Sasse, Hermann. *We Confess the Sacraments*. tr. Norman Nagel. St. Louis: Concordia Pub. House, 1985.
- Schlier, Heinrich. "αἵρέομαι, κ.τ.λ." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* vol. I. ed. Gerhard Kittel. Trans. Geoffery W. Bromiley. 180-185. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1964.
- Schniewind, Julius. "ἄγγελια, κ.τ.λ." *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament* vol. I. ed. Gerhard Kittel. Trans. Geoffery W. Bromiley. 56-73. Grand Rapids, MI: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co., 1964.
- Schoedel, William R.. *Ignatius of Antioch - A Commentary on the Letters of Ignatius of Antioch*. ed. Helmut Koester. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985.
- Smith, Dennis E. "Meals and Morality in Paul and His World" *Society of Biblical Literature 1981 Seminar Papers*. ed. Kent Harold Richards. 319-339. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1981.

Strack Herman L. and Paul Billerbeck. *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch - Dritter Band: Die Briefe Des Neuen Testaments und Die Offenbarung Johannis*. München: C.H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuch Handlung, 1954.

Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum. vol. 3. ed. Wilhelm Dittenberger. Hildesheim: Georg Olms, 1960.

Tate, Marvin E. *Psalms 51-100*. Dallas: Word Books, Publisher, 1990.

Theissen, Gerd. "Social Integration and Sacramental Activity" *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity* ed. & tr. John H. Schutz. 145-174. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982.

Turner, Nigel. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, Vol. III Syntax*. Edinburgh, Scotland: T&T Clark, 1963.

Voelz, James W. *Fundamental Greek Grammar*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1993.

Voelz, James W. "The Language of the New Testament." *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, 25/2. Berlin: De Gruyter, 1984. 893-977.

Voelz, James W. *What Does This Mean? Principles of Biblical Interpretation in the Post-Modern World*. St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1995.

Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Publishing House, 1996.

Walton, Francis Redding. "Asclepius." *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 2ed. ed. N.G.L. Hammond and H.H. Scullard. 129-130. London: Oxford University Press, 1970.

Weiss, Johannes. *Der Erste Korintherbrief*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 1910.

Wenham, Gordon J. *The Book of Leviticus*. Grand Rapids, MI:, William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1979.

Wevers, John William. *Notes on the Greek Text of Levitiucus*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1997.

Willis, Wendell Lee. *Idol Meat in Corinth - The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10*. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1985.

Witherington III, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth - A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Cortinthians*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1995.

Zaidman, Louise Bruit and Pauline Schmitt Pantel. *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*. tr. Paul Cartledge. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Zuntz, G. *The Text of the Epistles - A Disquisition Upon the Corpus Paulinum*. London: Oxford University Press, 1953.