

ELISABETH SCHÜSSLER FIORENZA

RHETORICAL SITUATION AND HISTORICAL
RECONSTRUCTION IN 1 CORINTHIANS*

In the past fifteen years or so New Testament scholars have sought to balance the predominantly historical orientation of biblical studies with insights and methods derived from literary studies and literary criticism.¹ In addition, discussions of hermeneutics² and pastoral ‘application’ have attempted to replace the overall framework of meaning that has been eroded by the eclipse of biblical theology understood as salvation history.³ Finally, the studies of the social world of early Christianity⁴ have focused anew on the social-political situation and economic-cultural conditions of the New Testament writers and their communities. However, these discussions have not yet led to the formulation of a new integrative paradigm⁵ in biblical interpretation. This paper seeks to contribute to this three-pronged discussion by utilizing rhetorical criticism for the interpretation of Paul’s first extant letter to the community of Corinth.⁶ My main goal is thereby not to add a ‘new interpretation’ to the many variant readings of 1 Corinthians but to explore the questions, methods, and strategies involved in the interpretation of the letter.

I have chosen rhetorical criticism for such an analysis because it is one of the oldest forms of literary criticism that explores the particular historical uses of language in specific social political situations.⁷ Such a choice seems to be appropriate not only because in antiquity the ‘science’ of rhetoric was practically identical with advanced education and conceived of as public discourse, but also because the pioneering studies of Paul’s rhetoric by H. D. Betz⁸ and W. Wuellner have demonstrated that Paul was well skilled in formal rhetoric, despite his claim to the contrary in 1 Corinthians. Moreover, discourse theory and reader-response criticism as well as the insight into the linguisticity and the rhetorical character of all historiography,⁹ represent a contemporary revival of ancient rhetorics. In the introduction to her anthology of *Reader-Response Criticism*, Jane Tompkins points out that its view of language as a form of action and power is similar to that of the Greek rhetoricians.

‘Relocating meaning first in the reader’s self and then in the interpretive strategies that constitute it,’ the reader-response critics ‘assert that meaning is a consequence of being in a particular situation in the world. The net result of this epistemological revolution

* Main paper presented at the 41st General Meeting of *SNTS* in Atlanta, Georgia on 13 August, 1986.

is to repoliticise literature and literary criticism. When discourse is responsible for reality and not merely a reflection of it, then whose discourse prevails makes all the difference.¹⁰

I am not so much concerned in this paper to elaborate the rhetorical arrangements¹¹ that were employed by Paul in writing the letter to the Corinthians as to explore its rhetorical functions. While Old Testament rhetorical criticism as practised by J. Muilenburg and his students¹² shares in the formalism of the *New Criticism*, I would like to investigate whether a critical rhetorical interpretation of 1 Corinthians is able not only to say something about the rhetorical techniques and narrative strategies of Paul's letter to the community in Corinth, but also something about the actual rhetorical historical situation to which the letter is addressed.

In my work on the Book of Revelation¹³ I have proposed that the concept of 'rhetorical situation' developed in rhetorical criticism might help us to gain access to the historical communicative situation of New Testament writings. Unlike poetic works, actual speeches, homilies, or letters are a direct response to a specific historical-political situation and problem. As Bitzer points out, they come into existence because of a specific condition or situation which invites utterance. The situation controls the rhetorical response in the same sense that the question controls the answer.¹⁴ Rhetorical criticism focuses on the persuasive power and literary strategies of a text which has a communicative function in a concrete historical situation. Rhetorical discourse is generated by a specific condition or situation inviting a response. In a rhetorical situation, a person is or feels called to a response that has the possibility to affect the situation. Whereas the poetic work attempts to create and to organize imaginative experience, rhetoric seeks to persuade and to motivate people to *act right*. Rhetoric seeks to instigate a change of attitudes and motivations, it strives to persuade, to teach and to engage the hearer/reader by eliciting reactions, emotions, convictions, and identifications. The evaluative criterion for rhetoric is not aesthetics, but praxis.

According to Bitzer a rhetorical situation is characterized by an actual or potential exigence which can be completely or partially removed if discourse, introduced into the situation can so constrain human decision or action as to bring about a significant modification of the exigence. In other words, a rhetorical situation is a situation where a person is or feels called to a response that has the possibility for affecting the situation. Such a response depends on the argumentative possibilities of the speaker as well as the possible expectations of her audience. Not only the exigence, but also these two types of constraints which affect the audience decision or action and which are imposed on the author constitute a rhetorical situation. Therefore the key question is not simply: Is the speaker's/author's understanding of the audience adequate; Does her rhetoric meet

the expectations of the audience? What is the overriding *rhetorical problem* the speaker/writer has to overcome in order to win over the audience to her point of view? Such a rhetorical problem is usually mentioned in the beginning of the discourse, and it may colour the whole speech. In short, in the rhetorical act speakers/writers seek to convey an image of themselves as well as to define the rhetorical problem and situation in such a way that both 'fit' to each other so that the audience/reader will be moved to their standpoint by participating in their construction of the world.¹⁵

How then can we utilize rhetorical criticism in order to read a historical text in such a way that we move from the 'world of the text' of Paul to the actual world of the Corinthian community?¹⁶ In order to do so I would argue that rhetorical criticism needs to distinguish not only between poetic and rhetorical texts, but also between at least three levels of communication. Rhetorical criticism must distinguish between the historical argumentative situation, the implied or inscribed rhetorical situation as well as the rhetorical situation of contemporary interpretations which works with the canonical collection and reception of Paul's letters.

I therefore propose that a rhetorical critical analysis has to move through four stages: It begins – as I have sketched above – by identifying the rhetorical interests and models of contemporary interpretation; then moves to delineate the rhetorical arrangement, interests, and modifications introduced by the author in order to elucidate and establish in a third step the rhetorical situation of the letter. Finally, it seeks to reconstruct the common historical situation and symbolic universe of the writer/speaker and the recipients/audience. True, such a rhetorical reconstruction of the social-historical situation is still narrative-laden and can only be constituted as a 'sub-text' to Paul's text. Yet this 'sub-text' is not simply the story of Paul; it is, rather, the story of the Corinthian church to which Paul's rhetoric is to be understood as an active response.¹⁷ Therefore, it becomes necessary to assess critically Paul's theological rhetoric in terms of its function for early Christian self-understanding and community. The nature of rhetoric as political discourse necessitates critical assessment and theological evaluation.¹⁸

In the following I would like to utilize these four levels of rhetorical critical analysis for the interpretation of 1 Corinthians:

First, Reader-response criticism distinguishes between the actual writer/reader and the implied writer/reader. The implied writer/reader encompasses the contemporary interpreter who in the process of reading constructs the inscribed author and reader. Reader-response criticism has developed the notion of implied author and implied reader that can help us to elucidate Paul's rhetorical intention as it is constructed in the act of reading/interpretation today (reception hermeneutics¹⁹).

Second, the rhetorical arrangement or disposition of 1 Corinthians not only embodies the rhetorical strategies which Paul employs for persuading the Corinthian community to act according to his instructions, but also indicates the intended or implicit audience of the letter.

Third, the 'rhetorical situation' is constituted by the rhetorical occasion or exigency to which 1 Corinthians can be understood as a 'fitting' response as well as by the rhetorical problem Paul had to overcome. Attention to both can help us to avoid reconstructing the historical situation of the Corinthian community simply as the story of Paul.

Fourth, since rhetoric also can be used negatively as propaganda or crafty calculation, ethical evaluation of the speaker and moral judgment of the rhetorical discourse in a concrete political situation is an essential part of philosophical discussions in ancient rhetoric. New Testament rhetorical criticism, therefore, cannot limit itself to a formalistic analysis of 1 Corinthians, nor to an elucidation of its historical-social context; rather it must develop a responsible ethical and evaluative theological criticism.

First: Contemporary Interpretations:

In *The Rhetoric of Fiction*, W. Booth has distinguished between the actual author/reader and the implied author/reader. The implied author is not the real author, but rather the image or picture which the reader will construct gradually in the process of reading the work. 'The actual reader is involved in apprehending and building up the picture of the implied author (and implied reader); but in doing this the reader is assuming the role dictated by the author.'²⁰ In other words, in the process of reading 1 Corinthians the interpreter follows the directives of the implied author, who is not identical with the 'real' Paul, as to how to understand the community of Corinth. That interpreters follow the directives of the implied author to understand the Corinthian Christians as 'other' of Paul or as 'opponents' becomes obvious in all those interpretations that characterize the Corinthians as foolish, immature, arrogant, divisive, individualistic, unrealistic illusionists, libertine enthusiasts, or boasting spiritualists who misunderstood the preaching of Paul in terms of 'realized eschatology'.

Since many things are presupposed, left out, or unexplained in a speech/letter, the audience must in the process of reading 'supply' the missing information in line with the rhetorical directives of the speaker/writer. Historical critical scholars seek to 'supply' such information generally in terms of the history of religions, including Judaism, while preachers and bible-readers usually do so in terms of contemporary values, life, and psychology. Scholarship on 1 Corinthians tends to 'supply' such information about Paul's 'opponents'²¹ either with reference to the symbolic universe of contemporary Judaism, of pagan religion, especially the mystery cults,

philosophical schools, Hellenistic Judaism, or developing Gnosticism. The studies of the social setting or 'social world' of Pauline Christianity in turn, do not utilize ideological, doctrinal models of interpretation, but supply the missing information in terms of 'social data' gleaned from the Pauline corpus, Acts, and other ancient sources, which in turn, are organized in terms of sociological or anthropological models.

As diverse as these interpretations and their implications for the understanding of the community in Corinth are, they all follow Paul's dualistic rhetorical strategy without questioning or evaluating it. In short, a cursory look at scholarship on 1 Corinthians indicates that Paul is a skilled rhetorician, who, throughout the centuries, has reached his goal of persuading his audience that he is right and the 'others' are wrong. The difference in interpretations is more a difference in degree than a difference in interpretational model. It depends on which directions encoded in the letter exegetes choose to amplify historically and theologically. Moreover, insofar as New Testament scholars read 1 Corinthians as a 'canonical text', we often uncritically accept the implied author's claims to apostolic authority as historically valid and effective. However, we must ask whether the interpretation of 1 Corinthians would have developed different heuristic models if, for example, Paul was believed to be a Valentinian gnostic or a Jewish rabbi writing against Christians.²² In other words, does Paul's power of persuasion rest on his presumed authority or did it have the same effect in the historical situation in which such canonical authority can not be presupposed?²³

Second: The Rhetorical Arrangement of 1 Corinthians:

At first glance, the rhetorical strategies and situation of 1 Corinthians seem to be obvious. The Corinthians had written to Paul about certain issues and 1 Corinthians is a response to their inquiries or declarations. The letter form is a 'fitting response' to the Corinthian correspondence. If that is the case, however, it must be explained why Paul's first reference to their correspondence is in chapter 7 and not in the beginning of the letter. If this ordering is an intended part of the rhetorical *dispositio*, then one must ask whether this indicates a different argumentative situation, since the rhetorical problem is usually articulated in the beginning of the discourse? In order to explore this question it becomes necessary to discuss the rhetorical genre of 1 Corinthians.

Ancient rhetoric distinguishes between 'three types of oratory, the deliberative, the forensic, and the epideictic, which . . . corresponded respectively to an audience engaged in deliberating, an audience engaged in judging, an audience that is merely enjoying the orator's unfolding argument without having to reach a conclusion on the matter in question'.²⁴ Forensic or judicial rhetoric has its 'Sitz im Leben' in the courtroom. It

seeks to accuse or to defend and to persuade the audience as the judge of its own assessment of the past. Deliberative rhetoric is at home in the *forum* and it seeks to convince and move the audience to make the right decision for the future, whereas *epideictic* or demonstrative rhetoric is exercised in the marketplace or amphitheatre, where the audience as spectators judge the oratory of the speaker in order to award praise or blame.

An exploration of rhetorical genre and its function can thus contribute to an understanding of the rhetorical situation insofar as arrangement and style reveal the speaker's perception of the audience and the ways chosen to influence it. Thus the audience is a construction of the speaker, but in a real life situation, as in the case of 1 Corinthians, care must be taken to form a concept of the audience as close as possible to reality if the speaker/writer wants to have any effect or influence on the actions of the hearers/readers.

1. In his article on 'Greek Rhetoric and Pauline Argumentation', W. Wuellner has argued that 1 Corinthians represents *epideictic* or demonstrative discourse.²⁵ He thereby relies on the work of Perelman, *The New Rhetoric*, that seeks to redefine the *genus demonstrativum* or *epideictic* genre. In antiquity, according to Lausberg, demonstrative rhetoric was, in distinction to forensic and deliberative rhetoric, not so much concerned with the content or topic of the discourse, as with the art of presentation or the rhetorical skills and eloquence which speakers exhibited at festivals and in the amphitheatre. Its primary function was the praise in celebration of a person, community, or action.²⁶ Perelman seeks to redefine the *genus demonstrativum* not so much with reference to the speaker's performance, but rather with respect to the audience and its values.²⁷ *Epideictic* discourse, he argues, 'sets out to increase the intensity of the audience's adherence to certain values which might not be contested when considered on their own but may nevertheless not prevail against other values that might come into conflict with them. In epideictic oratory the speaker turns educator.'²⁸ Such discourse is less directed toward changing or modifying beliefs than toward strengthening the adherence to what is already accepted. It seeks to reinforce the sense of *communio* between the speaker and the audience by utilizing every means available to the orator.

Wuellner examines the phenomenon of Pauline digressions in 1 Corinthians in order to show that they are not careless style but rather examples of Paul's rhetorical skill for, in classical rhetoric, digressions are introduced for the purpose of elucidating the issue at hand. He identifies three major digressions: 1. 19–3. 21; 9. 1–10. 13; and 13. 1–13. These digressions function *affectively* to intensify adherence. They belong to three argumentative units: 1. 1–6. 11; 6. 12–11. 1; and 11. 2–14. 40. He concludes: 'The appeals to the audience to imitate the speaker . . . are an example, a

paradigm, of the values lauded, with Paul seeking adherence to these values on the one hand, and on the other hand to strengthen disposition toward action.²⁹ He therefore rejects the thesis of Nils Dahl, who on the basis of a contentual but not formal analysis had argued that chapters 1–4 are best understood as an *apologia* because in these chapters Paul seeks to ‘reestablish his apostolic authority as the founder and spiritual father of the whole church in Corinth’.³⁰

2. However, Dahl’s rhetorical understanding of chs. 1–4 as Pauline apology has received support from recent formal studies of Paul’s rhetoric. In his dissertation, *Briefformular und rhetorische Disposition im 1. Korintherbrief*, Michael Bünker has analyzed 1 Cor 1. 10–4. 21 and 1 Cor 15 in terms of epistolary form and rhetorical arrangement. He shows that both sections have the rhetorical structure of forensic or judicial discourse. Although Paul claims that he did not speak in Corinth with ‘lofty words of wisdom’, his distinction between *ἐν πειθοῖ σοφίας* and *ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος* indicates that he knew the rhetorical distinction between oratory as mere persuasion and speech as a process of forming one’s opinion on the basis of arguments and proofs.³¹

Moreover, Bünker argues that, according to rhetorical conventions, Paul’s arrangement and disposition is artful and well planned, but not obvious. This is the case especially in those sections in which Paul could not count on the agreement of the audience but rather expected attacks and counter arguments. Bünker, therefore, concludes that while Paul formally addresses the whole community in Corinth, in reality he is arguing with those few Corinthian Christians who are well educated and of high status. His rhetorical location of the implicit or intended reader thus confirms Theissen’s social identification of the troublemakers in Corinth who have caused divisions and conflicts by competing with each other for the approval of different apostolic authorities.³² Bünker’s results, however, speak against Wuellner’s thesis that Paul did not choose the *epideictic* genre in order to change the beliefs of the audience but rather in order to strengthen the Corinthians’ adherence to values and beliefs which, although already accepted by many, were still contested by some.

In my opinion, Bünker’s argument, however, also has several weaknesses: He discusses the rhetorical disposition of chapters 1–4 and 15 only and not the rhetorical genre of the whole letter. Furthermore, his delineation of the intended or implicit audience is derived from considerations of general rhetorical practices which can be used in all kinds of rhetorical discourse. Finally, the ending of 1 Corinthians, where Paul appeals to the Corinthians to acknowledge and accept the leadership of Stephanas and his co-workers, speaks against an identification of the intended audience whom Paul wishes to compel to act with those who cause the difficulties in the community. Since Stephanas is clearly one of the better situated

and educated members of the community, and since he belongs to those who are loyal to Paul, we have to conclude, to the contrary, that Paul relies on such persons for implementing his directives. Consequently, if Paul does not argue against, but rather appeals to the social status group of Stephanas as the intended or the implicit readers, the overall genre of 1 Corinthians is not judicial or forensic. Rather, it appears that the genre of 1 Corinthians is best understood as 'largely deliberative although it contains some judicial passages . . .'³³

3. The disposition or arrangement of deliberative rhetoric is closely related to that of the forensic genre. It consists basically of three sections: The *exordium* intends to secure the goodwill of the audience and states the desired goal of the speech. In the main body or proofs the argument is advanced with reference to what is honourable, useful, and possible by appeal to *ethos* as a reflection of one's own good character (Paul's example), to *pathos* as a stirring appeal to the heart and the emotions, and to *logos*, that is, to reasoned argument. The *peroration* restates with all possible force factors that are alluded to in the *exordium* and adduced or developed in the proofs.³⁴

The major goal of deliberative rhetoric is to persuade the audience to take action for the future and that this action is in its best interest. This goal is expressed in 1 Cor 1. 10 where Paul appeals to the Corinthians that they should all agree without dissensions and be united in the same mind and the same opinion.³⁵ It is also articulated in the *peroration* 16. 15–18, where Paul urges the Corinthians to subject themselves and to give recognition to such persons as Stephanas and every co-worker.³⁶ Bünker is thus correct in his suggestion that the inscribed or intended audience which is asked to decide the issues under discussion is composed of those who have either social or missionary status or both. The major issues which need to be settled are discussed in the main body of the letter: marriage and sexuality (chapters 5–7);³⁷ meat sacrificed to idols (8. 1–11. 1);³⁸ worship (11. 2–14. 40);³⁹ resurrection (15. 12–37);⁴⁰ and the collection for the saints (16. 1–4). In order to show that this delineation of 1 Cor as deliberative rhetoric is plausible, we have to see whether it can be construed as a 'fitting' response to the rhetorical situation.

Third: Rhetorical Situation:

At first glance the rhetorical situation of 1 Cor seems to support the understanding of the letter as epideictic rhetoric. The Corinthians had written to Paul about certain issues and 1 Cor is a response to their request for advice and answers. If that were the case, however, it must be explained why Paul does not in the beginning but only in chapter 7 refer to the Corinthian letter. This observation suggests a different argumentative genre and situation. As we have seen the 'rhetorical situation', is constituted by

the rhetorical occasion or exigency to which 1 Cor can be understood as a 'fitting' response as well as by the rhetorical problem Paul had to overcome. Attention to both can help us to avoid reconstructing the historical situation of the Corinthian community simply as the story of Paul. Therefore it is necessary to define the argumentative situation in terms of the exigence and rhetorical problem articulated in the beginning of 1 Cor.

The basic issue of the case is usually discussed in the beginning of the discourse, but it needs to be restated also during the discourse. This seems to be the case in chapters 1. 11–4. 21; 9; 15. 1–12; and 16. 5–12. In 1 Corinthians *stasis* seems to be understood best as *status translationis* that is given when the speaker's/writer's *auctoritas* or jurisdiction to address or settle the issue at hand is in doubt and needs to be established.⁴¹

'Those of Chloe' in 1. 11 function as interlocutors who articulate such doubt as to the qualifications of Paul to settle the issues about which the Corinthians have written. It is generally assumed that Stephanas delivered the formal written questions or statements of the community,⁴² whereas 'those of Chloe' supplied the oral information, hearsay, and gossip to which Paul refers. Scholars such as J. Hurd, N. Dahl, or G. Theissen who seek to reconstruct the social-historical situation in Corinth from the information of the letter and not through outside influence also make this distinction. For example, Dahl assumes that the official delegation of the church in Corinth headed by Stephanas 'had not gossiped'⁴³ whereas the people of Chloe had supplied the oral information referred to by Paul in 1. 10–5. 8; 5. 13b–6. 11; and 11. 17–34.⁴⁴ G. Theissen, on the other hand, argues that the 'people of Chloe' who provided the information on party-strife were slaves who looked at the problems in Corinth from 'below' whereas the letter which did not mention that problem was probably written by people who possessed some degree of culture and, therefore, by some of the more prominent members of the community.⁴⁵ He concludes from this that Paul adopts the view 'from below' and argues against the upper class members who were responsible for the divisions in the church. However, we have no indication that Stephanas was the carrier of the letter sent by the Corinthians. It appears that he arrived later and gave Paul a more positive view of the situation at Corinth so that Paul could rely on him to present his response to the community and to see to it that his instructions were followed, for the community is told to subordinate itself to Stephanas and his co-workers.

'Those of Chloe' are usually understood to be either slaves or family members of the household of Chloe, a woman who might or might not have been a Christian. This prevalent interpretation overlooks however that here the Greek grammatical form (article with *genitivus possessivus*) is the same as the expression used for characterizing the followers of Paul, Apollos, Cephas, and Christ. It also overlooks that Paul uses a different

grammatical expression (τοὺς ἐκ τῶν with *gen. poss.*), for instance, in Rom 16. 10 and 11, where he greets the members of the households of Aristobulos and of Narkissos.⁴⁶ It seems likely that the expression ‘those of Chloe’ means ‘the people or followers of Chloe’ in Corinth; therefore, I would suggest they were the official messengers of the community. They not only supplied Paul with oral background information but they also presented the written communication of the community to him. Chloe’s status in the community of Corinth was probably similar to that of Stephanas even though she and her followers did not belong to the converts of Paul because they obviously were not baptized by him. However, her social status and that of her followers is not clear.⁴⁷

If the delegation travelled under the name of a woman, women must have had influence and leadership in the Corinthian church not only in worship meetings but also in everyday life and the decision-making processes of the community. Against this assumption one cannot argue that Paul uses only ‘brothers’ to address the members of the community, for androcentric language functioned in antiquity just as today as generic, inclusive language.⁴⁸ Furthermore, this reading would explain the crucial place women are given in the discussion of marriage in chapter 7,⁴⁹ and especially, in the ring-composition of chapters 11. 2–14. 40, a section beginning and ending with a discussion of women’s role.⁵⁰

In this section persuasive argument breaks down and is replaced with strong appeals to authority. After a *captatio benevolentiae* in 11. 2 that the Corinthians have observed the traditions which Paul preached to them, Paul in vs. 3 emphatically (‘but I want you to know’) introduces a peculiar theological patriarchal chain: God-Christ-man-woman [the head or source of every man is Christ, the head of woman is man and the head of Christ is God] which is re-stated in vs. 7 as ‘man is the image and glory of God but woman is the glory of man’. The argument in 11. 2–16 is so convoluted that we can no longer say with certainty what kind of custom or style Paul advocates for women prophets and liturgists. It is clear, however, that he does so because he wants them to know that the head or source of woman is man just as the head or source of Christ is God.⁵¹

Just as 11. 2–16 ends with an authoritative assertion of the will of Paul, so does the argumentation in chapter 14 which demands silence, order, and subordination from speakers in tongues, interpreters of pneumatic speech, and prophets as well as from women or wives who participated in public discourse. ‘What, did the word of God originate with you . . . If anyone believes that he or she is a prophet, or spiritual, he or she should acknowledge that what I am writing to you is a command of the Lord. If anyone does not recognize this, he or she is not recognized.’⁵² Did Paul fear that some of the Corinthian women prophets would not acknowledge what he is writing? Why does he need to appeal to a command of the Lord

which is not known from anywhere else? Finally, it is interesting to note that in the final greetings of Corinthians only is Prisca mentioned after Aquila, a change which corresponds to patriarchal custom.

If, as I have argued, a reconstruction of the argumentative situation cannot assume without discussion that only oral information was communicated by Chloe and, conversely, can also not demonstrate that the written information was entrusted to Stephanas as the head of the 'official delegation', then the question must be raised anew: What was the rhetorical situation to which Paul's letter can be construed as a 'fitting response'? Although the literature extensively debates whether there were four, three, or only two factions in Corinth,⁵³ it usually overlooks that the information of Chloe's followers about ἐριδες (Pl.) that is, that debates, discussions, or competing claims among them are reinterpreted by Paul (λέγω δὲ τοῦτο) as party-strife. It is Paul, and not the Corinthians, who understands their debates as party or school divisions.

Whereas Hurd has insisted that the Corinthians have not challenged Paul's authority as an apostle,⁵⁴ Dahl has argued that Paul had to establish himself as the apostle of the whole church. He construes the following situation: The quarrels in Corinth were the result of the Corinthians' debate about whom to consult for answers to some of their questions. Some might have suggested Cephas, because he was the foremost among the twelve, whereas Paul's credentials were questionable; others might have voted for Apollos who, in contrast to Paul, was a wise and powerful teacher; many might have argued that they did not need to consult anyone since as a spirit-filled people, they were mature and competent enough to decide for themselves. Since the letter was sent to Paul, those like Stephanas who thought that Paul was their best choice must have won out. While the official delegates, Dahl argues, represented the Corinthians as loyal to Paul, the people of Chloe informed him of the quarrels and latent objections which broke into the open after the delegation had left. 'As a consequence, Paul had to envisage the possibility that his letter containing his reply might easily make a bad situation worse. Quarrel and strife might develop into real divisions of the church, if his recommendations were enthusiastically received by one group and rejected by others.'⁵⁵

However, Paul's rhetoric of biting irony, and his attempt to shame, belittle, and undermine the Corinthian self-understanding is hardly designed to lessen tensions and to prevent divisions. Rather, just as in chapter 15, so also here the combative style of this section introduces dualistic categories and antagonistic alternatives.⁵⁶ Moreover, Hurd has observed that Paul's attitude towards the Corinthian community 'contained a substantial measure of veiled hostility'.⁵⁷ While I agree with Dahl that the rhetoric of 1 Corinthians clearly intends to *establish* 'the authority of Paul as the founder and father of the entire church at Corinth', I would argue that

it does not re-establish, but introduces such unique authority claims. In other words, Paul does not defend his authority as an apostle among other apostles but rather, argues for his authority as the *sole* founder and father of the Corinthian community.

Paul establishes a line of authority God, Christ, Paul, Apollos, Timothy, Stephanas, and other local co-workers to which the Corinthians should subordinate themselves because they are 'Christ's'. Paul understands himself not only as Christ's steward and administrator, but he can also say that 'in Christ he has begotten them through the gospel' (4. 15). Moreover, the Corinthians do not only owe their Christian existence to Paul's generative action but they also are seen as passive objects (field, temple) of his missionary activity that establishes his unique authority. This hierarchy of authority which extends from God down to the community seems to be paralleled by the one established in 11. 2: God-Christ-man-woman. Just as the community is admonished to 'subordinate' itself, so women/wives are not allowed to speak in the *ekklesia* but must subordinate themselves. In 1 Corinthians Paul introduces the vertical line of patriarchal subordination not only into the social relationships of the *ekklesia*, but into its symbolic universe as well by arrogating the authority of God, the 'father', for himself. He does so in order to claim for his interpretation of divine power the authority of the singular father and founder of the community. He thereby seeks to change the understanding of persuasive-consensual authority based on pneumatic competence accessible to all into that of compulsory authority based on the symbolization of ultimate patri-archal power. It is Paul who introduces into the early Christian special missionary movement 'Christian patriarchalism which receives its coloration from the warmth of the ideal of love'.⁵⁸

Fourth: Historical Reconstruction and Theological Assessment:

The rhetorical situation to which 1 Corinthians can be understood as a 'fitting' response might then be conceived as follows: The Corinthians had debates and discussions as to how their new self-understanding expressed in the pre-Pauline baptismal formula in Gal 3. 28 could and should be realized in the midst of a society rooted in the patriarchal status divisions between Greeks and Jews, slave and free, men and women, rich and poor, wise and uneducated. Especially, the notion 'no longer male *and* female', that is, patriarchal marriage is no longer constitutive for the new creation in the Spirit, presented difficult practical problems in everyday life and might have raised questions such as: Did baptism abolish all previous marriage relationships; could one, especially a woman, remain marriage-free even though this was against the law; if one remained married to a pagan, what about the children; did it mean that one could live together without being married; did it imply that one should live as a celibate and abstain

from all sexual intercourse; was marriage only a legal, but not also a religious affair; did women just like men have control over their own body and life?

In this situation of competing interpretations and practices of what it meant to realize the 'new life' in Christ the Corinthian community decided to write to different missionaries for their advice since some of their differing interpretations most likely originated in different theological emphases of these missionaries and their preaching. Thus, the Corinthians and not Paul understood God's power of salvation in the sense that John Schütz has described as Paul's own understanding of power. 'Power is not a personal attribute because power is essentially an historical force. The central role of the gospel as an interpretation of this power stems from the fact that all Christians have access to power through the gospel. The apostle may preach the gospel, he may thereby make power available but he does not himself provide it or control it.'⁵⁹

Given this understanding, the consultation of missionaries did not mean that the community would accept and obey such advice without critical evaluation and judgment in terms of their own pneumatic self-understanding. Moreover, among those asked, Paul could have appeared – at least to some – as the least qualified in terms of pneumatic competence: he preaches on the elementary level and, as for actual pastoral experience, he hasn't shown up for a long time and does not live a lifestyle appropriate to an apostle. Paul must somehow have learned that some of the Corinthians held his pneumatic as well as his practical competence in low esteem. In order to secure their acceptance of this interpretation he had to argue why they should follow his instructions and not those of others if these turned out to be different from his own.

If Paul had only to assert that he shared access to divine power for building up the community with the Corinthians and other apostles we could understand 1 Cor 1–4 as an apology for his apostleship and spirit-filled status. Yet, Paul asserts more than this when he presents himself not only as the father of the community who in analogy to God, the Father, has begotten or brought forth the community in Christ through the gospel, but also as the one who has the power to command and to punish,⁶⁰ although he ostentatively chooses persuasion and love. Therefore, whenever, as in 1 Cor 11. 1–16 or 1 Cor 14. 33b–40, appeals and arguments break down, he resorts to commands and claims the authority of Christ and that of other churches. His rhetoric does not aim at fostering independence, freedom, and consensus, but stresses dependence on his model, order and decency,⁶¹ as well as subordination and silence. His theological reasoning and skilful rhetorical argument demonstrate, however, that the rhetorical situation required persuasion but did not admit of explicitly coercive authority.⁶² Whom did Paul seek to persuade to accept his

interpretation as ‘authoritative’? Following the lead of Theissen, Bünker has argued, as we have seen, on grounds of a formal rhetorical analysis that the intended or inscribed audience against whom Paul argues are the few members of the community of high social status and considerable education who have caused the party-strife in Corinth. However, this claim that the intended readers are those who have caused the problems in Corinth can be maintained only if 1 Corinthians is classified as forensic or judicial discourse. In deliberative discourse the author does not seek to pass judgment but to appeal to the audience so that they will make the right decision for the future just as an orator appeals to the *ekklesia*, i.e. the voting assembly of freeborn men, to make the right political decisions for the common good of the *polis*. If my assessment of 1 Corinthians as deliberative discourse is correct, then Paul appeals to those who, like himself, were of higher social and educational status. They should make the ecclesial decisions which are, in his opinion, necessary in Corinth. His emphatic recommendation of Stephanas speaks for this understanding. His ‘veiled hostility’ and appeal to authority in the so-called women’s passages indicates, however, that he does not include women of high social and educational status in this appeal.

One could object to my thesis that Paul appeals to the well-to-do and knowledgeable male members of the community by pointing to 1 Cor 1. 26–29, where he reminds the Corinthian community that not many of them – when called – were wise, powerful, and highborn according to worldly standards. Rather, God has chosen what is foolish, weak, low, despised, even what is nothing in the world.⁶³ This objection is not valid, however, because Paul does not say here that God has chosen the foolish, low, weak and despised in order to make them wise, powerful, strong, and esteemed, a theology which the baptismal self-understanding of the Christians in Corinth seems to have asserted. Paul himself confirms this theological self-understanding of the Corinthian community in the *proem* in which he gives thanks that in Christ Jesus the Corinthians were made rich in everything, in all speech and in all knowledge, lacking in nothing. The whole letter documents this baptismal self-understanding of the many who were nothing in the eyes of the world before their call, but who now have freedom, knowledge, wisdom, riches, and power over their own bodies and life in their new kinship-community.

This pattern of reversal – the old life is contrasted with the new, weakness with power, foolishness with wisdom – also shapes Paul’s own theological pattern of cross and resurrection. But, he asserts it over against the baptismal self-understanding of the Corinthians for whom being in Christ, that is, in the church, meant living the ‘new creation’ here and now. Paul also contrasts his former life with his new life in Christ, but he sees this new life as suffering, hardships, and cross, the marks of his apostleship for

which he will be recompensed in the future. This different emphasis in theological interpretation must be rooted in Paul's own experience. If, as Hock and Bunker have argued, Paul himself was of relatively high social and educational status,⁶⁴ then his experience of becoming a follower of Jesus Christ was quite different from that of the majority of the Corinthians. While for them their call meant freedom and new possibilities not open to them as poor, slave and even freeborn women in 'the eyes of the world', for Paul and those of equal social status, their call implied relinquishment of authority and status, it entailed hardship, powerlessness, and foolishness 'in the eyes of the world'.

NOTES

[1] N. Petersen, *Literary Criticism for New Testament Critics* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978); R. A. Spencer (ed.), *Orientation by Disorientation. Studies in Literary Criticism and Biblical Literary Criticism* (Pittsburgh Theol. Mon. Ser. 35; Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1980); L. J. White, 'Historical and Literary Criticism: A Theological Response', *BTB* 13 (1983) 28–31.

[2] For discussion of the literature see J. A. Sanders, 'Hermeneutics', *IDBSuppl* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1976) 402–7; P. Stuhlmacher, *Historical Criticism and Theological Interpretation of Scripture* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1977); A. C. Thiselton, *The Two Horizons: New Testament Hermeneutics and Philosophical Description* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1980); R. M. Grant and D. Tracy, *A Short History of the Interpretation of the Bible* (2nd ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984); E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Bread not Stone. The Challenge of Feminist Biblical Interpretation* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1984); T. J. Keegan, *Interpreting the Bible. A Popular Introduction to Biblical Hermeneutics* (New York: Paulist Press, 1985); L. Russell (ed.), *Feminist Interpretation of the Bible* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1985); L. Poland, *Literary Criticism and Biblical Hermeneutics* (Chico: Scholars Press, 1985).

[3] Cf. J. Barr, 'Biblical Theology', *IDBSuppl*, 104–11; K. Stendahl, 'Method in the Study of Biblical Theology', in J. P. Hyatt (ed.), *The Bible In Modern Scholarship* (Nashville: Abingdon, 1965) 196–209; G. F. Hasel, 'Methodology as a Major Problem in the Current Crisis of Old Testament Theology', *BTB* 2 (1972) 177–98; H. Boers, *What is New Testament Theology?* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1979).

[4] For a general review of the literature cf. C. Osiek, *What Are They Saying About the Social Setting of the New Testament?* (New York: Paulist Press, 1984); Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians. The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983); Id., *The Moral World of the First Christians* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986); J. E. Stambaugh and D. L. Balch, *The New Testament in Its Social Environment* (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1986); E. V. Gallagher, 'The Social world of Saint Paul', *Religion* 14 (1984) 91–9; H. J. Klauck, 'Gemeindestrukturen im ersten Korintherbrief', *Bibel und Kirche* 40 (1985) 9–15; J. H. Elliott, *Social-Scientific Criticism of the New Testament and Its Social World* (Semeia 35; Decatur: Scholars Press, 1986).

[5] For the discussion of paradigm shifts in biblical interpretation see *Bread Not Stone*, 117–49.

[6] For the discussion of the Corinthian correspondence cf. V. P. Furnish, *II Corinthians* (Anchor Bible 32A; Garden City: Doubleday, 1984) 26–55.

[7] Cf. G. A. Kennedy, *Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1980); E. Black, *Rhetorical Criticism: A Study in Method* (Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press, 1978); W. J. Brandt, *The Rhetoric of Argumentation* (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1970); T. Eagleton, *Walter Benjamin or Towards a Revolutionary Criticism* (London: Verso, 1981) 101–13.

[8] H. D. Betz, 'The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians', *NTS* 21 (1975) 353–9; Id., *Galatians. A Commentary on Paul's Letter to the Churches in Galatia* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).

[9] See especially the work of Hayden White: 'The Value of Narrativity in the Representation of Reality', *Critical Inquiry* 7 (1980) 5–28; 'Historicism, History, and the Figurative Imagination', *History and Theory* 14 (1975) 43–67; 'The Politics of Historical Interpretation: Discipline and De-Sublimation', in W. J. T. Mitchell (ed.), *The Politics of Interpretation* (Chicago: Univ. Press, 1983) 119–43; *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth Century Europe* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1973); *Tropics of Discourse. Essays in Cultural Criticism* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1978); See, however, the critical discussion of G. G. Iggers, *New Directions in European Historiography* (rev. ed.; Middletown: Wesleyan Univ. Press, 1984) 202–5.

[10] J. P. Tompkins, *Reader-Response Criticism: From Formalism to Post-Structuralism* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1980) xxv. See also her historical overview (201–32) and her annotated bibliography. Cf. also B. Johnson, *The Critical Difference. Essays in the Contemporary Rhetoric of Reading* (Baltimore: John Hopkins Univ. Press, 1980).

[11] G. Lyons, *Pauline Autobiography. Toward a New Understanding* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1985) 64 points out: 'The freedom ancient writers exercised in the mixing of genres and in the organization of a discourse complicates rhetorical analysis making a measure of subjectivity unavoidable.' He insists over against Betz that the 'introduction and conclusion are particularly important for any determination of the genre and species of an oration, for here, if anywhere, the speaker makes his *causa* explicit' (26 f.).

[12] J. J. Jackson and M. Kessler, *Rhetorical Criticism. Essays in Honor of James Muilenburg* (Pittsburgh Theol. Mon. Ser. 1; Pittsburgh: Pickwick Press, 1974); P. Tribble, *God and the Rhetoric of Sexuality* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978); *Texts of Terror* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1984).

[13] E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *The Book of Revelation – Justice and Judgment* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985).

[14] L. F. Bitzer, 'The Rhetorical Situation', *Philosophy and Rhetoric* 1 (1968) 1–14.

[15] G. A. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism* (Chapel Hill: North Carolina Univ. Press, 1984) 34–6. Cf. also Ch. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric. A Treatise on Argumentation* (Notre Dame: Univ. of Notre Dame Press, 1969) 19–62.

[16] For a discussion of this problem cf. B. C. Lategan and W. S. Vorster, *Text and Reality. Aspects of Reference in Biblical Texts* (Semeia Studies; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985); N. R. Petersen, *Rediscovering Paul. Philemon and the Sociology of Paul's Narrative World* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985) and W. A. Meeks, 'Understanding Early Christian Ethics', *JBL* 105 (1986) 3–11.

[17] F. R. Jameson, 'The Symbolic Inference', in Hayden White and M. Brose (eds.), *Representing Kenneth Burke* (Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1982) 68–91.

[18] W. C. Booth, 'Freedom of Interpretation: Bakhtin and the Challenge of Feminist Criticism', *Critical Inquiry* 9 (1982) 45–76 has called for a revived ethical and political criticism in literary criticism. Cf. also G. Greene and C. Kahn (eds.), *Making a Difference. Feminist Literary Criticism* (New York: Methuen, 1985); J. Newton and D. Rosenfelt (eds.), *Feminist Criticism and Social Change* (New York: Methuen, 1985) and especially E. A. Meese, *Crossing the Double-Cross. The Practice of Feminist Criticism* (Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press, 1986) 133–50.

[19] For an overview see R. C. Holub, *Reception Theory. A Critical Introduction* (London: Methuen, 1984).

[20] E. V. McKnight, *The Bible and the Reader. An Introduction to Literary Criticism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985) 102; see, however, the incisive critique of the de-politicising tendencies in reader-response criticism which do not take power-relationships into account: M. L. Pratt, 'Interpretative Strategies/Strategic Interpretations; On Anglo-American Reader Response Criticism', in J. Arac (ed.), *Postmodernism and Politics* (Theory and History of Literature 28; Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1986) 26–54.

[21] For a discussion of the problem cf. E. E. Ellis, 'Paul and His Opponents. Trends in Research', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults. Vol. I* (Leiden: Brill, 1975) 264–98 and especially K. Berger, 'Die impliziten Gegner. Zur Methode der Erschließung von Gegnern in neutestamentlichen Texten', in D. Lührmann and G. Strecker (eds.), *Kirche* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1980) 373–400.

[22] V. Hasler, 'Das Evangelium des Paulus in Korinth. Erwägungen zur Hermeneutik', *NTS* 30 (1984) 109–29 points out that exegetes often succumb to the temptation to identify with Paul and to take over uncritically his theological interpretation.

- [23] For discussion and literature see G. Lüdemann, *Paulus Vol. II: Antipaulinismus im frühen Christentum* (FRLANT 130; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983).
- [24] Ch. Perelman and L. Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric*, 21.
- [25] In W. R. Schoedel and R. Wilken (eds.), *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition. In Honorem Robert Grant* (Théologie Historique 53; Paris: Editions Beauchesne, 1979) 177–88.
- [26] H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der Literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft* (2nd rev. ed.; München: Max Huber Verl., 1973) 55.
- [27] Perelman/Olbrechts-Tyteca, *The New Rhetoric*, 48 f.
- [28] Op. cit., 51.
- [29] W. Wuellner, 'Greek Rhetoric and Pauline Argumentation', 184.
- [30] N. A. Dahl, *Studies in Paul. Theology for the Early Christian Mission* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1977) 329; cf. also J. Bradley Chance, 'Paul's Apology to the Corinthians', *Perspectives in Religious Studies* 9 (1982) 144–55.
- [31] M. Bünker, *Briefformular und rhetorische Disposition im 1. Korintherbrief* (Göttinger theologische Arbeiten 28; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983) 48–76.
- [32] M. Bünker, *Briefformular*, 17 and 52 f. cf. also G. Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity. Essays on Corinth* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1982) 56 f.
- [33] G. Kennedy, *New Testament Interpretation Through Rhetorical Criticism*, 87.
- [34] See the literature cited by F. Forrester Church, 'Rhetorical Structure and Design in Paul's Letter to Philemon', *HTR* 71 (1978) 17–31.
- [35] H. Conzelmann's classification of this passage as 'paraenetic' is too general cf. 1 Corinthians (Hermeneia; Philadelphia; Fortress Press, 1975) 31.
- [36] The emphatic expression *παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς* serves as rhetorical marker in 1. 10; 4. 16 and 16. 15. For 4. 16 see B. Sanders, 'Imitating Paul: 1 Cor 4:16', *HTR* 74 (1981) 353–63 but with a different emphasis in interpretation.
- [37] It is debated where the first part of 1 Corinthians ends and the second section begins. The traditional outline is chapters 1–6 (subjects raised with Paul orally) and 7–16 (subjects about which the Corinthians have written) cf. W. F. Orr/J. A. Walter, *1 Corinthians* (Anchor Bible 32; New York: Doubleday, 1976) 120–2; K. E. Bailey, 'The Structure of 1 Corinthians and Paul's Theological Method With Special Reference to 4:17', *NovT* 25 (1983) 152–81 argues that 4. 17–21 are an introduction to chapters 5–7; the semiotic analysis of G. Claudel, '1 Kor 6,12–7,40 neu gelesen', *Trierer Theologische Zeitschrift* 94 (1985) 20–36 argues for the unity of this section.
- [38] For bibliography cf. W. L. Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth. The Pauline Argument in 1 Corinthians 8 and 10* (SBLD 68; Chico: Scholars Press, 1981); Id., 'An Apostolic Apologia? The Form and Function of 1 Corinthians 9', *JSNL* 24 (1985) 33–48 argues that here Paul is not defending his conduct but that he argues on the basis of it.
- [39] Cf. H. Wendland, *Die Briefe und die Korinther* (NTD 7; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965) 80; cf. also E. Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Women in the Pre-Pauline and Pauline Churches', *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 33 (1978) 153–66.
- [40] Cf. the careful structural analysis of W. Stenger, 'Beobachtungen zur Argumentationsstruktur von 1 Cor 15', *Linguistica Biblica* 45 (1979) 71–128.
- [41] H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der Literarischen Rhetorik*, 128 f.
- [42] H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der Literarischen Rhetorik*, 128 f.
- [43] N. A. Dahl, *Studies in Paul*, 50. [44] *Ibid.*, 93.
- [45] G. Theissen, *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity*, 57.
- [46] Cf. E. Schüssler Fiorenza, 'Missionaries, Apostles, Coworkers: Rm 16 and the Reconstruction of Women's Early Christian History', *Word and World* VI (1986) 420–33.
- [47] It is debated whether Chloe's followers live in Corinth or have returned from Corinth to their residence in Ephesus. W. A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, 59 argues that Chloe lived in Corinth because Paul expects that her name is recognized. However, he considers the people of Chloe to be her slaves or freedmen.
- [48] See my book *In Memory of Her. A Feminist Theological Reconstruction of Christian Origins* (New York: Crossroad Press, 1983) 41–67.

[49] See *In Memory of Her*, 220–6.

[50] 1 Cor 11. 2–16 and 14. 33b–36 are both considered to be post-Pauline ‘pastoral’ insertions by W. Munro, *Authority in Paul and Peter. The Identification of a Pastoral Stratum in the Pauline Corpus and 1 Peter* (SNTSM 45; Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1983) 67–82; I consider not only 1 Cor 11. 2–16 but also 1 Cor 14. 33b–36 as authentically Pauline since these verses cohere with the overall argument in chapter 14; cf. also the structural analysis of W. A. Grudem, *The Gift of Prophecy in 1 Corinthians* (Lanham: Univ. Press of America, 1982) 231–55, however with a different interpretational emphasis.

[51] For discussion of the literature and interpretation see *In Memory of Her*, 226–30.

[52] D. W. Odell-Scott, ‘Let the Women Speak in Church: An Egalitarian Interpretation of 1 Cor 14:33b–36’, *BTB* 13 (1983) 90–3 has argued that 1 Cor 14. 33b–36 represent a slogan of the Corinthian males against whom Paul argues. Cf. also C. H. Talbert, ‘Paul’s Understanding of the Holy Spirit’, in C. H. Talbert (ed.), *Perspectives on the New Testament. Festschrift Stagg* (Macon: Univ. of Mercer Press, 1985) 95–108. However, in light of Paul’s argument in 1 Cor 11. 3 f. such an interpretation is not convincing.

[53] Cf. Ph. Vielhauer, ‘Paulus und die Kephaspartei in Korinth’, *NTS* 21 (1975) 341–52; F. Lang, ‘Die Gruppen in Korinth nach 1. Korinther 1–4’, *Theologische Beiträge* 14 (1983) 68–79; and especially the overview by J. C. Hurd, *The Origins of 1 Corinthians* (New York: Seabury Press, 1965) 95–107; H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 33–4 (Excursus: The Parties); and H.-J. Klauck, *1. Korintherbrief* (Würzburg: EchterVerlag, 1984) 21–3.

[54] J. C. Hurd, *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*, 111.

[55] N. A. Dahl, *Studies in Paul*, 49 ff.

[56] W. Stenger, ‘Beobachtungen zur Argumentationsstruktur’, 85 f.

[57] J. C. Hurd, *The Origins of 1 Corinthians*, 113.

[58] E. Troeltsch, *The Social Teaching of the Christian Churches I* (New York, 1931) 78; cf. G. Theissen, *The Social Setting*, 107.

[59] J. H. Schütz, *Paul and the Anatomy of Apostolic Authority* (London: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1975) 285.

[60] Cf. C. Forbes, ‘Comparison, Self-Praise and Irony: Paul’s Boasting and the Conventions of Hellenistic Rhetoric’, *NTS* 32 (1986) 14 who suggests two alternative models: ‘those of a parent with children whose position is guaranteed by his paternity and of an ambassador, whose position is guaranteed by his sender’. For a different understanding cf., however, B. Holmberg, *Paul and Power. The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1980) 188 f.; for the function of the father-title in Paul’s symbolic universe cf. N. R. Peterson, *Rediscovering Paul*, 104–50.

[61] Cf. also S. Barton, ‘Paul and the Cross: A Sociological Approach’, *Theology* 85 (1982) 13–19. 18: ‘Paul augments his authority by focusing attention on how he himself interprets “Christ crucified”, thereby increasing dependence on himself as leader’.

[62] For different understandings of authority in antiquity and today cf. Th. Eschenburg, *Über Autorität* (Frankfurt: Suhrkamp, 1976); R. Sennett, *Authority* (New York: Vintage Books, 1980); D. H. Wrong, *Power. Its Forms, Bases, and Abuses* (New York: Harper & Row, 1979).

[63] Cf. L. Schottroff, ‘Nicht viele Mächtige. Annäherungen an eine Soziologie des Urchristentums’, *Bibel und Kirche* 40 (1985) 2–8.

[64] R. Hock, ‘Paul’s Tentmaking and the Problem of His Social Class’, *JBL* 97 (1978) 555–64; M. Bunker, *Briefformular*, 75; C. Forbes, ‘Comparison, Self-Praise, and Irony’, 24.