

UNIVERZITA KARLOVA
Katolická Teologická Fakulta
Adam Sabir

Three voices, one of which is Paul's

Abstract

The main question of the text is to explore what concern that is at the center of the arguments in the Corinthian debate surrounding food sacrificed to idols? To be able to answer the question we apply a new method to the text to reach the various positions in Corinth. The objective of this present text is therefore to provide a textual division which in the latter part of my dissertation (of which this paper is a chapter) is exegetically interpreted and further contextualized as to its central argumentation.

Hlavní otázkou textu je prozkoumat, jaké obavy jsou středem argumentů v korintské debatě o jídle obětovaném modlám? Abychom byli schopni odpovědět na otázku, aplikujeme na text novou metodu, abychom dosáhli různých pozic v Korintu. Cílem tohoto předkládaného textu je proto poskytnout textové členění, které je ve druhé části mé disertační práce (jehož je tato práce kapitolou) exegeticky interpretováno a dále kontextualizováno, pokud jde o jeho ústřední argumentaci.

Table of contents

1.1 Introduction to the work in its broader context.....	4
1.2 Terminological remarks.....	4
1.3 Key problems with past divisions of the text.....	5
1.4 Introduction to the present text and its outline.....	5
2.1 Principles behind previous divisions.....	6
2.2 Methodological deficiency.....	9
2.3 Way forward.....	10
2.4 Where does Paul take by?.....	11
2.4.1 How the voice and double sequence confirms this.....	12
2.4.2 Supportive arguments from stylometry.....	17
2.4.2.1 Prepositions.....	19
2.4.2.1.1 ἕως ἄρτι.....	23
2.4.2.1.2 ἐν οὐρανῷ εἶτε ἐπὶ γῆς.....	25
2.4.2.2 Emphaticized conjunctions, conditionals, kai, and structure.....	27
2.4.2.3 Other supportive arguments, from terminology.....	33
2.5 Where does the embedding begin?.....	37
2.6 Other interruptions by Paul?.....	40
2.7 Other Corinthian statements in chapter 10?.....	50
2.7.1 Statements that arguably are Corinthian.....	50
2.8 Embedded positions from the third party?.....	53
2.9 The worked out division.....	59
3 Summary and concluding remarks.....	59
4. Litterature.....	60
Apendix.....	71

Three voices, one of which is Paul's

1.1 Introduction to the work in its broader context¹

To put things in context. The dissertation of which this present paper forms an integral part has the title *Unity and Diversity in Corinth - Early Christian Disputes About the Significance of Idol Food*. The dissertation aims at contributing to the ongoing debate surrounding the key chapters of 1 Corinthians 8 and 10 as to their instructions pertaining to idol food. The aim of the dissertation as a whole is therefore to bring clarity to the Early Christian debate surrounding the topic of idol food, by way of giving heed to all the disputants and their respective arguments. The main question of the dissertation is therefore to explore what concern that is at the center of the arguments in the Corinthian debate surrounding idol food? To be able to answer the question and the main objective of the study, the first chapter of the dissertation is dedicated to develop a new methodology by which the various positions in Corinth could be reached. The present paper is the second step succeeding the development of the new methodology. Here the methodology is applied to the actual text in order to present a textual division which follows the application of the newly developed method. The objective of this present text is therefore to provide a textual division which in the latter part of the dissertation is exegetically interpreted and further contextualized as to its central argumentation.²

1.2 Terminological remarks

Scholarship has down the ages recognized that the apostle Paul interacts with his addressees in his Epistles. If the question is posed of how he does so, a partial answer is by paraphrases and quotations. In my dissertation such interactions are called *embeddings*. In absence of the written and oral correspondences that Paul may have had from the early Christians at Corinth, there is no certain way to determine whether such embeddings always are verbatim quotations from letters received by Paul (cf 1 Cor 7:1); or whether they are summaries of the positions the Corinthians held prior to Paul's instructions. The terminology chosen is therefore adequate to the state of affairs without necessarily to be interpreted as either of the two, even though there could be stronger arguments in favor of one of the two in certain loci. Embeddings are also not to be confused with interpolations. The latter would be later reworkings of earlier manuscripts to peddle an agenda, settle disputes or fabricate viewpoints held by a certain fraction or fractions. Embeddings are in contrast recognizing the integrity

¹ A table of contents for the dissertation is supplemented at the end of this paper to further contextualize where in the overall study this section occurs.

² Chapter 1 of the dissertation presents a thorough investigation of the past research surrounding this topic both in regard to how the text has been divided by previous scholars, what methods have been utilized, and consequently what arguments they have attributed both to Paul and to his interlocutors. The investigation results in the identification of different methodological approaches with a number of deficiencies clearly illustrated and discussed. Chapter 2 is where I try to resolve the difficulties and deficiencies inherent in previous approaches by developing a new methodology which takes into account specific linguistic features surrounding embeddings in the Pauline corpus. Chapter 3 which is attached as a separate paper here is the chapter where the new method developed in chapter 2 is applied to 1 Cor 8-10 which results in a new division of the text. The main purpose of the chapter below is consequently to answer *who says what in Corinth*. In chapter 4 the various positions (apostle Paul's and the Corinthian Christians') are discussed and their arguments evaluated. The purpose of this chapter is to reconstruct the positions pertaining to the topic of Idol Food. The dissertation also puts the arguments in context in order to explain what the main concern or the kernel of the debate may have been, and how it could be understood in its contemporary context.

of the text, by acknowledging that the apostle in addition to instructing also interacts with his addressees.

1.3 Key problems with past divisions of the text

Scholarship has always recognized that some of the apparent discrepancies in the instructions surrounding idol food could be solved by recognizing the presence of embedded arguments from the apostle's addressees. In more recent times various attempts have been made to more directly reach the positions of the Corinthians themselves.³ This has been done with various tools and often unsatisfying methods. Rhetorical criticism has for instance been prone to (as in the case of Fotopoulos) use certain ancient rhetors as templates through which 1 Corinthians is forcefully read to reach suggestions of where the apostle's addressees are to be found. Other scholars have yet again started from premises of what Paul must have or must not have argued in order to thereafter assign the "inconvenient" portions to others than Paul. The latter approaches have often shown the marks of doctrinal biases rather than a systematic approach. To deepen our understanding of where the embeddings could be found, there has therefore been a need to further develop a more systematic approach. The overarching purpose of the dissertation is therefore to develop a new methodology of identifying embeddings in order to solve the age old disputes surrounding where the embeddings could be found and further therefore to give a more adequate picture of what the Corinthians believed with regard to idol food; and what the apostle Paul actually instructed concerning this matter. Without such a systematic approach, modern scholars run the risk of ending with different Pauls and different Corinthians depending on how they choose to divide the text in their attempt at finding these embeddings. In the dissertation a methodology is developed starting with Paul's own Epistles and this is further applied to the text at dispute to identify and suggest where the embeddings are to be found. Once this is done, the text could be the subjected of an exegetical analysis wherein the various positions, both Paul's and his addressees are explored and explained within its proper context.

1.4 Introduction to the present text and its outline

To say something more about what follows below, it is important to remember that the reasons for the approaches in this present text are thoroughly established in chapter 2 of the dissertation. *The main arguments for why an approach is taken rather than another is not answered in this text.* Rather this paper takes its starting point from the main conclusions in the chapter which foregoes it in the dissertation. There in short it is identified that the apostle Paul in his corpus begins his interaction with embeddings *by imperatives, negations or questions.* To validate this, other patterns found in Paul's handling of similar statements as well as contemporary practice in antiquity suggest two further features that would need to be present for this assertion to have value. The one being the *shift in voices* and the other in the *point for point interaction* with whatever appeared before the demarcation line of the imperative, negation or question. In the text that follows it is illustrated that *both of these patterns are present in 1 Cor 8*, confirming therefore the suggested demarcation line between where the Corinthian embedding ends and where Paul takes by with his instructions. The division of the text is further then confirmed in this present text by comparing the results with additional evidence from the stylometric discipline. The stylometric insights give credence to the division of the text and therefore support to the newly developed methodology as such. The texts are then sifted through and discussed from the standpoint of the newly developed methodology to end in a division of the text which results from its application.

³ For a comprehensive exposition of the various attempts, the reader is advised to consult the section dealing with previous research on this topic in my upcoming dissertation *Unity and Diversity in Corinth - Early Christian Disputes About the Significance of Idol Food.*

2.1 Principles behind previous divisions

One of the major controversies surrounding the scholarly reconstruction of the Corinthian debate regarding food sacrificed to idols as - we have seen in the section dealing with previous research - has been how to explain the apparent inconsistencies inbetween chapters 8 and 10 in first Corinthians. It was further argued that recent rhetorical studies (Mitchell, Smit, Fotopoulos etc) have shown that a way forward could be to recognize that all the statements present within the text are not necessarily to be attributed to Paul. What these scholars have hence suggested is that interspersed within Paul's refutations are actual statements from Paul's Corinthian adversaries; the recognition of which would explain the discrepancies within the text. Yet these scholars have not agreed upon how to divide the text inbetween Paul and those he is supposedly quoting. They have further done little to deepen our understanding of how such a process could be conducted.

My dissertational project presents a way forward with regards to a) how such process could be conducted, namely how the text is to be divided b) the stages within this process have thus far been conducted to work out the tools necessary for such a textual discrimination; c) the next step is to apply these tools on the text for the final; d) analysis of how the resulting corpus and the arguments involved encircle the "bone at stake", the so called marrow of the debate. *The working hypothesis is that different perceptions of the implications of monotheism explain a larger deal of the debate than have previously been assumed.*

In this section I will thus give a brief overview of a) illustrating examples of how the text has been divided in previous attempt and the deficiencies involved b) demonstrate a way forward through applying the insights from the results of chapter 2; c) divide the text accordingly for the analytical chapter 4 where we also will contextualize the debate.

a) If the redactional critics so to speak kicked the can of dealing with the inconsistencies of chapter 8 and 10 in front of them, the problem for the rhetorical approach has been to find a model that would reconcile these statements while up-keeping the integrity of the letter. A growing support has been attached towards a model that recognizes that there is no necessity to assume that all the positions within the text need to reflect the mind of Paul. By recognizing the possibility of interspersed quotes suddenly Paul is saved from the ill reputation of inconsistency at the same time as the letter's integrity as a unified whole is upkept and alive.

The problem that has confronted the scholars has however been the one of the division of the text.⁴ Which statements are to be assigned to Paul, and which ones to his opponents? How many opponents are there? Are they furthermore quoted verbatim or paraphrased and does it make any difference? The various propositions and solutions suggested seem to reactualize the old "hen or the egg" problematic. *Are the divisions confirming the expectations of these scholars or are the expectations guiding the division?*

Examples of divisions of chapter 8-10. (Greek of chpt 8 below. Translations represent the original authors own.)

¹Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, οἶδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γινώσκουσιν ἔχομεν. ἡ γινώσκουσιν φυσιοῦ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ. ²εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωσκέναι τι, οὕτω ἔγνω καθὼς δεῖ γινῶναι: ³εἰ δὲ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἐγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. ⁴Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἶς. ⁵καὶ γὰρ εἴτερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, ὡσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί, ⁶ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ. ⁷Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γινώσκουσιν: τινὲς

⁴ Cf. Hurd, *Origins*, 62-94 with a table of summary on p. 68 presents several dozens of suggestions. A list that is ever growing. Hurd himself suggested rather unconvincingly that Περὶ δὲ introduced statements other than Paul's own. See Mitchell, "Concerning Περὶ δὲ in 1 Corinthians", 234 upon the expression as a topic marker that may or may not introduce embedded statements.

δὲ τῆς συνηθείας ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενῆς οὐσα μολύνεται. ⁸βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ: οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑπερούμεθα, οὔτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν. ⁹βλέπετε δὲ μή πως ἡ ἐξουσία ὑμῶν αὕτη πρόσκομμα γένηται τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν. ¹⁰ἐὰν γὰρ τις ἴδῃ σὲ τὸν ἔχοντα γνῶσιν ἐν εἰδωλείῳ κατακείμενον, οὐχὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθυτα ἐσθίειν; ¹¹ἀπόλλυται γὰρ ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἐν τῇ σῆι γνώσει, ὁ ἀδελφὸς δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν. ¹²οὕτως δὲ ἁμαρτάνοντες εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφούς καὶ τύπτοντες αὐτῶν τὴν συνείδησιν ἀσθενοῦσαν εἰς Χριστὸν ἁμαρτάνετε. ¹³διόπερ εἰ βρῶμα σκανδαλίζει τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, οὐ μὴ φάγω κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἵνα μὴ τὸν ἀδελφόν μου σκανδαλίσω.

Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth*⁵

8:1b We all possess knowledge

8:4b An idol is nothing and there is no God but one

Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*⁶

⁵Cf. Witherington, 187-9. The processes behind Witherington's textual division here are obscure. There is no clear methodological discussion as to how to reach embedded quotes within ancient texts. The starting point seems rather to be the authors' assumptions about Paul and his relation to the Corinthians. How does Witherington know that: "In Paul's view the issue is not what kind of meat one eats. It is rather, the social and moral effects of eating in certain contexts. Thus this discussion is primarily about interpersonal behavior in certain contexts and not about cuisine." (188) adding in note 4 that "Paul is operating as a teacher with students treating these Corinthians as immature students". There is no problem with reaching such a conclusion about a diligent textual analysis. It is however problematic to assume what in effect Witherington is expected to prove. As the survey of previous research has illustrated, assumptions of this nature have time and time again filled the vacuum of a more stringent process. If Witherington already knows what Paul's views are regarding this issue it naturally follows that he excludes and includes whatever statements he believes conform to his expectations. If associating in temple-related activities is the "real core" of this interaction, it becomes perplexing why temple activities in context are never discouraged apart from food. The latter in contrast not only forms the head topic of the section, but is a partaking of which somebody runs the risk of (8:9), is destroyed by (8:10) and furthermore the object of Paul's abstention if necessary (8:13) as well as incompatible with Divine service (10:21). These are points Witherington either must ignore or reinterpret to fit his preconceptions. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 359f agrees with Witherington with regard to the importance attached to the place of eating rather than what is eaten. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 177 in contrast stresses the importance of what is eaten over where it is consumed.

⁶ Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*, 82, 86, 224; On p. 97 he acknowledges quite promising that "the dangerous subjectivity of locating citations in Pauline letters" require that the "attempts to isolate any such quotation must be tentative in nature." Yet practically speaking there is no methodological section dealing with how a more reflective approach would look like. Nevertheless certain principles could be gathered from how Willis chooses to divide his text. Discussing whether verse 8 for instance is Corinthian or Pauline in origin, he reserves himself from what a) "does not really seem to fit the Corinthians own position" and for what b) he believes "reverses the argument of the strong." (97). Likewise grammar is sometimes set aside when Willis believes that "the position expressed is Paul's own" (97). This confidence in what is Corinthian and what is Paul leads occasionally to textual modification as in verse 8b where οὔτε is believed to misrepresent the Corinthian position, so that: "The second half of the verse...by a single simple change would represent accurately the enlightened Corinthian's outlook." (96). The endproduct of these alterations are seen above and represent what Willis hence assumes Paul argues and what "the enlightened Corinthian's" argue. Willis gives us no reasons for why the Corinthian's should be understood simply sociologically, but he gives clues about that this indeed is his assumption in several ways. To mention but one; by mirror-reading what Willis excludes as possible Corinthian references is quite revealing. The drop of the οὔτε in verse 8b is motivated by that the Corinthians were not interested in the afterlife nor (following Horsley, 578 "jewish food laws"), but solely motivated by what temporal advantages and disadvantages they could get in this life. The negation of any excesses in spiritual terms is also why v5b is excluded as possibly being Corinthian (86, cf. Conzelmann 143). Supportive arguments are sometimes provided from *unique syntax* (67), sometimes from what is believed to be a creedal confession (84-5), but the general methodological emphasis is however to include what he believes is consistent with the different parties arguments and exclude whatever he believes runs contrariwise. Willis believes that the conflict is encaptured in verse 1, where is seen "succinctly the basic conflict between Paul and the Corinthians, not only about idol meat but other issues as well. They and he have a fundamental difference in how they understand the gospel. For the Corinthians it is γνῶσις, for Paul it is ἀγάπη." (71). From this basic premise Willis then adds and subtracts whatever he believes is consistent with those concepts. As already should be apparent, there is a fundamental flaw in types of reconstructions that assume beforehand what they would need to prove. For Witherington the main thrust was to reconstruct the textual divisions from what he believed would be Paul's position. Willis, does basically the same – but has a more developed view on what we should expect the Corinthian's to argue. This leads him to find inconsistencies and construct consistencies where there not necessarily are any. Further dependent upon very dubious additions and subtractions.

- 8.1b We know that we all have knowledge
- 8.4bc We know that there is no idol in the world and that there is no God but one.
- 8.5a Although there are so-called gods, whether in heaven or on the earth,
- 8.6 Yet for [Christians as we confess], there is one God, the Father, from whom come all things, and to whom we belong, and one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things, and even we ourselves!
- 8.8b If we do not eat we are at a loss, if we do we have a positive gain.
- 10.23 All things are allowed for me.

Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*⁷

- 8:1b We know that we all have knowledge
- 8:4b-c We know that no idol exists in the world and no God exists but one.
- 8:5a For even if there are so-called gods, whether in heaven or whether on earth
- 8.6 But for us there is one God, the Father from whom are all things and for whom we exist, And there is one Lord, Jesus Christ from whom are all things and through whom we exist.
- 8:8 Food will not bring us before God [in judgement]. We are worse off if we do not eat, and we are better off if we eat.
- 10:23a,c All things are permissible.

⁷ Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 220, 238-9. On p. 191 he suggests “that many of the Strong’s positions which are used to justify their consumption of idol-food are embedded within the text itself”. The methodology for discerning which such are seems to have been fourfold: a) internal coherency (193); b) reoccurring stated positions (194); c) assumptions of deliberative rhetoric (195); and d) application of Quintilian’s *Institutio Oratorio* and Aristotle’s *Rhetoric* (195-206). Though the first two are logical in nature, precautions need to be applied so that coherency precedes any preconceived ideas of what the parties argue. The alternative is ad hoc and seeks to push a coherency where there perhaps is not any. The third and the fourth ways for Fotopoulos to discern what indeed is Paul and what is Corinthian in origin is particularly problematic. Below in the discussions of which rhetorical scheme that is to be applied we will treat more closely with the individual problems. On the level of reconstructing what is Paul and what is his opponents it becomes problematic from the standpoint that the model pushed upon the text expects by design to divide it according to one rhetorical model among many others that Paul either could or not be aware of as the variety of rhetorical handbooks in antiquity illustrates. At the basic level we have three types of rhetoric, the deliberative, the forensic and the epideictic. Fotopoulos chooses without a further ado to apply the deliberative rhetoric of Quintilian as the most explanatory loaded model for Pauline argumentative structure. The result being that what does not fit the model ends up in the rhetorical thrash-bin called the Corinthian position. The choice of any particular rhetorical model presupposes certain steps regarding coherency that may or may not apply to the other types of rhetoric or how it is understood by other rhetoricians. Like the assumptions Witherington displayed about what Paul’s position is, the avoidance of the complexity involved in rhetorical styles and disregarding different rhetorical schools seems to mirror Fotopoulos assumption about the relation between Paul and the Corinthian’s he addresses. It does further little to illuminate our understanding for what kind of rhetoric is involved in the Corinthian argument. The cautious reader should ask why a slavish following of Quintilian rather than any other? To shortly illustrate the practical difficulties this uncritical adaption of *deliberative* rhetoric creates for Fotopoulos two examples are sufficient. The first being the historical one. Deliberative rhetoric aims at addressing a current or future behavior. In of itself it is hence not evidence for that something has happened in lapsed time. Yet after spending 200 pages in search for which temple the Corinthian’s where supposedly seen eating idol-food, Fotopoulos compromises his whole enterprise by applying deliberative rhetoric rather than the forensic to the portions which could or could not hence be speculative. The second problem of forcefully pushing preconceived models appears on an analytical level. Mitchell in *Paul and Rhetoric*, 198-200 suggests that the whole letter as would be customary for deliberative rhetoric constitute a rhetorical whole centered at the *propositio* in 1:10 that calls for unity in a divided community. This is something that Fotopoulos concedes to (196). Normally in rhetorical analysis this means that each *probatio* constitutes proofs for the *propositio*. To be consistent therefore Fotopoulos would hence need to treat the rift about idol food as a *probatio* for the *propositio*. The difficulty involved in this seems to be that if the *propositio* is a call for unity, the divisions over food would not be an example of such a call, but rather a *probatio* of that such disunity does exist. At this point Fotopoulos dispends with Occam’s razor and invents an anomaly of that each subsequent section of a deliberative rhetorical unity could be a microcosmos of a whole integral deliberative structure with its own *propositio* and *probatio*. This is further ingenuitively supported by a reference gathered from Quintilians exposé of *forensic* rhetoric rather than the *deliberative* Fotopoulos pushes (197). If the reader had not been convinced thus far, it becomes apparently clear that Fotopoulos is willing to stretch the outreach of his model so that it could be pushed as far as possible on the text.

The above divisions reflect what these particular scholars would like to take as Corinthian in origin. The significance of the one division over the other lies in what kind of Paul you get or assume or what kind of Corinthians you get or assume. Moreover this will in turn reflect what the debate was about and from whom. A suggestion without a consistent methodology could be utilized both for various motives such as both create and hide inconsistencies within a perceived alternative. The purpose behind a textual division should however not be to reconcile the positions to our image, but rather to discern if there is a way to reach what actually was said, whether one agrees with the positions or not. Important to remember is also that the nature of an argument is not necessarily to be consistent, the latter is the characteristic of a good argument. The tools that hence start from prepositions that Paul must either must have argued or not have argued or must have been consistent from a modern perspective are not persuasive. Unfortunately the textual divisions presented above are often poorly motivated and not preceded by an investigation to actual embedding practices. Willis, as a general working theory for the whole Corinthian debate suggests social issues as the focal motive behind a sophisticated Christian elite's, coincidentally enough ends up with ascribing the most elaborate and extensive section to the Corinthians. Witherington with a "higher view" of Paul prefers to ascribe many of the same portions to him. Fotopoulos on the other hand, trying to illustrate the rhetorical nature of the texts, tries to divide the texts after a punctual list of a particular section of the Roman rhetor Quintillian deliberative rhetoric.

2.2 Methodological deficiency

In order to understand the discussions in Corinth over idol food one would first need to recognize that we are basically dealing with several levels of conflict. On the first level we have the actual debate as it went on in Corinth with all its details, exchange of arguments and letters. On the second level we have the part of the debate as it appears in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians with all its possible modes of interpretation and discrepancies. On the third level we have the scholarly debate over the actual interpretation of the conflict as it appears in first Corinthians.

While any attempt at solving the first level is impossible due to lack of sufficient resources, any scholarly attempt to the contrary should be excluded on the basis of outdated presuppositions regarding the comprehensibility of the actual text. The second level is potentially to be regarded solvable on the premise that the text-level discussions are not out of reach to the utilization of the right tools on the part of the scholar. The third level of discussions are whenever they arise from faulty premises to be regarded as dispensable with regards to arguments symptomatic of or dependable on such premises.

A way forward with regards to the second level debate is recognize that many of the third level solutions arise from shared but unproven premises. Of these, at least two deserve special attention. The first being the presumption which arises from regarding the text with all its components as representing Paul's position. The second premise regards the utilization of rhetorical theories from "top to bottom", meaning choosing a rhetorical framework into which the divergent parts of the text are more or less pushed within. In the following a couple of examples will be brought forward to illustrate both premises, the arguments arising from them and the problems they create. A way forward is to actually take a step backwards, disband the premises that have not lead to a satisfying solution and propose a new approach. Such an approach would be to challenge the first premise of Paul being the sole voice appearing in the Corinthian text and second to approach the rhetoric of

the text from the “bottom up” where elements within the text are first recognized and then interpreted from existing models.

With regards to the first premise the whole corpus in its entirety has been generally attributed to the pen and argument of Paul.⁸ The reasons for this are not given, but it seems rather to be supposed that since Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, no attention needs to be paid to the origin of its integral parts. In Barret’s commentary to First Corinthian’s the author first recognizes that the statement in 1 Corinthians 15:33 is not to be considered a quote from the Old Testament, but denies any intention on the part of Paul to quote from a pagan source other than if it happened proverbially.⁹ Despite such apparent cases of quotation as when Paul affirms the presence of them himself (1 Cor 7:1) they seem rather to be interpreted as exceptions to a general rule, than incitements to further investigation about which parts of the letter that could be ascribed to whom.¹⁰

The oftentimes poorly argued cases reflect hence several deficiencies that parallel those these scholars originally themselves addressed against the redaction critics. *Empirically* speaking, there is no original letter from the Corinthians that could confirm any of these divisions. *Logically* speaking, there is a lack of critical assessment assuming what one would need to prove in the first place and/ or by them appealing to authorities. *Methodologically* speaking, the kind of approaches *von oben*, as forcefully pushing the textual parts into a preconceived rhetorical model is obviously flawed in nature with regards to its presumptions. On the same working principle any other ancient rhetorical model could function as the standard into which first Corinthian’s would be forcefully adapted.

2.3 Way forward

First, an enterprise of discerning whether an author does and how and for what purpose he does embed statements would need to precede any attempts at reconstructing the various positions. Since we cannot go beyond our evidence, and the evidence does not consist of an original Corinthian correspondence to Paul, or in presuming what Paul thinks about this issue or which rhetor he would have preferred. The obvious way forward if we want to ask where the embedded sections are to be found on the presumptions that such are present in the text; would be to implement the results of the previous section of this study.

As a part of this dissertational project I have done an overview of the dozen non-sacred quotations in the generally accepted Pauline corpus. This has resulted in several insights among which the chief are:

- Paul does not agree with his non sacred quotes. He contradicts and modifies them at some occasion.
- This is the pattern no matter whether the quoted propositions are directed against Paul himself, his teaching or come in the form of doctrinal propositions.
- There is no fixed introductory formula. The quotes could be signaled by that something has been written, said or not marked out at all.
- There is a correspondence however in tone, personal vis a vie impersonal. Quotes with a personal voice are countered in personal form.

⁸ Cf the section dealing with previous research.

The various partition theories presented in late 19th century research are no exceptions to this. Even if several letters were assumed at some point to be merged into 1 Corinthians, the various letters were all believed to be different stages of Paul’s correspondence to the Corinthians.

⁹ Scherbenske, *Canonizing Paul*, 116–175, esp 139n. 71.

¹⁰ *Ibid*, 154.

- The content is most often doctrinal, then in falling order concerning Paul and his authority and lastly about internal discord.
- Every quote not preceded by a *verbum dicendi* has touched upon doctrine. However doctrinal quotations can also follow *verbum dicendi* introductions.
- Most frequently, either Paul or divisions as topics follow *verbum dicendi* introductions.
- Paul answers in a personal form whenever he is directly or indirectly the object considered in the quote.
- Paul contradicts his non-sacred quotes with a) imperatives b) negations c) questions. The *imperatives* can appear unaccompanied of the other forms of contradictions. They appear in contexts where the intention of Paul seems to be to change the mind of his addressees. *Negations* come more or less emphatically, never accompanied without a question and are generally directed at changing the thoughts rather than behavior of adversaries. *Questions* appear conjoint with negations or by themselves or in subsequent order. They have no fixed syntactical location with relations to the questioned quote.

From this list a basic prediction could be established. If Paul unlike his Scriptural quotations embeds his opponents in order to refute an idea or behavior of those he quotes, *the above passage in 1 Corinthians 8 would have to be assessed from how Paul usually does behave when doing so, namely starting with or in form of imperatives, negations or questions*. Any divergent behavior from how Paul usually presents his quotes would have to be emphatically defended by arguments and not assumptions.

In addition to Paul's handling of this type of sources we saw numerous examples from antiquity who despite their other differences of purposes were congruent with each other and with Paul when it comes to how statements embedded within an ancient text could be identified. Together the analysis of Paul's behavior with regard to the embedding of statements from correspondences as well as the insights provided from antiquity in general gives us the basic tools for such an identification. The most important of which is the prediction that: *We would expect to find a double sequence in different voices. The second sequence would respond to the first sequence point for point in another tone either qualifying, highlighting, rebuking or arguing with the contents received.*¹¹

In the following the result will be presented of how the text is divided once the tools are applied. This will then form the evidentially supported division between Paul and his Corinthian opponents. These are the following steps a) Where Paul takes by b) How the voice and double sequence confirms this c) Supportive arguments for the division d) other Corinthian statements in 8-10? e) Where does the embedding begin? f) Other interruptions of Paul g) Embedded positions from the third party?

2.4 Where does Paul take by?

Since our survey has displayed that Paul interacts with the quoted statements of his adversaries beginning by negations, questions or imperatives, we should look at where those appear within the text at hand.¹² After all, any combination of these would fill the

¹¹ The reader should refer the results discussed in the previous chapter.

¹² This approach is novel since it begins with asking where Paul "takes by" or begins his interaction with the Corinthian statements. While previous researchers have mainly been interested with suggesting often speculative introductory formulas or finding possible interjections that could be ascribed to Paul's opponents, our extensive study of such quotations has shown that there is no consistent "introductory formula" introducing

purpose of being the demarcation line inbetween Paul and his Corinthian correspondents on the assumption that these are already present within the text. If indeed a pattern here closely resembling the other examples already provided could be established it would constitute a strong argument for where the splinter should be thrust between Paul and the Corinthians. The case of the imperative is very peculiar. We see that the only imperative that does appear in this chapter is present at the beginning of verse 9 **βλέπετε** or beware resembles other locations wherein Paul first embeds his opponents statements and then addresses them with the help of the imperative (1 Cor 7:1; 2 Cor 10:10).¹³ Conceded, that an imperative by itself does not signal a quotation of any type – it is important to remember what other kinds of patterns surround embedded statements that are contradicted with imperatives.¹⁴ Whereas a broken pattern would be highly indicative of that the demarcation line should be drawn elsewhere, a consistency in practice on the other hand would be congruent with what we have seen thus far.¹⁵ To confirm whether this imperative follows the general line of demarcation between the embedded statements and the interaction with them it would thus be necessary to see whether it aligns to *the other patterns we have seen surround the imperatives once they function in this fashion*. Two of these patterns as discussed above are a) whatever precedes the imperative could appear in a personal form other than the personal form following the imperative; b) whatever succeeds the imperative would address all the points quoted in the section preceding the imperative. This would also be consistent with the ancient practice of interacting with embedded statements.¹⁶ When one thinks about it, it only makes sense to address all the points of what one quotes to refute or interact with.

2.4.1 How the voice and double sequence confirms this

embedded statements whenever they occur within Paul or in other antique documents at large. This being the case, a process that begins with asserting that such exist but furthermore what they are is not convincing. Starting with assuming what Paul's objectives are for a subsequent deduction becomes further a self-fulfilling prophecy in that whatever is perceived as being possibly not consistent with this is designated as Corinthian. A lesser subjectively oriented methodology is to begin as we have done with the actual patterns that do surround embedded quotations in Paul and other ancient authors. This means that the starting point must be with those consistent attributes that surround such loci without the baggage of assuming a priori what these may be. Since our survey has displayed a consistency at the point of interacting with embedded statements rather than at the inception of them, the former is also the place where we should begin our inquiry.

¹³ No commentators have previously taken systematical notice of how embedded statements are marked out in ancient texts. Hence the word βλέπετε has not been considered from this perspective. Some commentators have in spite of whole dissertations written about this subject not bothered to comment at verse 9 at all (cf. Ngozo, *The one God and the Many Gods*; Smith, *Pauline Communities as 'Scholastic Communities'*); some scholars have looked into the origins of the concerns expressed (cf. Gerhardsson, *Memory and Manuscript*, 316 suggests that the warning may have originated with a similar saying of Jesus [Matt 18.6 with par.]); other scholars have not viewed the imperative apart from the ἡ ἐξουσία with the emphasis of the latter and the urging of a moderate Corinthian utilization of it (Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric*, 129; Shen, *Canaan to Corinth*, 171n11; cf. Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 182 discussing ἡ ἐξουσία as something to be subjected in favor of "interpersonal relationships"); a minority of scholars have chosen to interpret this section as "sarcastic" (cf. Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth*, 129; 141); of those giving heed to the imperative in relation to embedded statements Ciampa & Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 390 sees this as a grave warning, following a reasoning attributed to Paul without any further structural significance. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 384 notices most convincingly though emphasizing the conjunction in wrong order that "He [Paul] begins with an adversative conjunction ("but"), followed by the imperative of warning..."

¹⁴ Our contention is not that an imperative could work independently of the other patterns as a marker of embedded statements whether originally written or spoken. This is also true with regards to βλέπετε which in of itself does not constitute such an indication as for instance when it occurs thrice in Phil 3:2 in which case the following patterns are absent and the imperative hence could not be argued to entail this function.

¹⁵ The interested reader should refer to the previous chapters of this dissertation for a detailed discussion of such examples.

¹⁶ Ibid. Especially the section *Putting Paul in further context* where such types of interaction are analyzed and discussed with relation to Paul.

Applying these principles to chapter 8, we see that it indeed fits both patterns. First we have the different “voices” in form of one consistent form above as well as one consistent form beneath the imperative of verse 9.¹⁷ These are never interchanged within the sections concerned.

¹Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, **οἶδαμεν** ὅτι πάντες γινώσκουσιν **ἔχομεν**. ἡ γνώσις φυσιοῦ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ. ²εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι, οὕτω ἔγνω καθὼς δεῖ γινῶναι: ³εἰ δὲ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἐγνωσται ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ. ⁴Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων **οἶδαμεν** ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδῶλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς. ⁵καὶ γὰρ εἴτερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, ὡσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί, ⁶ἀλλ' **ἡμῖν** εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ **ἡμεῖς** εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ **ἡμεῖς** δι' αὐτοῦ. ⁷Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνώσις: τινὲς δὲ τῆ συνηθεία ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενῆς οὕσα μολύνεται. ⁸βρῶμα δὲ **ἡμᾶς** οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ: οὔτε ἐάν μὴ **φάγωμεν** ὑστερούμεθα, οὔτε ἐάν **φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν**. ⁹**βλέπετε** δὲ μή πως ἡ ἐξουσία **ὑμῶν αὕτη** πρόσκομμα γένηται τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν. ¹⁰ἐάν γὰρ τις ἴδῃ **σέ** τὸν ἔχοντα γνώσιν ἐν εἰδωλείῳ κατακείμενον, οὐχὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθута ἐσθίειν; ¹¹ἀπόλλυται γὰρ ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἐν τῇ **σῆ** γνώσει, ὁ ἀδελφός δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν. ¹²οὕτως δὲ **ἁμαρτάνοντες** εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφούς καὶ **τύπτοντες** αὐτῶν τὴν συνείδησιν ἀσθενοῦσαν εἰς Χριστὸν **ἁμαρτάνετε**. ¹³διόπερ εἰ βρῶμα σκανδαλίζει τὸν ἀδελφόν **μου**, οὐ μὴ **φάγω** κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἵνα μὴ τὸν ἀδελφόν **μου σκανδαλίω**.

Green = self reflective personal tone “the voice” of the Corinthians.

Red = self reflective personal tone “the voice” of Paul. Demonstrative pronouns additionally signifying the Corinthians interacted with (also colored) and mark a further distance from them and their views.

Preceding the imperative the self-reflective personal tone appears in the 1 personal plural form. This is the case with οἶδαμεν in verses 1 and 4, ἔχομεν in verse 1, ἡμῖν in verse 6, the twice occurring ἡμεῖς in verse 6, ἡμᾶς in verse 8, the twice occurring φάγωμεν and περισσεύομεν in verse 8.

In contrast, after the imperative in verse 9, the text is not only characterized by the lack of self-reflection in the first personal plural form – but furthermore when self-reflection appears it does so in the first personal singular cf. the twice occurring μου, φάγω and σκανδαλίω of verse 13. Furthermore the part succeeding verse 9 further signals a distancing from the first personal plural form before verse 9. It does so by the use of the 2 personal plural or singular form as ὑμῶν of verse 9, see verse 10, 11 and ἁμαρτάνετε of verse 12. In context of verse 12 the ἁμαρτάνοντες and τύπτοντες are acts committed by the one ἁμαρτάνετε (2 pers plural) against Christ.

This is a clear mark of shift in perspective that needs to be discussed. Granted that one single author could change perspective within his writing, our working premises here are as already has been stated that embedded statements are present within this section. The scholars arguing for or against any particular verse originating with Paul or his opponents would need to take account for this shift.¹⁸ This pattern of shifting voices is consistent with

¹⁷ “Voice” as has been noted elsewhere should not here be confused with the grammatical concept. Whenever the latter is meant it will be made explicit to avoid confusion. Voice is used here as elsewhere in the dissertation as a generic term commonly utilized among scholars studying the phenomenon of embedded statements and multiple layers of speakers within a text See Rosenmeyer, *Ancient Greek Literary Letters*, 55: “Allusions to other voices or texts are an important dimension of the genre, as the epistolary experience, although predicated on an absent addressee is inherently reciprocal.” Cf. König, “Alciphon’s Epistolarity”, 269, 271; Hodkinson, “Some Advantages of the Letter”, 292; 297 both essays appearing in ed. Morello & Morrison, *Ancient Letters – Classical & Late Antique Epistolography*.

¹⁸ Even though such calls have been made before (cf. Lock, “1 Corinthians viii.1-9, A Suggestion”, 65ff) this shift has not been sufficiently accounted for since. Comparing the division presented above of Willis and Fotopoulos understanding of what is Corinthian, one major difference besides Fotopoulos addition of reflections about judgment in verse 8 is that he unlike Willis views οἶδαμεν ὅτι v.1 and 4 as an introductory formulation which on the grounds that it would contradict what he thinks is Paul in v.7 (cf. *Food offered to Idols*, 209; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 146; Merk, *Handeln aus Glauben*, 122). There is however no reflection about the shifts in number that this creates in those positions Fotopoulos attributes to Paul in his reconstruction. Willis interprets it rather

how Paul and other ancient authors behave whenever they interact with embedded statements. Already this strongly suggests that where the general line should be thrust inbetween Paul and his adversaries is at least with the beginning of verse 9. To further affirm this would require the imperative to follow the already mentioned second pattern surrounding embedded statements, namely the interaction point for point with the topics raised in the embedded portion. To state it differently, if the general demarcation line between Paul and the Corinthians appear beginning with the imperative of verse 9, then in addition to the different voices appearing in the text the expectation we have established from the first part of this study should be to find a point for point interaction the different sections inbetween. Whatever is interacted with is on all the standards we have seen consistent with the purpose behind embedded statements, whatever is left out most probably is not. This is consistent with the practice of interacting with embedded statements not only in Paul, but in antiquity at large. The opposite of sourcing something without interacting with it has not been evinced.

This leads us then to the already mentioned second pattern surrounding imperatives. To validate the proposition that Paul takes by succeeding verse 9, we would expect to find him address all the points that appear in the quote from his opponents or vice versa to find the points he addresses after verse 9, in the discourse preceding the verse.

¹Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, οἶδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γνῶσιν ἔχομεν. ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῦ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ. ²εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι, οὐπω ἔγνω καθὼς δεῖ γινῶναι: ³εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. ⁴Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς. ⁵καὶ γὰρ εἴπερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῶ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, ὡσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί, ⁶ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ. ⁷Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις: τινὲς δὲ τῇ συνηθείᾳ ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενὴς οὕσα μολύνεται. ⁸βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ: οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, οὔτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν. ⁹βλέπετε δὲ μή πως ἡ ἐξουσία ὑμῶν αὕτη πρόσκομμα γένηται τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν. ¹⁰ἐὰν γὰρ τις ἴδῃ σὲ τὸν ἔχοντα γνῶσιν ἐν εἰδωλείῳ κατακείμενον, οὐχὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθута ἐσθίειν; ¹¹ἀπόλλυται γὰρ ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἐν τῇ σῆι γνώσει, ὁ ἀδελφὸς δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν. ¹²οὕτως δὲ ἁμαρτάνοντες εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφούς καὶ τύπτοντες αὐτῶν τὴν συνείδησιν ἀσθενοῦσαν εἰς Χριστὸν ἁμαρτάνετε. ¹³διόπερ εἰ βρῶμα σκανδαλίζει τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, οὐ μὴ φάγω κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἵνα μὴ τὸν ἀδελφόν μου σκανδαλίσω.

Orange: The knowledge of the Corinthians

Purple: The knowledge God has

Red: The knowledge of the third party

Yellow: The conscience of the third party

Green: Third party in relation to Corinthians and Paul

Blue: Consequences for the third party

Underlines and italicized: Food/ Idol Food.

Grey: The one God and the many deities, consequences.

Many of the colorings above do overlap one another in one or several ways. A more thorough exposé of their internal relationship and meaning will be supplied in the next chapter. Here we are interested in demonstrating whether there is a correspondence between the points and topics appearing before verse 9 and those succeeding verse 9. The

as a part of the Corinthian argument (*cf. Idol Meat, 67; Barrett, 1 Corinthians, 189*). The use of the plural would be on the former view a way for Paul to establish rapport, on the latter a confirmation of that such already exists. The lack of consistency when reflected upon becomes at times problematically solved. Willis notes for instance upon verse 8 that the use of the plural is consistent in context with what he previously has ascribed to the Corinthians but rejects the phrase βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ on theological grounds: "It is less certain that 8:8 contains a quotation, but the first person plural, found in the earlier quotations, appears here also. However, the content of v. 8 does not really seem to fit the Corinthians' own position." (*Idol Meat, .97*). See previous note about the circularity of these types of arguments.

coloring illustrates what seems further to support what the imperative and the voices already suggested should be the demarcation line. Without foregoing into the pregnant meaning of the concepts involved here, a quick overview gives us the following insights.

The γνώσις mentioned before verse 9 is considered from three different perspectives. The investigation about what is meant about γνώσις has often treated this as one single type of γνώσις.¹⁹ Above, the coloring illustrates however that the γνώσις is at least threefold. The orange marks out the γνώσις as could and will further on be defended as the Corinthian. Preceding verse 9 it is recognized by the first person plural in verses 1 and 3 as well as distinguished from what is deemed insufficient types of knowledge by deeming those not being in the right possession καθὼς δεῖ γνῶναι, v.2. The second type of knowledge is the one attributed to God (ἐγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ, v.3) marked by the purple within the text. The third type of knowledge appears in the red and represents such knowledge or the lack thereof as is attributed to a third party, meaning neither the Corinthians themselves in self-reflection, God or Paul. Here the τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι of verse 2 and οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνώσις of v.7 further differentiates this knowledge from the one attributed to God and appearing in self-reflection.²⁰

Succeeding verse 9, the orange marks out the γνώσις which appeared in self-reflection before verse 9 now with a demonstrative σὲ τὸν ἔχοντα γνῶσιν (v.10) and ἐν τῇ σῆ γνώσει (v.11). There seems therefore to be a correspondence between the bringing up of this type of knowledge preceding verse 9 and it reappearing after it. The cases with the other types of knowledge are not as clear. An argument could be provided from verse eleven where ὁ ἀδελφὸς δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν (marked in green) could be said to tangent both the purple and the red section from before verse 9. To be a ὁ ἀδελφὸς would presupposes at least a common reference point, which just as well could be the type of knowledge denied to this party before verse 9. The addition of that Christ has died for this type of individual could be an indication of that they despite apparent suggestion before verse 9 indeed would be known by God. This will however be more elaborated upon in the next chapter. What significance the knowledge God bears towards his followers is anyway a topic thoroughly developed in chapter 10 of first Corinthians where especially the first parts deals with historical examples of such acknowledgement.

The yellow, green and blue marks out further topics with relation to the third party discussed both before and after verse 9. Common for the yellow marked description on both sides of βλέπετε is that the conscience described in either loci neither belongs to Paul nor to the Corinthians he interacts with. The τινὲς and αὐτῶν of verse 7 attributes the conscience discussed to others than those speaking. It marks hence a distance from the group possessing such a conscience. Likewise the αὐτοῦ of verse 10 and αὐτῶν of verse 12 piggy-backs on what not in essence is the conscience of the voice speaking before verse 9 nor could after verse 9 be attached to Paul. Another correspondence between the both sections appears in that this conscience attached to a third party is described as being “weak”. Significant dissimilarities appear however in that succeeding verse 9 the one possessing this

¹⁹ Héring, *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*, 72 is a rare exception finding two types of γνώσις one in the sharing of all and the other given only for some. Conzelmann thinks that what is perceived as a contradiction with regards to γνώσις is “formal and not material” (cf. *1 Corinthians*, 146). Other scholars have seen the Corinthian γνώσις as something Paul either agrees with or attacks (agrees: ex. Lowe, *Honoring God and Family*, 149 considers this as “a point of common agreement” from which what was not agreed upon would be addressed. cf. Cheung, *Idol Food in Corinth*, 114; Shen, *Caanan to Corinth*, 139; for rhetorical devices of this type see Pseudo-Demetrius 5.287 and *Ad Herennium* 1.6.9-10. Attacks: ex. Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 150, 226 rather unconvincingly argues that Paul attacks a “gnostic” form of knowledge. Others like Newton, Derek, *Deity and Diet*, 274-5 suggest tentatively that Paul rejects a definition of knowledge which is essentially dogmatic or an “only way”; Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 144; 163).

²⁰ This division does not necessarily negate one knowledge the Corinthians relate to. There is however a reciprocity involved in the knowledge of God which does not appear in the knowledge the Corinthians have about each other. There is also no direct denial about any kind of knowledge to the other party. Whatever knowledge they possess or are accused of thinking themselves to possess is differentiated from the previously mentioned ones. From a practical point of view knowledge has therefore at least three reference points in context.

weak conscience is described as ἀδελφούς and for the sake of whom one could sin against Christ εἰς Χριστὸν ἀμαρτάνετε (v.12). Neither of these concepts is attached to the “weak in conscience” before verse 9. Lacking there is hence the attribute of brother, the association of such a person with God/ Christ or possible sinning against God for the sake of this weak one.²¹ To the contrary in verse 7 such a one is said to lack ἡ γνῶσις which most probably is explicated in the preceding verses. Even though there is an overlap in theme, there seems hence to be a disagreement in concept.

The yellow markings illustrate that one topic in discussion is the conscience of the third party. Prevalent in the green section is as already touched briefly upon how the relation to the third party in discussion is described. Whereas both the verses before and after verse 9 utilize the demonstrative when speaking about the party taking scandal by the conduct of the Corinthians Paul interacts with; there is an important difference in how they are viewed with relation to the voices appearing before and after verse 9. Above the proposed demarcation line the group taking offense is never described as “brothers” in relation to those speaking. Rather in relation to the voice appearing there the third group is described as οὐπω ἔγνω (v.2) and ἀσθενῆς οὔσα (v.7). What undoubtedly is the same category of people mentioned after verse 9 are in contrast never described as lacking knowledge.²² In contrast despite the weakness conceded, their relation to Christ is affirmed by them being for whom Christ has died (v.11) and for the sake of whom one could sin against Christ (v.12). In this section the term τὸν ἀδελφόν appears three times in various forms (v.12, 13) and is even more explicated relationally in chapter 9. The blue marking appearing before and after verse 9 seems to touch briefly upon the consequences for the third party in discussion. Whereas both sections agree that this is an issue, the former describes this as a defilement μολύνεται (v.7), while the latter describes the consequences with the use of more fatalistic terminology ἀπόλλυται (v.11).

The underlined and italicized sections further illustrate an overlap in theme, but not necessarily in concept. Whenever idol food appears before verse 9 it is either not separated from what is designed as food τῆς βρώσεως οὓν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων (v.4), simply designed as food βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει (v.8) or being idol food only in perception ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον, (v.7). It is hence not altogether clear from these statements that such a thing as a εἰδωλόθυτα exists.²³ After verse 9 the term appears in verse 10 as something clearly definable οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθυτα ἐσθίειν, a definition which further is explicated in chapter 10:19-21. While 10:18 conveys the concept of that disassociation of the altar from its food is not unproblematic. In verse 13 both βρῶμα and κρέα are mentioned, but are preceded by the conditional εἰ. The terminology need therefore not reflect any definition given to εἰδωλόθυτα other than the one appearing in 10:19-21. There is no designation of εἰδωλόθυτα as “simply” βρώσεως or a subjective construct except if certain interpretive conditions are fulfilled with regard to 10:25; 28-29.²⁴

²¹ Previous commentators have generally assumed that the Corinthians addressed here by Paul regarded the other opposing group as brothers, see Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 144; Theissen, *Social Setting*, 125-9; Moffat, *First Corinthians*, 110-1; Gardner, *Gifts*, 40; Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 639. Even those believing the “weak” to be a rhetorical device invented by Paul assert on a level that the Corinthians responded to Paul as if there would be such brothers, see Hurd, *Origins*, 143-8; Fee, “Εἰδωλόθυτα Once Again,” 176; Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 68.

²² Whenever ignorance is attributed to the “weak” it is mainly done on the basis of verse 7. After verse 9 there seems to be a harder case for such a conclusion. See Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 194; Ciampa & Rosner, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 385-6.

²³ Scholars commenting upon the βρώσεως have acknowledged that it is different or broader in category than idol food, cf. Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 54 commenting upon 8:4: “Brōsis here means “eating,” but it is also a general term for food, with no necessary connotation of meat (compare Cor 2 9:10, where it clearly refers to bread).”

²⁴ To buy anything at markets has been presupposed to be an indulgence to partake of eidolothyta in a context other than is openly idolatrous (Fotopoulos) or because of a presupposed non-cultic setting. The latter is denied by Pausanias, clearly the market was the place that were most of all filled with religious paraphernalia like red-faced statues and the majority of temples (Paus. II.2.6-II.3.1). The former is a proposition that negates to discuss the status of what is being sold. A third alternative would be that something could cease to be eidolothyta just as it through processes first became it.

The section marked with grey coloring deals with concepts concerning the existence of idols and consequences flowing from the existence of the one God as exemplified by the οὐδὲν εἶδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἶς in verse 4 and the knowledge of which leads to certain consequences or possibly signs (v.8) a lack thereof does not seem to convey (v.7).²⁵ The latter seems to be picked up again in verse 9, but even more clearly with the bearing outward signs of Divine affiliation through sacred history (10:1-15); something that does not disassociate from participation in altar services (10:18); which in case of heathen sacrifices amounts to association with devils (10:20). The latter does together with 10:21 touch upon the issue of the existence of the εἶδωλον in verse 4. The section beginning with 10:22 seems to further specifically define the limits of the ἡ ἐξουσία referred to in 8:9 and generally exemplified in chapter 9.

To summarize then. Embedded statements are interacted with beginning with imperatives, negations or questions. In chapter 8 it was suggested that the demarcation line between where Paul begins his interaction with embedded statements is succeeding the imperative of verse 9. To validate this, other patterns found in Paul's handling of similar statements as well as prevalent practice in antiquity suggest two further features that would need to be present for this assertion to bear value. The one being the shift in voices and the other in the point for point interaction with whatever appeared before the suggested demarcation line. Both of these patterns are present in chapter 8, confirming therefore the suggested demarcation line. The voice preceding verse 9 is other than the one succeeding it, the same goes with the point for point interaction. If anything, the section succeeding verse 9 would add rather than subtract anything of the topics raised in the section preceding it. This does not necessarily mean that everything preceding verse 9 or succeeding it could not be put to further scrutiny. Before we evaluate if and where Paul may be present preceding verse 9 or the Corinthians succeeding verse 9, there are further supportive arguments for the initial division needful to consider.

2.4.2 Supportive arguments from stylometry

If it is true that the section dealing with food sacrificed to idols contains embedded statements with an original source other than Paul, we would expect certain peculiarities that are congruent with such an assertion. Besides the main thrust argued above from de point-for point interaction and the voice appearing within the sections preceding and succeeding verse 9, there are some further linguistic features that would be expected on such a division.²⁶ In the following we will look more closely and comparatively at the

²⁵ Cf. Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 144-6.

²⁶ The basis for such an assertion is already well established in critical scholarship in general and Pauline studies in particular. Of the four ways utilized to establish the genuine Pauline letters there has for long been a common understanding about which criteria figure in favor of or are rebutted against in discussions surrounding the 'genuine letters of Paul' (ex. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 357 where he poses the subsequent reasons as the main one's for rejecting Pauline authorship of Ephesians). These are arguments built on *internal evidence*, *external evidence*, *historical setting* and those relating to *language and style*. The arguments are not always clearly distinguished from one another, but could often overlap as for instance when internal evidence consisting of theology often is not easily separated from preference of terminology which encompass key concepts, but would fall under language and style. Nevertheless one working definition is that *internal evidence* could besides central theological concepts refer to what the author says of him- or herself. *External evidence* on the other hand could consist of secondary quotes, citations and attributions that would support or undermine any particular attribution the scholar wants to make of a work or parts of a work to any particular author. *Historical setting* requires the reconstruction of a reliable historical narrative within which for instance a suggested event could be fitted. These three criterion could only be said to match our current purposes little or not at all. Internal evidence has an inbuilt contradiction in that the choice of where to start often affects where the scholar ends up. So beginning with assuming for instance that Romans and Corinthians are written by Paul and leaving the authorship of other epistles open, issues are raised against the possibility of a Pauline origin in documents as Ephesians and Colossians (Cf. Mitton, "Important Hypotheses Reconsidered - VII. The Authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians", 195-8; *The Epistle to the Ephesians*; Percy, *Die Probleme der Kolosser- und*

prepositions and conjunctions appearing before and after verse 9 as well as the specific minological peculiarities.²⁷ We call these arguments supportive, because they have a

Epheserbriefe; and utilizing *stichometry* Goodspeed, *An Introduction to the New Testament*, 222-39). Starting on the other premise would most likely result in a different assessment. For our purposes we could not start with assuming what Paul argues to distill the textual corpus from what does not fit our assumptions. The deficiency in previous attempts of this similitude has been discussed briefly with regard to previous divisions made on the Corinthian text. Neither could we, short of any original or copied example of the Corinthian correspondence to Paul use this as a basis to gather external support for our suggested divisions. As it stands, arguments from historical setting with the definition given above are not relevant for the stated purpose. Given the material we have to our disposal, the most natural starting point for textual discriminations come from arguments related to language and style. This is a well-established methodology that analyzes vocabulary, sentence structure, idioms and common phrases for consistency with what is already attributed to a particular author. In our case, there is a possibility to do precisely this since we have access to Pauline material to which our present sections could be related to. Comparing the style before and after verse 9 with Paul in general gives us either supportive or unconfirming results with regard to the suggested division. It could perhaps be objected that the relatively small corpus of 8:1-8 does not consist of sufficient material to draw a far-reaching conclusion with regard to dissimilarities. The edge of this argument is however filed away once one recognizes that it works equally well in both directions. It would be even more impressive that a small sample lacks correspondingly wording in the whole of Pauline corpus and NT at large. Surely if there are likely to appear dissimilarities the larger corpus one deals with, it would/ should be more difficult to find this in smaller corpuses. However even if a small corpus portraying sufficient dissimilarities could be said to support the input at some stage from another hand, it does not necessarily work the other way around. Minor dissimilarities could be dismissed as inconclusive, due to paraphrasing, argument, possible interjections or for a number of other reasons. Such scenarios do actually work in favor of smaller corpuses. But more importantly a pattern that correspondingly portrays a more thorough consistency for one and less for the other section with Pauline corpus in general as well as displaying dissimilarities these sections inbetween works supportive both laterally and horizontally in conjunction of our major arguments. See Kenny, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament*, 17-25 about the "distribution of words and parts of speech".

²⁷ There are numerous examples of scholars that have utilized some variant of this method to discriminate between letters traditionally attributed to Paul. Walter Bujard has for example in his *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen zum Kolosserbrief* accounted for stylistic differences between Colossians and Paul's other works which he thinks are sufficient to attribute to different authors. Part of his argument centered on the peculiarities of the "genitivkonstruktion" in the former (cf. Bujard, *idem*, 228; Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 574-5). Other authors appealing to the argument from style have evoked a) *peculiarities of prepositions* (ex. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastorals*, 36-7 who found 112 prepositions, pronouns and particles which occur in the other Pauline epistles, but absent from the pastorals indicate different authorship. Harrison utilized elaborated statistical tables on the model of W.P. Workman's words-per-page method in demonstrating that Shakespeare's language showed similar variations to Paul's, cf. Workman, "The Hapax Legomena", 418ff; Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 357 speaks of certain prepositions as KATA which "occur with unusual frequency for Paul, while there is an unparalleled number of genitival formations" in the Ephesians he rejects as Pauline. Goguel, *Introduction*, IV, 2, 433 argues in a similar fashion); b) *peculiarities of conjunctions* (ex. Dodd, *The Johannine Epistles*, xlviii who as a part of his stylistic argument against the same authorship behind John and 1 John noted "the fewer number of compound verbs in the epistle and the greater absence of particles and conjunctions. Moreover, the language of the epistle is said to approximate more that of Hellenistic philosophy and to have no examples of Semitisms in contrast to the Gospel." cf. Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 629; Merton & McLennon in *Christianity and the Computer*; Morton, *Paul, the Man and the Myth* conducted frequency counts of KAI+article to suggest that only Galatians, Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians were Pauline); c) *peculiarity with reference to word-choice* (ex. Moffatt, *Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 412ff; Guthrie, *New Testament Introduction*, 443n4 notes that: "175 hapaxes (words used nowhere else in the New Testament) and 130 non Pauline words shared by other New Testament writers" have been evoked for conclusions suggesting different authorship; Turner, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, 102 admits that of the 901 words used in the pastorals, 306 are not found elsewhere in Paul and 335 are NT hapax, making him conclude that "the vocabulary, by and large, is not that of Paul. Indeed, the vocabulary of the Pastorals is nearer to Hellenistic literary writers, such as Epictetus, and especially to the Hellenistic-Jewish wisdom books. The Pastorals use LXX words to a less extent than Paul." Turner does also note the absence of otherwise frequently occurring Pauline terminology, *ibid*; similar arguments have been evoked in dismissing certain epistles as Pauline, see Goodspeed, *Key to Ephesians*, vi-viii; Mitton, *The Epistle to the Ephesians*, ii). This being the case, arguments from style whether convincing or not are part of an accepted interaction between those scholars that find them convincing and those that do not. Our contention is that such a process is applicable to purposes of our size. Should it be otherwise, the whole enterprise of discerning genuine letters and not would admittedly be flawed. Since the premises could not be objected to by the very proponents of them or the adherents to the conclusions otherwise drawn from them. Supportive of our assertion is further that this type of limited textual discrimination has already been conducted in other locations. Muddiman & Barton, *The Pauline Epistles*, 137 have for instance noted that the stylistic peculiarities as "vocabulary and ideas" more specifically "a large number of *hapax legomena*" within 2 Cor 6:14-7:1 have raised doubts about this sections authenticity. Betz, "2 Cor 6:14-7:1", 88-109 suggested that this was an "anti-pauline fragment"; Furnish, *II Corinthians*, 383 suggested on similar basis that this was an "Pauline interpolation of non-Pauline material"; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 402 saw a "deliberative

supportive force for the division based on the main arguments presented above. On their own without the preliminary division that correspond to Paul's other utilization of embedded statements and the like appearing in the classical context, the following arguments (even though unlikely) would on the assumption that no embeddings are present have to be as Paul's choice of preference to suddenly shift his mode of expression. Once we do however acknowledge that embedded statements do present themselves in the context and once we have founded the division on a general practice rather than on presumption, the case is different. Any linguistic and terminological features that do appear in the one, but not in the other section would work supportive for the suggestion of where the line of division between Paul and his adversaries is to be drawn. This is especially the case if the tendency is not only lateral but correspondingly horizontal through Paul's corpus. In other words if the one of the sections shows a comparatively high correspondence while the other does not. On the contrary if no linguistic or terminological peculiarities do present themselves it would not only fail to give such a support, but would further be inconsistent with the idea that the reader encounters information coming from different sources in an less altered form. No author could be expected to be entirely consistent in expression, but nobody expects there to be several authors whenever such a consistency presents itself. Hence whenever there is an expressional consistency in one section that is inconsistent with the expressional consistency of another section, the reader would expect that this most likely is explained by different sources of origin.²⁸

2.4.2.1 Prepositions

¹Περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, οἶδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γινώσκουσιν ἔχομεν. ἡ γινώσκουσα φύσις, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ. ²εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι, οὐπω ἔγνω καθὼς δεῖ γινῶναι: ³εἰ δὲ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἐγνωσται ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ. ⁴Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς. ⁵καὶ γὰρ εἴτε εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, ὡς περ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοὶ, ⁶ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ⁷ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, ⁸δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι'

digression"; Fitzmyer, "Qumrân and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6:14-7:1". 271-80 suggested an Essene origin; Heil, "Die Spracher der Asenderung in 2 Kor 6,17 und bei Paulus," in *The Corinthian Correspondence* (ed. Reimund Bieringer), 717-29 argued for its incompatibility with Paul; others like Starling, "The ἄπιστοι of 2 Cor 6:14", 45-60 have rejected these "interpolation theories" but indirectly recognized that this is done only on depending with the force in the *hapax legomena*; in context ἐτεροζυγεῖν, μετοχή, συμφώνησις, Βελιάρ, συγκατάθεσις, ἐμπεριπατέω, εἰσδέχομαι, παντοκράτωρ, μολυσμός cf. Fee, "II Corinthians VI.14-VII.1 and Food Offered to Idols", 140-161 who unsatisfactory depends with for instance μολυσμός on his assumption that its occurrence in 1 Corinthians 8 is Pauline. Those scholars that have suggested a form of interpolation do not necessary treat it as embedded statements from Paul's opponents (with the exception of Whitelaw, "A Fragment of the Lost Epistle to the Corinthians." 12 who argues: "The passage, where it stands, is without connection before or after: neither will it fit in elsewhere in the Epistle: we have only to remove it, and the continuity of vi. 13 and vii.2 is unmistakable"). Our purpose has not been to suggest this with regard to the passage from 2 Corinthians. Rather it has been to illustrate that the practice of discerning between what is Pauline and not, has demonstratively relied upon features dealing with linguistics and style both when it comes to discriminatory evaluations of epistles at large as well as various sections of them. Hence we are justified to apply the self-same principles in the process of evaluation of another type of possible embedding that admittedly on our working premises have a non-pauline origin. This to further see how far it could bring us in the evaluation process. There is no necessity to suggest an interpolator beyond Pauline embedding of statements in our context of 1 Cor 8-10 (see the section on previous research for the more indept discussions surrounding the fallacies of the form critics).

²⁸ The reader should remember that we already do work on the presumption that such embedded statements exists in the vicinity around verse 9. The reader needs to be conscious about what has been done so far, where in context the arguments appear and that they do not work independent of it. For successful non-biblical applications of stylometrical variables see Neumann, *The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in Light of Stylostatistical Analysis*, 17-20; Morton, *Literary Detection. How to Prove Authorship and Fraud in Literature and Documents*, 158-164 (Homer); 184-188 (Shakespeare). The latter author has also found considerable variations in 1 Corinthian which is compatible with our suggestions about embedded statements. These variations pertain to "variations in the mean length of sentences in 1 Corinthians" and positioning of words see *ibid*, 170-1 table 14.2; 177-180 table 14.4 with regard to mean length of sentences as compared to other Pauline epistles (see table 14.3, 14.4 14.5 and 14.6 with regard to positioning of frequent words *ibid*. 172, 181-4).

αυτοῦ. ⁷Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις: τινὲς δὲ τῆ συνηθεία ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενῆς οὔσα μολύνεται. ⁸βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ: οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, οὔτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν. ⁹βλέπετε δὲ μή πως ἡ ἐξουσία ὑμῶν αὕτη πρόσκομμα γένηται τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν. ¹⁰ἐὰν γὰρ τις ἴδῃ σὲ τὸν ἔχοντα γνῶσιν ἐν εἰδωλείῳ κατακείμενον, οὐχὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθута ἐσθίειν; ¹¹ἀπόλλυται γὰρ ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἐν τῇ σῆ γνώσει, ὁ ἀδελφὸς δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν. ¹²οὕτως δὲ ἀμαρτάνοντες εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφούς καὶ τύπτοντες αὐτῶν τὴν συνείδησιν ἀσθενοῦσαν εἰς Χριστὸν ἀμαρτάνετε. ¹³διόπερ εἰ βρῶμα σκανδαλίζει τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, οὐ μὴ φάγω κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ἵνα μὴ τὸν ἀδελφόν μου σκανδαλίσω.

Green = Prepositions appearing before verse 9.

Red = Prepositions appearing after verse 9.

The most striking differences these two sections apart is the prevalence of prepositional phrases with the genitive in the section preceding verse 9.²⁹ In this section there is no less than 8 prepositions with the genitive, while the section succeeding verse 9 lacks these kind of constructions altogether. In the following chapters 9 and 10, prepositions with the genitive are scarce.³⁰ In the lengthy chapter 9 they appear only four times and then consistently with the use of ἐκ. The concentration of the prepositions with genitive (four of them only in verse 6) as well as the variability of the prepositional phrases (ὕπ' v.3; Περὶ v.1,4; ἐπὶ v.5; ἐξ v.6; δι' v.6; ἕως v.7) show a concentration and variability that thus is possible to compare with Paul from several aspects. Similarly the four prepositions with the accusative in the section succeeding verse 9 have only one such correspondent in the section preceding verse 9.

In Koine Greek the subtle uses of the cases so prevalent in classical Greek was replaced with statements of more explicit character. In the Attic dialect, the genitive of separation was not an uncommon feature. In Koine it has found its equivalent by the construction of apo + genitive. The genitive of source has in similar fashion for the most part been substituted by ek + genitive.³¹ Wallace has correctly observed that there is no exact correlation either in category or frequency between the uses of a case without a preposition

²⁹ For studies including counts and usages of other linguistical variables see Middleton, *The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament*, 71-88; Peters, *The Greek Article: A Functional Grammar of ó-Items in the Greek New Testament with Special Emphasis on the Greek Article*; Moorhouse, *Studies in the Greek Negatives*, 69-156; Thrall, *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*, 34-40. For future prospects in identifying textual architecture see Smith, "Digital Infrastructure and the Homer Multitext Project," 121-138 in Bodard, Gabrriel & Mahony, Simon (eds.) *Digital Research in the Study of Classical Antiquity*.

³⁰ Martin, R., *Syntax Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels*, 9ff; Martin, R., *Syntax Criticism of Johannine Literature: The Catholic Epistles, and the Gospel Passion Accounts*, 163-181 has utilized a similar stylistic evaluation of prepositions and occurrences of various cases in evaluating the authorship of the Gospels. Kenny, *A Stylistic Study of the New Testament*, 44-50 who finds that Paul himself has almost as high a numerical utilization of the preposition ἐν (1006 occurrences) as the Gospels taken together (Matt 293, Mark 135, Luke 361, John 226). Moreover the frequency rate of 3,10% as way above the median 1,60% and the average NT usage of 1,99%. The total number for the NT-version he analyzed was 2,752.

Some scholars as Greenwood, *Structuralism and the Biblical Text*, 113-14 have voiced disagreement about the possibility of an "inductively" based structuralism by which he refers to stylometry. His argument is none other that it is not "objective". Granted that no objectivity is never inherent in an inductive argument, it is hard to phathom how the criteria of "objectivity" could be better approached with regard to the actual biblical texts than materially speaking counting frequencies and function of indispensable conjunctive words and prepositions. Greenwood fails actually in providing us with an "objective" truth from which we would deduct further objective-implications. Would his criticism be narrowed down to certain aspects of stylometry as hapaxes and others it would have some merit. As we have stated earlier infrequencies are common in short texts and stylometry could not be persuasive without corroborative evidence.

³¹ There are two schools of thought when it comes to prepositions in koine. The more convincing position taken by Young, *Intermediate Greek*, 85 argues that prepositions gradually "gained more independent force" in relation to the case in koine. Other grammarians have no separate treatment of the prepositions and cases, but emphasize the clarifying force of relation the former has on the latter (see Brooks-Winbery, 2-59; Vaughan-Gideon, 30-77).

as in those cases that do.³² If it is true that “prepositions are used with cases either to *clarify, strengthen, or alter* the basic case usage” a number of things need to be taken into consideration.³³ If there are any linguistical nuances between the prepositional phrases appearing before and after verse 9, such do not necessarily need to be limited to frequency of construction i.e. type of preposition + particular case. It would also be equally necessary to take into account the sphere of potential meaning pregnant in such constructions. The latter means to take into account the potential relation of the functions of the preposition; their spatiality and whether they are stative or transitive and put it in consideration to the elasticity and function of the case. Only then could a judgment be passed on whether the similar prepositional phrases utilized before and after verse 9 express the same function. The absence of such an overlap in functionality does not conclusively suggest that the sources of the statements before and after verse 9 are different. If they are of different origin however, certain particularities in linguistic features are to be expected and a demonstration of this would be consistent with our proposition. The prepositional phrases do work cumulatively with the other arguments presented in this section in establishing that it is a difference between these two sections. This difference overlaps other features characteristic of the sections. The contention here is that taken together, the phenomenon of all the particularities characteristic of the verses preceding and succeeding verse 9 are best explained by their different origins on the already acknowledged model that there indeed are other voices present within the text than Paul’s own.

The first time succeeding verse 9 that prepositional phrases do appear with the genitive are found in chapter 9:7 (ἐκ τοῦ γάλακτος τῆς ποιμνῆς); 9:13 (ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ); 9:14 (ἐκ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου); 9:19 (ἐκ πάντων).³⁴ Of the six basic uses of the preposition ἐκ, i.e. the one of source, separation, temporality, causativeness, partitive and of means;³⁵ only the one of source and separation comes into play here.³⁶ Similarly in 10:4 (ἐκ πνευματικῆς ἀκολουθούσης πέτρας) and 10:17 (ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν) the prepositional phrase seems to emphasize source. In contrast the ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα of 8:6 could not possibly be of source as it would transform the argument into a suggestion of that everything either emanates from God or participates in the divine nature.³⁷ Since neither pantheism nor Gnosticism could be argued from context, the force of the prepositional phrase is signifying either means or cause. Hence everything is in existence because of or by the operation of God. This would also correspond more closely to the succeeding preposition with the dative case δι’ οὗ τὰ πάντα (v.6) and δι’ αὐτοῦ (v.6) which signify agency or means.³⁸ While none of the seven prepositions with genitive signify source in the verses preceding verse 9, this is the most common feature of the ἐκ + genitive constructions in chapter 9 and 10. Likewise in 10:1 (spatial); 10:9 (intermediate agency); 10:10 (intermediate agency); 10:14 (separation); 10:29 (intermediate agency); 10:30 (reference) are all uses dissimilar to the force of the highly concentrated genitive constructs with preposition in the first eight verses of chapter 8.

Thus we have seen a threefold difference in preference both for the types of prepositions utilized, their frequency as well as different spheres of meaning in the remaining and overlapping prepositional constructs.

³² Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 361-2.

³³ Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 361; *ibid. The Basics of New Testament Syntax*, 113.

³⁴ The ἐκ + genitive construct appears 23 times in 1 Corinthians. Except these passages in: 1 Cor 2:12; 5:2, 10; 7:5,7; 10:4, 17; 11:8, 12, 28; 12:15,16,27; 13:9; 13:10,12; 15:12,20,47.

³⁵ Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 371.

³⁶ The ἐκ πάντων most probably is a prepositional phrase indicating separation from the dependency of other men. If this were to be interpreted as a genitive of source it would make little sense. Paul would essentially say in contrast that out of all [men], he is the only free one. Most likely it is not a statement about other men’s dependency and bondage, but rather about Paul who in his free and independent state chooses voluntarily to submit this for the most purposeful ends. Arguably 9:7 could be a partitive or “wholative” genitive construct. In koine such a construct frequently squeezed out the simple partitive genitive (see Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 85n37). In 9:14 arguably the construction could signify “means” rather than source.

³⁷ See the opposition to Gnosticism in the section dealing with previous research.

³⁸ Since this dative appears with the genitive either agency, means, spatiality or temporality is expressed. With the accusative it would express cause. See Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 368-9.

To view the prepositions from this perspective i.e. in form of frequency of the “improperly” utilized prepositions in this section is one way of looking at the phenomenon. The other would be to look at the proper prepositions whenever they function as such in compounds.³⁹ Both perspectives are serving the purposes of highlighting what is stylistically specific for a particular author(s). The differences could be said to be that the latter perspective looks more at the scarce elements of a text in forms of compounds in order to find indications of various degrees of uniqueness. The former on the other hand has as we have seen the prevalent frequency of characteristics in mind when it notices the most emphatic reoccurrences. Frequency counts are in many ways more advantageous in analyses of shorter texts than merely looking at what is scarce about them.⁴⁰ In this capacity the method already forms an integral part of stylometry and has been utilized to prove and disprove authorships of books as well as parts of books.⁴¹ Looking at the most frequently occurring prepositions we have already found important distinctions that correspond to our initial division. Unlike Neumann we see no reason why more unique features should not be taken into consideration in conjunction with the more stylistically reoccurring patterns in establishing origin of source.⁴²

2.4.2.1.1 ἕως ἄρτι

Paul uses various modes of expression to describe the notion of something *continuing up to the present moment* seen from the perspective of the timeframe of his writing. The prepositional phrase ἕως ἄρτι as utilized in verse seven above our demarcation line is by no means the most common way for Paul to do this. Infact except for the three occurrences within 1 Corinthians (4:13; 8:7; 15:6), the expression is not found anywhere else in the entirety of the Pauline corpus. In fact, the only other occurrences in the New Testament of this expression are found in the idiomatic more “Hebrew” accentuated Greek-style of the Gospel of Matthew (11:12); Gospel of John (2:10; 5:17; 16:24) and 1 John (2:9).⁴³ We have

³⁹ The technical terminology of proper and improper prepositions does not bear any functional force. At the center of the distinction lies the ability of the 18 frequently occurring so called proper prepositions to be compounded with verbs, while the forty-two ‘improper’ prepositions lack this force. (cf. Moule, *Idiom Book*, 48; Porter, *Idioms*, 140-1).

⁴⁰ Cf. Harrison, *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*, 18 (who counts hapax per page); Brown, *The Authentic Writings of Ignatius: A Study of Linguistic Criteria*, 120-3. Some authors have even suggested that a hapax legomenon is never an indication of style (cf. Mealand, 326; Holmes, 113-4; Alviar(?)). This conclusion is especially drawn with references to text of limited lengths, but does also apply to longer texts. In the former case frequency is considered to be more representative of the unconscious style of an author. Content words as hapax-legomena would on this view be much more subject to a conscious choice for a specific subject matter and therefore the preference for *function words* rather than *content words*. We agree hence fully with Kenny, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament*, 25: “Though it is the uncommon words in a text which catch the eye and attract the interest of scholars, the common words are often the most important for stylometric studies. It is not so much the rare words an author uses, as the characteristic rate of his use of the words he shares with all other writers, which often mark a text with his particular stamp.” Hence content words could be useful in characterizing the positioning in subject matters, but not necessarily the style different *authors/ source of origins* in between.

⁴¹ For an overview of how various statistical studies have contributed to discussions surrounding authorship see Neumann, *The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in Light of Stylostatistical Analysis*, 23-43 (lexical); 44-9 (morphological-length); 50-6 (syntactic-length); 57-84 (morphological-category); 85-94 (syntactic-category); 95-114 (non-grammatical variables).

⁴² Neumann is interested in style, however style is too broad a category to be reduced to one hapax. A more stylometrical convincing argument in shorter texts would be the utilization of more frequent or “favorite” words than to exclusively search for what does not occur. Likewise to delve into the preferences for expressing things in one way rather than in another, when a variable of choices are present. Neumann sees language and vocabulary as one way in establishing authorship, separate from it he sees style, theology, literary relationship and imitation and finally historical background (Neumann, *The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in Light of Stylostatistical Analysis*, 4ff).

⁴³ On Hebrew idioms in the NT see Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, 133-138; cf. Gehman, “The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek,” 81-90; on Schweizer and Ruckstuhl’s stylistic tests on the Gospel of John where 33

reasons to return to the occurrences within 1 Corinthians, but first we need to ask about the range of expressions Paul utilizes when expressing something occurring even until his present moment. The argument will not aim at excluding the possibility for Paul to utilize such expression as ἕως ἄρτι. Such a reduction of an argument would be negative in nature. In order not to argue in a circle, we would rather need to supplement a negative assessment about what Paul does not - with what he actually does. Any unique pattern occurring consequently in Paul, but on the other hand more rarely amongst other documented authors works in such case cumulatively in presenting a reasonable case for why the broken pattern here is more consistent with our demarcation line rather than with the notion that Paul breaks a habitual mode of expression for interjecting a statement. The point is that we could not assess given our sources if something is habitual to a “Corinthian” style, but we could assess whether something is in line with the Paul we come across in his Epistles. Those looking for a “proof” of the Corinthians, should remember that the premises of this study are that there occurs embedded statements within 1 Corinthians in general and chapter 8 in particular. That the results so far have argued in favor of a demarcation line beginning with verse nine and that any stylistic peculiarities within the section preceding verse 9 should therefore be assessed with this parameter in mind, namely whether it (i.e. broken stylistic patterns) does strengthen or weaken our thesis that this section contains embedded Corinthians statements. The “proof” refers not to conclusivity, but to consistency. Starting with our premises and utilizing occam’s razor, would we say that any broken stylistic pattern is more consistent with our suggestion for demarcation than attempts adding another explanatory layer of possible habitually divergent Pauline interjections.⁴⁴

The most common ways for Paul to express the notion of continuity in a present moment is either by ἕως or ἄχρι. Thus listing the ways in which Paul conveys the notion the results of a subsequent comparison becomes way more apparent.

- Romans 11:8 ἕως τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας
- Romans 8:22 ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν
- 1 Corinthians 4:11 ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας
- 2 Corinthians 3:14 ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας
- 2 Corinthians 3:15 ἕως σήμερον ἡνίκα
- Philippians 1:5 ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡμέρας ἄχρι τοῦ νῦν

The listing represents the complete spectrum of *how Paul expresses* the notion in the source-material to our disposal and not the complete spectrum of *how Paul could express* the notion. The distribution over several Epistles strengthens any reoccurring patterns as a stylistic feature or preference of choice in Paul’s mode of expression. Any reoccurring patterns would be further accentuated as habitual for Paul if other authors could be demonstrated to prefer other modes of expression to convey the same notion.

As it stands this is precisely the case in that the above list demonstrates a characteristic found there and only in the Pauline corpus taken the entirety of the New Testament into account. The feature is that Paul always attributes terminology expressing time in conjunction to the present. This is significant, since the habitual addition of ἡμέρας and ὥρας could not be explained away by reference to choice of topic or regarded as a necessary addition from the standpoint of comprehension. From a grammatical point of view they do not add anything to the meaning, but from a stylistic point of view it is precisely the “filler

expressions found in John but not elsewhere have been used to determine underlying layers in John see Fortna, *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel*, 203-22. Schweitzer used the criterion not only to distinguish John from the rest of the literature of the New Testament, but also to distinguish layers within John. Our purpose is a more modest one, we advance the stylistic features in to compare their alignment to our general division. Hence they do not work primarily redactional and are not primarily conclusive, but supportive.

⁴⁴ Cf stylistic arguments with regard to Aristotelian writing in Kenny, “The Stylometric Study of the Aistotelian Writings”; for Pauline habitual choices see Kenny, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament*, 80-101.

words” that assist in determining habits. Both points are demonstrated by the fact that other New Testament authors in conveying the same notion *never* do add the “extra” ἡμέρας, ὥρας or other filling notion of time to what subsequently already is understood without the addition (ex. ἕως τοῦ νῦν of Matt 24:21; Mk 13:19). This is true even among those utilizing as Paul σήμερον or ἕως + σήμερον, and thus we encounter ἕως τῆς σήμερον in Matt 27:8; μέχρι τῆς σήμερον in Matt 28:15 with the ἡμέρας or ὥρας understood and without them being explicitly mentioned. Whereas the searching for another example of this characteristic among the authors of the New Testament or approximate literature results in no parallel example, it becomes even more significant that the only other example of expressing this notion in a similar fashion is found in Acts 23:1 with ἄχρι ταύτης τῆς ἡμέρας. The reason is that the saying in Acts is attributed to the very selfsame Paul. If we allow ourselves to concede that Acts as an additional or even external source has anything to say about Paul, it does little difference for our purposes whether this saying represents an external reference to what Paul actually said on that occasion or if it is an echo of a mode of expression characteristic of the Apostle. For our argument it works either way to strengthen this mode as a particular Pauline habit of expressing himself.

If our suggestion hold any value it would further indicate that the expression in 8:7 not only does not follow the pattern Paul consistently follows elsewhere, but moreover would in resemblance be more in line with how the notion is expressed among other contemporary authors. We have already noted that the exact mode of expression occurs in the Greek among the more Hebrew accentuated authorships. This has a further important implication for whom exactly Paul may be encountering here. Still, leaving 8:7 aside there are two occurrences of this expression within 1 Corinthians that may be put forward as examples where Paul expresses this notion in a similar fashion. There are good reasons however for why these expressions should not be included in the above given list of Paul’s way of expressing himself and therefore are not material to evoke in this case. First in 15:6 the expression occurs within the context of what many authors have suggested to be a profession of faith in the risen Christ. The formulaic and the reoccurring rhythm of the section has been arguments put forward by many scholars as reasons for why this passage should be taken as a formulaic profession of faith. If this is what it is, then Paul’s handing down of what he himself has received suggests that the formulation is not a formulation originating with himself. Rather than being an example to the contrary to our proposition, it would support our notion since it would be a further example of that the expression occurring in 8:7 has a formulaic correspondence in mode of expression in a profession of faith originating in similar linguistic proximity to the examples in Matthew, John and 1 John. The only other possible example of Paul utilizing such an expression would hence be in 1 Corinthians 4:13. However once more the context seems to dispense with such a necessity. Already in 4:11 Paul as we have seen initiates a line of thought with ἄχρι τῆς ἄρτι ὥρας a thought that forms an integral part with the expression found in 4:13. It seems that the avoidance of excessive repetitiveness is the reason for why the habitual addition does not reoccur a second time in close proximity. A confirmation of such a reading is supported by how Paul expresses himself elsewhere. In 2 Corinthians 3:14-15 there is another example of where Paul avoids an excessive repetitiveness when expressing this precise notion of thought.⁴⁵

Seeing therefore that the only two other examples of where Paul may utilize this type of an expression does not hold up to scrutiny, we are left with an expression in verse 7 which is consistent with the notion that Paul succeeds at least after verse 9 in chapter 8 of first Corinthians. This is the case since the expression is sufficiently consistent with how other authors express themselves and sufficiently divergent to how Paul and only Paul habitually expresses himself. Hence the ἕως ἄρτι of 8:7 lend support for the initial division in that it is consistent with formulaic not habitually Pauline.

⁴⁵ For repetition of words as a general Pauline characteristic see Thörnell, *Pastoralbrevens äkthet*, 122; For the occasional modification of the repeated statement see *Ibid.* 157; 167; 168-9.

2.4.2.1.2 ἐν οὐρανῷ εἶτε ἐπὶ γῆς

In the formulation ἐν οὐρανῷ εἶτε ἐπὶ γῆς that appears in verse 5 before the suggested demarcation line of verse 9, two prepositions do appear that in conjunction with their respective nouns both individually as well as combined constitute an expression that is possible to compare to statements evoking related concepts.⁴⁶

In classical Greek the οὐρανός appears almost without exception in the singular. The fifty-one instances in the LXX where οὐρανός appears in its plural form are hence foreign in form and concept from the classical use. Various suggestions have appeared as to the definition of the original concept transmitted through the use of the plural.⁴⁷ What is certain however, is that the Hebrew עַמָּוָה made it at least convenient to retain the plural in the translation of the OT. In later writings (ex. 2 Macc. 15:33; 3 Macc 2:2; Wis 9:10,16; 18:15; Tob 8:5) the plural becomes a more prominent feature alongside the singular. The linguistic influence LXX Greek had on various subsequent writings means in effect looking retrospectively that the plural οὐρανοί as status constructus could not automatically be assumed to refer to a true plural as opposed to a stylistic feature. The presence of the terminology as well as the choice mode of expression among the New Testament writings are therefore a feature conducive for a stylistic comparison, irrelevant of whether the author utilizing the plural retains a Hebrew mode of expression or projects a linguistic influence genealogically originating in the LXX. As related above the various prepositions govern different types of cases. The preposition tells us further something about the relation of the action or item to which the prepositional object is linked. In the New Testament there are 94 instances of the plural form of οὐρανός. As it has been observed by others, the singular form is used exclusively in the New Testament with ὑπό, ἕως, ἄχρι, nearly always so with ἐκ (exceptions Matt 3:17 par.; 1 Thess 1:10), ἀπό (except Heb. 12:25) and εἰς (except Acts. 2:34). On the other hand there are no exceptions in the singular for ἐπί and ὑπεράνω that are consistently followed by the plural. It is significant that the term οὐρανός does not appear in any form in the pastorals. In our verse here in 1 Cor 8:5 we find the term preceded by ἐν and followed by the ἐπὶ γῆς. In the following will be demonstrated why this feature is unique for this section and hence consistent with the division of the chapter.

Whether preceded by the article or not, the plural form (ex. ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς) is often preceded by ἐν in the Synoptics. This combination occurs no less than nineteen times in the Gospel of Matthew, four times so in Mark and on three occasions in Luke.⁴⁸ This is also the case in the epistles. The anarthrous ἐν οὐρανοῖς occurs in Eph. 3:15; 6:9; Phil 3:20; Col 4:1; the arthrous ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς appears in 2 Cor 5:1; Eph. 1:10; Col 1:5; 16; 20. In all these cases the ἐν is succeeded by the plural οὐρανοῖς. Infact, so prominent is this feature that unlike the Synoptics, there is no instance in the entire collection of the Pauline epistles where the ἐν would be succeeded by the singular οὐρανῷ, except in this particular chapter of 1 Corinthians 8:5. If the consistent choice of the plural form following ἐν in the corpus traditionally ascribed to Paul could be interpreted as either due to a conceptual statement or a linguistic semitism, the unique feature of choosing the singular after the prepositional form could not be explained by the same genealogical motives.⁴⁹ Whether the choice

⁴⁶ Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*, 132-3 in quoting Black notes “the repetition of the preposition before each noun of a series governed by it.” is a mannerism inherent in semitic Greek style.

⁴⁷ BDAG, 737-9. Philo and Josephus do however not utilize it cf. Katz, *Philo's Bible. The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings*, 145.

⁴⁸ Alongside the occurrences in the singular. Ge exempel Matt 5:12; 5:16; 5:45; 5:48; 6:1; 6:9; 7:11; 7:21; 10:32; 10:33; 12:50; 16:17; 16:19x2; 18:10x2; 18:14; 18:19; 23:9.

⁴⁹ For an overview of semitisms in NT, see Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, 171-191; Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. II – *Accidence and Word-Formation with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament*, 12-34. Moulton distinguishes between “primary” and “secondary” semitisms – the former are

represents a polished Greek or the abandonment of the conceptual framework attached to a real plural does not at this point necessitate a further inquiry into. It could be both or neither; the latter being the case if the concept or general Hebraism is foreign to the original formulator.⁵⁰ The important thing to notice here is that it reflects a conscious way of expression which is consistent with the habit of the Synoptics, but more importantly distinct from Paul. This becomes even more apparent once we limit ourselves to what most modern scholars would still categorize as the Pauline epistles.

For instance even though Paul is consistently following the general pattern of the other New Testament authors with regard to which numerical form of οὐρανός follows the respective articles, at instances the linguistic “semitisms” of Paul become manifest when he “slips” into using the plural even though the preposition does not require it.⁵¹ This is for instance the case in 1 Thess 1:10 where Paul utilizes ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν in spite of the ἐκ in all other instances in the NT including Paul’s own writing (ex. 1 Cor 15:47 ἐξ οὐρανοῦ) consistently is followed by the singular form. The only other examples of such semitism “slips” are found in the already acknowledged to be so accentuated Gospel of Matthew (3:17 par. ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν).⁵² It should therefore be considered highly unlikely that Paul, who occasionally “slips” into a Hebrew accentuation and maintains the plural on another occasion would slip to the opposite antithetical extreme and write out the singular form to a preposition that otherwise “requires” the plural.⁵³ This is especially significant considering that Paul in other loci uses ἐν (whether anarthrous or not) consistently with the plural οὐρανοῖς. In Phil. 3:20 Paul has for instance the ἐν οὐρανοῖς and in 2 Cor 5:1 the arthrous ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς.

Another significant observation is the relation between the expressions involving some form of οὐρανός with some form of γῆ. This is a common combination in the New Testament which gives further possibilities of reference with regard to style. In the New Testament any combination of these terms whenever οὐρανός is preceded by ἐν is always succeeded by the genitive τῆς γῆς in the singular and the latter most often preceded by the preposition ἐπί.⁵⁴ This is the case in Matt 6:10; 16:19; 18:18; 24:30; 28:18; Luke 11:2; Acts 2:19; Rev 5:3; Eph 1:10; 3:15; Col 1:16; 1:20. While the ἐν-ἐπί construct with οὐρανῶ and γῆς in 1 Cor 8:5 is consistent in form and order to the other loci, both the non-pauline and the disputed ones, it does show significant difference to how the individual words and the construct appears in what most modern scholars accept as genuine Pauline letters. First, the prepositional sequence ἐν-ἐπί is very rare for Paul. Except for ex Rom 9:28; Phil 3:9; 4:10 where it appears in Christological discussions it does not appear elsewhere not least in any combination with οὐρανός and γῆ. In fact “ἐπί τῆς γῆς” only appears in Rom 9:28 except for 1 Cor 8:5. Second, οὐρανός, considering the following epistles: to the Romans, 1 Cor, 2 Cor,

understood to be conscious or unconscious renderings of translation Greek (LXX), the latter “slavish rendering” of sources that have semitic origin. Paul is especially under scrutiny on p. 21-4. Some have unconvincingly argued for their “fiction” or absence, see Horsley, *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*, vol 5, linguistic essays, 5-40.

⁵⁰ This is of interest in determining whom Paul interacts with, an integral part of the upcoming chapter. Naturally any indicator of the identity of the one interacted with would need to take into account the all the present indices before drawing a conclusion.

⁵¹ Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. II – *Accidence and Word-Formation with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament*, 21-24.

⁵² Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, 171-191; Sparks, “The Semitisms of the Acts”, 16-28; Wilcox, *The Semitisms of Acts*. The latter author differentiates between influences stemming from religious texts and ritual formulae (chpt I-III); “residual semitisms in the vocabulary” (chpt IV); and stylistical elements (chpt. V). The latter is divided inbetween *word-order*, *subordinate clauses*, *the verb*, *the pronoun*, *the preposition*, *idiom*, and *mistranslation*, 112-153.

⁵³ For discussions surround “Hebrew” Greek syntax see Cotterell & Turner, *Linguistics & Biblical Interpretation*, 110-128.

⁵⁴ The only known exception to this being Rev 5:13 where the preposition ἐν is repeated and the γῆ consequently appearing in the dative case. In every single other case no more than one anomaly presents itself as to order or appearance of ἐπί. Thus the only exception to the preposition ἐπί appears in Matt 24:30 which however retains the construction otherwise to form and order. A reverse order appears arguably in Matt 16:19; 18:18 however retaining form and the preposition ἐπί.

Gal, Phil, and 1 Thess appears 11 times. In eight instances it does so in the genitive form (Rom 1:18; 10:6; 1 Cor 15:47; 2 Cor 5:2; 12:2; Gal 1:8; 1 Thess 1:10; 4:16).⁵⁵ In this collection only one instance except 1 Cor 8:5 has the οὐρανός in the dative. This should be compared to the 7 occurrences of the dative form out of the total 10 occurrences of οὐρανός in Eph, Col, 2 Thess. Here the order is reversed and the genitive form only appears 2 times (Eph 4:1; 2 Thess 1:7). In the latter group οὐρανός appears together with γῆς four times and every time the prepositional sequence ἐν-ἐπὶ is retained. 1 Cor 8:5 is hence more consistent in this regard with what many deem deutropauline than with what is acknowledged to originate with Paul. The consistency does not only appear in order, but also in form. The only time Paul has γῆς and οὐρανός together (1 Cor 15:47) he has put them both in the genitive, in reverse order and without the (from this standpoint) appropriate prepositions.⁵⁶ 1 Corinthians 8:5 lacks hence a consistency with Paul on several levels while it contains a more similar correspondence with regard to form, sequence and use of prepositions to other New Testament authors including the epistegraphy that many a scholar already has judged not to originate with Paul.

We have hence seen that while the wordplay with heaven and earth is a frequent construct in the New Testament, the consistent modes of formulating this wordplay varies. In 1 Corinthians a prepositional sequence ἐν-ἐπὶ is in form, order and construct consistent in its mode with literature either known not to be Pauline or suspected of not being his. Paul on the other hand being reminiscent of other authors, rarely uses the wordplay and whenever he does utilize it or the constituent parts of this expression, varies then both in form, order, number and in prepositional preference from the expression in 1 Cor 8:5. In this case as with ἕως ἄρτι the question is not whether Paul *could* utilize this expression, but whether there is any consistency with *what he does* express elsewhere. Once the habitual anomalies to how Paul expresses himself stack up for this section (1 Cor 8:1-8) it becomes supportive of the results presented for our main division and increasingly more difficult to suggest that Paul in this particular section would concentrate a large amount of anomalies in relation to his stylistic habits.

2.4.2.2 Emphaticized conjunctions, conditionals, kai, and structure

¹Περὶ **δὲ** τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων, οἶδαμεν **ὅτι** πάντες γινώσκοντες ἔχομεν. ἢ γινώσκοντες φυσιοῖ, ἢ **δὲ** ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ. ²**εἴ** τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι, οὐπω ἐγνω **καθὼς** δεῖ γινώσκειν: ³**εἰ δὲ** τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἐγνωσται ὑπὸ αὐτοῦ. ⁴Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως **οὖν** τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων οἶδαμεν **ὅτι** οὐδὲν εἰδωλὸν ἐν κόσμῳ, **καὶ ὅτι** οὐδεὶς θεὸς **εἰ** μὴ εἶς. ⁵**καὶ γὰρ εἶπερ** εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ **εἴτε** ἐν οὐρανῷ **εἴτε** ἐπὶ γῆς, **ὡςπερ** εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ **καὶ** κύριοι πολλοὶ, ⁶**ἀλλ'** ἡμῖν εἶς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα **καὶ** ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, **καὶ** εἰς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα **καὶ** ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ. ⁷**Ἄλλ'** οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γινώσκοντες: τινὲς **δὲ** τῆ συνηθεία ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου **ὡς** εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, **καὶ** ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενῆς οὕσα μολύνεται. ⁸βρῶμα **δὲ** ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ: **οὔτε** ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, **οὔτε** ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν. ⁹βλέπετε **δὲ** μή πως ἡ ἐξουσία ὑμῶν αὕτη πρόσκομμα γένηται τοῖς ἀσθενέσιν. ¹⁰**ἐὰν γάρ** τις ἴδῃ σὲ τὸν ἔχοντα γινώσκοντα ἐν εἰδωλείῳ κατακείμενον, οὐχὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτοῦ ἀσθενοῦς ὄντος οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθута ἐσθίειν; ¹¹ἀπόλλυται **γὰρ** ὁ ἀσθενῶν ἐν τῇ σῆι γνώσει, ὁ ἀδελφὸς δι' ὃν Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν. ¹²οὕτως **δὲ** ἀμαρτάνοντες εἰς τοὺς ἀδελφούς **καὶ** τύπτοντες αὐτῶν τὴν συνείδησιν ἀσθενοῦσαν εἰς Χριστὸν ἀμαρτάνετε. ¹³**διόπερ εἰ** βρῶμα σκανδαλίζει τὸν ἀδελφόν μου, οὐ μὴ φάγω κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, **ἵνα** μὴ τὸν ἀδελφόν μου σκανδαλίσω.

⁵⁵ The genitive construct a favorite of Revelations. Matt 11:25; 16:19; Mark 13:27; Luk 10:21; 12:56; Joh 6:33; Acts 17:24; 2 Peter 3:13; Rev 6:13; 9:1; 10:8; 18:1.

⁵⁶ Compare with other loci. Genitive-Genitive constructs Rev 10:8; 18:1; Luk 10:21; 12:56; Mark 13:27; Matt 11:25; Matt 16:19; Acts 17:24.

Another way to describe stylistic differences or mannerism so to speak is to look at *another* frequently occurring linguistic feature, namely the conjunction.⁵⁷ To the virtuous side of the conjunction for such an estimation is the fact that the conjunction is usually indeclinable. It is so to speak like the preposition less affected by the particular topic or question in discussion than a noun or a particular verb would be. Another point to make is that the conjunction is something that an author could not get by without. Among the various conjunctions to choose from in the Greek language, the utilization of one or another conjunction especially in the case when multiple choices are present are conducive in any description involving investigations of style. Their relative frequency does also require less amount of material for inferences of style. Conjunctions on the other side are seldom suited for searches of any hapax. If present they constitute a topic of discussion, but if not that does not necessarily disprove the absence of different styles. The main reason for this is that the very nature of conjunctions allows them such a frequency that any discussions of style could not be reduced merely to searches of a hapax. It is more likely than not, given sufficient material that any given author would cover most of the conjunctions in one way or another. Still, the conjunction is suited for stylistic investigation in that wherever multiple choices expressing the same or virtually the same relationship between clauses, the utilized one or if asyndeton says something about preferences and habits in style. In other words, the preference for a conjunction does not only tell us something about how to interpret the actual relation between the clauses. Further than that, it tells us something about how a particular author chooses to express this very relation.

In the text subjected to our discussion we do not run the hazard of mixing texts involving various themes.⁵⁸ The topic at discussion is set and the embedding of the Corinthian statements represents a choice of conjunctions independent of the one Paul makes.⁵⁹ The question here is whether the suggested demarcation line beginning with verse 9 is preceded by choices different from those succeeding verse 9? If the former is demonstrable, we have yet another supportive argument for the general division stemming from the main argument. In the following, the case will be made that there indeed is a shift in tone between those two sections.

The first thing to spot in the verses preceding verse nine is the share amount of the conjunctions present. The compact feature of introducing multiple conjunctions, sometimes closely knitted together as at the beginning of verse 5 were three conjunctions appear in a row without any intermediary; is highly reminiscent of the high amount of prepositions discussed in the section above. Likewise the fewer amount of conjunctions appearing subsequently after verse nine are reminiscent of the pattern seen regarding the prepositions. Previous studies have explained the rapidity of the conjunctions preceding verse nine as due to Paul's supposed adversative reaction to Corinthian statements. We have however already seen that what the positions and reactions involved were already determined beforehand as opposed to being the inference of a close scrutiny. We have also seen that both Paul's style of embedding statements other than from Scripture and the way of conduct in antiquity presents us with more argumentatively based tools to affirm a general division at the beginning of verse nine.

⁵⁷ For previous stylistic studies with a special emphasis on the conjunction see Morton, *Literary Detection. How to Prove Authorship and Fraud in Literature and Documents*, 158-164; Black, *Sentence Conjunctions in the Gospel of Matthew: καί, δέ, τότε, γάρ, οὐν and Asyndeton in Narrative Discourse*; Porter and O'Donnel, "Conjunctions, Clines and Levels of Discourse," 3-14.

⁵⁸ Sometimes being a major cause for varieties. A descriptive text where one author explains the particulars of what he saw in and around an object he or she visited would naturally have another set of conjunctions both in type and quantity than a text expressing a motion on rhythm would have.

⁵⁹ It is important to remember that the purposes of this study do not involve speculations of whether the embedded Corinthian statements were tampered with and if so to what degree. The assumption is that a tampering beyond recognition would not be serving Paul's purposes of convincing the recipients of his letter about the issues concerned, neither is such a flexibility (unlike Biblical quotations) a representative feature of the embedding of statements in Paul nor in antiquity at large. Refer to the first section of this work for a more detailed discussion of embedding of statements in antiquity.

The happy jump of ἄλλα (vv.6, 7) have been one favorite way of interjecting Paul somewhere along the lines⁶⁰, as if an adversative feature within a potential Corinthian argument are unthinkable. We will have reasons to come back to the function of ἄλλα here. Sufficiently enough here is to notice the emphatic force of this particular conjunction.⁶¹ Among several possible choices of adversative conjunctions, the choice of ἄλλα represents one of the more emphatic ones. It is precisely the feature of the choice of emphatic conjunctions or to emphasize otherwise fully functional conjunctions that is a significant feature of this section; thereby not only eliminating any forced reading of ἄλλα as an anomaly in context, but also serving as a contrast to what succeeds verse 9 were the emphaticizing is scarce.

We could categorize the section preceding verse 9 into conjunctions of emphatical force that are a) clearly such; b) likely such; c) arguably such. With reference to those that are a) clearly emphatic we find besides the already mentioned ἄλλα (vv.6, 7); the twice occurring εἶτε (v.5) and twice occurring οὔτε (v.8); the εἴπερ (v.5) and ὥσπερ (v.5); to the likely such is the οὖν of verse 4 and to the arguably such the εἰ δέ of verse 3. Leaving discussions of δέ aside, what is worthwhile noting here is that of the remaining possibly 8 instances of *emphatic* conjunctions, only two could clearly be said to be adversative. Hence the main feature of the emphatic conjunction here is not adversative. What is particularly interesting to note are the particles –τε and –περ which are suffixed to οὖ- and εἶ- in the former case and to εἶ- and ὥσ- in the latter case. What makes these cases particularly interesting is not whether they are found elsewhere in Paul or not, but the actual concentration here of the amount of emphaticized conjunctions. What should make this feature a feature of style is their otherwise dispensable nature. In all the six cases where the emphatical particles are added to the conjunctions we deal with from the standpoint of meaning otiose additions.⁶² What that in reality means is that to express the same or similar thought, the addition of the suffixed emphatic particles is redundant. Since it is present however it says something about the style or at least tone involved in the discourse. Clearly this topic is of high concern and attention, perhaps even emotional in the section preceding verse nine.

In contrast the scarcity of such emphatic expressions are a clear attribute of the subsequent section. Here the emphaticized conditionals of verse 8 are exchanged for the double negative οὐ μὴ of verse 13.⁶³ This is a construct otherwise absent from the section preceding it. Likewise the διόπερ of the same verse 13 constitutes the only emphasized inferential conjunction with a suffixed particle of emphatic force in this section. That it is Pauline seems to be supported by its only other appearance in 10:14 of this very letter. So whereas we have support for that the double negative and that the otherwise scarce διόπερ is Pauline, we lack the same kind of affirmation for the concentration of various particle-emphaticized conjunctions in conditionals. A further peculiarity found in this section is that in verse 12 the participles ἀμαρτάνοντες and τύπτοντες seem to indicate the protasis of a

⁶⁰ This seems to be the only argument for such a conclusion, see Gardner, *Gifts*, 40; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 192ff; Shen, *Canaan to Corinth: Paul's Doctrine of God and the Issue of Food Offered to Idols in 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*, 162 goes so far as to identify the Corinthians as preceding reoccurring ἄλλα. In 10:23 he would be right for other reasons than he specifies, but the mere adversative feature of ἄλλα does not in of itself suggest that Paul, the Corinthians interact with one another's statements or that they could not utilize this within their own discourse. To assume that whenever ἄλλα appears, Paul succeeds is nothing less than reiterate the old monopolizing assumptions about Pauline authorship and not seriously considering the implications of the presence of embeddings.

⁶¹ In our exposé of how Paul handles his embedded statements as well as our exposé of the habits in antiquity of taking by after embedded statements, ἄλλα has never served such a purpose. This is particularly interesting since the adversative force of the conjunction would on the surface of it be interchangeable with imperatives, negations and questions serving to illustrate disagreement with what has been "quoted".

⁶² This is also a feature of style. For additional variables following the choice of conjunction or connective see Kenny, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament*, 32-42.

⁶³ For a comprehensive study of the stylistic feature of conditionals, see Tjen, *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax*, especially 33-67 with references to koine and NT; cf. Winger, "Unreal Conditions in the Letters of Paul," 110-12; Roberts, "Some Aspects of Conditional Sentences in the Greek New Testament," 70-6.

conditional-like statement; a rarity in style further distanced from the emphasized conditionals with particles preceding our demarcation line.⁶⁴

In sum therefore, the insistent nature of emphaticized conjunctions in the early section forms a clear attribute not only absent from the latter section, but clearly distinguishable from how conjunctions in general and conditional constructs in particular appear in the latter.⁶⁵ Taken together this aspect strengthens and contributes to the suggested demarcation rather than being an example of the opposite.⁶⁶

The very concept of a conditional-construct with the help of a participle is interesting and tickling. The most common way to construct a conditional sentence on a formal level would be through the three cases involving combinations of εἰ or ἐάν.⁶⁷ The fourth involving an optative is not relevant to the study of the NT. Two other ways involve the imperative or the participle. While most cases involving the imperative are not convincing and highly debated, the participle on the other hand has been proven to function in a conditional-like construct.⁶⁸ Boyer describes that the notion “that participles do sometimes bear a conditional relationship to the governing verb is undoubted”.⁶⁹ As such three main features are discernable regarding the relation between the protasis and the apodosis whenever the participle has this function. The three features are common to all conditionals.⁷⁰ The relationship or logical relation could either be the one of a) cause-effect; b) evidence-inference; or c) equivalence. On an interpretive level we need to discern how it works here in chapter 8:12.⁷¹ From a stylistic point of view such a necessity is not incumbent upon the interpreter for the moment. Sufficient is to discern the conditional element. There are other examples in Paul of participles working in this way, for instance in 1 Cor 11:29; Gal 6:9.⁷² To establish whether the participles of verse 12 really bear a conditional-like force we would first need to establish whether they are adverbial, then to decide whether the affect it bears is conditional as opposed to other possibilities.⁷³ Since both of these cases are met here in

⁶⁴ Cf. Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 192. Occasionally the participle can indicate the protasis in a “conditional-like statement”. This is the case for instance in Lk 9:25; Acts 15:29; and Heb 2:3. In the example from Luke, a participle even indicates the apodosis.

⁶⁵ We only have a couple of instances taken the entirety of chapters 9 and 10 inclusive of conjunctions enforced by an emphatic particle. In fact all of them occur in chapter 10 and are there enforcing inferential conjunctions (διόπερ, v. 14); comparative (ὥσπερ, v.7; καθάπερ, v.10) and resultative (ὥστε, v.12). Only in verse 31 do we have an example of an enforced conditional (εἴτε). On the other hand, there is a great prevalence of conjunctions not found in 8:1-8 (ἦ, 9:6x2; 8; 10; 10:19; 22). Likewise the way of utilizing enforced particles differs as is seen by the use of γε 9:2 and μὲν 9:24; 25. Not only are these particles absent from the early section, but particles are never used there except as suffixes to other conjunctions predominantly conditional in nature. By far the final conjunction ἵνα (13 times) and the explanatory γὰρ (14 times) are the most prominent ones. Except one γὰρ in 8:5 both are absent from the section preceding our demarcation line where the conditionals often fill the explanatory function the γὰρ does in the latter sections. Combined and taken together, this variable choices suggest a shift in tone rather than a sudden variety after v.9.

⁶⁶ Which of course could be the case whenever we find a rare feature that otherwise is only found in Paul reproduced in both sections. In that case on our working premises it would be a testimony at least for a Pauline interjection.

⁶⁷ Caragounis, *The Development of Greek and the New Testament*, 227ff; Porter, *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*, 192, 254-267; Brooks & Winbery, *Syntax of New Testament Greek*, 181-5; Moule, *An Idiom-Book of New Testament Greek*, 148-152.

⁶⁸ Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 687-705; cf. *ibid.* 762-3.

⁶⁹ Boyer, “Other Conditional Elements in New Testament Greek”, 185.

⁷⁰ Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 762.

⁷¹ Encountering a compound protasis does further not imply that the apodosis has the same relation to both. See examples illustrating this in Wallace, *Greek Grammar Beyond the Basics*, 684. For the significance of analyzing whether the condition could be conversed or reversed see *ibid.* 685-6.

⁷² Boyer, “Other Conditional Elements in New Testament Greek”, 185 adds another example from 1 Tim 4:4 *lambanomenon*.

⁷³ *Ibid.* 184. Boyer concedes that the decision ultimately rests with the interpreter. An illustrative example of this is perhaps Acts 18:21 ἀλλὰ ἀποταξάμενος καὶ εἰπὼν, Πάλιν ἀνακάμψω πρὸς ὑμᾶς τοῦ θεοῦ θέλοντος, ἀνήχη ἀπὸ τῆς Ἐφέσου: where the θέλοντος is taken as a conditional element signaled in some translations by the insertion of “if”. Cf. LEB, ASV, NIV. Others do not emphasize the conditional element cf. RHE. The interpretive difference could therefore range from an actual statement of God’s expressed will, through an implied

that the interpreter encounters a conditional adverbial participle with a ring of contingency and as the following εἰς Χριστὸν ἀμαρτάνετε is grammatically independent, there is no reason to infer that the latter is not the semantically dependent apodosis of a conditional-like statement. As such type of conditional construct, it is clearly distinguishable from the multiple conditional constructions preceding verse 9 who are built after other principles.⁷⁴

A final thing to take notice of is how the kai works in the different sections. The copulative kai has been a reoccurring feature in many stylistic evaluations of ancient Greek texts.⁷⁵ The reason for this should be quite obvious. The very frequency of kai allows the researcher even in assessing less bulky material, to have multiple nodes of references as to where it appears in the sentence, if it interlocks clauses or words as well as to what of its multiple meanings that it is most frequently given by a particular author.⁷⁶ Taken individually or collectively, the kai suits well any comparative assessments between different authors. Looking closely, the use of kai in the section preceding verse nine is predominantly paratactic in nature.⁷⁷ Just as the asyndeton the paratactic construct has been seen as a figure of style representative of the Greek idiom stemming from speakers with an idiolect corresponding to or closely resembling semitic languages such as Hebrew.⁷⁸ The hypotaxis on the other hand would more correspond to the subordination of clauses to each other in a web of interlinked thought. The kai does not in of itself necessarily signal a subordination, for that other conjunctions are more likely to be used. However the kai could be used in a number of different ways other than in paratactic structures. One such usage prevalent in the sections succeeding verse 9 is the utilization of kai as a conjoiner not exclusively of clauses as also of individual nouns within clauses. This is one of the most prominent features of kai within this discourse as it appears from 9:4; 9:5-6; 9:7; 9:27; 10:2b; 10:7; 10:13; 10:26; 10:32c. While there is an example of kai conjoining a preceding adjective with a succeeding noun in 8:5b, its function as a copula inbetween nouns within a clause structure are completely absent from this section. Moreover before the suggested demarcation line its usage is almost exclusively as a paratactic conjoiner inbetween independent clauses as is seen in 8:4; 8:5a; 8:6b; 8:7. The most striking characteristic appears in the way in which some of the clauses conjoined by kai logically function in this section. The independent clauses seem to introduce complete concepts conjoined but neither logically or semantically necessitated by the clauses to which they are linked. For instance, there is no structural necessity to

conditional all the way to an expressed conditional. With a passive participle the notion would switch the spectrum to a scale of known unknowns to unknown knowns.

⁷⁴ Cf. 1 Cor 5:3 and a similar function there of παρῶν; Rom 7:3 γενομένην.

⁷⁵ Pioneering the utilization of more frequent words as opposed to hapax have been convincingly argued and demonstrated by Morton and McLeman, *Paul, the Man and the Myth*, 65-80 (for kai), tables 12-28 in the appendix where Paul is compared to both other NT-writers as well to large samples from other ancient writers. Cf. Ellegård, *A Statistical Method for Determining Authorship*, 20-38

⁷⁶ Postpositives for instance are by definition never initiating a sentence but stand regularly as the second words. Other such nodes refer to a) the positioning of kai, i.e. where does it appear? As it stands kai is more flexible than for instance de, and as such has a broader range of possibilities to be utilized by an individual author in a characteristic way. The employment of kai does not require it by necessity to have any particular positioning; b) related to the first node is the second which deals with what the kai actually "interlocks". There are a number of possibilities ranging from general thoughts, to individual words and clauses. In the latter case this "interlocking" could be either of a set of independent clauses, dependent clauses, or a combination of independent/ dependent clauses. A frequency count allows the interpreter to suggest the particular habitus of a given author; c) the third thing to look for in kai once its positioning and formal interlocking has been taken noticed of is what force it is given in its capacity. There are a number of possibilities for kai, such as being a pure connective, ascensive, contrastive, correlative or explanatory (cf. Wallace, *Greek Grammar*, 761; Runge, *Discourse Grammar*, 7). A combination of two or three of these nodes increases the likelihood of the presence of a habitus wherever it could not be explained away by differences with regards to subject matter. For the stylistic use of kai in Paul, see Morton, *Literary Detection. How to Prove Authorship and Fraud in Literature and Documents*, 165-184; and Figure 9.1 "2 positional distributions: (a) the positional distribution of occurrences of the conjunction kai in the sentences of I Corinthians" (ibid. 120ff).

⁷⁷ The parataxis could either be formal or logical. This is not to say that in contrast the paratactic feature is absent in the subsequent sections (cf. kai pantes of chapter 10). It is rather suggested that the hypotactic feature is scarcer in the section preceding verse 9.

⁷⁸ Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, vol. II – *Accidence and Word-Formation with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament*, 12-34.

insert οὐδεις θεος εἰ μὴ εἷς in v.4. There is neither nothing that compels the author for the sake of clarity to insert this in order to understand what precedes or succeeds this very phrase.⁷⁹ When something that is not compelled either structurally or logically to be present is nevertheless found inserted, it seems that its very presence suggests a certain emphasis. In context this emphasis stresses a principle that is deemed relevant for the subject matter and consequently highlighted by its proponents. The case in verses 8:5a and 6b are quite similar. The information appearing there is not necessitated once the major premise preceding the *kai* are accepted. Indeed if everything is created by and through God, that would include the ones hiding behind the ἡμεῖς on the assumption that they also are created. The fact that it is made explicit focuses the attention of the argument. In the responsorial statements to this section in chapter 10 the *καὶ πάντες* follows another stylistic path. The rapport that is established inbetween what was argued essentially “being created by and for” God in chapter 8 is here contrasted with what God in his capacity has made for his chosen ones through a series of paratactic statements linked by the combination of *καὶ* + *πάντες*. The latter statements are concrete examples culminating in a warning as opposed to the former section in chapter eight where the principle is culminating in a statement of confidence. The function in chapter 10 is to build rapport to the principle by way of example and negate the previous conclusion by facts of history. The function of the interjections beginning with ἡμεῖς and following the *καὶ* in chapter eight are in contrast by way of logical deduction.

The structure of the argumentation “formulas” appears therefore to be another major difference in style.⁸⁰ To return to the *καὶ οὐδεις θεος εἰ μὴ εἷς* in v.4, it does refer not only to an independent clause, but moreover to a notion that in of itself could be a proposition, conclusion or both (sorites).⁸¹ It further also bears the force of being the inverted “truth” to what immediately precedes it.⁸² In contrast, what succeeds the *καὶ* in the subsequent sections does not introduce a sorites, an independent conclusion or proposition. In chapter 10:20 *καὶ οὐ* Thew could be interpreted as supplying, completing or qualifying the thought. It is not redundant and would change the argument if not present. To take one example, to say that what they offer, they do so to demons is quite different than to state that what they do offer to the demons is not offered to God. It puts these two activities at odds with each other, while the former alternative only stresses the affinity of the offering without further elaboration of its antonyms, incompatibilities or how such an offering relates to God, the latter forms the malign element to the selfsame notions. At odds and even more emphatical is the expression (10:21) *οὐ δύναστε ποτεῖον κυρίου πίνειν* (further marked with A) and what is qualified with the *ποθέριον δαιμονίων* (further marked with B). It could be translated in a number of ways: a) You have not the power (right, allowance) to either drink of A & B; b) You do not drink of A at the same time as you drink of B; c) You cannot drink A if you drink B. Each of the cases relate the A (poterion kuriou) to the B (poterion daimoniwn) in a logically intertwined argument where the *καὶ* links a constituent part of the argument. The difference in structure of argument on a formulaic level is not reconcilable between the chapters concerned. The above taken statement from 10:21 could be formulated based on

⁷⁹ There is no necessity to affirm that there is no God but one to disprove what is already denied preceding it, namely that the idols are not anything in the world; nor what succeeds it, that they are not compelled to accept anything that is called a deity as such. The presence of it is a *contrapositive* to what is denied i.e. what does not exist (idols) what does exist (God).

⁸⁰ If Paul is to be asserted to be the composer of both this structures he would in the first case deduct a security from a principle, implications of which he in the other instance negates. The already argued for embedding of statements seems therefore to be a much more reasonable suggestion. For studies where order has been seen as a component of style see Kuno, “The Position of Relative Clauses and Conjunctions,” 117-36; Wills, “Homeric Particle Order,” 61-81; Dover, “Abnormal Word Order in Attic Comedy,” 324-43; Banker, “The Position of the Vocative *adelphoi* in the Clause,” 29-36; Porter, “Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek: An Unexplored Area of Greek Linguistics Using Philippians as a Test Case,” 177-206; *ibid.* “Greek Word Order: Still and Unexplored Area in New Testament Studies?,” 347-363 in Porter, *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testamen: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice.*

⁸¹ The interpretation of which pertains to the upcoming section of this dissertation.

⁸² On the assumption that a higher power of this nature exists, the suggestion that more than one does not exist already implies that only one such higher power does exist.

its various translations as: a) A & B requires at least C. Since no C, therefore not A & B;⁸³ b) B does not equal A;⁸⁴ c) Either A or B (If A not B, if B not A).⁸⁵ Each of these alternatives present real interpretive challenges with significant impacts on the understanding of the debate. However, from a stylistic point of view b and c represent some kind of incompatibility or restraint between what precedes and succeeds the conjunct καὶ. Comparing this with the function earlier mentioned in 8:4 for instance, the καὶ introduces there an independent clause that works in of itself as a proposition. Οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς (or: no A, if not A=B) has a complete significance if the οτι is taken as a recitative. If the οτι is taken as a causal-οτι the linkage between the independent clauses surrounding the καὶ becomes more intimate. That the idols are nothing in the world would hence be explained by the knowledge of that there is no God if not one. The proposition just explicated would hence form a part of another argument or reason for rejecting the idols (C); (i.e. Since A=B, then not C, since if C, then not A=B).⁸⁶ In both cases the proximity of A=B is undoubted and a prerequisite for explications of what follows from this principle. In the examples from chapter 10 however the argument with καὶ is disjunctive in force. There is nothing that would prevent the arguments from either chapter to be outlined in a fashion similar to how it now stands in the other, and as such stand therefore as a supportive argument for the general division argued above.

It is important to recapitulate what has been said in reference to the other supportive arguments of the demarcation line at 8:9. Here the case is not made that Paul could not structure his argument in both fashions. Neither is the task here to outline every single Pauline argument in search for logical patterns. What is conducive on the assumption that we have embedded statements within this chapter however, is the significance of that the structure of an argument within the range of the same conjunction diverges from how Paul could construe and does construe it within the very same discourse. The differences are therefore far from being detrimental, rather congruent with what is expected of stylistic preferences. In other words, the presence of stylistic shifts at the points outlined are benign towards our general division.

2.4.2.3 Other supportive arguments, from terminology

It has been noted above with regard to the discussion of the general segmentation that the point for point interaction between embedded statements and the subsequent interaction with them which is the very purpose behind their presence in the first place, requires an equivalence in that the amount of embedded points are interacted with correspondingly. This interaction can work in a number of different logical ways. Conceiving that the embedded statement is disputed with, at least in regard to the entailed concept, formulation, interpretation or implication - would necessitate on the former two, challenges of word choice and definitions, on the latter two re-interpretation and other priorities of consequentiality. This is however very schematic and in an actual dispute, the amount of enacted points could vary correspondingly both to quantity and intense. The important thing

⁸³ C stands for the concept behind dunaste. Whether the lack of dynaste could be supplied for A & B is an open question on this (a) translation.

⁸⁴ What "hinders" A is the participation of B. Focus lies with identity.

⁸⁵ Mutual exclusiveness.

⁸⁶ The structure of the arguments are highly reminiscent of the three fundamental laws of logic as outlined by Aristotle. Those being: the law of identity (Metaphysics, Book IV, part 4); the law of non-contradiction (idem; de Interpretatione, 7.17b 4-15 on contrary statements, and 7.17b 16-18 on contradictory statements within categorical syllogisms); the law of the excluded middle (Metaphysics, Book IV, part 7). There are several ways in which these laws can come into play here. God's oneness could both follow the law of identity, and hence resemble the very indispensable "quality" of God in 8:4, but it could also follow the law of non-contradiction God could not both be and not be one at the same time. Further it could be reached by the way of the excluded middle, were the proposition "no God if not one" asserts that the logical disjunct "either there is no God except one, or it is not the case that God is one" is true by the virtue of its form and excluded would therefore be the "middle" i.e. "God is neither one, nor not one (among many)".

to note with regard to terminology is hence not only whether there are any hapax present, but whether the terminology employed is antonymic to terminology employed in the preferences appearing in the comparative text. In the following the case will be expressed for a couple of such word pairs. The more antonymic terminology employed with regard to the same theme, then less likely is it that the same author is responsible for both terms especially in cases where they invoke different concepts, provoke misunderstanding or imply different ends.⁸⁷ Terminology that not necessarily is antonymic could still invoke different perspectives or stress various aspects depending on the respective authors concerns and emphasis of aspect. In the latter cases, not so much the terminology as how it is used comes into play. Inbetween these ends are a plethora of possible spectra all of which relate to the dimensions of a particular dispute. What a determination from antonymic terminology would not be, is a choice of synonyms by an individual author. While the latter is likely to happen in lengthier exposes and monologues, it is less likely that an author if nothing else is suggestive to the contrary should be engaged in bipolar activities within an ongoing dialogue.

One of such concepts that seems to strengthen the suggested demarcation line of segmentation seems to be touching the very core of the topic at discussion. Beginning at verse 1 and beginning at verse 4 in the eight chapter we have at least the topic marker *περὶ δὲ*. But while the one introduces what is following as *περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων* (v.1), the other dropping the otherwise for Paul characteristic *δὲ*, runs *περὶ τῆς βρώσεως* (v.4). At first glance the interpreter could run the risk of equating these terminologies as synonymous and essentially the same. This does however assume an interpretation that does not necessarily have to be true. In the above section, when we discussed themes and more specifically the sections that were underlined and italicized it was noted that a clear distinction seems to present itself in the verses preceding verse nine in that idol food is either simply designed as food *βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει* (v.8), being idol food in perception *ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον* (v.7) or by name *τῆς βρώσεως οὗ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων* (v.4). The question no interpreter has asked himself thus far is whether the section preceding verse nine does concede that there exists any such thing as idol food? Considering these statements as they stand there is simply no support for this assertion. Quite to the contrary there seems to be a restraint in even calling it so. When it is mentioned it is mentioned simply as food, not attaching any status to it other than what it is in perception of some or called so by others. Reversely in line with the introduction of verse 1 *περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων*, the section succeeding verse nine does not put any restraint or qualifying marks of the sort. The tenth verse is quite clear that the behavior of the Corinthians affects in way of *οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθута ἐσθίειν*, where the *εἰδωλόθута* is clearly definable and qualified (cf. 10:19-21). Likewise in 10:18 it becomes more apparent that there is no automatic disassociation between the altar and the food associated with it. In the thirteenth verse of chapter 8 both *βρῶμα* and *κρέα* are mentioned, but the preceding conditional *εἰ* does not force or necessitate another definition than what appears in 10:19-21. Rather it seems that by building rapport an argument is built up from *minorem ad majorem*, i.e. if regular food and meat should regulate ones behavior with regards to ones brethren, so much the more things that offend more than regular meats. The point is that there is no designation of *εἰδωλόθута* as only *βρώσεως* or to be a subjective construct by the perceiver. The question of the existence of things such as *εἰδωλόθута* by themselves does not implicate whether they could be eaten or not and if so under what circumstances.⁸⁸ Those questions of interpretative importance do not need to bother us right now, the more indicative support for our segmentation is the incompatible notions that while *εἰδωλοθύτων* is a judgment about a piece of food; *βρώσεως* is a judgment about a piece of *εἰδωλόθута*. The one being consistent with what is already conceded to be Paul, while the other not.

⁸⁷ Cf. Kenny, *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament*, 80-101.

⁸⁸ It neither does answer the question how a piece of food becomes *eidolothyta*, whether it by necessity remains so i.e. is stative in this or if there are any procedures by which it could cease to be such.

Another word pair briefly touched above was the word choice with regard to consequentiality of partaking of certain types of food i.e. the μολύνεται (v.7) vis a vie the ἀπόλλυται (v.11). Just as with regard to the notion of idol-food vis a vie food, there is an interpretative challenge in determining questions as whether the third party concerned actually existed and if so consumed what they should not and/ or otherwise would not consume. As it appears the perspective in verse 7 is that these people ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν i.e. whatever they do, they have done so for a time following a seemingly unbroken pattern. In contrast verse 10 has it that presumably the same group is οἰκοδομηθήσεται εἰς τὸ τὰ εἰδωλόθυτα ἐσθίειν. The difference is that while the former statement does not entail the notion of an initiated behavior but stresses the ongoing habit, the latter section seems to indicate the opposite. The notion of being “built up to” entails concepts of affect and initiation. Whether they would or have ceased with this type of consumption or whether they are “new” to the phenomena is not explicated in the verses succeeding verse 9. What is clear is that those with the “weak conscience” have the behavior of the addressed Corinthians to thank or blame for their own approaching actions, past or both. These different notions as to the “third party’s” reasons for eating are not reconciliatory if the premises of the observation are true. What is perhaps indicative of which, but more importantly so antinomic is the word choice with regard to the consequential nature for the “third party” consumption. Both preceding and succeeding verse nine there is an agreement that consequences seemingly follow for the unsteady. However, the former preceding section chooses to describe this as a defilement μολύνεται (v.7) with a genesis in those being defiled and their wrongly determined conscience. The latter post verse 9 section evokes the more fatalistic terminology of destruction ἀπόλλυται (v.11).

One way to spot the differences in the chosen terminology is to determine when and how it is used. Since the definition of a word is more sharply contoured in relation to a contrast, here a synonym or an antonym serve well as opposite ends of the spectrum of such an evaluation. As it stands the word-choice of μολύνεται is by no means a frequently occurring term in the New Testament.⁸⁹ Various dictionaries range in their definitions from something being impure, defiled, stained or soiled.⁹⁰ Often the term has been connected to a Jewish thought-flora of purities and impurities.⁹¹ This is however by no means an exclusive attribute of antique Jewish religious concepts.⁹² In the New Testament it does however appear in the

⁸⁹ With some variations in John 18:28; Rev 3:4; 14:4; 2 Cor 7:1; (Jas 1:27); (Acts 15:20).

⁹⁰ For an overview of the impurity terminology within the Dead Sea Scrolls, New Testament and the Old Testament consult Paschen, *Rein und Unrein: Untersuchung zur biblischen Wortgeschichte*, 28-68. Klawans, "Idolatry, Incest, and Impurity: Moral Defilement in Ancient Judaism", 392 distinguishes between two types of defilement in ancient Jewish thought. The one been ritual defilement and the other being moral defilement. To the latter pertains acts of idolatry. Usually the consequences of moral defilement are more dire than the ones of ritual defilement (ibid, 404-5). Others only allow one type of defilement, namely ritualistic cf. Neusner, *The Idea of Purity in Ancient Judaism*, 108;

⁹¹ There is often an underestimation of similarities between different religions in antiquity. No singular cult should be considered as having an exclusive right to a particular pattern of behavior. This is witnessed not the least with regard to Corinth. Dio Chrysostom refers to ceremonies of mourning in honor of Palaemon-Melicertes on the Isthmus (Or.46.40), a temple of which Pausanias testifies a century later (2.2.1). The latter does perhaps with equal reliability refer to a temple of Medea (2.3.6-11) of which rites are said by the sophist Philostratus (Heroic, 20.24) to have included among other things the ritual shaving of heads: οσοσα οι αυτοι [Κορινθοι] δρωσιν επι τοις της Μηδειας παισιν...θρηνω εικασται τελεστικω τε και ενθew. This should be compared to what Paul does when he κειράμενος ἐν Κεγχρεαίς τὴν κεφαλὴν (Acts 18:18) and invites others to do (Acts 21:24). The very same locality and practice where Paul shorns of his hair is the site for a ritual hair-cutting specific to the Corinthians. Despite these similarities, there is no further likeness between Paul's vowed motives in correspondence to a practice similar to the Nazarite one and which further is motivated in reference to the Jews rather than the Corinthians (Acts 21:24). So dealing with terminology of purity and impurity we must not assume that any behavior is more Jewish in of itself without any upbacking evidence. The section preceding verse nine may use terminology evoking Jewish or Pagan concepts either by “former” Jews or Pagans and which combination would be most plausible should be subject to further scrutiny.

⁹² Theon of Smyrna, ca 100 A.D, the Platonist mathematician for instance compares philosophy to initiation. Worth to notice is the similarity of how he describes having knowledge to being known by deity and having reached a state of being not shared by everybody to the argument from knowledge and love of God preceding

more accentuated literature. If the question is about what the concept entails it is productive to look at the word in its occurrences. In John 18:28 Jesus is led to the praetorium but not further by those who do not wish to be defiled which would, early as it was in the morning, bar them from eating the paschal victim. In Revelation 3:4 the word is used to designate unstained garments which further are emphasized by their whiteness/brightness. In Revelation 14:4 the term is used to describe virgins, undefiled by women who further are blameless since they neither lie but do further follow the lamb. These designations employ the notion of maintaining a purity corresponding to the requirements of the law. In James 1:27 we most probably have a negated synonym to *μολυσμός* in *ἀμίαντος* θρησκεία καθαρὰ καὶ ἀμίαντος, designating a religion clean and undefiled or more specifically a religion that is clean and made undefiled.⁹³ In both cases the negation of the synonym which is a derivative of *μαίνω* makes it in all practicality equivalent or synonymous to the *καθαρὰ* to which it is conjoined by *καὶ*. This antonymic relation between purity and impurity is further emphasized even by Paul himself in 2 Cor 7:1 *καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἀγιοσύνην ἐν φόβῳ θεοῦ*. To run the risk of being *μολύνεται* is hence an argument that essentially says that what is being at stake is not to remain *καθαρός*. Somebody defiled could be made clean again as evinced by Paul, he is not thereby destroyed.

In contrast to this word-choice the reader encounters *ἀπόλλυται* in verse 11 of chapter 8. What concept this word entails and how it relates to the choice above is by the utilization of equal standards as those applied above to be investigated with regards to its synonyms and antonyms. The frequency of this terminology within the New Testament and the Pauline corpus marks it out as a word-choice not foreign to Paul.⁹⁴ In the Pauline corpus the term appears about 12 times with its usual connotations of destruction and perishing. What it more specifically entails does however stand out in contrast with the terminology it is associated with. In Romans 2:12 it is used in conjunction with sin and judgment. In 1 Corinthians it is conjoined with *ἀθετέω* i.e. to be put away set aside. In the narrower context of 1 Corinthians 10:9-10 the term is used twice designating the destroying consequences after sinning against Christ. It could occasionally refer strictly to physical death as in 1 Cor 15:18; 2 Cor 4:9. One of the more interesting features however is when it is used antithetically. This happens whenever as subject the *ἀπολλυμένοις* are put in contrast to the *σωζόμενοις* (1 Cor 1:18; 2 Cor 2:15). The antithetical contrast between destruction and salvation are hence also entailed in conjunction to the consequences for the third party as explicated in 1 Cor 8:11. If the one affected to participate of sacrificial food are thereby *ἀπόλλυται*, then he also inevitable belong to the *ἀπολλυμένοις* and therefore not to the *σωζόμενοις*.⁹⁵ The choice of terminology before and after verse 9 does hence entail different consequences in view of how the third party is perceived to be affected by the consumption of idol food. In the succeeding section the consequences are eschatological, to be destroyed stands in contrast to be saved; while the preceding section terms the consequences with language more reminiscent of ritual purity/ impurity. Since the power of the idols and idol

verse 9. So Theon writes about initiation as five stages of *Myseis, Util. Math. 14.18ff* (Hiller). Without mentioning how purity relates to conscience he speaks about those who are excluded from participating in the mysteries of philosophy through their *χειρας μη καθαρὰς καὶ φωνὴν ἀζυγετον εχοντας*. He does further in his five initiatory ways suggest that the first step should be purification: *μυσησεως δε μερη πεντε. το μεν προηγουμενον καθαρμος*, while the last step subsists in living in mutual cordiality with the gods: *πεμπτη δε η εξ αυτων περιγενομενη κατα το θεοφιλες και θεος συνδιατιον ευδαιμονια*. Cf. Scuddeboom, *Greek Religious Terminology*, 63-4.

⁹³ The latter example would emphasize what had happened in a movement from uncleanness to cleanness, while the previous examples talked about the other direction cleanness in relation to potentiality of uncleanness. In 1 Cor 7:1 the direction of moving from an unclean to a clean state is emphasized with the aspect of initiating this movement. Those spurred on are designated as beloved ones and hence there is no necessity to read in that every *μολυσμος* necessarily has the dreadful consequences of eternal punishment attached to the *ἡ ἀκάθαρτος* in Eph 5:5.

⁹⁴ With a frequency rate of 376 times in the Septuagint and 92 times in the New Testament it is for all practical purposes necessary to restrict ourselves to its utilization in the Pauline corpus.

⁹⁵ The interpretative challenge is perhaps to determine in what sense the *ἀπόλλυται* is to be understood. It seems however that a physical death necessarily ensues the consumption of any food unless if perhaps poisoned.

food is further altogether denied in the preceding section this would also entail any affect they purportedly would have in eschatological terms. What further emphasizes the irreconcilable differences are that while the concept of ἀπόλλυται entails the notion of a more definitive state, μολύνεται on the other hand does not necessarily anticipate anything beyond ritual purity.⁹⁶ Finally, there is an interpretive task in determining whether Romans 14 does refer to idol food or not; but even if assumed that it does not, the formulation μὴ τῷ βρώματί σου ἐκεῖνον ἀπόλλυε ὑπὲρ οὗ Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν (Rom 14:15) is highly reminiscent about a) the consequences the third party eater in 1 Cor 8:11 are said to suffer and b) who further is described for whom Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν. Both expressions are essentially reproduced, the latter exactly so to the phrase found in verse 11. Without premature speculations about what these correspondences of expression entail with reference to Paul's stance towards idol food, the similar expressions do however affirmatively lend support that the section succeeding 8:9 are Pauline.

So far we have argued the case from the stylistic features of why a demarcation line with what is embedded and what is Pauline should be drawn somewhere along verse 9. In response to what many authors in reference to 1 Cor 8 have called a “seemingly contradictory”⁹⁷ discussion there is hence reasons to affirmatively even go beyond what many rhetoricians have entertained in theory. Hence ends also the section of supportive arguments for the main division. What remains is to investigate where Paul possibly could appear preceding verse 9 and respectively where embedded Corinthian statements may appear succeeding verse 9. The former could be divided into a) where the embedding does begin; and b) whether there are any interjections of Paul inbetween the beginning and demarcation line at verse 9. Likewise there is a need to investigate if and where further embedded statements appear succeeding verse 9 and whether any of those could come from the third party.

Hence we proceed with in order d) Where does the embedding begin? e) Other interruptions by Paul in chapter 8? f) Other Corinthian statements in 8-10? g) Embedded positions from the third party?

2.5 Where does the embedding begin?

So far the task has been to apply the methodological insights to pinpoint where Paul takes by i.e. resumes after an embedding. Two relevant questions arise in conjunction to this. The first being where Paul could be said to initiate his embedding and the second whether there are any Pauline interjections within the section appearing inbetween where Paul initiates embedded statements and where Paul takes by again. In one sense the enterprise of establishing the beginning of an embedded statement is not easily solved by our worked out methodology. The methodology has taken into consideration how embedded statements are interacted with both within Paul and other contemporary authors. Since neither in Paul nor in his surrounding world was there any established way of introducing embedded statements with a fixed formula, no such expectations should therefore burden the methodological tool. There are however good grounds for why the introduction should be considered to start and end with the *περὶ δὲ τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων*.

Περὶ δὲ does not as much inform us about the character of the following formulation, whether it is simply a topic statement or a quotation as much as it informs us that the author has ended a previous discussion.⁹⁸ In other words it marks in a way the end of the

⁹⁶ Whether physical or ritual, cf. BDAG 657 with references.

⁹⁷ Houston, *Purity and Monotheism. Clean and Unclean Animals in Biblical Laws*, 269.

⁹⁸ Previous authors have not emphasized this aspect. *Περὶ δὲ* has played various roles within different reconstruction theories. For the partition theorists it worked as a marker of excerpts from an Corinthian

previous section by introducing something new.⁹⁹ In context it marks a shift away from what pertains to marital considerations of chapter 7 to those dealing with sacrificial food. The question here is what it does introduce and if this goes beyond τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων? Many scholars have unconditionally seen the naked construct without its object as a general introductory formula for subsequent quotations.¹⁰⁰ We do not find this argument from necessity to be convincing. Margaret M Mitchell has by investigating the occurrences of περὶ δὲ formulation within other Greek epistolary and literary letters reached the conclusion that for each sentence introduced by the preposition περὶ with the conjunction δὲ as a postpositive there are a range of possibilities out which the one of being an introductory formula for reference to previous letters is only one.¹⁰¹ Her work had however no suggestions with regard to how to determine when this is the case. The enquiry that we have conducted has resulted in an affirmative argument for that the Corinthians are indeed embedded in this section. If the case is as we have argued, then it would be consistent with Margaret M. Mitchell's study. It would be so, because we do not evoke περὶ δὲ in order to define what succeeds, but rather by having identified these sections as embedded we predict how the περὶ δὲ functions in this discourse. This in turn is a function among others Margaret M Mitchell's study has evinced in relation to περὶ δὲ.

Among the scholars that have accepted the notion that περὶ δὲ together with its object here introduces an embedded discourse, there are a division with regard to where actually this embedding should be initiated. Some have argued that it succeeds immediately after τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων in verse 1, while others have preferred to see the succeeding οἶδαμεν ὅτι as a part of the Pauline introduction.¹⁰² As it seems therefore the debate ranges about whom οἶδαμεν ὅτι is to be ascribed to. There is no doubt that it plays an important difference interpretatively speaking if Paul affirms what the Corinthians say and qualifies it or whether the Corinthians start with a principle they are sure of but others deny. However our task here should not be to determine which based on the theological implications it may have, but rather to evaluate what formal arguments could be mustered for either position and to evaluate the conclusion on this merit. Unfortunately the arguments pro and con have mainly

Antwortbrief and served further to reconstruct the "original" Pauline letter behind 1 Corinthians (cf. Schenk, "Der 1 Korintherbrief als Briefsammlung", 224; Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth*, 85). For those scholars arguing the unity of the letter it has worked as a distinction mark between what Paul has received orally (and responds to in an angry fashion) and what he has receive by way of written communication introduced by περὶ δὲ and responded to calmly (ex. Hurd, *The Origins of 1 Corinthians*, 61-94 [especially 64]; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 146). Indispite the "unionist" view of Paul balancing the different sources of information both they and the partition theorists are not only agreeing on that the composition and structure of the letter is dependent upon its occurrences in 7:1, 25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1, 12 but that it moreover introduces written information (cf. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 207; Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 135; Bruce, *I and II Corinthians*, 66). The perspective taken in this dissertation does not assume an incompatibility of the integrity of a letter based on its utilizing embedded statements whatever their source. Rather it is a prerequisite.

⁹⁹ Mitchell, "Concerning περὶ δὲ", 234 notices the fact that the formulation is a shorthand introduction of a familiar subject to the correspondents, not necessarily restricted to excerpts of any kind. Though Mitchell's conclusion is sound, some of her argumentation is flawed. First to halt at the familiarity of a topic begs the question of where the particular information comes from and why precisely it is introduced. If it is true that the scholar could not restrict the περὶ δὲ to introduce excerpts, it is also true that the scholar could not reduce the sections not introduced by περὶ δὲ as being unfamiliar information to the receiver or the communication of necessarily new information. Second, she restricts the meaning of "περὶ δὲ" simply by external references without discussing their bearing upon Paul. This is unlike or methodological section and should open her up for criticism with regard to what bearing these references have upon 1 Corinthians. Having said this, Mitchell's criticism does not reach our suggestion. The question is not whether embedded statements must follow περὶ δὲ, but given that they can, it is consistent with what we have argued to be the case by way of our methodology.

¹⁰⁰ It has been seen as an introductory formula for quotations. See White, *The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter*, 31; Sanders, "The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letter of the Pauline Corpus", 350; cf. references in preceding notes.

¹⁰¹ Cf. Mitchell, "Concerning περὶ δὲ", 229-56.

¹⁰² 1st those who say short introduction; Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*, 67; Lock, "1 Corinthians viii.1-9, A Suggestion," 65-74; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 220; Gardner, *The Gifts of God and the Authentication of a Christian*, 22-3; Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 189. 2nd those who say long introduction: Horsley, *1 Corinthians*, 117; Phua, *Idolatry and Authority*, 3; 128; Perkins, *First Corinthians*, 114; Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 330; Sanger, "Problems Arising from the Worship of Idols," 364; Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth*, 187-9; Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 63;73;192.

gone through a theological reverse-engineering. It has been first determined what Paul argues and this has worked as the determinant for what to suggest in this place.¹⁰³ Such kind of thinking is flawed not only to its circularity, but moreover in its assumption that the scholar first and foremost should be interested in helping either Paul or the Corinthians to form a consistent argument. This is not the task of a scholarly enterprise. Rather, the task as we have argued is to approach as closely as is methodologically possible to the different positions. The evaluation of the arguments should succeed not precede this enterprise. Should the arguments for the various positions be found flawed or inconsistent, then it would only reflect the nature of an argument. Not every argument is immaculate, coherent and intact. That is rather the definition of a particular argument, namely a good one. We should not confuse arguments as such with a particular quality incumbent in some of them. Hence the scholar feeding on the grasses of idealistic consistency engages himself in a semi-sacred mission for his or her particular idiosyncrasy.

The question at hand is that since we do not have access to any consistent introductory formula, how far could our suggestions with regard to the embedded nature of statements take us with regard to where they could begin here? The question could perhaps be reformulated as does our division suggest anything with regard to the initiatory parts and if so what parts? Earlier in this dissertation we discussed some of the thematic features separating the text preceding and succeeding verse 9. The interplay between τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων and τῆς βρώσεως did furthermore form a supportive terminological-stylistic argument in favor of the general division. Another feature as we have seen are the prevalence of the first person plural in the preceding section vis a vie the first person singular in the succeeding. It seems therefore from what we have said so far, that the former i.e. εἰδωλοθύτων is consistent with the terminological preference of Paul. While the latter οἶδαμεν is more consistent with the self-reflection found in the embedded statements. The question is not whether Paul would or could utilize a plural to build rapport. Evidently he could, but given that the succeeding embeddings are found in the very self-reflective formula also found in the οἶδαμεν – it seems that the burden of proof would fall upon those suggesting that the apparent consistency in this regard is only illusory.¹⁰⁴ This is especially the case since the construct οἶδαμεν ὅτι is repeated in verse 4 as a part of the suggested embedding. In other words, there are good grounds even in this small corpus not to exclude this particular formulation from being considered Corinthian. On the other hand we have a comparatively lengthier corpus attributed to Paul. We are therefore legitimated in asking whether there are any further evidence of that Paul would precede embedded statements with something equivalent to οἶδαμεν ὅτι? If so, there indeed would at least be a precedence for suggesting this being the case in 8:1. If not, the argument it seems should in lack of any corroborating evidence scale over to what is supported by consistency.

¹⁰³ This has been a cross-pollinating disease among both the “longer introduction” and “shorter introduction” parties. Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*, 68 for instance argued for a shorter introduction partly on that: “Paul seems to be in self-contradiction in verses 1 and 7. In the former he says *all* have γνώσεις while in the latter verse he says *all* do not...the contradiction really disappears if the quotation of 8:1 begins with οἶδαμεν. Then it is Paul’s questioners who assert *all* have knowledge” and (ibid.70): “it seems better to say it begins with οἶδαμεν both on grammatical and theological considerations. In this way 8:7 is less problematic, and one can avoid having to split Paul’s thought into conflicting theoretical and practical halves.” (cf. Gardner, *The Gifts of God and the Authentication of a Christian*, 22; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 209.) This is evidentially flawed logic. To save Paul on theological considerations because the argument would supposedly appear contradictory is no other enterprise than a reformulation of apologetics. It is not material to the point whether Willis here is correct in ascribing verse 7 to Paul or not, what is worth nothing are the criterion upon which the determination is being drawn. This type of logic is also representative of the other side of the argument. Jeremias, “Briefzitate”, 273-276 tries for instance to absolve Paul from too much agreement with the Corinthians by suggesting that οἶδαμεν in 8:1,4 should be read as οἶδαμεν.

¹⁰⁴ The consistency in number has been also noted and argued as Corinthian by Lock, “1 Corinthians viii.1-9, A Suggestion”, 65ff.

There are no other instances where Paul would utilize οἶδαμεν ὅτι as an introductory formula for embedded statements.¹⁰⁵ The few instances where moreover ὅτι are not decisively, but arguably utilized as a part of an introduction they are preceded by a verbum dicendi (Rom 3:8; 1 Cor 15:12) with only one instance where the ὅτι would intake the postpositive position (Rom 3:8).¹⁰⁶ It is by no way a “standard” way for Paul either to introduce embedded statements with such a formulation or to moreover utilize ὅτι whenever he does so. The use of οὖν is much more standard in this fashion than the ὅτι.¹⁰⁷ Another argument to consider is our analysis of Paul’s utilization of embedded statements. In the investigation conducted by us so far, the one of the most prominent features was the lack of evidence for that Paul utilized embedded statements to build rapport. Yet this is assumed he must have done here if he introduced a set of embedded statements with the use of οἶδαμεν ὅτι.¹⁰⁸ Rather whenever Paul embeds something from those he interacts with, he does so on the grounds that he does not find the statements or the implications drawn from them entirely agreeable.¹⁰⁹ Hence in order to suggest that the οἶδαμεν ὅτι here is Pauline one would have to disregard a) how Paul usually introduces embedded statements; b) the purposes for why he does so; c) that the Corinthians evidentially on the other hand utilize this very formulation; and d) that it in form corresponds to the voice arguably Corinthian. These facts seem to suggest that it is highly unlikely that the words should be ascribed to Paul and rather more consistent with what should on stylistic grounds be attributed to the Corinthians.

2.6 Other interruptions by Paul?

Where our methodology is incomplete in answering where an embedded statement *could* begin, it is more precise with regard to which indispensable parts *must* fall into such a category once they are present. It is pregnant with such a force because the toolkit of point for point interaction means that each responsorial point has a preceding counterpoint. What this further implies for the determination of what hence needs to be incorporated into an interaction between at least two communicants will indispensably “lock” certain parts from interjection theories. What remains are hence possible to evaluate as interjections, but they would need support in form of arguments and be moreover consistent in form. Differently stated, the broader the area covered by the corresponding point for point sections, the lesser space for possible interjections. There has however been fashionable to suggest a Pauline interjection merely on the basis of an adversative. This is not generally speaking

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*, 68 who states that this is “unique in syntax within the Pauline letters, which suggests that the style is not Paul’s but that of someone else.”

¹⁰⁶ There are totally 8 instances where Paul utilizes οἶδαμεν, nine if 1 Tim 1:8 should be counted. Of the six instances where ὅτι is found in its vicinity it does never appear postpositive to οἶδαμεν. In three instances (Ro 7:14; 8:22; 2 Cor 5:1) the postpositive is γὰρ. In the remaining three (Ro 2:2; 3:19; 8:28; [1 Tim 1:8]) the postpositive is δὲ. Should Paul have authored both 8:1 and 8:4 these would be the only instances where he would diverge from how he behaves in other loci and moreover adopt a Johannine pattern. An explanation should hence be required for why he stacks up so many anomalies in this section. Besides two further points should be contemplated. Of the references given above, none conclusively could be said to build rapport rather than formulate what Paul believes. The second point is that the οἶδαμεν ὅτι is a very common feature especially in the Johannine literature (cf. John 3:2; 4:22; 4:42; 9:20; 9:24; 9:29; 10:30; 21:24; 1 John 3:14; 5:15x2; 5:18; 5:19; see also Matt 22:16 with par; Mark 12:19; Luke 20:21). In no other case in the whole of NT does γὰρ work as a postpositive to οἶδαμεν and only in John 9:31; 1 John 3:2; 5:20 is δὲ utilized as a postpositive. Hence we could affirmatively state that it is a unique Pauline feature to have either γὰρ or δὲ as postpositives to οἶδαμεν, while ὅτι is particular for the Johannine literature in this position. Here it is most often used to introduce a fact, saying or a combination of the both. The synonym γινώσκω does not appear in third person plural in the NT.

¹⁰⁷ Compare previous section of this dissertation where the attributory statements of Ro 9:19-20 and 11:19-20 were discussed.

¹⁰⁸ Cf. BAGD, 556; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 209; Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*, 68.

¹⁰⁹ Refer to the previous sections of this dissertation for the specifics.

convincing. There is no evidence for why an adversative by default should be taken as Pauline or conversely why we would assume that adversatives could not form a part of the Corinthian argument. Another problem is that it has scarcely been evaluated if these interjections make sense in form and content. Our study thus far would it seems suggests that it does not make any sense in form, since the behavioral pattern of not restraining oneself from interjections in writing is a condition more speculative than evidentially based. Secondly, it does not make any sense in form since it runs contrary to how embedded statements usually are presented by Paul and in antiquity in general.

Nevertheless, there is a point for us of interacting with some of the arguments presented in favor of such interjection theories. Since the methodological tools we have worked out in this dissertation have not been available before, this interaction will necessarily be bound by how the original arguments were formed and hence unavoidably touch upon content. Looking at section 1b-8 the general question is if Paul appears here anywhere? This question could be restated, *on which grounds could we say that Paul appears in a section that we have argued thus far stylistically should be ascribed to the Corinthians?* We will first list the section subject to the debate and highlight the potential points of interjection. We will then examine the arguments in favor of those interjections. The prediction is that many of the arguments from content have reflected what the particular scholars have restricted themselves to ascribe to either Paul or the Corinthians. Consequently many arguments from subjective theological eisegesis could be turned on their heads and be reversed.

Our demarcation line at verse 9 and argued for introduction 1a inclusive leaves us with a corpus ranging between 8:1b-8 that would potentially be Corinthian. The question ahead of us is whether Paul does appear anywhere within this section. It would not be possible to enumerate all the variants of suggestions breaking up this section into smaller constituent parts, each variously attributed. We would have to limit ourselves and we would have to do so on sound grounds. First and foremost we would limit ourselves to those scholars that do recognize that embedded statements are present in one form or another within this section. Secondly we would have to limit ourselves to scholars that have broadly speaking suggested similar hedges for the Corinthian interaction. This leaves us with a fair amount of respected scholars that if one would wish could be said to argue for a longer variant embedding. Among these the most prominent ones have already been mentioned at the beginning of this section. Those being Willis, Fotopoulos and thirdly we add Lock which is the originator of similar divisions. Their divisions upon this section could be divided into statements that a) they do agree are Corinthian¹¹⁰; b) Statements that they do agree are not Corinthian;¹¹¹ and c) Statements that they are disagreeing about.¹¹² With regard to a) there is nothing further to be added by us, since there is no dispute. With regard to b) and c) we would however further need to scrutinize a) their arguments in favor of those positions and b) evaluate their coherency with the backdrop of the insights we have gained thus far; and finally c) take a stance for or against their suggestions. We will begin by introducing a colored scheme of the points outlined above.

The parts of 1b-8 subject to scrutiny. Green = Corinthian, Red = Pauline, Blue = Disputed, all inbetween Fotopoulos, Lock and Willis.

οἶδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γινώσκουσιν ἔχομεν. ἡ γινώσκουσιν φυσιοῦ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ. ²εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι, οὐπω ἔγνω καθὼς δεῖ γινῶναι: ³εἰ δὲ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἐγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. ⁴Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἶς. ⁵καὶ γὰρ εἶπερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, ὡσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί, ⁶ἀλλ' ἡμῖν εἶς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἶς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ. ⁷Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γινώσκουσιν: τινὲς δὲ τῆ συνηθείᾳ ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ

¹¹⁰ That is as far as chapter 8 goes verses 1bc, 4bc,5a,6,8b.

¹¹¹ That is as far as chapter 8 goes verses 2,3,4a,5b,7

¹¹² That is as far as chapter 8 goes verses 8a, 8b.

ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενὴς οὕσα μολύνεται. ⁸βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ: οὔτε ἔάν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, οὔτε ἔάν φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν.

From this scheme it appears that our results thus far are consistent with what these scholars have suggested upon 1bc, 4bc,5a,6,8b where we are in fair agreement about their embedded nature. This section is marked out with the green coloring. Even though we agree in conclusion, the worked out methodology in this dissertation represents a novel and fine-tuned argument in support of these divisions. There are however also points of disagreement both inbetween the scholars themselves as well as between some of their suggestions and our proposal.

If we begin with 8:8 there are different conclusions drawn as to which parts of the verse that should be considered Corinthian. The divisions surrounds 1) the βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ¹¹³ and 2) regarding the double οὔτε. Of the scholars outlined above that agree with our general hedges of wherein the Corinthian positions are to be found within this section two (Fotopoulos, Lock) agree concerning the longer reading including 8:8a. They in turn disagree about the double οὔτε which Lock retains while Fotopoulos does not. Willis agrees with Fotopoulos about the οὔτε, but in turn disagrees with what to make about 8:8a which Willis does not agree is embedded from the Corinthians.¹¹⁴ Willis main arguments for suggesting that 8:8a is Pauline stems from two principles, the one is what he believes is Paul's *position* and the second what he believes *could* not be what the Corinthians argue.¹¹⁵ None of the starting assumptions are convincing. First, Willis does recognize that there is a stylistic argument for the coherency of 8:8 with what is ascribed to the Corinthians elsewhere both in form and consistency. He writes:

because of the precedent quotes in 8:1 and 8:4-6 it is entirely reasonable to suspect a quotation here...the ἡμᾶς would incline one to think it comes from the Corinthians" and "the first personal plural, found in the earlier quotations, appears here also."¹¹⁶

He even sees what this would imply for the Corinthian argument.¹¹⁷ However, Willis lets his theological assumptions supersede the arguments from style. First he argues that "the content of v.8 does not really seem to fit the Corinthians' own position" and secondly, "it sounds more like Paul's own view".¹¹⁸ There is however no explication why the reconstruction of what is Corinthian or Pauline should be preceded by certain theological caveats or if so which ones. The theological caveats are also at the center of the suggestion for why the double οὔτε should not be ascribed to the Corinthians. In Willis own words: "that would alter the controversy into a debate about Jewish food laws which it is not".¹¹⁹ Willis hence suggests that "by a single simple change the latter half of the verse would represent accurately the enlightened Corinthian's outlook."¹²⁰ The question the scholar should ask himself is why we should assume that it could not be a discussion concerning food laws and furthermore divide the chapter after that assumption?¹²¹ Similarly, why

¹¹³ Barrett, *1 Corinthians*, 195 would disagree with the scholars above and suggest that 8:8b is not Corinthian, but rather 8:8a.

¹¹⁴ Cf. Hurd, *The Origin of First Corinthians*, 68 who lists other ten scholars who suggest that verse 8 is Corinthian in origin. Hurd himself is more inclined to see it as a Pauline correction (ibid, 123). More recent scholars who see verse 8 as Corinthian include Cheung, *Idol Food*, 134; Fee, *First Corinthians*, 382-4.

¹¹⁵ Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*, 97-98.

¹¹⁶ Ibid, 97.

¹¹⁷ Ibid, 97: "If the text is taken as it stands and is considered to contain quotations from the Corinthians, their position seems to say this eating of meat is an adiaphoron. They are saying that eating (sacrificial) meat will not be a factor in divine judgment and that not to eat does not cause one to excel, nor does eating diminish one before God."

¹¹⁸ Ibid.

¹¹⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁰ Ibid, 97-98.

¹²¹ Previous research have had formed opinions about the proto-gnostic thought of Paul's Corinthian opponents. Likewise strong views about Paul's supposed non-jewishness seem both to be principles that could explain arguments assuming that "trifling" matters such as food-laws could not possibly be at dispute. Both of these past

should there be an antithesis between “Jewish food laws” and being “enlightened”? Since there is no logical incoherency with the notion of Corinthians interacting with Paul concerning idol food and since there is a consistency in form and grammatical voice as Willis and others readily admit, there seems not to be any grounds for why verse 8 could not be Corinthian.

Fotopoulos makes a little more sophisticated argument in this regard.¹²² He argues from internal coherency to a) demonstrate that 8:8a is not in line with what Paul argues in 10:1-22. In the latter Paul utilizes examples from Israel’s history to demonstrate that the eating of sacrificial food is not a matter of adiaphoron for Paul and that the statement therefore should be considered Corinthian. He also argues b) that the double οὔτε should be ascribed to Paul, since if it is taken as Corinthian it would “seem to contradict their prior advocacy of idol-food consumption.”¹²³ The argument from internal coherency is an appealing one and convincing as far as 8:8a goes.¹²⁴ With regard to the double οὔτε this specific argument would however presume that there is a mutual exclusivity in saying that food has no bearing with God, and to state that one does neither abound nor have less by eating of presumably the same food. There is however no such constraint here. If what the Corinthians eat does not commend them to God, it follows quite logically that it is perceived by them an adiaphoron in the eyes of God, meaning whether they eat or not. Neither is there any contradiction to be found if the ὑπερούμεθα and περισσεύομεν refer to their social situation. There are plenty of reasons why a socially interacting Corinthian fraction would downplay the role of their social ties in determining their conduct in this regard. There is neither nothing inconceivable why a socially aspiring Corinthian fraction would argue in the same fashion. A third and very important observation is that there is really nothing as we have seen thus far, that would suggest that the Corinthian’s believed there existed any such thing as idol-food.¹²⁵ Certainly Paul did and referred to it with its proper term. The Corinthians however are mostly speaking about food (vv.4,8) or referring to idol-food as subsection of food (vv.4,7). Fotopoulos is hence wrong in referring to “their prior advocacy of idol-food consumption”. Their case is not to advocate a consumption of idol-food as such with all the connotations this brings with it. Their case is that they should not abstain from regular food referred to by some as “idol-food”. Once this distinction is grasped, namely that the Corinthians do not make such a distinction, there seem not be any arguments from internal coherency that would contradict our suggested division so far. Our suggestion is therefore that Fotopoulos has the benefit of the argument as far as 8:8a goes and that the arguments evoked by Willis and Fotopoulos are neither convincing theologically or formally with regard to the double οὔτε.¹²⁶ This means that we suggest that verse 8 in its entirety is to be considered an embedded statement.¹²⁷

This leaves us to proceed with the sections that these scholars in conclusion agree are not to be ascribed to the Corinthians. These are 2-4a, 5b and 7. Looking at 5b ὡσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ

assumptions have however long since been disbanded by more recent scholarship. The implications stemming from them should follow suit.

¹²² Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 217-8.

¹²³ *id.*, 217.

¹²⁴ This conclusion is shared by the NRSV which puts 8:8a within quotation marks. In a note it entertains the possibility of including the whole of verse 8 within the quotations marks. Cf. Omanson, “Acknowledging Paul’s Quotations,” 209.

¹²⁵ See previous sections of this dissertation for the reasons behind this conclusion.

¹²⁶ Here we agree with the observation of Lock upon the relation between vv.8 and 9, “1 Corinthians viii.1-9, A Suggestion,” 68: “It explains the antithesis between “we” (v. 8) and “you” (v. 9). Throughout the whole passage the first person plural is the language of the Corinthians (οἶδαμεν, i. 4; ἡμῖν, ἡμεῖς, 6; ἡμεῖς 8); the second person in vv. 9-12 is in St. Paul’s address to them.”

¹²⁷ This conclusion should not be confused with us suggesting that Paul necessarily disagrees with the Corinthians. In point of fact he could very well agree with them about food in general. They could even evoke principles reminiscent of what Paul has explicated elsewhere (cf. Ro 14:17). The point of disagreement seems however to be how to categorize εἰδωλόθυτον. The existence of the effects of the latter Paul are affirmed by Paul in 10:1-22. The Corinthian’s would however not as it seem agree that the category existed or was incumbent with any negative effects at all.

πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί the enumerated scholars are in agreement that these words are not Corinthian.¹²⁸ Yet Willis concedes that there is an increased likelihood of that verse 5 comes from the Corinthians since it intervenes inbetween two statements attributed to the Corinthians in verse 4 and 6 and is syntactically linked to the latter.¹²⁹ The main reason why he takes it as Pauline seems however to be due to the ὥσπερ εἶσιν which he takes as qualifying.¹³⁰ Fotopoulos for the same reason argues that “5a is interrupted by a Pauline refutation”.¹³¹ This leads both of them to conclude that Paul argues for the existence of pagan deities. So Willis states: “Paul is in the awkward position of having to argue with some Christians (formerly pagans) for the reality of the pagan divinities”; while Fotopoulos concludes that “Paul states that the so-called gods and lords whom the Strong do not believe do, in fact, exist.”¹³² Thus both Willis and Fotopoulos agree that Paul believes and argues for the existence of these gods. Willis believes this as something *de facto*, namely since there are things worshipped as such. Fotopoulos on the other hand since the so-called gods are confused with demons.¹³³ However, if as we have argued above concerning the supportive arguments for our general division, namely that the enclitic -περ strengthens the conjunction it is attached to, then the translation should perhaps not be “as there are” but rather “as if” or an emphatic “like”. This would dispense from reading in a qualification to the existence of one God. It would furthermore not necessitate to argue that either Paul or the Corinthians suggest that there are a multiplicity of gods. Moreover it would work perfectly well with 5a καὶ γὰρ εἴπερ εἶσιν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς in that it would emphasize that there really are those things that by some are invoked with conviction as gods and lords. In other words it would perfectly well fit within a Corinthian argument suggesting that they themselves are not affected by whatever is called a god or even invoked as if they would exist. For the Corinthians there would still only remain one Deity. This seems to be a more natural reading of ὥσπερ rather than to take it as an affirmative. There is hence no necessity to interject a polytheistic Paul in this context and break an otherwise fully discernable argument. This leads us to suggest that 5b if properly translated is most probably Corinthian to.

Another subsection these scholars agree are not to be considered Corinthian is 4a Περί τῆς βρώσεως οὗν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων. They are by no means unchallenged in this conclusion.¹³⁴ Their two main reasons for ascribing this to Paul seems to be 1) that they believe that Paul interjects in verses 2-3 and in order to resume his quotations again uses a topic marker in 4a; 2) that there is a close resemblance between 1a and 4a and that this therefore should be considered the topic marker. What they do not agree about is what Paul is resuming. Willis suggests that Paul returns to the announced topic, while Fotopoulos suggests that “the very act of eating, not just the food itself” is set as a central problem.¹³⁵ Earlier we have noted two things. First, that Margaret M. Mitchell has demonstrated that περί δὲ is a topic marker that could or not introduce embedded statements.¹³⁶ One of the theories that Margaret M. Mitchell’s study therefore has made implausible are those early attempts at recreating a Corinthian original letter through the alignment of whatever succeeds the topic marker in 1 Corinthians as necessarily stemming from a Corinthian

¹²⁸ Others do not find 5a and 5b mutually exclusive. See Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 369-70.

¹²⁹ Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*, 85.

¹³⁰ *Ibid*, 86.

¹³¹ Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 212.

¹³² Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*, 86; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 212.

¹³³ *Ibid*.

¹³⁴ Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*, 82n63 concedes even though he does not follow through to a difference in that the terminology “makes the inquiry more specific.”

¹³⁵ The full quotes are as follows: Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*, 82: “In 1 Cor 8:4 he [Paul] resumes quoting from the Corinthian’s inquiry. The introductory words, Περί τῆς βρώσεως οὗν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων return to the topic announces [sic!] in 8:1 and indeed closely resembles that verse”; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 210: “Paul uses the topic marker Περί τῆς βρώσεως οὗν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων (v 4a) in order to resume the Strong’s *propositiones*...thus indicating that the central problem faced by Paul and the Corinthians is the very act of eating sacrificial food, not just the food itself...”

¹³⁶ Mitchell, “Concerning περί δὲ”, 229-56.

literary correspondence.¹³⁷ We have also demonstrated from our study of Paul's embedded statements in general as well as those in antiquity that there are no fixed formulas introducing such statements. There is hence no necessity even if assuming that Paul interjects in 8:2-3 to require that he in order to resume the habit of embedding would need to introduce such an embedding with an introductory formula. Secondly we have noted from our discussions about where the embedding might begin that there is a difference between 1a and 4a. The first difference which Fotopoulos also notes is that the emphasis is put on eating idol food in 4a, while in 1a the subject is simply idol-food.¹³⁸ The second difference has also been noted even among the proponents of the partition theories and that is that the otherwise always occurring postpositive δὲ is lacking here.¹³⁹ This has made them not to include this περὶ among what they believed were the "quotation marks".¹⁴⁰

These facts do all illustrate the difficulty incumbent in the task of discerning between what could be Corinthian respectively Pauline. However it seems farfetched to assume that Paul would need to introduce the topic twice. If Willis is right in that there is no difference between 1a and 4a, then the incumbent question would be what would necessitate Paul to return or reintroduce the same topic again? It does not seem that the space of verses 2-3 was sufficiently divergent from the general argument, that the Corinthians should be presumed to have been affected by amnesia or distracted from the general topic in order to be reintroduced to it again. However if Fotopoulos is right in that neither Paul nor his opponents are as much interested in the τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων of 8:1a as of the actual eating of it in 4a. Then who is? What would necessitate Paul to introduce two different topics twice in the space of 4 verses rather than immediately cut to the chase if neither he nor his addressees are really interested in the first one? Is there any other possibility that these scholars have not contemplated?

We have already mentioned in several loci that there is a difference in perceptions with regard to idol food. It is not at all clear that the ones Paul interacts with would believe that any such thing actually existed. This is especially the case since they do not acknowledge the existence or power of other deities (v.4b-6) and use a language that seems to describe idol-food as simply food (v.8). For them it does not simply seem to be an issue of concern (v.8) and hence they appear to explain the uneasiness of some in this regard by assuming that such people lack the type of knowledge they themselves have (v.7). For Paul on the other hand there exists such a thing as τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων (8:1a, 10), if food as such should regulate ones conduct (8:13), so much the more idol-food seeing that it does contrary to the assertion of 8:8 affect both the relationship with fellow-believers (8:9-13) as the relation to God (10:14). This regulation does not seem to be mitigated by any particular favors one would believe assures oneself before God (cf. 8:1b-3 with 10:1-14). Could it therefore be excluded that also the 4a is Corinthian? If 1b-3 are general principles as will be argued, then 4a could very well introduce how this principle works out in practice with regard to the eating of idol-food. In other words, the question of eating idol-food is ultimately a subject decided upon the principles it evokes. For the Corinthians it is to love and in return be known by God (8:1b-3). The one who loves and is known by God has nothing to fear (8:1b-3,8) especially the effects of eating idol-food, seeing that there is no other God (8:4b) and that the existence of those who do believe and call upon such beings does not affect their firmness (8:5-6). Hence if one claims to have knowledge but yet is unaware of the state of affairs, that one is defiled by his or her own lack of the right knowledge (8:6,7) and possibly even lack of love of God (8:3). It is therefore not unlikely that if the 4a is taken as Corinthian

¹³⁷ cf. Schenk, "Der 1 Korintherbrief als Briefsammlung," 224; Schmithals, *Die Gnosis in Korinth*, 85; Hurd, *The Origins of 1 Corinthians*, 61-94. These scholars believed wrongfully that the περὶ δὲ was a quotation mark.

¹³⁸ Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 54 does also note this difference and suggests from the terminology that eating may include other foods than meat.

¹³⁹ The other occurrences are 7:1, 25; 8:1; 12:1; 16:1, 12 cf. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 207; Vielhauer, *Geschichte der urchristlichen Literatur*, 135; Bruce, *I and II Corinthians*, 66).

¹⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

it introduces the practical application of shared principles in 1b-3 in regard to the practical issue of food consumption of which the embedded Corinthian's seem to categorize idol food.

At the end of the previous section it was indirectly argued that verse 7 should be considered Corinthian. This it would seem to be one of the more clear cases to argue and yet perhaps the one there has been the most consensus against.¹⁴¹ Verse 7 which runs Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις: τινὲς δὲ τῆ συνηθείᾳ ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενὴς οὕσα μολύνεται has decisively been judged as non-Corinthian. The first argument usually runs like this, verse 7 is a blatant contradiction to verse 1b. If verse 1b is Corinthian then verse 7 surely must be a Pauline qualification. The second argument is simply put that the verse is adversative, it includes a ἀλλὰ which qualifies something of what the Corinthians are saying. Variations of these arguments are to be found universally. In the following it will be demonstrated why the arguments are not consistent and secondly a positive case will be made for why it is better to be taken as a Corinthian statement.

With regard to the first argument, since verse 1b runs that πάντες γινώσκωμεν it would seem that 7a οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνῶσις contradicts the former. This is however a misconception. First, at the beginning of this chapter we noted that there has been a lack of comprehension for the different types of knowledge appearing within the first eight verses. To recapitulate: The first type of knowledge is the one God has, the second the knowledge that the embedded ones argue they have and thirdly the knowledge the embedded ones argue some lack. The division is confirmed by how Paul point for point interacts with each one of them. The ἡ γνῶσις of 7a has been taken as the same type of knowledge as is referred to in verse 1b. Had this been the case and especially if verse 7a would immediately follow upon 1b there would perhaps be a better case.¹⁴² As it stands now 7a stands in immediate succession to the creed explicated and confirmed by the Corinthians in verse 6. The content of verse 6 is therefore the knowledge the embedded Corinthians argue they have and possess. It is this knowledge that makes them sure that as far as idol food goes they have nothing to fear. It is also this knowledge that they would claim some lack, namely the ones the Corinthians perceive do not agree with them with regard to food. While 1b affirms that everybody has a type of knowledge, verses 5-6 explicate what kind of knowledge the embedded Corinthians have. The adversative and the knowledge in verse 7 is the beginning of an argument presented against those not reaching the same conclusion as the embedded Corinthians, namely the accusations of that such as they must lack this knowledge. Had the stop been put after 7:a the interpretive problem would have been to figure out whether the ignorance in others was in reference to the creed in verse 6 or in reference to that the embedded Corinthians *accept* the creed. The continued emphasis on the weakness of the consciousness of some transforms this into a coherent accusation that the adversaries of the embedded Corinthians lack the very same knowledge the former take pride in.

The second argument usually comes from the utilization of the ἀλλὰ. This argument seems particularly weak. There are many reasons for why this is so and the confusion upon its role could partly be explained by the earlier absence of any preliminary studies upon embedded statements. First, we have seen that the use of adversatives are not the usual mark of embedded statements. For each embedded statement we found three criterion of which an adversative could at the most function as one. From one naked adversative nothing much really follows. Second, there is often a widespread assumption of that only Paul could form arguments utilizing adversatives. This is by no reason a position that somehow should be taking by default. There is nothing that logically speaking would hinder the Corinthians from construing qualified arguments. Thirdly, the argument from necessity is

¹⁴¹ Witherington, *Conflict and Community in Corinth*, 187-9; Willis, *Idol Meat in Corinth*, 224; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 220.

¹⁴² Formally speaking there is no contradiction to be found inbetween the statements "we all have knowledge" and "this knowledge is not in everyone". The particular does not negate the universal. For a formal contradiction the one would either have to affirm that *we all have knowledge* respectively *we all have not knowledge* or in particular *we all have this knowledge* and *we all have not this knowledge*.

particularly weak especially since many scholars already have conceded that ἄλλ' ἡμῶν εἰς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ at the beginning of verse 6 belongs to the embedded statements of the Corinthians. Even if verse 6 is a creedal formula, the ἄλλ' would fall into the vocabulary of the embedded Corinthians. Having conceded that the Corinthians could argue in this fashion in one instance, there is nothing that really hinders them from doing this again.

To what has been said about the relation between verse 7 to the knowledge confessed in verse 6 further arguments could be brought in support for this verse's Corinthian origin. First there is a thematic overlap between what the Corinthians seem to argue about the nature of εἰδωλόθυτον as merely food (8:8) and the utilization of the description ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον. The conjunct does fall perfectly in line with the succeeding argument in verse 8, namely that the embedded Corinthians seem to perceive idol-food as simply speaking food. The ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον suggests that what is eaten "as" or "as if" it would be idol-food is in the perception of those lacking the "right" type of knowledge etc. There is no more objective reality to such type of food in the perception of the embedded Corinthians than there is in the idols and gods people evoke as such (vv.4-6). This thematic coherency with regard to food and idol-food is furthermore thematically present and interacted with in the Pauline point for point interaction. Such is as we have seen one of the criterion for embedded statements. In 10:19 Paul for instance guards himself from the accusation of assigning too much importance to idol-food. This is coherent with the notion that the embedded Corinthians would denigrate its status (8:7-8) while Paul warned against the effects of eating it (8:9-13; 10:1-14). There is also a thematic overlap though disagreement about the consequential nature of the consumption as we have seen earlier by those weak in conscience (ἡ συνείδησις) and lacking real knowledge (μολύνεται, 8:7 vis a vie ἀπόλλυται, 8:11) and the disagreement about the status of those of different opinion (cf. 8:7 and the "brothers" for whom Christ had died in 8:12-13 and the absence of fraternal language in 8:1b-8). In short, the suggestion from style does not seem to be contradicted by the arguments suggested from content. On the contrary on a closer examination, they rather support such a division. Our suggestion is therefore that verse 7 more clearly than the other verses discussed here could be affirmed as Corinthian.

The final verses usually ascribed to Paul are verses 1c-3. We have already seen how the interjection of Paul here has in turn necessitated some scholars to suggest that 4a therefore must be a new introduction of the same topic. On the discussion upon 4a we briefly touched upon how verses 2-3 could structurally work within a coherent Corinthian argument. We did also note when discussing verse 7 that a mere adversative should not be taken as a Pauline interjection by default. The main reason for why these verses (2-3) have been assigned to Paul are their qualifying nature. So far we are in agreement with past scholarship. These verses are most convincingly to be taken as qualifying statements of the general proposition explicated in 8:1b. Where we disagree is to whom this qualification should be attributed. If the immediate response to a qualification is not to exclude it as a possibility of being other than Pauline, then it will be much easier to explore why it makes more sense to take them as Corinthian qualifications of this probably shared and repeated principle.¹⁴³ First, the suggestion that these verses could be fitted into a coherent argument has been recognized earlier by many of those arguing for a *partitio in this loci*.¹⁴⁴ Smit in arguing against partitions based on too much emphasis on the qualifiers noted three characteristics of verses 1-6 which he suggests point to their integrity as an rhetorical whole: 1) "A series of parallelisms...all sentences or parts of sentences are interrelated by twos through an indirect

¹⁴³ I think that there is a slight likelihood that the Corinthians here respond to a principle they have heard either from Paul or from other Corinthians. The embedded Corinthians emphasis on the right type of knowledge 8:4-8 they do have and others supposedly lack could very well have been met with an equally affirmative claim to knowledge. In that case the embedded Corinthians could in turn start off by acknowledging the universality of knowledge, but breaking it down into its subsequent parts of which they of course got the choicest ones. Cf. Odeberg, *Pauli Brev till Korintierna*, 147-8 who is right in noting that the content of 2-3 is most probably a universal affirmative among both the sender and receiver of the letter.

¹⁴⁴ See section on previous research.

beginning (anaphora)”; 2) the plural in the grammatical voice; 3) the “high number of general indefinite utterances”.¹⁴⁵ To Smit’s arguments and the ones above explicated on 4a we would like to add or own. The entire section (8:1b-3) looks like this: οἴδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γνῶσιν ἔχομεν. ἡ γνῶσις φυσιοῖ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οικοδομεῖ. ²εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι, οὐπω ἔγνω καθὼς δεῖ γνῶναι: ³εἰ δέ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ’ αὐτοῦ. Now looking at verse three what is the object of love? God. What is the consequence of loving God? Being known by him. This explicates the proposition about love in verse 1. Similarly with regard to verse two there is a right way of knowing things emphasized by the compulsory force of δεῖ. This explicates the proposition about the knowledge that puffs up. While the right way of knowing things is opposed to knowing things in a manner that puffs up, the love that builds up is the one directed towards God. While a type of knowledge could be had without love, the latter never comes without the right type of knowledge.

Too much emphasis in scholarship has been put on where the Corinthians and Paul disagree, and too little has been done in illustrating where they actually do agree. The disagreement between them does not surround common shared principles (cf. 8:6). The disagreement surrounds the implications of those principles and if they apply in the way the Corinthians understand them to do. The thesis that puts the embedded Corinthians and Paul in an either or category misses what they actually share. If verses 2-3 should be taken as Paul’s qualification of what the Corinthians know and consequently an appeal to love God, it would on this view suggest that the embedded Corinthians would be accused of lacking proper knowledge and love of God. Now this begs the question why the section does not continue in that case with Paul emphasizing a shift to their knowledge and appeal for them to start loving God? Are there any reasons why Paul would not make such an appeal if this was the case? Are there any reasons to suppose that Paul does not share the type of knowledge explicated by the Corinthians in this section? In context the reason behind the puffing up in verse 2, is knowledge. This could not be any knowledge, since Paul himself calls for knowing things (7:sss). If not a general statement about knowledge, the only other option in this context would be that Paul talks specifically about the knowledge the embedded Corinthians had. What was this knowledge? We saw earlier that it is explicated in verses 4-8 with the emphasis surrounding monotheism. Is anything in the content of the knowledge explicated by the Corinthians disagreeable to Paul? It does not seem that there is any reason to suppose this.

There is hence a basic coherency in this section. What it does lack is a clear grammatical voice on the part of the speaker. There seems however to be a consistency both with what the Corinthians argue and with what Paul argues. Looking at the Corinthians, from the verses we have attributed to them thus far, it is apparent for instance that they speak about those disagreeing with them by utilizing an indefinite voice. They are “some” (8:7), lack the proper knowledge (8:7) and have a weak conscience (8:7). Even if we would limit ourselves to 4b-6 as embedded statements, the emphasis of the type of knowledge the embedded Corinthians claim they have is consistent with them perceiving others to not be in possession of. This corresponds to the indefinite “one” who lacks proper knowledge in verse 2. As it stands there is nothing controversial with the notion that the Corinthians would appeal to principles in support for their behavior while denying the adherence to them for those they are in commotion with. There is neither nothing that would suggest that Paul would disagree with the principles contained in 2-3. There seems to be ample evidence that he may even have been the originator of similar formulations. In-fact his appeal in this very letter as conceivable on other occasions has been as in 1 Cor 4:6 μὴ εἶς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου and he returns frequently to similar expressions 1 Cor 13:4 [ἡ ἀγάπη] οὐ περπερεύεται, οὐ φυσιοῦται. There is however a slight change in emphasis here. Paul presupposes the presence of the love of God (1 Cor 16:22); he utilizes it as a rule of conduct (1 Cor 10:31); uses himself as an example in this regard (1 Cor 9:1-27); and anticipates its

¹⁴⁵ Smit, “1 Cor 8,1-6: A Rhetorical Partitio, A Contribution to the Coherence of 1 Cor 8,1-11,1,” 577-91 esp. 580.

rewards (1 Cor 2:9). What he on the other hand returns to are appeals to mutual unity (1 Cor 1:10), to love one another (1 Cor 16:20) and to emphasis of brotherhood (1 Cor 6:6-7; 16:24).¹⁴⁶ The ἀγαπᾶ τὸν θεόν in 8:3 is never included among those things Paul emphasizes the Corinthians to change. This observation would be magnified by that the lack of love of God evidentially is one of the things that “tick” him off (cf. 1 Cor 16:22 εἴ τις οὐ φιλεῖ τὸν κύριον, ἦτω ἀνάθεμα). So it would seem unlikely that Paul would leave it unmentioned if it indeed was a defect among the embedded Corinthians. On the other hand there is nothing surprising with the Corinthians explaining their case and position by appealing to the principles cherished by Paul.¹⁴⁷ Infact this would be an effective way strategically speaking for the embedded Corinthians to disavow their role in the ongoing dispute while justifying their own practices. At the same time it would enforce the argument against their opponents by aligning them with one of the things Paul does hate, namely lack of love of God. The Corinthians would claim as disputing parties generally do, that the wrong is on the opposite side. For the embedded Corinthians the obstruction with regard to this issue are certain other Corinthians not yet reconciled with the notion of the existence of one God. These are the ones creating the havoc. The absence of them being called brothers and the accusation of them lacking the proper creedal knowledge seems to be an attempt to distance their adversaries from the category of brotherhood by an appeal to principles shared with Paul. The latter is not buying into their argument. He goes rather out of the way in suggesting that the adversaries of the embedded statements share the belief system if not the conclusions of the embedded Corinthians. He does so by describing them as “brothers” for whom Christ has died (8:9-13). It is not likely that Paul would call anybody a brother that was ignorant of the creedal formulation in verse 6.¹⁴⁸ Rather it is the embedded Corinthian argument that amounts to that this must be what explains the behavior or lack thereof of the opposing party and it furthermore explains also why they never are designated as brothers by them, but rather as continuing in pagan practices (8:7). In other words the

¹⁴⁶ There are those who have argued that the δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ in 1c refers to what Paul later would explicate as love towards a brother. However in context, the object of ones love is God (8:3). If Paul would make this argument, he would essentially say that the one who lacks love, lacks it in reference to God as an object. If this would be Paul’s argument, namely that the Corinthians lack a proper love towards God or are not known by him he would contradict himself (cf. 1 Cor 2:9-10; 15:2; 16:20) and furthermore fail to raise this surely important issue (i.e. no love of God) in his further exploration upon this issue (8:9-13;9;10). It is in addition not clear what role the love of God with a reciprocal knowledge would really mean for Paul in his subsequent argument with regard to idol-food. He sees the problems with regards to brethren (8:9-13; 10:24-32); uses himself as an example in this regard (9:1-27); and warns against syncretism (10:1-23).

¹⁴⁷ They have indeed done this on other occasions as we saw in the previous part of this dissertation while discussing the origins of 6:12-13 we wrote about the mirroring: “The reoccurring statement and the qualification of it seems to best fit a pattern where the Corinthians make use of Paul’s own slogan in application to questions not covered by his original intention.” Paul himself seems to make such appeals, as for instance 1 Cor 10:26 where Paul echoes what is argued by the Corinthians in 8:4-6 either by utilizing their own scriptural quotation or appealing to such as fit their conclusion (τοῦ κυρίου γὰρ ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλῆρωμα αὐτῆς).

¹⁴⁸ Shen, *Canaan to Corinth: Paul’s Doctrine of God and the Issue of Food Offered to Idols in 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1*, 145 has observed the same thing: “First, those with “weak conscience” (8:7b) did have knowledge, the essentials of the faith Paul just stated: (1) many “gods” and many “lords” in the demonic realm, (2) one God the Father, and (3) the Lord Jesus Christ (8:5-6). Such basic truths are part of the fundamentals to being a Christian. In fact Paul repeatedly addressed those with weak conscience, or “the weak,” as “brothers” (ἀδελφός) “for whom Christ died” (8:11).” Other interpreters also do affirm this fundamental notion. Murphy-O’Connor, “Freedom or the Ghetto (1 Cor. VIII, 1-13; X, 23-XI,1),” 545 calls it “a fundamental element of the kerygma”; Horsley, “Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8:1-6,” 36 calls it “the essence of one’s conversion”. In distinction to Shen who views 8:7 as a Pauline statement directed against the generally embedded Corinthians, we view this verse as the embedded statements argument against their opposing brethren. This possibility has not been contemplated by Shen who does not delve into a systematic categorization of what is Paul and what is not. Shens proposal which changes the referent in the statement and the conclusions reached in this study which discloses both the referent and the originator of the statement dispend with speculations rising from puzzling notions about why Corinthian converts would be unaware of such a fundamental principle, see Dawes, “The Danger of Idolatry,” 89; Calvin, *The First Epistle of Paul the Apostle to the Corinthians*, trans. Fraser in Torrance & Torrance (ed.) *Calvin’s Commentaries*. One merit of Dawes study is his systematic disjunction between supposed affinities inbetween the “weak” of Romans 14-15 and those here commonly referred to as “weak”. The differences pertain both to types of food discussed and whom Paul sides with (see Dawes, “The Danger of Idolatry”, 82-98 esp. 88).

embedded Corinthians would suggest that if the opposing party claim they know God, they would not be acting as if the idols are anything. We on the other hand have the right knowledge, belief and moreover by loving God we are also protected by him they would claim. It is the latter conclusion, and Paul's subsequent response to this type of security (1 Cor 10:1-14) that will be explored further in the upcoming chapter of this dissertation.

In conclusion, the Corinthians would start off their argumentation from affirmatives shared between them and Paul to illustrate how they are consistent with the shared principles while the others are not. The notions about knowledge and the qualifying factors are something that neither the embedded Corinthians nor Paul himself necessarily disagree about. Rather this is a basis for their agreement. The disagreement surrounds the implications of the common principles and how they relate to this issue. Does the existence of the one God exclude other powers or include protection from them?

2.7 Other Corinthian statements in chapter 10?

So far we have looked at where Paul may have embedded statements from Corinthians in chapter 8. We have also put under discussion the possibility of Paul interjecting statements within the section broadly ascribed by us to the Corinthians. There is however incumbent to also investigate if this could be the case in the other pillar supporting the structure of this debate. Is the entirety of chapter 10 to be ascribed to Paul or are there any grounds for suggesting that the Corinthians could be represented here in a similar fashion as they have appeared in chapter 8? It is the contention of the present author that there indeed are good grounds for asserting the presence of embedded Corinthian statements within this section. We have divided our enquiry into three parts: a) statements that probably are Corinthian considering our previously worked out premises; b) Those statements that upon the same premises could not be considered embedded and therefore most likely Pauline. c) The more disputed ones. In the following we account for the probable ones.

2.7.1 Statements that arguably are Corinthian

The first thing to recognize is that there have been a long range of authors that have conceded that there are Corinthian statements present in this chapter.¹⁴⁹ By far the verse that has gained the most attention and consensus is 10:23 with 10:29-30 as a close second.¹⁵⁰ In one sense we do not therefore present an unconceived idea from the standpoint of what is possible to entertain if we propose the presence of such embeddings.

¹⁴⁹ Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence*, 122; Omanson, "Acknowledging Paul's Quotations," 210-1; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 108-9, 140; Moffat, *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*, 112; Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 62,91-2; Wire, *Woman Prophets*, 103; Cheung, *Idol Food*; 113; Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 130, 166; Henrici, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 198; Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul*, 213; Robertson & Plummer, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the First Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians*, 121-2; Lietzmann-Kümmel, *An die Korinther I, II*, 27; Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric*, 33; Clarke, *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth*, 106; Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 373; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols*, 205, 237; Shen, *Canaan to Corinth*, 192; Willis, *Idol Food*, 224; Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 144-5.

¹⁵⁰ For 10:23 see the apparatus below. As goes for 10:29-30 Omanson, "Acknowledging Paul's Quotations," 210-1 has pointed out how various translations illustrate this assertion. NBE has for instance put quotations marks around 10:29b-30; REB and Barclay have inserted a "you say"; while GND and FrCL a preceding "someone will ask". Whatever reasons the translators found convincing, they were persuaded to distance these sayings as reflective of the mind of Paul.

If there are one or more such present within chapter 10, there certainly could be more.¹⁵¹ There are still grounds for rejecting *the reasons* behind some of the earlier suggestions especially with regard to 10:29-30. Since the latter have drawn attention for its supposedly incompatibility with what is regarded as a Pauline argument, it falls under the same critique we raised earlier about the circularity of a reasoning which determines what could or could not be Pauline based on what Paul in a sense “must” argue.¹⁵² Here, like when chapter 8 was put under scrutiny, the criterion from how Paul evidentially behaves when he embeds his opponents should be the methodological way forward rather than criterion often stemming from subjective theological assessments. Once a workable division of the text has been presented, the theological content could be put under scrutiny and the theological positions assessed. This same standard applies to 10:29-30 and any other possible embedded statement within chapter 10. With regard to 10:23 however the case is much more different than the previous assessment of 10:29-30 and further the least challenged. The reasons for this have been argued more at length in our exposé of Paul’s behavior with regard to his employment of embedded statements in 6:12-13. If the argument for their Corinthian origin is valid, then the repetition of the statements in 10:23 should as several scholars also have argued be attributed to other origins than Paul.¹⁵³

To entertain the possibility of embedded Corinthian statements within chapter 10 is one thing. To sift through the text with a methodology that could be validated is a whole different matter. Repeating phrases are a convincing standard, but scholars have not struggled to find a way beyond this. The methodology employed by us in chapter 8 does however precisely allow us such an assessment also with regard to chapter 10. We have seen that Paul a) interacts with his embedded statements by way of imperatives, negatives and interrogations. If we concede that 10:23 is interacted with by Paul, then we could also add adversatives to the list. But these interactions do not stand by themselves, we would further need to find b) different voices preceding and succeeding the demarcation line and c) a point-for-point interaction with whatever the putative embedding contains. Once these patterns (a,b,c) are present, we have solid reasons for suggesting which statements that are embedded, which statements that interact with those and finally which statements that do fall outside the scope of the methodology’s range of assessment.

¹⁵¹ Here as in previous scholarly speculations, the grounds upon which something is to be accepted or rejected as an embedded statement have been obscure. Our worked out methodology serves to counter this deficiency.

¹⁵² For instance Omanson, “Acknowledging Paul’s Quotations” makes an argument from theological content in that: “1 Cor 10.29b-30. These two verses, traditionally translated as Paul’s words, appear to contradict all that he has said in the previous verses”. This incompatibility is further theorized by Lietzmann, *An die Korinther*, 51 as a possible diatribe. Héring, *La première épître de Saint Paul aux Corinthiens*, 99 on the other hand found Paul addressing this question to the “weak”. A third theory put forward by Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 265-7 was to take this as a textual gloss introduced by one of the “Corinthian Strong”. All these theories follow upon an imagined necessity these exegetes have felt at reconciling their own Pauline image and should therefore stand as negative warnings of why theological outlooks should not guide the analysis of this debate.

¹⁵³ So Cheung, *Idol Food*, 113 calls it “most obvious is Paul’s quotations of the Corinthian motto: PANTA [MOI] EXESTIN in 6.12 and 10.23”; Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric*, 33 says “Paul...quotes the Corinthian slogan”; Newton, *Deity and Diet*, 373 calls it a “slogan”; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols*, 237 says this slogan “is quoted twice” even though he attentively recognizes that it does so “without any introduction or topic marker”; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 140 argues from this texts repetitive nature. Most reflective and explicit is Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 62 who writes: “It has long been recognized that 1 Corinthians includes quotations from (or at the very least allusions to) the Corinthian letter to Paul. These are indicated by a repeated feature of Paul’s letter that is hard to explain otherwise: occasionally Paul will make a bold aphoristic statement which immediately he retracts or strongly qualifies. For example in 6:13 he says “Food for the belly, and the belly for food, but God will make nothing both one and the other.” Four times Paul says “All things are permitted” (6:12; 10:23) and each time immediately suggests otherwise: “but not all things are helpful or constructive” and “but I won’t be mastered by anything.”...The quotations may be recognized by both their aphoristic quality and Paul’s hasty subversion of them.” Cf. Barrett, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 144, 239; Chow, *Patronage and Power*, 145, Shen, *Canaan to Corinth*, 162, 192; Willis, *Idol Food*, 224. What Gooch intuitively have tapped in to is partly confirmed by our study. His attempt however at describing the general marks of embedded statements is solely built upon this example without any further demonstrations of recognized embedded statements by way of application.

In the following I will suggest why 1 Corinthians 10:16-17 should be considered an embedded statement. This proposal will be novel, but nevertheless consistent with the worked out methodology.¹⁵⁴ Following the outlined pattern above, we need to determine a possible point of interaction within chapter 10. For 10:16-17 there is an imperative of warning βλέπετε at the beginning of verse 18. Now that it happens to be βλέπετε just as in 8:9 may be a coincidence. The word choice is not the genealogical motive behind or neither requisite for why this instance necessarily should be noted. Rather its form is consistent with what happens at the point of interaction whenever embedded statements do present themselves. In of itself it does however not prove anything. There is thus a further necessity to corroborate this point of interaction with the other patterns, all of which need to be present in order to suggest a firm case.

If indeed the βλέπετε of verse 18 is the mark of the point of interaction, then what succeeds it must utilize another voice in a point for point interaction with whatever that precedes the βλέπετε. Once again, these patterns do not work in isolation, but need to be present simultaneously as has been demonstrated from previous sections of this dissertation. With regard to verses 16-17 the voice appearing within them is in the first personal plural, so in verse 16 we have εὐλογοῦμεν, κλῶμεν; in verse 17 ἔσμεν and μετέχομεν. This does not in of itself suggest that Paul could not have been the originator of such formulations and on a theoretical level several reasons may suggest why Paul could utilize the first person plural. Taken together with the other patterns it is however suggestive to the fact that it has other origins than Paul, since it would fit the pattern of embedded statements whenever such occur and further in a discourse already conceded to contain such. The other patterns in this context are except the adversative imperative of verse 18, the absence of any first person singular form which nevertheless are present subsequently to verses 16-17 and immediately preceding them. So in verse 15 we have ὡς φρονίμοις λέγω: κρίνατε ὑμεῖς ὃ φημι where two forms in the first personal singular distinguishes the expression from what succeeds them and where the κρίνατε ὑμεῖς further puts a distance between the speaker and those he addresses. The case is quite similar in verse 19 where φημι appears once again in the first person singular; piggy backing on the βλέπετε already spotted in verse 18. In verse 20 there is further a θέλω. Both the imperatives κρίνατε and βλέπετε appear in the second personal plural to further distinguish the speaker from those addressed. An element repeated then in the twice occurring οὐ δύνασθε of verse 21.

The third element, that being the point for point interaction is also present. Following the imperative of warning in verse 18 there is an additional mentioning of the “fleshly” Israel. This would indeed it seems be referencing back to the first section of this chapter where verses 1-12 speaks about how the Israelites who were led through the desert partook of the same favors. These favors were however no guarantee for keeping their relationship with God intact. Particularly of notice are verses 3-4 where πάντες τὸ αὐτὸ βρῶμα ἔφαγον and ἔπιον πόμα of which source was ὁ Χριστός. Likewise verse 21 references the incompatibility of ποτήριον πίνειν and τραπέζης μετέχειν if they are not of the same kind. So while the first section builds up an exemplary momentum to verse 12 and ὁ δοκῶν ἐστάναι βλεπέτω μὴ πέση; both the grounds/ object for why the Corinthians are being warned at the present moment appear in 10:16-17 and the warning itself (10:18, 21) is added. Of further notice is the terminological correspondence between ποτήριον (10:16;21) - πίνειν (10:3,7,21,31); μετέχομεν (10:17) - μετέχειν (10:21); βρῶμα (10:3) - ἄρτος (10:17); ἔφαγον (10:3), φαγεῖν καὶ πεῖν (10:7). An thematic overlap is evident in that 10:16-17 argues for effects that are either extrapolated from or denied altogether in 10:18-22. The extrapolation would go from a known effect (i.e. union with Christ through his table) to the extension of such effects to other comparable domains. Such a view would entail an argument from conceded effects by

¹⁵⁴ Cf. Barrett, *The First Letter to the Corinthians*, 234 entertains the thought that “in verse 16 Paul is quoting commonly accepted belief...”; Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols*, 234 distances somewhat this saying from Paul by calling it “an argument from the tradition of the Lord’s Supper...”.

way of illustrating how the principle also comes into play with regard to comparable participations. The alternative view that a thematic overlap presents itself by way of denial of the effects of what (10:21) the Corinthians either could benefit from or alternatively are not in actuality benefitting from. The former essentially denying the simultaneous mix of worships. The other in essence that the Corinthians do not re-enact the benefits of the Lord's table they would believe was possible to tap into for the believer at the pagan altars themselves. The kind of suggestion that would be most convincing depend essentially on the force of οὐ δύνασθε in verse 21. In either case it is perfectly compatible with an embedding.

At this point it perhaps could be interjected that if verses 16-17 indeed are embedded statements then it seems to lack a proper introduction. Furthermore, the text immediately preceding it ends with φημι and could therefore assign the mentioned verses to Paul. A third objection would perhaps be that the text could be reconciled within a Pauline argumentation. The last point lacks merit in our context. The reason for this is because what we are interested in is not to reconcile any preconceived idea of Pauline or Corinthian theology, but how the text falls out when assessed with regard to the stylistic features identified in association to embedded statements. This chapter does already contain embedded statements, and how to determine which further statements if any are or are not embedded would therefore need to be assessed according to the same criterion as do apply to other identifiable instances. The second objection does not need to be taken as signaling an introduction to what follows, but the relative ὃ rather seems to round up what immediately precedes it. The word play in designating the addressee as wise and the subsequent call for judgment seems to anticipate what in the authors mind is a call for flight from idolatry (10:14). Likewise the first point of objection does not have any force. First and foremost as this present study has pointed out, there is no such thing as one or even multiple "introductory" formulas working in introducing embedded statements. To expect a particular one in this case is hence unmotivated. What is present, is however what evidentially have been proven to be common among embedded statements both within Paul as well as in many other contemporary authors. Secondly other authors have already noticed that the embedded statements in verse 23 start quite abruptly without any introductory formula.¹⁵⁵ Yet these same scholars do agree that verse 23 inculcates Corinthian statements. This proves two things. First it is supportive of the possibility in our general conclusion, secondly it constitutes another example of that an embedded statement within this context is not introduced by a particular formula. No such requirement is hence incumbent to stretch over verses 16-17. Taken as embedded statements they would work similarly to verse 23. An abrupt embedding is countered and interacted with by Paul following the usual pattern of similar sayings.

2.8 Embedded positions from the third party?

There has been doubt among some scholars about the existence of a third position in Corinth.¹⁵⁶ The suggestion that Paul would invent a party to be persuasive in his argumentation does however not stand up to scrutiny. Cheung has expressed this most succinctly in that if Paul is seen as being in agreement with the embedded Corinthians, then

¹⁵⁵ Cf. Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 237: "vv 23-24 The Strong's slogan, PANTA EXESTIN is quoted twice by Paul in 10:23 and was also quoted by the apostle in 6:12. Although Paul's transition from 10:1-22 to 10:23ff. may seem abrupt in English – v. 23 standing as it does without any introduction or topic marker..."

¹⁵⁶ Hurd, *Origins*, 125; For an overview of the division of the scholars opposed to a "Strong/Weak division": Cheung, Conzelmann, Fee, Gooch, Newton, Smit, Willis, Yeo and those affirming it: Barrett, Murphy-O'Connor, Theissen, Weiss, Witherington see tale 1.1 in Fotopoulos, *Food Offered to Idols in Roman Corinth*, 41-5.

he would on such a view construct a hypothetical case in order to persuade the Corinthians about changing a behavior neither he nor they find obstructive.

There is also another point to be taken into consideration. The mentioning of divisions, the call for unity and the instructions to that effect throughout the letter are all indicative that divisions at Corinth were real rather than imaginary. This undoubtedly seems to be the case with regard to idol-food which is a discussion that quantitatively takes up constitutes one of the larger sections of this letter. There does not seem to be any reason why the scholar should assume a hypothetical debate concerning this issue, especially since most of the other divisions touched upon in this letter are conceded.

Further there is no incumbent necessity for the scholar to simplify the debate and exaggerate all the disputes as being between two parties i.e. that each and every dispute must have had the same individuals on the pro and con side. Like any other division different constellations of affinity could be formed surrounding different questions; different parties could take collective stance for different issues or association could be made on an individual basis surrounding the teacher most favorable to one's own conclusion. To simplify any division along the lines of social status or as earlier has been the case among those in possession of a proto-gnostic knowledge and those not is not convincing. What we should be delving into are the possible reasons and arguments behind the behaviors in question, rather than to speculate what other perceptions these "parties" may have had in conjunction to their stances with regard to this issue.

Still, the existence of a division surrounding idol-food is one thing. To reach the position of such a third position is a totally different enterprise. Since Paul does not address all Corinthians (as is seen from his call to salute other Corinthians at the end of the letter 1 Cor 16:12-19), we could not assume that these instructions surrounding idol-food were directed towards all the Corinthians. This being the case there are still three ways in which we could get a grasp of what those perhaps not directly addressed, namely the third party could argue. The first being if there are directly embedded positions that could be affirmed to represent this party (party in the sense of positioning towards idol food). The second being as reflected in the embedded Corinthian argumentation. The third being as reflected in Paul's argumentation. The first would be direct information from the disputants themselves. This would be the closest way for us to approach them. The second and third are more indirect ways and should not be taken independently of each other. If taken independently they would represent how the opposing party described them or contrariwise how Paul saw them. Still the embedded Corinthians and Paul would be though biased, two "independent" sources for the reconstruction of the third party, i.e. who they were, what were their concerns and what they argued. In the following we will explore how close we could come the first of the three ways. The second and the third ways will be further explored in the next part of this dissertation.

Are the third position present and voiced and how would we know? Our worked out methodology says us something about where embeddings' take place. It does not specify from which source, whether written or oral or for that matter from whom. This means that if the third party is somehow embedded, it would be located among the statements that are identified by us as being such. If that is the case, which are the likely candidates? In form there is a consistency as we have seen among the majority of the statements embedded. For instance there is a consistency in grammatical voice and argument. The only sentences that are divergent are the previously already scrutinized 10:29b-30 i.e. ἵνατί γὰρ ἡ ἐλευθερία μου κρίνεται ὑπὸ ἄλλης συνειδήσεως; 30εἰ ἐγὼ χάριτι μετέχω, τί βλασφημοῦμαι ὑπὲρ οὗ ἐγὼ εὐχαριστῶ. And the idiomatically divergent 10:28b. Could Paul echo the third position in one or both of these statements?¹⁵⁷

¹⁵⁷ Some scholars have in answer to others given reasons for why this section (10:29-30) should not be considered to be embedded statements. Gooch, *Dangerous Food*, 91-2 has for instance listed two "observations" counter to the notion of any embedding. The first being that they "are not immediately falsified or denied by Paul"; the second "both the content of the verses and the stress on the pronoun "I" clearly reflect Paul's demand

The first passage that stands out is 28b which follows, Τοῦτο ἱερόθυτόν ἐστιν, μὴ ἐσθίετε δι' ἐκεῖνον τὸν μηνύσαντα καὶ τὴν συνείδησιν. The reason for its standing out is the choice in terminology. As we have seen, the terminological choice has been considered by previous scholars in many different ways. Some have even suggested that it could represent a statement from the third party. The reason for this seems at least at the surface level to be convincing. In the discussions leading us up thus far we have seen that the embedded Corinthians do most often categorize what Paul describes as idol food under the general heading of food. They are hence reluctant to specify something as really existing as idol food which of course would be consistent with their view of that there is no such thing as an idol in the world. Paul on the other hand does utilize the terminology without any such reservation. For him, idol food is not merely a subset of food – but ultimately incumbent with characteristic not present in every sort of food. Nevertheless, inconceivable as it would seem that the embedded Corinthians would be the source of calling something a holy offering especially in light of them being reluctant to even call it idol food, this observation seem further to be strengthened by 10:28a where Paul puts this saying in the mouth of somebody directing this statement at the ones he himself also addresses, the ὑμῖν.

The question hence remains whom the utterance should be attributed to if not to a construct of Paul's? The three likely options would be that τὸν μηνύσαντα is either a) the unbelieving host; b) somebody from the opposing party; c) either one of them. Is there any way of minimizing the alternatives? Most scholars who have contemplated 10:28b as being sourced from somebody or a realistic scenario have contemplated the extent of the embedding to be Τοῦτο ἱερόθυτόν ἐστιν. The following μὴ ἐσθίετε has been taken as a Pauline instruction about how to behave in such a situation. This interpretation holds whoever is the originator of the utterance. However, keeping in mind that the punctuation of the Greek corpus is a latter scholarly invention, an appealing alternative not contemplated previously by scholarship would present itself if the extension of the embedding would not terminate with ἐστιν, but rather extend with the μὴ ἐσθίετε inclusive and perhaps even more. How would such a reading affect the interpretation? First, it would reduce the alternatives of whom could be the originator of the statements to the opposing party. The terminology would reflect their pagan background as witnessed by the embedded Corinthians (8:7). Second, it would complete the requirement of practical conduct following the judgment of the other party. Third, it would highlight the practical outcomes and tensions incumbent in the philosophical divergences. Fourth, it would be the only indication of that the opposing party not only found it incompatible to consume idol food on a theoretical level but moreover did not consume it themselves once it was identified as such.¹⁵⁸ Fifth, it would absolve Paul from the contradiction of instructing to eat everything in 10:27 πᾶν...ἐσθίετε and its reverse negation of not eating μὴ ἐσθίετε 10:28b, since the latter would not reflect Paul's instruction. Appealing as such a novel alternative would be, there are however difficulties with such a suggestion which could make it unlikely.

The major difficulty seems to surround the extension of such an embedding. If the entire clause-structure in 10:28b is to be ascribed to the opposing party, namely Τοῦτο ἱερόθυτόν

for consideration of the consciousness of others". Instead Gooch proposes that it could be an anticipation by Paul of how the Corinthians would react to his statement. These arguments are partly reproduced in Omanson, "Acknowledging Paul's Quotations", 211 but here by digging up the "Translator's Handbook" as authority. The objections provided by Gooch and reproduced in part by others are hence not as convincing as those following a consistent methodology. Neither the arguments of those produced thus far either for or against are convincing to the point. They are moreover contradictory at instances. So those arguing for its quotational nature stress that they contradicted whatever Paul is saying; while those arguing against on the other hand say that Paul does not contradict its content. Both views could of course not be right.

¹⁵⁸ As we have noticed earlier. Past scholarship has assumed that one of the parties did not consume idol food. However as we have seen both the Corinthians (8:7) and Paul (8:13) seem to indicate that this however may have been the case. However this conduct seemed to run contrary to their consciences. If 10:28b with the imperative of abstention would be assigned to the other party it would highlight their requirement to abstain from such food and hence counter-balance the accusation of the Corinthians to the opposite.

ἔστιν, μὴ ἐσθίετε δι' ἐκεῖνον τὸν μὴνύσαντα καὶ τὴν συνείδησιν it would be a shift of perspectives requiring major reinterpretations of the present sentence references. Secondly such a change in perspectives would require a re-assessment of how Paul relates to this issue at large, but more functionally to the embedding in particular. Thirdly the question of whether such an assessment can be validated would need to be contemplated. With regard to the first, one advantage of this perspective is that it would account for what really differs the ἐκεῖνον τὸν μὴνύσαντα καὶ τὴν συνείδησιν. On the traditional view of interpreting this as a Pauline instruction with regard to the opposing Corinthian fraction it is hard to explain what really is the difference between taking into consideration *the one mentioning* and the *conscience* which also is attributed to the one mentioning (10:29a). It seems to be redundant to state that consideration should be shown to the one mentioning this and also to the conscience of the one mentioning this. If we however switch perspectives in that the statement in its entirety is attributed to the opposing party, the one τὸν μὴνύσαντα would not be the opposing Corinthian, but more likely the inviting host specifying the content of the table.

The appeal to conscience on the other hand would be the opposing Corinthian's statement with regard to what he believes should be the conscience based response in the generally embedded Corinthians Paul addresses. In other words, the opposing Corinthian would expect that the Corinthians Paul generally embeds would react with abstention once the character of the food is made known. This would emphasize that the third or opposing party would react negatively towards anything that was identified as idol food and moreover that this identification could come from the pagan himself. The pagan (host in this case) is the ultimate source of the character of the food he presents. In the belief of the opposing party the eating of pagan food would not as much be prohibited as the eating of food the pagan would explicitly identify as holy. This would explain two things previously baffling scholars. First, it would explain why the third party Corinthian could be present at the dinner in the first place. He would eat food served by pagans, but not food believed to represent something beyond bodily satisfaction. Second, it would explain why the embedded Corinthians accuse their opponents of eating food as if it would be idol food. For the embedded Corinthians, unlike the third party it made little difference what the pagan invoked or identified as a particular meat. For them it remained food without change of character. The distinction was artificial and the character would remain the same. For the opposing party, the character of the food could be changed and this mainly by the conduct of the pagan. The section could then be translated in the following:

Paul: *"If somebody says"* (10:28a):

Third party (to the generally embedded Corinthians, 10:28b): *"This is a holy offering, do not eat because of the one mentioning it (the pagan) and for conscience sake (as believers)."*

Paul: *"But I say, not your own conscience (the Corinthians addressed by the third party), but the other ones"* (the third party conscience) (10:29a).

Such a division would highlight the role of conscience in this debate. Paul has recognized that the third party conscience is weak, but has conceded to that it is not to be disregarded since it ultimately affects the weak party's salvation. The embedded Corinthians have accused the third party of having a weak conscience stemming from ignorance of the central principles and a not entirely unshackled pagan past. The third party on the other hand, seem to expect that the conscience based response in light of what is clearly designated as idol food is abstention.

The question remains however whether such a division does makes a stylistic and structural sense? In other words, is such a proposal verifiable considering the worked out toolkit? Keeping this toolkit in mind, we would need to verify a) where Paul could take by; b) the grammatical voice; c) the point for point interaction. Are all these elements present? The introduction of 10:28a with a *verbum dicendi* would be a rare example of a formulation that

unmistakably are not to be confused with anything else than it implies.¹⁵⁹ As stated earlier, there is no consistent introductory formula with the *verbum dicendi*. Whenever it is present however it is not insignificant. In this case the introduction is consistent with the voice appearing in 10:29a where it appears again in the first person singular further underlining the difference of what is being said there and the preceding part (10:28b). In the middle section we do not have a clear grammatical voice. True the Corinthians are addressed in the second person plural, but that has also been a consistent feature whenever Paul has addressed them. Should this someone i.e. *τις* in 10:28a be a reference to another competing teacher to Paul's or another believer it is not at all unthinkable that he would address the Corinthians Paul embeds in the same fashion as Paul does, namely with the second person plural. This could however not be verified with certainty. Paul does however seem to interact with the statement at least in a qualifying manner. The *οὐχὶ* is consistent with the three major ways in which Paul interacts with embedded statements (imperatives, negations, questions). There is also a consistency in the third element of point for point interaction in that Paul raises as already has been spotted and expanded upon the question of the *συνείδησιν* (10:28-9), but changes its reference from the generally embedded Corinthians to the one(s) addressing them. Hence he does not entirely agree with the statement, a feature further indispensably characteristic of the interaction with embedded statements we have seen thus far. Structurally it seems that what Paul initiates at 10:27 is continued in 10:29b-30, with 10:28-29a being an excursus or parenthesis including a third party statement attributed or real in 10:28bc. Hence there is a case to suggest that 10:28b if not a Pauline invention is reflective of what the third party Corinthian/ Corinthians' may have uttered to the generally embedded Corinthians.

In sum, what is so appealing with *ιερόθυτόν* is that the terminology is not of the embedded Corinthians. It is furthermore directed against them and not by Paul. In context the utterance could either be the one's who has invited them or somebody else present there. The most likely candidate seems to be the third party objector. The traditional restriction of what has been deemed to be embedded as the statement "holy offering" has an alternative. The worked out methodology lends some support for a longer reading which moreover has the advantage in that it seems to supply answers to some of the issues scholarship has not reached a consensus upon yet, namely why the third party would be present at such a dinner and how it comes that the embedded Corinthians accuse their objectors of eating meat as if it were idol food (8:7).

Our exposition upon 10:28b does already imply as we have seen that 10:29b-30 most probably is Pauline. But being the only other possible candidate of originating with the third party Corinthians it merits a closer examination if this could be so. On one level (disregarding 10:28b) the sentence sounds very familiar with regard to how the Corinthians possibly could have argued. The theme of the freedom or right to consume or behave in accordance with

¹⁵⁹ The *verbum dicendi* has also been the main reason for why some scholars have assigned this statement to others than Paul. Among those that do that or even among those that would rather decide upon this statement being entirely Pauline, there is a raging debate of who to ascribe this statement to or to whom Paul supposedly ascribes this statement. There are a number of suggestions raging from the weaker party of the Corinthians to a heathen guest or a heathen host (weaker brother: Barrett, *I Cor*, 239; Meyer, *I Cor*, 309-10; Murphy-O'Connor, "Freedom", 570 n.79; Weiss, *1 Kor*, 265; Klauck, *Henenmahl*, 277; Robertson-Plummer, *I Corinthians*, 221. Guest: Lietzmann, *I Korinthisians*, 51; von Soden, "Sakrament", 250-1. Hypothetical construct: Hurd, *Origins*, 125. Host: cf. Cheung, *Idol Food*, 157). The point of debate has often surrounded the terminology employed here. Some scholars emphasize that the choice of the terminology *ιερόθυτόν* is a reflection of the uttering individual's religious beliefs and hence concluded that it must be somebody external to the Corinthian Christian fraternity (cf. Lietzmann, *I Korinthisians*, 51; von Soden, "Sakrament", 250-1). Others have reconciled such a word-choice with the notion of a Corinthian Christian heavy laden with past unchristian notions or to be the hosts (cf. Willis, *Idol Food*, 240-2 who gives an overview of these alternatives). Another possibility could be that the Corinthian's have quoted in their communication to Paul what they have encountered, and hence the terminology could form a significant part of their argument for why there is a misconception among certain Corinthians. Other issues have dealt with how to interpret the occasion. Whom may for instance be perceived to be present at the house of a pagan? What would the troubled in conscience expose themselves for such dangers? All these issues are significant from the standpoint of interpretation of the debate and should be further explored in the next chapter.

their convictions has evidently been a topic of discussion both conceded and qualified by Paul. On the other hand there is a divergence with regard to this statement in that it is found in the first person singular. Whereas the embedded Corinthian's do appear in the plural when reflective of themselves and their arguments, Paul is giving responses utilizing the singular. That this singular should also most likely been attributed to Paul seems to be supported by two major reasons. First and foremost, Paul after qualifying the Corinthians rights and freedoms, which he does by calling for abstention from what would be considered legitimate rights attributed to the apostleship he lays claim to; would benefit on a strategical level to at some point also affirm the legitimate utilization of rights. In other words, if he in theory affirmed rights but in practice always made exemptions from their utilization he would not only run the risk of being accused to deny those very rights but could be suspected of siding completely with the opposing fraction. By conceding in 10:27 to the freedom of eating whatever is presented at an invitation, the 10:29a-30 would function as a motif for why it is so, namely that he shares their (the embedded Corinthians) conviction that one does not loose ones freedom to consume (especially after thanksgiving) by the dictates of the conscience of another. The conscience of another is not a guide for behavior as long as they are not present to be scandalized. This is seen by the conduct expected on the market and in the private setting. However the rule of conduct is another when such a one with a divergent conscience actually is present. If such a type is present, then ones freedom even though retained would not benefit the conviction of the other by being utilized. To consume clandestinely is accepted as long as it remains so. The second reason for why it most likely is Pauline is that the alternative would as it seem to be only consist of either the embedded Corinthians or the third party. We have however already noticed that the embedded Corinthians appear in another grammatical form whenever they are present in the text. Similarly if it would be the third party as is entertained hypothetically here it would run into serious problems. In that case the third party would argue for a freedom independent of somebody else's conscience. However the argued for freedom is not a freedom to abstain, since it in context refers to a participation. As it stands this seems to be more consistent with what the embedded party signaled and Paul consequently addressed in detail 8:9-9:1-31. Most convincingly however is that the section is not surrounded by all the general characteristics of embedded statements. Rather it contains several of the reverse elements consistent with an interaction towards an embedded statement. So the $\iota\upsilon\alpha\tau\acute{\iota}$ consistent with the point of interaction including imperatives, negations or questions is followed by the singular voice and theme which is consistent with what is already conceded to be Pauline. In other words, the theme that is expressed in this loci with regard to the question of conscience is far from being qualified, rather conceding. Should this be an embedded statement we would expect the content to be interacted with point for point and the content furthermore being somehow qualified. These arguments considered together seem to argue the case for that this part should be assigned to Paul most probably for the reasons expressed above namely with regards to the necessity of affirming utilization of rights.

In conclusion then. Of the two passages in chapter 10 that have divergent characteristics. The one appearing in a grammatical voice particular to it, the other being the one employing a terminology that is not found among the positions attributed to the Corinthians, nor anywhere else in Paul; our suggestion is that whereas 10:28b is likely a statement that could originate in form or spirit to the contention of the third party, 10:27 and 10:29b-30 on the other hand seem to form a unity with Paul as originator.

2.9 The worked out division

The application of the worked out methodology and the supportive tools on 1 Corinthians 8-10 leads us to the following suggestion of division. This division will in turn be subjected to a content analysis in the subsequent chapter and then in a final step, the most interesting results will be contextualized. The division below represents the statements that we assign the Corinthian's and their opponents respectively. The Pauline response are for practical reasons not marked out here with the exception of those statements that have been argued to be shared principles between Paul and the Corinthians he addresses. Others are common to all the three parties. The former are marked with red coloring, the latter with blue. Some of the statements that are common principles would be denied to be so by the parties involved, but that will be discussed in more detail in the next section.

The addressed to Corinthians (1 Cor 6:12-13 included):

Πάντα ἔξεστιν Πάντα ἔξεστιν τὰ βρώματα τῆ κοιλία, καὶ ἡ κοιλία τοῖς βρώμασιν: ὁ δὲ θεὸς καὶ ταύτην καὶ ταῦτα καταργήσει.

1 Cor 8:1b-8 οἶδαμεν ὅτι πάντες γινώσκοντες ἔχομεν. *ἡ γνώσις φυσιοῦ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ. ²εἴ τις δοκεῖ ἐγνωκέναι τι, οὕτω ἔγνω καθὼς δεῖ γινῶναι: ³εἰ δὲ τις ἀγαπᾷ τὸν θεόν, οὗτος ἔγνωσται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.* ⁴Περὶ τῆς βρώσεως οὖν τῶν εἰδωλοθύτων οἶδαμεν ὅτι οὐδὲν εἰδωλον ἐν κόσμῳ, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς. ⁵καὶ γὰρ εἶπερ εἰσὶν λεγόμενοι θεοὶ εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ εἴτε ἐπὶ γῆς, ὡσπερ εἰσὶν θεοὶ πολλοὶ καὶ κύριοι πολλοί, ⁶ἀλλ' *ἡμῖν εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς εἰς αὐτόν, καὶ εἷς κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα καὶ ἡμεῖς δι' αὐτοῦ.* ⁷Ἄλλ' οὐκ ἐν πᾶσιν ἡ γνώσις: τινὲς δὲ τῆς συνηθείας ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου ὡς εἰδωλόθυτον ἐσθίουσιν, καὶ ἡ συνείδησις αὐτῶν ἀσθενῆς οὖσα μολύνεται. ⁸βρῶμα δὲ ἡμᾶς οὐ παραστήσει τῷ θεῷ: οὔτε ἐὰν μὴ φάγωμεν ὑστερούμεθα, οὔτε ἐὰν φάγωμεν περισσεύομεν.

1 Cor 10:16-17 τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας ὃ εὐλογοῦμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία ἐστὶν τοῦ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ; τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστίν; 17 ὅτι εἷς ἄρτος, ἐν σώμα οἱ πολλοὶ ἐσμεν, οἱ γὰρ πάντες ἐκ τοῦ ἐνὸς ἄρτου μετέχομεν.

(1 Cor 10:23 Πάντα ἔξεστιν Πάντα ἔξεστιν)

The opposing Corinthians:

1 Cor 10:28b Τοῦτο ἱερόθυτον ἐστίν, μὴ ἐσθίετε δι' ἐκεῖνον τὸν μνηύσαντα καὶ τὴν συνείδησιν

3. Summary and concluding remarks

In the present text we have delved into how previous divisions of the corpus 1 Cor 8-10 have been divided between Paul and his interlocutors. Some of the guiding principles behind these divisions were analysed and found deficient. A way forward in regard to reaching embeddings was proposed and applied to the text in question. In summary we would expect to find a double sequence in different voices whenever an embedding was suggested. The second sequence would respond to the first sequence point by point in another tone or person either qualifying, highlighting, rebuking, or arguing with the content in the first sequence. Further, we took a look at supportive arguments from the stylistic discipline which indicate that indeed the present division is congruent with the personal use of prepositions, emphatical conjunctions, conditionals, and terminology in the Pauline corpus at large. We also discussed where the embedding may have begun, proposed interjections of Paul, Corinthian statements in 1 Corinthians chapter 10 (both those of the main disputants as well as

of the suggested third party). The investigation ended in a division of the study text which is therefore transparent in how it came about.

4. Litterature

- Alcock, Susan E. *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece*. 1. paperback ed. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 1996.
- Allan, William. "Religious Syncretism: The New Gods of Greek Tragedy." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 2004, no. 102 (n.d.): 113–55.
- Anderson, R. Dean. *Ancient Rhetorical Theory and Paul*. Rev. ed. Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology 18. Leuven: Peeters, 1999.
- Bandstra, Andrew J. "Interpretation in 1 Corinthians 10:1-11." *Calvin Theological Journal* 1971, no. 6/1 (n.d.): 5–21.
- Bandstra, Barry L. *Reading the Old Testament: An Introduction to the Hebrew Bible*. 4th ed. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/ Cengage Learning, 2009.
- Banker, John E. "The Position of the Vocative 'Adelphoi' in the Clause." *Selected Technical Articles Related to Translation* 1984, no. 11 (n.d.): 29–36.
- Barrett, C.K. "Things Sacrificed to Idols." *New Testament Studies* 1965, no. Volume 11, Issue 2 (n.d.): 138–53.
- . "Εἰδωλοθύτα Once More." In *Aksum-Thyateira. A Festschrift for Archbishop Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain*, edited by G.D. Draga, 155–58. London: Thyateira House, 1985.
- Bauckham, Richard. "The Worship of Jesus in Apocalyptic Christianity." *New Testament Studies* 1981, no. vol. 27, issue 3 (n.d.): 322–41.
- Beckwith, R. "The Formation of the Hebrew Bible." In *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling, 39–86. Peabody: Hendrickson Publishers, 2004.
- Betz, Hans Dieter. "2 Cor 6:14-7:1: An Anti-Pauline Fragment?" *Journal of Biblical Literature* 1973, no. 92 (n.d.): 88–108.
- Biber, Douglas. *Variation across Speech and Writing*. Transferred to digit. pr. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000.
- Bidez, J. *L'empereur Julien Ouvres Complete*. tome 1 vols. Paris: Societe d'Edition les Belles Lettres, 1932.
- Biers, Jane. "Lavari Est Vivere: Baths in Roman Corinth." In *Corinth: The Centenary, 1896-1996*, edited by Charles K. Williams and Nancy Bookidis, 303–19. Corinth 20. Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2003.
- Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 1992, no. 25 (n.d.): 1–14.
- Black, Stephanie L. *Sentence Conjunctions in the Gospel of Matthew: Καὶ, Δὲ, Τότε, Γὰρ, Οὐὲν and Asyndeton in Narrative Discourse*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament. Supplement Series ; Studies in New Testament Greek, 216. 9. London : New York: Sheffield Academic, 2002.
- Blair, Ann. "The Rise of Note-Taking in Early Modern Europe." *Intellectual History Review* 2010, no. 20(3) (n.d.): 303–16.
- Blair, Ann M. *Too Much to Know: Managing Scholarly Information before the Modern Age*. New Haven: Yale Univ. Press, 2010.
- Blegen, Carl William, Richard Stillwell, Oscar Brooner, and Alfred Raymond Bellinger. *Acrocorinth: Excavations in 1926*. Vol. 1930. Corinth : Results of Excavations, vol III, part I. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, n.d.
- Bookidis, Nancy. "Dining in the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth: Some Questions." In *Symptotica: A Symposium on the Symposion: [First Symposium on the Greek Symposion, Held at Balliol College, Oxford, on 4 - 8 September 1984]*, edited by Oswyn Murray and Symposium on the Symposion, Reprinted., 86–94. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999.
- Bookidis, Nancy, and Joan E. Fisher. "Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore on Acrocorinth. Preliminary Report V: 1971-1973." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 1974, no. vol. 43, 3 (n.d.): 267–307.

- Bookidis, Nancy, and Ronald S. Stroud. "Apollo and the Archaic Temple at Corinth." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 2004, no. vol. 73, 3 (n.d.): 401–26.
- . *The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore: Topography and Architecture*. Corinth, v. 18, pt. 3. Princeton, N.J: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1997.
- Borgen, Peder. "'Yes', 'No', 'How Far?': The Participation of Jews and Christians in Pagan Cults." In *Early Christianity and Hellenistic Judaism*, [2.] impr., 15–44. Edinburgh: T & T Clark, 1998.
- Bornkamm, Günther, and Lore Jeanneret. *Paul, apôtre de Jésus-Christ*. Genève; [Paris: Labor et fides ; [Diff. Bégédis, 1988.
- Boyer, James L. "Other Conditional Elements in New Testament Greek." *Grace Theological Journal* 1983, no. 4.2 (n.d.): 173–88.
- Brady, Thomas A. "A Head of Sarapis from Corinth." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 1940, no. vol. 51 (n.d.): 61–69.
- Bremer, Jan N. "Greek Hymns." In *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, edited by H. S. Versnel, 193–215. Studies in Greek and Roman Religion, v. 2. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Brettler, Marc Zvi. *The Book of Judges*. Old Testament Readings. London ; New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Broer, I. "'Darum: Wer Da Meint Zu Stehen, Der Sehe Zu, Daß Er Nicht Falle.' 1 Kor 10,12f Im Kontext von 1 Kor 10,1-13." In *Neues Testament Und Ethik: Für Rudolf Schnackenburg*, edited by Rudolf Schnackenburg and Helmut Merklein, 299–325. Freiburg: Herder, 1989.
- Broneer, Oscar. "Area North of Basilica." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1926, no. vol. 30, 1 (n.d.): 49–57.
- Brooks, James A., and Carlton L. Winbery. *Syntax of New Testament Greek*. Washington, D.C: University Press of America, 1979.
- Bronner, Oscar. "Hero Cults in the Corinthian Agora." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 1942, no. 11 (n.d.): 128–61.
- . *Terracotta Lamps*. Corinth : Results of Excavations, vol. IV, part II. Cambridge, Massachusetts: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1930.
- Brown, Milton Perry. *The Authentic Writings of Ignatius: A Study of Linguistic Criteria*. Duke Studies in Religion, II. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2012.
- Brown, Raymond Edward. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. New Haven, Conn.; London: Yale University Press, 2010.
- Bruce, F. F. *1 and 2 Corinthians*. New Century Bible. London: Oliphants, 1971.
- Brueggemann, Walter, and K. C. Hanson. *The Role of Old Testament Theology in Old Testament Interpretation: And Other Essays*. Eugene, Oregon: Cascade Books, 2015.
- Brunt, J.C. "Love, Freedom and Moral Responsibility: The Contribution of 1 Cor 8-10 to an Understanding of Paul's Ethical Thinking." In *SBL 1991 Seminar Papers*, edited by K.H. Richards, 1991:19–33. Chico: Scholars Press, n.d.
- Bryce, Trevor. *Letters of the Great Kings of the Ancient Near East: The Royal Correspondence of the Late Bronze Age*. 1. issued in pbk. London: Routledge, 2014.
- Buchanan, George Wesley. *Jewish Messianic Movements: From AD 70 to AD 1300: Documents from the Fall of Jerusalem to the End of the Crusades*. Eugene, Or.: Wipf and Stock Pub., 2003.
- Bujard, Walter. *Stilanalytische Untersuchungen Zum Kolosserbrief Als Beitrag Zur Methodik von Sprachvergleichen*. Studien Zur Umwelt Des Neuen Testaments, Bd. 11. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1973.
- Cadbury, H.J. "Macellum." *Journal of Biblical Literature* LIII (1934): 134–41.
- Calvin, Jean, John W Fraser, David W Torrance, and Thomas F Torrance. *The first epistle of Paul the apostle to the Corinthians*. Grand Rapids, Mich.; Carlisle, Cumbria, U.K.: Eerdmans ; Paternoster, 1996.
- Caragounis, Chrys C. *The Development of Greek and the New Testament: Morphology, Syntax, Phonology, and Textual Transmission*. 1st pbk. ed., With corrections. Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2006.
- Chapple, Christopher Key, and Thomas P. Rausch, eds. *The College Student's Introduction to Theology*. Collegeville, Minn: Liturgical Press, 1993.
- Charles K Williams II, and Orestes H. Zervos. "Corinth, 1990: Southeast Corner of Temenos E." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 1991, no. vol. 60, 1 (n.d.): 1–58.

- Charlesworth, James H., and Craig A. Evans, eds. *The Pseudepigrapha and Early Biblical Interpretation*. Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha 14. Sheffield, England: JSOT Press, 1993.
- Chilton, Bruce, and Jacob Neusner. *Judaism in the New Testament: Practices and Beliefs*. London ; New York: Routledge, 1995.
- Choi, John H. *Traditions at Odds: The Reception of the Pentateuch in Biblical and Second Temple Period Literature*. The Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 518. New York: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Clarke, Andrew D. *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-6*. Milton Keynes, UK; Waynesboro, GA: Paternoster, 2006.
- Collins, John J. *The Bible after Babel: Historical Criticism in a Postmodern Age*. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2005.
- Corbett, P.E. "Greek Temples and Greek Worshippers: The Literary and Archeological Evidence." *Bulletin, Institute of Classical Studies* 1970, no. 17 (n.d.): 149–58.
- Cotterell, Peter, and Max Turner. *Linguistics & Biblical Interpretation*. Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press, 1989.
- Coye Still III, Elias. "Divisions Over Leaders and Food Offered to Idols: The Parallell Thematic Structures of 1 Corinthians 4:6-21 and 8:1-11:1." *Tyndale Bulletin* 2004, no. 55:1 (n.d.): 17–41.
- . "The Meaning and Uses of Εἰδωλοθύτον in First Century Non-Pauline Literature and 1 Cor 8:1-11:1: Toward Resolution of the Debate." *Trinity Journal* Volume 23, no. 2 (October 2002): 225.
- Coye Still III, Elias. "Paul's Aims Regarding Εἰδωλοθύτα: A New Proposal for Interpreting 1 Corinthians 8:1-11:1." *Novum Testamentum* 2002, no. Volume 44, Issue 4 (n.d.): 333–43.
- Dawes, Gregory W. "The Danger of Idolatry: First Corinthians 8:7-13." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 1996, no. 58 (n.d.): 82–98.
- Detienne, Marcel, and Anne Doueïhi. "Apollo's Slaughterhouse." *Diacritics* 1986, no. vol. 16, 2 (n.d.): 46–53.
- Dignas, Beate. "A Day in the Life of a Greek Sanctuary Beate Dignas." In *A Companion to Greek Religion*, edited by Daniel Ogden, 163–77. Blackwell Companions to the Ancient World. Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub, 2007.
- Dinsmoor, W.B. "The Largest Temple in the Peloponnesos." In *Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear*, 115. Hesperia Supplement, VIII. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1949.
- Dixon, Michael D. "A New Latin and Greek Inscription from Corinth." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 2000, no. vol. 69, 3 (n.d.): 335–42.
- Dodd, David Brooks, and Christopher A Faraone. *Initiation in Ancient Greek Rituals and Narratives: New Critical Perspectives*. London; New York: Routledge, 2003.
<http://site.ebrary.com/id/10670597>.
- Dover, K.J. "Some Types of Abnormal Word-Order in Attic Comedy." *Classical Quarterly* 1985, no. 35(02) (n.d.): 324–43.
- Duff, Arnold Mackay. *Freedmen in the Early Roman Empire*. 1928. Oxford: Clarendon Press, n.d.
- Dumézil, Georges. *Archaic Roman Religion: With an Appendix on the Religion of the Etruscans*. vol. 2 vols. Baltimore, Md: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1996.
- Easterling, P. E., E. J. Kenney, and B. M. W. Knox, eds. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature. [...]* Pt. 2: *Greek Literature Greek Drama*. Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1989.
- Edwards, Charles M. "The Arch Over the Lechaion Road at Corinth and Its Sculpture." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 1994, no. vol. 63, 3 (n.d.): 263–308.
- Ehrhardt, Arnold. "Social Problems in the Early Church. I. The Sunday Joint of the Christian Housewife." In *The Framework of the New Testament Stories*, Vol. 1964. Manchester: Manchester University Press, n.d.
- Ekroth, Gunnel. *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-Cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods*, 2002. <http://books.openedition.org/pulg/490>.
- Elderkin, George W. "The Fountain of Glauce at Corinth." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1910, no. vol. 14, 1 (n.d.): 19–50.
- Ellegård, Alvar. *A Statistical Method for Determining Authorship: The Junius Letters, 1769-1772*. Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis. Göteborg, 1962.

- Eriksson, Anders. *Traditions as Rhetorical Proof: Pauline Argumentation in 1 Corinthians*. Coniectanea Biblica New Testament Series 29. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell Internat, 1998.
- Estienne, Henri. *Comitorum Græcorum Sententiæ, Idest, Gnomæ Latinis Versibus*. Edited by Stephanus Henricus. Vol. 1569. Genève, n.d.
- Evelyn-White, Hugh G. *Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, and Homeric*. Edited by Hesiod and Homer. Stilwell, KS: Digireads.com, 2008.
- Faas, Patrick. *Around the Roman Table*. University of Chicago Press ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005.
- Fee, Gordon D. "II Corinthians VI.14-VII.1 and Food Offered to Idols." *New Testament Studies* 1977, no. volume 23, issue 2 (n.d.): 140–61.
- . "Εἰδωλοθῦτα Once Again: An Interpretation of 1 Corinthians 8-10." *Biblica* 1980, no. 61 (n.d.): 181–87.
- Ferguson, William Scott. "The Attic Orgeones." *Harvard Theological Review* 1944, no. vol. 37, 2 (n.d.): 61–140.
- Fine, Steven, ed. "Non-Jews in the Synagogues of Late-Antique Palestine: Rabbinic and Archeological Evidence." In *Jews, Christians and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue: Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period*, 198–214. Baltimore Studies in the History of Judaism. London: Routledge, 2012.
- Finkelstein, Louis. "The Pharisees: Their Origin and Their Philosophy." *Harvard Theological Review* 1929, no. vol. 22, 3 (n.d.): 185–261.
- Fisk, Bruce N. "Eating Meat Offered to Idols: Corinthian Behavior and Pauline Response in 1 Corinthians 8-10 (A Response to Gordon Fee)." *Trinity Journal* 1989, no. 10 (n.d.): 49–70.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. "Qumran and the Interpolated Paragraph in 2 Cor 6:14-17." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 1961, no. 23 (n.d.): 271–80.
- Foerster, G. "Traces of the Synagogue at Corinth." *Gadmoniot* 1930, no. 3 (n.d.): 104.
- Fortna, Robert Tomson. *The Gospel of Signs: A Reconstruction of the Narrative Source Underlying the Fourth Gospel*. Society for New Testament Studies. Monograph Series, 11. London: Cambridge U.P, 1970.
- Fotopoulos, John. "The Misidentification Of Lerna Fountain At Corinth: Implications For Interpretations Of The Corinthian Idol-Food Issue (1 Cor 8:1–11:1)." *Novum Testamentum* 2006, no. 122 (n.d.): 35–48.
- . "The Rhetorical Situation, Arrangement, and Argumentation of 1 Corinthians 8:1-13: Insights into Paul's Instructions on Idol-Food in Greco-Roman Context." *Greek Orthodox Theological Review* 2002, no. vol.47, issue 1-4 (n.d.): 165–98.
- Furnish, Victor Paul, ed. *II Corinthians*. 1st ed. The Anchor Bible, v. 32A. Garden City, N.Y: Doubleday, 1984.
- García, J.F. "Ritual Speech in Early Greek Song." In *Epea and Grammata: Oral and Written Communication in Ancient Greece*, edited by Ian Worthington and John Miles Foley, 29–54. Orality and Literacy in Ancient Greece, v. 4. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2002.
- García López, José. *Sacrificio Y Sacerdocio En Las Religiones Micénica Y Homerica*. CSIC. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 1970.
- Gardner, Paul Douglas. *The Gifts of God and the Authentication of a Christian: An Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 8-11:1*. Lanham, Md: University Press of America, 1994.
- Gebhard, E.R. "The Early Sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1987, no. 91 (n.d.): 475–76.
- Gehman, Henry S. "The Hebraic Character of Septuagint Greek." *Vetus Testamentum* 1951, no. vol.1, issue 1 (n.d.): 81–90.
- Georgoudi, Stella. "Sacrificing to the Gods? Ancient Evidence and Modern Interpretation." In *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*, edited by Jan N. Bremmer and Andrew Erskine, 92–105. Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Georgourdi, Stella. "Sanctified Slaughter in Modern Greece: The 'Kourbânia' of the Saints." In *The Cuisine of Sacrifice among the Greeks*, edited by Marcel Detienne and Jean Pierre Vernant, 183–203. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989.
- Gerhardsson, Birger. *Memory and Manuscript: Oral Tradition and Written Transmission in Rabbinic Judaism and Early Christianity ; With, Tradition and Transmission in Early Christianity*.

- Translated by Eric J. Sharpe. The Biblical Resource Series. Grand Rapids, Mich. : Livonia, Mich: William B. Eerdmans Pub. ; Dove Booksellers, 1998.
- Gill, David. "Trapezomata: A Neglected Aspect of Greek Sacrifice." *The Harvard Theological Review* 1974, no. Vol-67, No. 2 (n.d.): 117–37.
- Gill, David W.J. "Corinth: A Roman Colony in Achaëa." *Biblische Zeitschrift* 1993, no. 37 (n.d.): 259–64.
- Gilman Romano, David. "City Planning, Centuriation, and Land Division in Roman Corinth: Colonia Laus Iulia Corinthiensis & Colonia Iulia Flavia Augusta Corinthiensis." In *Corinth: The Centenary, 1896-1996*, edited by Charles K. Williams and Nancy Bookidis, 279–301. Corinth 20. Princeton, NJ: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2003.
- Goguel, Maurice. *Introduction Au Nouveau Testament, Tome IV: (Deuxieme Partie) Les Epitres Pauliniennes*. Paris: Ernest Leroux, 1926.
- Gooch, Peter David. *Dangerous Food: I Corinthians 8-10 in Its Context*. Studies in Christianity and Judaism = Etudes Sur Le Christianisme et Le Judaïsme 5. Waterloo, Ont: Published for the Canadian Corp. for Studies in Religion by Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1993.
- Goodspeed, Edgar. *An Introduction to the New Testament*. Chicago: The University of Chicago press, 1937.
- Goodspeed, Edgar Johnson. *The Key to Ephesians*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1956.
- Graf, F. "What Is New about Greek Sacrifice." In *Kykeon: Studies in Honour of H.S. Versnel*, edited by H. S. Versnel and H. F. J. Horstmanshoff, 113–25. Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, v. 142. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2002.
- Grafton, Anthony, and Megan Hale Williams. *Christianity and the Transformation of the Book: Origen, Eusebius, and the Library of Caesarea*. 1. Harvard Univ. Press paperb. ed. Cambridge, Mass.: Belknap Press of Harvard Univ. Press, 2008.
- Greenwood, David. *Structuralism and the Biblical Text*. Religion and Reason 32. Berlin ; New York: Mouton Publishers, 1985.
- Gregory, Timothy E., ed. *The Corinthia in the Roman Period: Including the Papers given at a Symposium Held at The Ohio State University on 7-9 March, 1991*. Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series 8. Ann Arbor, Mich: Journal of Roman Archaeology, 1993.
- Grintz, Y.M. "Do Not Eat on the Blood." *Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute* 1970–1, no. 8 (n.d.): 78–105.
- Guarducci, Margherita. *L'epigrafia Greca Dalle Origine Al Tardo Impero*. IV. Roma: Istituto Poligrafico e Zecca dello Stato, 1987.
- Guthrie, Donald. *New Testament Introduction*. 4. ed. (rev.). Leicester: Apollos [u.a.], 1990.
- Haran, Menahem. "The Uses of Incense in the Ancient Israelite Ritual." *Vetus Testamentum* 1960, no. vol. 10, fasc. 2 (n.d.): 113–29.
- Harrison, P.N. *The Problem of the Pastoral Epistles*. London: Oxford University Press, H. Milford, 1921.
- Hatch, William H.P. "Τὰ Στοιχεῖα IN PAUL AND BARDAISĀN." *The Journal of Theological Studies* 1927, no. vol.28, 110 (n.d.): 181–82.
- Hayman, Peter. "Monotheism – A Misused Word in Jewish Studies?" *Journal of Jewish Studies* 1991, no. 42 (n.d.): 1–15.
- Heil, Christoph. "Die Spracher Der Asenderung in 2 Kor 6,17 Und Bei Paulus." In *The Corinthian Correspondence*, edited by R. Bieringer, 717–29. Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium 125. Leuven: Leuven University Press : Uitgeverij Peeters, 1996.
- Helmbold, William Clark, and E.N. O'Neil. *Plutarch's Quotations*. Philological Monographs. Baltimore: American Philological Association, 1959.
- Henrichs, Albert. "Moira." In *Der Neue Pauly*. Enzyklopädie Der Antike. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1999.
- . "What Is a Greek God?" In *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*, edited by Jan N. Bremmer and Andrew Erskine, 19–42. Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Henrici, C.F.G. *Der Erste Brief an Die Korinther*. KEK 5. Göttingen, 1896.
- Héring, Jean. *La Première Épître de Saint Paul Aux Corinthiens*. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1949.
- . *The First Epistle of Saint Paul to the Corinthians*. Translated by A.W Heathcote and P.J. Allcock. London: Epworth Press, First Edition, 1962.
- Hill, Bert Hodge. *The Springs Peirene, Sacred Spring, Glauke*. Corinth, v. 1, pt. 6. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1964.

- Hitch, Sarah. *King of Sacrifice: Ritual and Royal Authority in the Iliad*. Hellenic Studies 25. Washington, D.C. : Cambridge, Mass: Center for Hellenic Studies, Trustees for Harvard University ; Distributed by Harvard University Press, 2009.
- Hodkinson, Owen. "Better than Speech: Some Advantages of the Letter in the Second Sophistic." In *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*, edited by Ruth Morello and A. D. Morrison, 283–300. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Hoffman, Herbert. "Foreign Influence and Native Invention in Archaic Greek Altars." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1953, no. vol. 57, 3 (n.d.): 189–95.
- Hohfelder, Robert L. "Pausanias, II, 2, 3. A Collation of Archaeological and Numismatic Evidence." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 1970, no. vol.39, 4 (n.d.): 326–32.
- Horrell, David G. *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondance: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*. Studies of the New Testament and Its World. Edinburgh: Clark, 1996.
- Horsley, Greg H. R. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity. Vol. 5: Linguistic Essays: With Cumulative Indexes to Vols. 1 - 5*. [North Ryde], NSW: Ancient History Documentary Research Centre, Macquarie Univ, 1989.
- Horsley, Richard A. "Consciousness and Freedom among the Corinthians: 1 Corinthians 8-10." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 1978, no. 40 (n.d.): 574–89.
- Horsley, Richard A. "Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8:1-6." *New Testament Studies* 1980, no. 27 (n.d.): 32–51.
- Hoskins Walbank, Mary E. "Pausanias, Octavia and Temple E at Corinth." *The Annual of the British School at Athens* 1989, no. vol.84 (n.d.): 361–94.
- Hurd, John Coolidge. *The Origin of I Corinthians*. New ed. Macon, Ga: Mercer University Press, 1983.
- Hurtado, L.W. "Monotheism, Principal Angels, and the Background of Christology." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Timothy H. Lim and John J. Collins, 1. publ. paperback., 547–64. Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, 2012.
- Imhoof-Blumer, F., and Percy Gardner. *A Numismatic Commentary on Pausanias*. London and Bungay: Richard Clay and Sons, 1887.
- Isenberg, M. "The Sale of Sacrificial Meat." *Classical Philosophy* 1975, no. 70 (n.d.): 271–73.
- Jacoby, Felix. *Die Fragmente Der Griechischen Historiker*. II. Berlin: Weidmann, 1929.
- Jayne, Walter Addison. *The Healing Gods of Ancient Civilizations*. Whitefish, MT: Kessinger Publications, 2003.
- Jeffers, James S. *The Greco-Roman World of the New Testament Era: Exploring the Background of Early Christianity*. Downers Grove, Ill: InterVarsity Press, 1999.
- Jeremias, Joachim. "Zur Gedankfuhrung in Den Paulinischen Briefen: (3) Die Briefzitate in I. Kor 8, 1-13." In *Studia Paulina in Honorem Johannis de Zwaan Septuagenarii*, edited by J.N. Sevenster and W.C. van Unnik, 273–76. Bohn: Haarlem de Erven F. Bohn, 1953.
- Jim, Theodora Suk Fong. "The Vocabulary of Ἀπάρχεσθαι, Ἀπαρχή and Related Terms in Archaic and Classical Greece." *Kernos* 2011, no. 24 (n.d.): 39–58.
- Johnston, Sarah Iles. "Demeter in Hermione: Sacrifice and Ritual Polyvalence." *Arethusa* 2012, no. vol. 45, 2 (n.d.): 211–41.
- Kajava, Mika. "When Did the Isthmian Games Return to the Isthmus? (Rereading 'Corinth' 8.3.153)." *Classical Philology* 2002, no. Vol. 97, No. 2 (n.d.): 168–78.
- Katz, Peter. *Philo's Bible: The Aberrant Text of Bible Quotations in Some Philonic Writings*, 2013.
- Kenny, Anthony. *A Stylometric Study of the New Testament*. Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1986.
- . "The Stylometric Study of the Aistotelian Writings." In *Essays on the Aristotelian Tradition*, 127–49. Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 2001.
- Kent, John Harvey. *The Inscriptions 1926-1950*. Vol. Part III. Corinth : Results of Excavations, Volume VIII. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1966.
- Kérényi, C. *The Religion of the Greeks and the Romans*. New York: E.P. Dutton, 1962.
- Kittel, Gerhard, and Geoffrey William Bromiley. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. 9 9. Grand Rapids (Mich.): WM. B. Eerdmans, 1974.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef. *Herrenmahl Und Hellenistischer Kult: Eine Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung Zum Ersten Korintherbrief*. Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen, n. F., Bd. 15. Münster: Aschendorff, 1982.

- Klauck, Hans-Josef, and Daniel P. Bailey. *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis*. Waco, Tex: Baylor University Press, 2006.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef, Rudolf Schnackenburg, and Hans-Josef Klauck. 1. *Korintherbrief*. 4., Unveränd. Aufl. Die neue Echter-Bibel, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament mit der Einheitsübersetzung / von Rudolf Schnackenburg ; 7. Würzburg: Echter-Verl, 2000.
- . 2. *Korintherbrief*. 3. Aufl. Die neue Echter-Bibel, Kommentar zum Neuen Testament mit der Einheitsübersetzung / von Rudolf Schnackenburg ; 8. Würzburg: Echter-Verl, 1994.
- Klöckner, Anja. "Getting in Contact: Concepts of Human-Divine Encounter in Classical Greek Art." In *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*, edited by Jan N. Bremmer and Andrew Erskine, 106–25. Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Koch, Dietrich-Alex. "Alles, Was Ev Μακελλω Verkauft Wird, Esst". Die Macella von Pompeji, Gerasa Und Korinth Und Ihre Bedeutung Für Die Auslegung von 1 Kor 10, 25." *Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft Und Die Kunde Der Älteren Kirche* 1999, no. 90 (n.d.): 194–219.
- . "'Seid Unanständig Für Juden Und Für Griechen Und Für Die Gemeinde Gottes' (1 Kor 10,32). Christliche Identität Im Makellon in Korinth Und Bei Privateinladungen." In *Paulus, Apostel Jesu Christi: Festschrift Für Günter Klein Zum 70. Geburtstag*, edited by Günter Klein and Michael Trowitzsch, 35–54. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- König, Jason. "Alciphron's Epistolarity." In *Ancient Letters: Classical and Late Antique Epistolography*, edited by Ruth Morello and A. D. Morrison, 257–82. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- Kraybill, Donald B. *The Upside-down Kingdom*. Updated ed. Harrisonburg, Va: Herald Press, 2011.
- Królczyk, K., and J. Trynkowski. "Inskrypcje łańskie." In *Vademecum historia starożytniej Grecji i Rzymu. T. 1-2, T. 1-2*, edited by Ewa Wipszycka, 186–252. Warszawa: Wydaw. Naukowe PWN, 2001.
- Kuck, David W. *Judgment and Community Conflict: Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5*. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, v. 66. Leiden ; New York: E.J. Brill, 1992.
- Kuno, Susumu. "The Position of Relative Clauses and Conjunctions." *Linguistic Inquiry* 1974, no. vol.5, 1 (n.d.): 117–36.
- Lang, Friedrich, and Friedrich Lang. *Die Briefe an die Korinther*. 17. Aufl., (2. Aufl. dieser neuen Bearb.). Das Neue Testament deutsch, in Verbindung mit Horst R. Balz ... hrsg. von Peter Stuhlmacher und Samuel Vollenweider ; Teilbd. 7. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1994.
- Langlotz, Ernst. "Wesenszüge Der Bildenden Kunst Großgriechenlands." *Antike Und Abendland* 1946, no. 2 (n.d.): 114–39.
- Laudan, Rachel. *Cuisine and Empire: Cooking in World History*. University of California Press, 2015.
- Laumonier, Alfred. *Les Cultes Indigènes En Carie*. Paris: Bibliothèque des Ecoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, 1958.
- Lemche, Niels Peter. *Ancient Israel: A New History of Israel*. Second edition. Cornerstones Series. London: Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.
- Lengauer, Włodzimierz. *Religijność starożytnych Greków*. Warszawa: PWN, 1994.
- Levenson, Jon Douglas. *The Hebrew Bible, the Old Testament, and Historical Criticism: Jews and Christians in Biblical Studies*. 1st ed. Louisville, Ky: Westminster/John Knox Press, 1993.
- Levine, Amy-Jill, and Marc Zvi Brettler, eds. *The Jewish Annotated New Testament: New Revised Standard Version Bible Translation*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Lietzmann, Hans, and Werner Georg Kummel. *An Die Korinther 1.2*. Auflage: 5. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1969.
- Lightfoot, Joseph Barber. *Notes on Epistles of St. Paul from Unpublished Commentaries*. Cambridge University Press, 1895.
- Lilja, Saara. *The Treatment of Odours in the Poetry of Antiquity*. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum 49. Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Fennica, 1972.
- Lindemann, Andreas. *Der Erste Korintherbrief*. Handbuch Zum Neuen Testament, 9/1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Lock, Walter. "I Corinthians VIII.1-9: A Suggestion." *Expositor* 1897 5th series, no. 6 (n.d.): 65–74.
- Longfellow, Brenda. "Roman Fountains in Greek Sanctuaries." *American Journal of Archaeology* 2012, no. vol. 116, 1 (n.d.): 133–55.

- Łoś, A. "Struktury społeczne w epoce wczesnego cesarstwa (27 p.n.e.-235 n.e.): warstwy wyższe." In *Starożytny Rzym we współczesnych badaniach: państwo, społeczeństwo, gospodarka*, edited by Ludwik Piotrowicz, Józef Wolski, Tadeusz Kotula, and Andrzej Kunisz, 281–317. Varia 334. Kraków: Uniwersytet Jagielloński, 1994.
- Louw, J. P. *Semantics of New Testaments Greek*. Semeia Studies 11. Philadelphia, Pa: Fortress Press [u.a.], 1982.
- Lowe, Chuck. *Honoring God and Family: A Christian Response to Idol Food in Chinese Popular Religion*. Wheaton, IL; Bangalore, India: Evangelical Missions Information Service ; Theological Book Trust, 2001.
- Manson, T.W. "The Corinthian Correspondence (1) and (2)." In *Studies in the Gospels and Epistles*, by Matthew Black, 190–224, 1962.
- Martin, Raymond A. *Syntax Criticism of Johannine Literature, the Catholic Epistles, and the Gospel Passion Accounts*. Studies in Bible and Early Christianity, v. 18. Lewiston, N.Y., USA: E. Mellen Press, 1989.
- . *Syntax Criticism of the Synoptic Gospels*. Studies in the Bible and Early Christianity, v. 10. Lewiston, N.Y.: E. Mellen Press, 1987.
- McClymond, Michael James. *Familiar Stranger: An Introduction to Jesus of Nazareth*. Grand Rapids, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans Pub. Co, 2004.
- Meeks, Wayne A. "'And Rose up to Play': Midrash and Paraenesis in 1 Corinthians 10:1-22." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 1982, no. 5 (n.d.): 64–78.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Meggitt, J.J. *Paul, Poverty and Survival*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Mejer, Jørgen. *Diogenes Laertius and His Hellenistic Background*. 1. Aufl. Hermes, Zeitschrift Für Klassische Philologie : Einzelschriften, Heft 40. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1978.
- Merk, Otto. *Handeln Aus Glauben: Die Motivierungen Der Paulinischen Ethik*. Marburg: N.G. Elwert, 1968.
- Merklein, Helmut. *Der Erste Brief an Die Korinther. Kap. 5,1 - 11,1*. Ökumenischer TB- Kommentar Zum NT 7/2, Helmut Merklein ; Bd. 2. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Mohn, 2000.
- Meyer, H.A.W. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians Volume I, First Epistle, C. I-XIII*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1883.
- Middleton, Thomas F. *Doctrine of the Greek Article: Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament*. S.I.: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 2005.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. "Concerning Περὶ Δὲ in 1 Corinthians." *Novum Testamentum* 1989, no. vol. 31 (n.d.): 229–56.
- Mitton, C. Leslie. "Important Hypotheses Reconsidered - VII. The Authorship of the Epistle to the Ephesians." *The Expository Times* 1956, no. vol.67, 7 (n.d.): 195–98.
- Mitton, C Leslie. *The Epistle to the Ephesians: Its Authorship, Origin and Purpose*. London: Oxford University Press, 1951.
- Moffatt, James. *An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament*. NY: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1911.
- . *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*. The Moffatt New Testament Commentary. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1943.
- Molland, Einar. "La Circoncision, Le Baptême et L'autorité Du Décret Apostolique (Actes Xv, 28sq.) Dans Les Milieux Judéo-Chrétiens Des Pseudo-Clementines." *Studia Theologica* IX (1955): 1–39.
- Moorhouse, A.C. *Studies in the Greek Negatives*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press, 1959.
- Morgan, Charles H. "Excavations at Corinth, 1936-37." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1937, no. vol. 41, 4 (n.d.): 539–52.
- Morgan, II, Charles H. "Excavations at Corinth 1936-37." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1937, no. 41 (n.d.): 539–52.
- Morton, A. Q. *Literary Detection: How to Prove Authorship and Fraud in Literature and Documents*. New York: Scribner, 1978.
- Morton, A.Q., and James McLeman. *Christianity in the Computer Age*. New York: Harper & Row, 1964.
- . *Paul, the Man and the Myth: A Study in the Authorship of Greek Prose*. New York: Harper & Row, 1966.

- Moule, Charles Francis Digby. *An Idiom Book of New Testament Greek*. 2. ed., Repr. Cambridge: Univ. Press, 1971.
- Moulton, James H., Wilbert F. Howard, and Nigel Turner, eds. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. 3. *Syntax*. Edinburgh: Clark, 1963.
- Muddiman, John, John Barton, Loveday Alexander, and Henry Wansborough, eds. *The Pauline Epistles*. Updated selection. The Oxford Bible Commentary. Oxford [England] ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Murphy-O'Connor, J. *Keys to First Corinthians: Revisiting the Major Issues*. Oxford ; New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. "Food and Spiritual Gifts in 1 Cor 8:8." *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 1979, no. 41 (n.d.): 292–98.
- . "Freedom or the Ghetto (1 Cor. VIII, 1-13; X, 23-XI,1)." *Revue Biblique* 1978, no. 85 (n.d.): 543–74.
- Musti, D., and M. Torelli. *Pausania: Guida Della Grecia 2: Libro II: La Corinzia E l'Argolide*. Milano, 1986.
- Nanos, Mark D. In *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*, edited by Stanley E Porter, 179–210. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2008. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163/ej.9789004171596.i-370>.
- Németh, György. "Μεῦδ' Ὀνθον Ἐγβαλεν. Regulations Concerning Everyday Life in a Greek Temenos." In *Ancient Greek Cult Practice from the Epigraphical Evidence: Proceedings of the Second International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 22-24 November 1991*, edited by Robin Hägg and Svenska institutet i Athen, 59–64. Skrifter Utgivna Av Svenska Institutet I Athen, 80 = Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae, Series in 80 13. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen : Distributor, P. Åströms Förlag, 1994.
- Neumann, Kenneth J. *The Authenticity of the Pauline Epistles in the Light of Stylostatistical Analysis*. Dissertation Series / Society of Biblical Literature, no. 120. Atlanta, Ga: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Neusner, Jacob. "Jewish Use of Pagan Symbols after 70 CE." *The Journal of Religion* 1963, no. vol.43, 4 (n.d.): 285–94.
- Ngozo, Ruben. *The One God and the Many Gods: Monotheism and Idolatry in 1 Cor 8:1-11:1 in Light of Philo's Writings (PhD Thesis)*. Vol. 2012. Dissertation Series 13. Stavanger, Norway: School of Mission and Theology, n.d.
- Nilsson, Martin P. *A History of Greek Religion*. 2d ed. The Norton Library N287. New York: Norton, 1964.
- Odeberg, Hugo. *Paul Brev till Korintierna*. Tolkning Av Nya Testamentet, VII. Lund: SKDB, 1944.
- Odelberg, Per. *Sacra Corinthia, Sicyonia, Phlasiā*. Uppsala, 1896.
- Oliver, Harold H. *Helps for Readers' in Greek New Testament Manuscripts, ThM Thesis*. Vol. 1955. Princeton Theological Seminary, n.d.
- Olszewski, L. "'Religia' i 'kult Cesarski' w Starożytnym Rzymie - Z Życia Pojęć." In *Spółczesność i Religia W Świecie Antycznym: Materiały Z Ogólnopolskiej Konferencji Naukowej (Toruń, 20-22 Września 2007 R.)*, edited by Szymon Olszaniec, Przemysław Wojciechowski, and Uniwersytet Mikołaja Kopernika w Toruniu, Wyd. 1., 361–77. Toruń: Wydawn. nauk. Uniwersytetu Mikołaja Kopernika, 2010.
- Palinkas, Jennifer, and James A. Herbst. "A Roman Road Southeast of the Forum at Corinth: Technology and Urban Development." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 2011, no. vol. 80, 2 (n.d.): 287–336.
- Paschen, Wilfried. *Rein Und Unrein: Untersuchung Zur Biblischen Wortgeschichte*. Vol. 1970. Studien Zum Alten Und Neuen Testament 24. München: Kösel-Verlag, n.d.
- Pausanias. *Beschreibung Griechenlands. Übersetzt Und Herausgegeben von E. Meyer*. Translated by E. Meyer. Zürich/Stuttgart: Artemis Verlag, 1954.
- Pawlak, Marcin. *Rzymski Peloponez: greckie elity polityczne wobec cesarstwa*. Kraków: Towarzystwo Wydawnicze "Historia Iagellonica," 2011.
- Pelikan, Jaroslav. *Whose Bible Is It? A Short History of the Scriptures*. New York: Penguin Books, 2006.
- Percy, Ernst. *Die Probleme Der Kolosser- Und Epheserbriefe*. SVSL. Lund: C.W.K. Gleerup, 1946.
- Perkins, PHEME. *First Corinthians*. Paideia : Commentaries on the New Testament. Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Academic, 2012.
- Perrot, Yann. "Les Exemples Du Désert (1 Co. 10:6-11)." *New Testament Studies* 1983, no. 29 (n.d.): 445.

- Peters, Ronald D. *The Greek Article: A Functional Grammar of Ó-Items in the Greek New Testament With Special Emphasis on the Greek Article*. Linguistic Biblical Studies, volume 9. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2014.
- Petrovic, Ivana. "Transforming Artemis: From the Goddess of the Outdoors to City Goddess." In *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*, edited by Jan N. Bremmer and Andrew Erskine, 209–27. Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Pettersson, Michael. *Cults of Apollo at Sparta: The Hyakinthia, the Gymnopaïdai and the Karneia*. Skrifter Utgivna Av Svenska Institutet I Athen 8° 12. Stockholm: Univ, 1992.
- Pfaff, C. "Archaic Corinthian Architecture Ca. 600-480 B.C." In *Corinth XX: Corinth, the Centenary 1896-1996*, edited by C.K. Williams, II and N. Bookidis, 95–140. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 2003.
- Phua, Richard Liong-Seng. *Idolatry and Authority: A Study of 1 Corinthians 8.1-11.1 in the Light of the Jewish Diaspora*. Journal for the Study of the New Testament 299. London ; New York: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Pitcher, Luke. *Writing Ancient History: An Introduction to Classical Historiography*. Library of Classical Studies, v. 1. London ; New York: I.B. Tauris : Distributed in the United States and Canada exclusively by Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
- Porter, Stanley E. "Greek Word Order: Still an Unexplored Area in New Testament Studies?" In *Linguistic Analysis of the Greek New Testament: Studies in Tools, Methods, and Practice*, 347–63. Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic, 2015.
- . *Idioms of the Greek New Testament*. 2. ed. reprinted. Biblical Languages Greek 2. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- . "Word Order and Clause Structure in New Testament Greek: An Unexplored Area of Greek Linguistics Using Philippians as a Test Case." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 1993, no. 6 (n.d.): 177–205.
- Porter, Stanley E., and Matthew B. O'Donnel. "Conjunctions, Clines and Levels of Discourse." *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 2007, no. 20 (n.d.): 3–14.
- Powell, Benjamin. "The Temple of Apollo at Corinth." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1905, no. vol. 9, no 1 (n.d.): 44–63.
- Prothero, Stephen R. *God Is Not One: The Eight Rival Religions That Run the World*. 1st. ed. New York: HarperOne, 2011.
- Pulleyn, Simon. *Prayer in Greek Religion*. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Ramsay, William Mitchell. *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia: Being an Essay of the Local History of Phrygia from the Earliest Times to the Turkish Conquest*. Chestnut Hill, Mass.: Adamant Media, 2005.
- Reichert-Südbeck, Petra. *Kulte von Korinth Und Syrakus: Vergleich Zwischen Einer Metropolis Und Ihrer Apoikia*. Würzburger Studien Zur Sprache & Kultur, Bd. 4. Dettelbach: J.H. Röhl, 2000.
- Richardson, Rufus B. "The Excavations at Corinth in 1898: Preliminary Report." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1898, no. vol. 2, 3/4 (n.d.): 233–36.
- Richter, Hans-Friedemann. "Anstößige Freiheit in Korinth: Zur Literarkritik Der Korintherbriefe (1 Kor 8,1-13 Und 11,2-16)." In *The Corinthian Correspondence*, edited by R Bieringer, 561–75. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996.
- Rizakēs, A. D., and Francesco Camia, eds. *Pathways to Power: Civic Elites in the Eastern Part of the Roman Empire: Proceedings of the International Workshop Held at Athens, Scuola Archeologica Italiana Di Atene, 19 December 2005*. Tripodes 6. Atene: Scuola archeologica italiana di Atene, 2008.
- Robert, Jeanne, and Louis Robert. "Bulletin Épigraphique." In *Revue Des Études Grecques*, edited by Marcel Bizos, 424–540. tome 82, no 391-3, 1969.
- Roberts, Alexander, James Donaldson, and A. Cleveland Coxe. *The Apostolic Fathers with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus*. New York, NY: Cosimo Classics, 2007.
- Roberts, Alexander, James Donaldson, and Arthur Cleveland Coxe, eds. *The Ante-Nicene Fathers: The Writings of the Fathers Down to A.D. 325 Volume III Latin Christianity: Its Founder, Tertullian - Three Parts*. New York: Cosimo Classics, 2007.
- Roberts, E. S., and E. A Gardner. *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy*. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

- Roberts, J.W. "Some Aspects of Conditional Sentences in the Greek New Testament." *Bible Translator* 1964, no. 15 (n.d.): 70–76.
- Robertson, Archibald T., and W. H. Davis. *A New Short Grammar of the Greek Testament: For Students Familiar with the Elements of Greek*. 4. print. Grand Rapids, Mich: Baker Book House, 1985.
- Robinson, Henry S. "Excavations at Corinth: Temple Hill, 1968-1972." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 1976, no. 45 (n.d.): 203–39.
- Roebuck, Carl A. *The Asklepieion and Lerna*. Vol. 1951. Corinth : Results of Excavations, XIV. Cambridge, Massachusetts: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, n.d.
- Rosenmeyer, Patricia A., ed. *Ancient Greek Literary Letters: Selections in Translation*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Roux, G. *Pausanias En Corinthie*. Vol. 1958. Annales de l'Université de Lyon, ser. 3: Lettres 31. Paris, n.d.
- Rudhardt, J. "A Propos de L'Hymne Homérique Á Déméter." *Museum Helveticum* 1978, no. 35 (n.d.): 1–17.
- Rudhardt, Jean. *Notions Fondamentales de La Pensée Religieuse et Actes Constitutifs Du Culte Dans La Grèce Classique*. Genève: Droz, 1958.
- Runge, Steven E. *Discourse Grammar of the Greek New Testament: A Practical Introduction for Teaching and Exegesis*. Lexham Bible Reference Series. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers Marketing, 2010.
- Ruprecht, Jr, Louis A. "Athenagoras the Christian, Pausanias the Travel Guide and a Mysterious Corinthian Girl." *The Harvard Theological Review* 1992, no. vol.85, 1 (n.d.): 35–49.
- Saldarini, Anthony J. *Pharisees, Scribes, and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach*. New ed. Grand Rapids, Mich. : Livonia, Mich: W.B. Eerdmans ; Dove Booksellers, 2001.
- Salmon, John. *Wealthy Corinth: A History of the City to 338 BC*. Oxford : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1984.
- Sandelin, Karl-Gustav. *Attraction and Danger of Alien Religion: Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 290. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- . "Do Not Be Idolaters!' (1 Cor 10:7)." In *Texts and Contexts. Biblical Texts in Their Textual and Situational Contexts. Essays in Honor of Lars Hartman*, edited by Tord Fornberg and David Hellholm, 257–73. Oslo: Scandinavian University Press, 1995.
- . "Drawing the Line: Paul on Idol Food and Idolatry in 1 Cor 8:1-11:1." In *Neotestamentica et Philonica: Studies in Honor of Peder Borgen*, edited by Peder Borgen, David Edward Aune, Torrey Seland, and Jarl Henning Ulrichsen, 108–25. Supplements to Novum Testamentum, v. 106. Leiden ; Boston, MA: Brill, 2003.
- . "The Danger of Idolatry According to Philo of Alexandria." In *Attraction and Danger of Alien Religion: Studies in Early Judaism and Christianity*, 27–59. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament 290. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Sanders, J.T. "The Transition from Opening Epistolary Thanksgiving to Body in the Letter of the Pauline Corpus." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 1962, no. 81 (n.d.): 348–62.
- Schaefer, Herbert. *Die Laubhütte. Ein Beitrag Zur Kultur- Und Religionsgeschichte Griechenlands Und Italiens*. Borna, Leipzig: Verlag Robert Noske, 1939.
- Schenk, Wolfgang. "Der 1 Korintherbrief Als Briefsammlung." *Zeitschrift Für Die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft Und Die Kunde Der Älteren Kirche* 1969, no. 60 (n.d.): 219–43.
- Scherer, Jean. *Extraits des livres I et II du Contre Celse d'Origène : d'après le papyrus no 88747 du Musée du Caire (Thesis)*. Paris: Le Caire : Institut français d'archéologie orientale, 1956., 1955.
- Schleiermacher, Friedrich, H. R Mackintosh, and James S Stewart. *The Christian Faith*. Berkeley, CA: The Apocryphile Press, 2011.
- Schlesier, Renate. *Kulte, Mythen Und Gelehrte: Anthropologie Der Antike Seit 1800*. Originalausg. Fischer Wissenschaft. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag, 1994.
- Schmithals, Walter. *Die Gnosis in Korinth: Eine Untersuchung Zu Den Korintherbriefen*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1956.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Der Erste Brief an Die Korinther*. EKK, Evangelisch-Katholischer Kommentar Zum Neuen Testament, Bd. <7.2-7.4>. Zürich: Benziger ; Neukirchen-Vluyn : Neukirchener, 1991.
- Schüssler-Fiorenza, Elisabeth. "1 Corinthians." In *The HarperCollins Bible Commentary*, edited by James Luther Mays, Joseph Blenkinsopp, and Society of Biblical Literature, Rev. ed., 1074–93. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 2000.

- Scranton, R.L. "Glass Pictures from the Sea." *Archaeology* 1967, no. XX.3 (n.d.): 163–73.
- Scranton, Robert L. *Monuments in the Lower Agora and North of the Archaic Temple*. Corinth : Results of Excavations, vol. I, part III. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1951.
- Scranton, Robert L., and Edwin S. Ramage. "Investigations at Corinthian Kenchreai." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 1967, no. 36 (n.d.): 124–86.
- Shaw, Joseph W. "Shallow-Water Excavations at Kenchreai." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1967, no. vol. 71, 3 (n.d.): 223–31.
- Shear, Theodore Leslie. "Color at Corinth." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1928, no. vol. 32, 3 (n.d.): 330–32.
- Sissa, Giulia, and Marcel Detienne. *The Daily Life of the Greek Gods*. Mestizo Spaces. Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press, 2000.
- Smit, Joop F.M. "1 Cor 8,1-6: A Rhetorical Partitio: A Contribution to the Coherence of 1 Cor 8,1-11,1." In *The Corinthian Correspondence*, edited by R Bieringer, 577–91. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996.
- Smith, Claire S. *Pauline Communities as "Scholastic Communities": a Study of the Vocabulary of "Teaching" in 1 Corinthians, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*. Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen Zum Neuen Testament. 2. Reihe 335. Tübingen, Germany: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Smith, Dennis Edwin. "The Egyptian Cults at Corinth." *The Harvard Theological Review* 1977, no. vol.70, 3/4 (n.d.): 201–31.
- Smith, Neel. "Digital Infrastructure and the Homer Multitext Project." In *Digital Research in the Study of Classical Antiquity*, edited by Gabriel Bodard and Simon Mahony, 121–38. Digital Research in the Arts and Humanities. Farnham, Surrey, England ; Burlington, VT: Ashgate, 2010.
- Smith, R. J., and R. G. Bryant. "Metal Substitutions Incarbonic Anhydrase: A Halide Ion Probe Study." *Biochemical and Biophysical Research Communications* 66, no. 4 (October 27, 1975): 1281–86.
- Sokolowski, F. "Fees and Taxes in the Greek Cults." *The Harvard Theological Review* 1954, no. vol. 47, 3 (n.d.): 153–64.
- Songer, Harold S. "Problems Arising from the Worship of Idols: 1 Corinthians 8,1-11,1." *Review & Expositor* 1983, no. 80 (n.d.): 363–75.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. *"Reading" Greek Culture: Texts and Images, Rituals and Myths*. Oxford [England] : New York: Clarendon Press ; Oxford University Press, 1991.
- Sparks, H.F.D. "The Semitisms of the Acts." *Journal of Theological Studies* 1950, no. 1 (n.d.): 16–28.
- Spengel, Leonhard von. *Rhetores Graeci*. vol. III vols. Lipsiae: Sumptibus et Typis B.G. Teubneri, 1853.
- Stafford, Emma. "Herakles Between Gods and Heroes." In *The Gods of Ancient Greece: Identities and Transformations*, edited by Jan N. Bremmer and Andrew Erskine, 228–44. Edinburgh Leventis Studies 5. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010.
- Starling, David. "The Ἄπιστοι of 2 Cor 6:14." *Novum Testamentum* 2013, no. volume 55, issue 1 (n.d.): 45–60.
- Stavrianopoulou, Eftychia. *Ritual and Communication in the Graeco-Roman World*. Vol. 2006. KERNOS 16, n.d.
- Stengel, Paul. *Opferbräuche Der Griechen*. Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1910.
- Stillwell, Richard. "Architecture: Illustration Plates." In *Architecture*, edited by Richard Stillwell, L. Scranton, and S.E. Freeman, 1941:21–30. Corinth : Results of Excavations, vol I, part II. Cambridge, Massachusetts: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, n.d.
- Stowers, Stanley K. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. 1. paperback ed. Library of Early Christianity 5. Philadelphia, Pa: Westminster Press, 1989.
- Tcherikover, Victor. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Peabody, Mass: Hendrickson Publishers, 1999.
- Theissen, Gerd. "Social Conflict in the Corinthian Community: Further Remarks on J.J. Meggitt, Paul, Poverty and Survival." *Journal for the Study of the New Testament* 2003, no. vol.25, 3 (n.d.): 371–91.
- Theißen, Gerd. "The Strong and the Weak in Corinth." In *The social setting of Pauline Christianity: essays on Corinth*, edited by Gerd Theissen, 121–44. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf & Stock, 2004.
- Theissen, Gerd, and John Howard Schütz. *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clarke, 1990.
- Thörnell, Gösta. *Pastoralbrevens Äkthet*. Göteborg: Eranos Förlag, 1931.

- Thrall, Margaret E. *Greek Particles in the New Testament: Linguistic and Exegetical Studies*. vol. III vols. New Testament Tools and Studies. Leiden: Eerdmans / Brill, 1962.
- Tjen, Anwar. *On Conditionals in the Greek Pentateuch: A Study of Translation Syntax*. New York, NY [u.a.: T & T Clark, 2010.
- Tomson, Peter J. "Jewish Food Laws in Early Christian Community Discourse." *Semeia* 1999, no. 86 (n.d.): 193–211.
- . *Paul and the Jewish Law: Halakha in the Letters of the Apostle to the Gentiles*. Compendia Rerum Iudaicarum Ad Novum Testamentum, v. 1. Assen [Netherlands] : Minneapolis: Van Gorcum ; Fortress Press, 1990.
- Tov, Emanuel. *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judaean Desert*. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2010.
- Tov, Emmanuel. "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources." In *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*, edited by Adrian Schenker and International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies, 121–44. Society of Biblical Literature Septuagint and Cognate Studies, no. 52. Leiden ; Boston: Brill, 2003.
- Treggiari, Susan. *Roman Freedmen during the Late Republic*. Oxford Scholarly Classics. Oxford : New York: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Tropper, Josef. *Ugaritische Grammatik*. Alter Orient Und Altes Testament, Bd. 273. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag, 2000.
- Tsagarakis, Odysseus. *Nature and Background of Major Concepts of Divine Power in Homer*. Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner, 1977.
- University of Chicago, Bloomington Indiana University, and American School of Classical Studies at Athens. *Kenchreai, Eastern Port of Corinth: Results of Investigations by the University of Chicago and Indiana University for the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*. Leiden; Boston: Brill, 1976.
- Versnel, H.S. "Religious Mentality in Ancient Prayer." In *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World*, edited by H. S. Versnel, 1–64. Studies in Greek and Roman Religion, v. 2. Leiden: Brill, 1981.
- Vidman, Ladislav. *Sylloge inscriptionum religionis Isiacae et Sarapiacae*. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter, 2011. <http://site.ebrary.com/id/10598466>.
- Vielhauer, Philipp. *Geschichte Der Urchristlichen Literatur: Einl. in D. Neue Testament, D. Apokryphen U. D. Apostol. Väter*. De Gruyter Lehrbuch. Berlin ; New York: de Gruyter, 1975.
- Vince, C.A. *Private orations: L - LVIII. In Neaeram: LIX*. Edited by Demosthenes. Reprinted. Demosthenes 6. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Univ. Press, 2001.
- von Soden, Hans. *Sakrament und Ethik bei Paulus*. Gotha: Leopold Klotz Verlag, 1931.
- Vriezen, Theodore C. *The Religion of An Ient Israel*. Library of Theological Translations. James Clarke & Co Ltd, 2002.
- Waele, Ferdinand Joseph de. "The Fountain of Lerna and the Early Christian Cemetery at Corinth." *American Journal of Archaeology* 1935, no. vol. 39, 3 (n.d.): 352–59.
- Wallace, Daniel B. *Greek Grammar beyond the Basics: An Exegetical Syntax of the New Testament : With Scripture, Subject, and Greek Word Indexes*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan, 1996.
- Wallace, Daniel B., and Daniel B. Wallace. *The Basics of New Testament Syntax: An Intermediate Greek Grammar*. Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan Pub. House, 2000.
- Walter, N. "Christusglaube Und Heidnische Religiosität in Paulinischen Gemeinden." *New Testament Studies* 1979, no. 25 (n.d.): 425–36.
- Weniger, L. "Theophanien: Altgriechische Götteradvente." *Archiv Für Religionswissenschaft* 1923–4, no. 22 (n.d.): 16–57.
- West, Martin Lichtfield. *Hesiod: Theogony: Edited with Prolegomena and Commentary*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1966.
- West, Martin Litchfield. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Reprinted. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2003.
- White, John L. *The Form and Function of the Body of the Greek Letter: A Study of the Letter-Body in the Non-Literary Papyri and in Paul the Apostle*. 2d ed., Corr. Dissertation Series - Society of Biblical Literature ; No. 2. Missoula, Mont: Published by Scholars Press for the Society of Biblical Literature, 1972.

- Whitelaw, R. "A Fragment of the Lost Epistle to the Corinthians." *The Classical Review* 1890, no. volume 4, issue 1-2 (n.d.): 12.
- Wikander, Ola. *Kanaaneiska myter och legender*. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand, 2003.
- Wilcox, Max. *The Semitisms of Acts*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965.
- Will, E. *Korinthiaka. Recherches Sur L'histoire et La Civilisation de Corinthe Des Origines Aux Guerres Médiques*. Paris: De Boccard, 1955.
- Williams, Charles K. "Corinth, 1969: Forum Area." *Hespeira: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 1970, no. vol. 39, issue 1 (n.d.): 1–39.
- . "The Refounding of Corinth: Some Roman Religious Attitudes." In *Roman Architecture in the Greek World*, edited by Sarah Macready, Reprinted., 26–37. Occasional Papers, N.S., 10. London: Soc. of Antiquaries of London [u.a.], 1990.
- Williams, C.K. II, and O. Zervos. "Corinth, 1983: The Route to Sikyon." *Hespeira: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 1984, no. 53 (n.d.): 83–122.
- Williams, II, Charles K., and Orestes H. Zervos. "Excavations at Corinth 1989: The Temenos of Temple E." *Hespeira: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 1990, no. vol, 59, issue 2 (n.d.): 325–69.
- Wills, Jeffrey. "Homeric Particle Order." *Historische Sprachforschung* 1993, no. 106(1) (n.d.): 61–81.
- Winger, Michael. "Unreal Conditions in the Letters of Paul." *Journal of Biblical Literature* 1986, no. vol.105, 1 (n.d.): 110–12.
- Wire, Antoinette Clark. *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1990.
- Wiseman, James. "The Fountain of the Lamps." *Archaeology* 1970, no. 23 (n.d.): 130–37.
- Witherington, Ben. "Not So Idle Thoughts About Εἰδωλοθύτων." *Tyndale Bulletin* 1993, no. 44/2 (n.d.): 237–54.
- Wolff, Christian. *Der Erste Brief Des Paulus an Die Korinther*. Theologischer Handkommentar Zum Neuen Testament 7. Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt, 1996.
- Workman, W.P. "The Hapax Legomena of St. Paul." *Expository Times* 1896, no. vii (9) (n.d.): 418–19.
- Wortham, Robert A. "Urban Networks, Deregulated Religious Markets, Cultural Continuity and the Diffusion of the Isis Cult." *Method & Theory in the Study of Religion* 2006, no. vol.18, issue 2 (n.d.): 103–23.
- Wyatt, Nick. *Religious Texts from Ugarit: The Words of Ilmilku and His Colleagues*. The Biblical Seminar 53. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.
- Yavis, Constantine G. *Greek Altars: Origins and Typology: Including the Minoan-Myceanean Offertory Apparatus: An Archaeological Study in the History of Religion*. Saint Louis University Studies 1. St. Louis, Missouri: Saint Louis University Press, 1949.
- Young, Richard A. *Intermediate New Testament Greek: A Linguistic and Exegetical Approach*. Nashville, Tenn: Broadman & Holman, 1994.
- Zaidman, Louise Bruit, and Pauline Schmitt Pantel. *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*. Cambridge ; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Zakrzewski, Kazimierz. *Samorząd Miast Achai Rzymskiej. Arkadya, Messenia, Lakonia*. Lwów: nakł. Towarzystwa Naukowego, 1925.

Unity and Diversity in Corinth

Early Christian Disputes about the Significance of Idol Food

Adam Sabir

Contents

1 Introduction	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.1 The Pluralistic Roman Corinth as scenery for the Dispute over Sacrificial Food	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2 The Corinthian diversity	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.1 Religious diversity	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.1.1 <i>Roman & Greek</i>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.1.2 <i>Jewish</i>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.1.3 <i>Eastern</i>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.2.1.4 <i>Conclusion</i>	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.3 Question & Thesis statement	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.4 Previous research	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.4.1 C.K. Barrett	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.4.2 Gerd Theißen	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.4.3 Joop F. M. Smit	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.4.4 E. Coxe Still, III	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.4.5 John Fotopoulos	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.4.6 Bruce N. Fisk	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.4.7 Karl-Gustav Sandelin	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.5 Are all statements Pauline? The elephant in the room of previous scholarship.	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.6 Terminological framework	Error! Bookmark not defined.
1.7 Methodological way forward	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2 Identifying embedded statements	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1 Paul’s non-biblical embeddings	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1 Paul embedding his opponents	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.1 Verbum dicendi	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.1.1 2 Corinthians 10:10	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.1.2 Romans 3:8	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.1.3 1 Corinthians 15:12	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.1.4 1 Corinthians 1:12 & 3:4	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.2 Autem scripsistis	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.2.1 1 Corinthians 7:1	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.3 Embeddings without introduction	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.3.1 1 Corinthians 6:12-13	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.4 Summary with regards to Paul’s direct quotes from opponents	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.4.1 More conclusive trends	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.1.4.2 Inconclusive traits	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.2 Paul attributing words to his opponents	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.2.1 Romans 9:19-20	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.2.2 Romans 11:19-20	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.2.3 1 Cor 12:15-16, 21	Error! Bookmark not defined.

2.1.3 Paul and other non-sacred quotes	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.3.1 1 Corinthians 15:33	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.4 Paul and contemporary embedding practices	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.4.1 Organizing embeddings	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.4.2 Collecting information	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.4.3 Introducing citation's in ongoing discourses	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.4.4 Functions in point-for-point embedding and interactions	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.4.4.1 Seneca instructing	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.4.4.2 Cicero advising/ deciding	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.4.4.3 Cicero recounting memories	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.4.4.4 Pliny informing and Trajan's executive order	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.1.4.4.5 Cicero's apologetics	Error! Bookmark not defined.
2.2 Summary and way forward	Error! Bookmark not defined.
3 Three voices, one of whom is Paul's	1
3.1 Principles behind previous divisions	6
3.2 Methodological deficiency	9
3.3 Way forward	10
3.4 Where does Paul take by?	11
3.4.1 How the voice and double sequence confirms this	12
3.4.2 Supportive arguments from stylometry	17
3.4.2.1 Prepositions	19
3.4.2.1.1 ἕως ἄρτι	22
3.4.2.1.2 ἐν οὐρανῷ εἶτε ἐπὶ γῆς	25
3.4.2.2 Emphaticized conjunctions, conditionals, kai, and structure	27
3.4.2.3 Other supportive arguments, from terminology	33
3.5 Where does the embedding begin?	37
3.6 Other interruptions by Paul?	40
3.7 Other Corinthian statements in chapter 10?	50
3.7.1 Statements that arguably are Corinthian	50
3.8 Embedded positions from the third party?	53
3.9 The worked out division	59
4 Idol food and the concept of Monotheism. Towards the kernel of the debate	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.1 The arguments of the Corinthians in favor of eating	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.1.1 End-purpose of food	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.1.2 The role of knowledge	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.1.3 How the idol food relates to the monotheistic confession	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.1.4 Ignorance of monotheistic confession the root of the problems	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.1.5 The confession in practice	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2 The Corinthian arguments against eating	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.2.1 When eating denies the confession	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3 Paul's argument upon idol food	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3.1 Precision of terms	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3.2 Secondary rights and primary purposes	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3.3 The grounds for the fathers confidence, their subsequent fall	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3.4 Particular negative examples to beware off	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3.5 Idolatry and the faithfulness of God	Error! Bookmark not defined.

4.3.6	The actual limits of the common principle the Corinthians have evoked	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3.7	What is allowed and its priorities ..	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.3.8	Never occasion the jeopardizing of the principle	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4	The debate in context	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.1	The distribution of powers in Greek religion	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.2	The distribution of powers in Corinth	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.2.1	Jurisdictional distribution	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.3	Where could the Corinthians have been spotted eating?	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.2.2	Further remarks on the market	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.2.3	Why not Acrocorinth and the Kenchrae?	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.2.4	The thirst of man	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.2.4.1	Peirene	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.2.4.2	Glauke unique leverage and reasons for access	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.2.4.3	Glauke and proximity to worship	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4	The sacrifice of the Corinthian debate	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4.1	The framework of prayers	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4.1.1	Summoning the deity	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4.1.2	Summoning the particular deity	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4.2	Historical novels	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4.2.1	The Homeric paean to Apollo	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4.2.2	The Homeric ioulos to Demeter	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4.2.3	The realms of Apollo and Demeter	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4.3	Self-reflecting systematizations	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4.3.1	Sallustius περί θεῶν και Κόσμου	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4.3.2	Plato and sacrificial thought	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.4.3.3	Concluding remarks and some implications	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.5	The monotheism of Paul	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.5.1	The divinities and Paul	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.5.1.1	What those having left foreign worship have left behind	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.5.1.2	What those engaged in foreign worship do worship	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.5.2	Paul and the jurisdiction of his God	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.5.2.1	Geographical outreach and claims of Paul's God	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.5.2.2	The functions of Paul's God	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.5.2.3	God with limits to people?	Error! Bookmark not defined.
4.4.6	How monotheism explains the Corinthian debate	Error! Bookmark not defined.
5	Conclusion	Error! Bookmark not defined.
6	Suggestions for further research	Error! Bookmark not defined.
7	Bibliography	Error! Bookmark not defined.
8	Index	Error! Bookmark not defined.

