*Stefan M. Attard*

# The Relevance of Rhetoric in 1 Corinthians 14. A Critique of Views on the Oral and Conceptual Analysis of this Pauline Text

The import of 1 Corinthians 14 can be understood without detailed knowledge of Paul's mentality and the literary techniques he employs. Nevertheless, it is the subtle and intricate reasons which give rise to the text, as well as its immediate and less immediate contexts, that are most intriguing and, ultimately, highly revealing. What seems to be a rather uncomplicated text proves to hide within it a number of remarkable elements which could easily go unnoticed to the unskilled reader. Even a Corinthian Christian living in the middle of the first century may not have been able to grasp the complexity of Paul's structured rhetorical strategy that has become increasingly brought to light by scholars in the last decades.

The text under investigation unmistakably lends itself to a conceptual analysis which is of a rhetorical nature and that fits like a glove in relation to the rest of the letter[1]. One must only very cautiously steer away from such rhetorical

---

[1] V. Masalles, *La Profecia en la Asamblea Cristiana. Analisis retórico-leterario de 1 Cor, 14-25*, Roma 2003, pp. 90–98 provides us with a brief history of the development of the study of rhetoric in Paul's letters. He shows that this interest dates back

analysis when studying Paul, even though it must also be stated that these cannot always be applied rigidly to all his texts[2]. The basic presupposition is that the rhetorical structure of the text is the royal road that leads to its understanding. This does not mean that the analysis Betz applied to Galatians must be reproduced to the letter in analysing 1 Corinthians 14. In this article I would like to point to the importance of modifying this approach when seeking to unravel Paul's method in this chapter.

## *Letter Type and Genre*

In order to put 1 Corinthians 14 in context, a word on the intention of the whole letter is in order. Following Schüssler-Fiorenza[3], Mitchell unwaveringly and convincingly upholds the deliberative genre – γένος συμβουλευτικόν – of 1 Corinthians in her excellent monograph *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*[4]. She does so by seeking to elucidate how this genre is present in extant

---

as far as Augustine, but that increased and more scientific research of classical rhetoric in the NT began in the early 20th century and was specifically applied to a NT text by H.D. Betz in 1975 in *The Literary Composition and Function of Paul's Letter to the Galatians*, New Testament Studies 21 (1975), pp. 353–379.

[2] One need only consider, for example, Paul's use of *periautologia* in the *dispositio* of Phil 3 and how those who insist on applying a model of rhetorical analysis to this text find themselves going all over the place without offering convincing proof for the validity of their claims.

[3] Cf. E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetoric and Ethic. The Politics of Biblical Studies*, Minneapolis 1999, pp. 121f.

[4] "… the whole of 1 Corinthians should rightly be considered to be deliberative rhetoric, on the basis of several different lines of argument, dealing comprehensively with form, function and content." M.M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, Louisville 1993, p. 12–13. On p. 23, Mitchell claims that this type of rhetoric has four characteristics, all of which are present in 1 Corinthians: "1) a focus on future time as the subject of deliberation; 2) employment of a determined set of appeals or ends, the most distinctive of which is the advantageous τὸ συμφέρον; 3) proof by example (παράδειγμα); and 4) appropriate subjects for deliberation, of which factionalism and concord are especially common." B. Witherington III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth. A Socio-rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, Minneapolis 1994, p. 77, too classifies it as deliberative. Puskas says that there is both deliberative or symboleutic rhetoric (e.g. 1 Cor 5,1-2 [we believe that this is of a judicial nature, and not deliberative]; 6,1-5; 7,1-7; 8,1-3; 11,17-22; 12,1-3; 15,12.35; 16,1-4) and judicial rhetoric (e.g. 1 Cor 1,10–4,41; 9; see the article on authority in

sources and then to see whether there is a correlation with 1 Corinthians insofar as the characteristic features of the genre are present or not within it. Though this epistle does not have the harshness of a judicial stance, one gets the impression that this group of Christians were not quite easy to deal with. Paul has to address his piercing words on various levels, at one time addressing their weakness in chapter 5, at another their selfishness in 11,17-34, and at yet another their wrong conceptions in chapter 14. The latter pose a particularly problematical situation since, as Douglas puts it, the freedom associated with the Spirit of the Lord (cf. 2 Cor 3,17) goes hand in hand with weaker institutional structures, more fluid community boundaries, and a greater sense of individualism[5]. In this respect, one could argue that Paul's epistle could have judicial overtones insofar as he condemns their improper behaviour, though he does so in a more mitigated manner in chapter 14[6].

As for 14,1-25, Masalles says the following: "Se podría decir que nuestra perícopa está en el momento más deliberativo de la sección"[7]. Wuellner opts for a different position when he asserts that the letter is epideictic. He does so on the basis of the emphasis given to the concepts of what is praiseworthy and what is shameful[8]. But this is only possible for him because he reinterprets the

---

Paul by J.-N. Aletti, *L'Autorité Apostolique de Paul: Théorie et Pratique*, in: A. Vanhoye (ed.), *L'Apôtre Paul: Personnalité, Style et Conception du Ministere*, Leuven 1986, pp. 229–246. Even though it seems strange that Puskas sifts out such verses to put them into his baskets of judicial or deliberative rhetoric, he does, to be fair, consider chapters 5-16, excluding chapter 9, as deliberative. Cf. C.B. Puskas Jr., *The Letters of Paul*, Collegeville 1993, pp. 16 and 59.

[5] Cf. J.H. Neyrey, *Paul, In Other Words. A Cultural Reading of His Letters*, Louisville 1990, p. 128f.

[6] One can compare his correctional approach here (which is void of stern descriptions of the Corinthians, except for a hypothetical reference to ignorance in v. 38, but in which they are frequently addressed with the vocative ἀδελφοί) with his harsher approach elsewhere in the epistle, for example (σάρκινοι in 3,1; ἄφρων in 15,36).

[7] V. Masalles, *La Profecia*, p. 177. Also see M.M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, p. 13 n. 44 for a list of authors who claim it is deliberative.

[8] Cf. W. Wuellner, *Paul as Pastor*, in: A. Vanhoye (ed.), *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 62, and *Greek Rhetoric and Pauline Argumentation*, in. W.R. Schoedel, R.L. Wilken (red.), *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition. In honorem Robert M. Grant*, Paris 1979, pp. 184-185. Wuellner seems to base his conclusion on the works of Perelman and Olbrects-Tyteca who assign to epideictic rhetoric the task of paving the way to a particular course of action. This view of theirs, to some extent, could actually overlap with the task of deliberative rhetoric.

meaning of epideictic genre as referring to an intensifying of one's adherence to some generally accepted value which would otherwise be discarded if in conflict with other values. Goulder unnecessarily complicates the matter when he asserts that Paul purposely divides the 'enemy' by introducing discourse on σχίσματα (1,10; 11,18), then seeks to win them over by harping on the beauty of love[9].

# The Rhetorical Structure of the Epistle

According to Witherington, 1 Corinthians has a grand scheme which fits quite neatly into a conceptual framework[10]. Below is a concise presentation of this scheme as he envisages it[11], as well as Mitchell's own division of the letter[12].

---

[9] M.D. GOULDER, σοφία *in 1 Corinthians*, New Testament Studies 37 (1991), pp. 177f. According to E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians*, New Testament Studies 33 (1987), pp. 156f, Paul's making recourse to discourse on party-strife is actually only his way of reinterpreting the situation in Corinth in order to attain his desired goal. The scholar makes this claim in the process of seeking to ascertain which is the true rhetorical occasion/exigency to which 1 Corinthians is a fitting response. She thus sees Paul's irony and his attempt to belittle them, as she puts it, as having an aim other than bringing about unity, but rather to impose adherence to him by one and all.

[10] Masalles gives no less than 16 different schemes as presented by an equivalent number of scholars, namely Barrett, Conzelmann, Orr-Walther, Wolff, Standaert, Fee, Carrez, Mitchell, Smit, Kistemaker, Barbaglio, Hays, S. Bosch, Schrage, Collins and Lambrecht. The differences in their division of chapter 14 are indeed striking.

[11] B. WITHERINGTON III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth*, p. 76.

[12] M.M. MITCHELL, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, pp. 184–186. Conversely, Goulder criticizes Mitchell's approach to 1 Corinthians (and 2 Corinthians too) since, in his opinion, Paul would have lacked the knowledge to argue in the style of Graeco-Roman orators. Thus, the scholar contends that Mitchell's *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation* lacks precise technical evidence to show that the striving for unity is the crux of the matter in this epistle. Some examples Mitchell gives to show Paul's deliberative approach in reaching this goal are dismissed by Goulder for their being far too common elements in many Greek speeches, thereby mitigating their relevance to this specific situation. Yet, it is difficult to see how such a scholarly work on Mitchell's part could be so flippantly brushed aside in one page by Goulder's criticism that seems to be tainted with unnecessary and unscholarly sarcasm. Cf. M.D. GOULDER, *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth*, Peabody 2008, p. 272f.

| Witherington | Witherington | Mitchell |
|---|---|---|
| Epistolary prescript | 1,1-3 | 1,1-3 |
| Epistolary thanksgiving and *exordium* | 1,4-9 | 1,4-9 προοίμιον[14] 1,10–15,58 Epistolary body |
| *Propositio* of entire letter | 1,10[13] | 1,10 πρόθεσις |
| Brief *narratio* | 1,11-17 | 1,11-17 διήγησις[15] |
| *Probatio* | 1,18–16,12 | 1,18–15,57 πίστεις |
| This *probatio* consists in 9 sections: | (i) 1,18–4,21; (ii) 5–6; (iii) 7; (iv) 8–11,1 with a digression (*egressio*) in chapter 9; (v) 11,1-16; (vi) 11,17-34; | **A. 1,18–4,21** **B. 5,1–11,1** (i) 5,1–7,40 (ii) 8,1–11,1 **C. 11,2–14,40** (i) 11,2-16 |

---

[13] In pointing out that Paul's goal is set in 1,10, W. Wuellner, *Greek Rhetoric and Pauline Argumentation*, in: W.R. Schoedel, R.L. Wilken (eds.), Early Christian Literature, pp. 182f and 183 n. 33 states that Paul uses the *genos endoxon* in this epistle. Quoting Lausberg for his terminology, he gives different kinds of approaches possible: "1. *endoxon* (the issue is agreeable to the readers); 2. *amphidoxon* (provokes serious questions); 3. *paradoxon* (shocking); 4. *adoxon* (uninteresting); 5. *dysparakoloutheton* (baffling or obscure)."

A.C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Grand Rapids 2013, p. 100, challenges Mitchell's and Witherington's assumption that 1,10 is the *propositio* of the entire letter. He stresses that Paul's concern was with constructing "an eschatology of promise and a theology of salvation", and that the immediate church set-up was only meant to prepare the fulfilment that was yet to come. Thus he sets aside the church's being united *per se*, opting for one's concentration on how unity is only a stepping stone to better permit and reveal the Lord's presence in and through the community. Yet, this position need not be contentious. Thiselton could have very well upheld 1,10's centrality without forgoing his convictions. Paul's main aim was to change their behaviour in order to become more worthy of the promised salvation. But overemphasis on the latter, without clear directions on practical behaviour, would have tantamounted to a mere lumping of dogmatic teachings on them that they would have been unable to digest.

[14] Προοίμιον is the introduction to the argument of the letter.

[15] Διήγησις is a statement of facts.

| Witherington | Witherington | Mitchell |
|---|---|---|
| | (vii) 12–14 with a digression in chapter 13;[16] (viii) 15; | (ii) 11,17–34 (iii) 12,1–14,40 **D. 15,1-57** |
| | | 15,58 ἐπίλογος[17] |
| *Peroratio* | (ix) 16,1-12 16,13-18 | |
| Closing greetings/ remarks | 16,19-24 | 16,1-24 Epistolary closing a) instructions on collections b) visit plans c) recapitulation + advice d) epistolary greetings e) curse + prayer calling for unity in love and in Jesus Christ. |

On a more detailed level, Carrez takes 11,2–14,40 as one unit which deals with three problems relating to the community.[18] He adopts Standaert's division of the text, which is the following[19]:

| | |
|---|---|
| 12,1-3 | *propositio* |
| 12,4-11 | *exordium* |

---

[16] Witherington thus claims that chapter 13 is a *digressio*. In similar vein, B. STAN-DAERT, *La Rhétorique Ancienne dans Saint Paul*, in: A. VANHOYE (ed.), L'Apôtre Paul, p. 80 who, as Masalles points out, was the first to apply the *dispositio* of a conceptual model to 12,1–14,40, considers 12,31–13,13 as a *digressio*. "Toutes les tentatives pour prouver que 1 Co 13 n'est qu'un 'corps étranger' dans cette composition sont de ce fait vouées à l'échec." It being a *digressio* does not mean that this was a later insertion. Such a position would diminish the value of this chapter within the whole framework of chapters 12–14. Masalles makes an interesting remark about chapter 13 when he claims that it belongs to the epideictic genre, yet this being so at the service of the deliberative genre which characterizes our text; cf. MASALLES, *La Profecia*, p. 176 especially n. 158.

[17] The ευπίλογος is the conclusion of the argument.

[18] These are: 1. Woman and man before the Lord (11,2-16); 2. The Lord's meal and mutual love (11,17-34); and 3. The proper use of spiritual gifts (12,1–14,39).

[19] M. CARREZ, *La première épître aux Corinthiens*, Cahiers Evangile 66 (1989), p. 38.

| 12,12-30 | *narratio* |
| 12,31–13,13 | *digressio* |
| 14,1-36 | *argumentatio* |
| 14,1 | *partitio* |
| 14,2-25 | level of principles |
| 14,26-36 | practical level |
| 14,37-40 | *peroratio* |

One is left wondering what precise connection Standaert sees between 12,1-3 (his *propositio*) and chapter 14. The only idea that is taken up again is that of the spiritual gifts, which is only mentioned in v. 1 as an introduction to the discourse and not as a thesis (Περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν). With regards to 12,2, one notices that the concept of mute idols is not brought up at all in the main argument, for disorder and lack of love are the main issues, and not idolatry (though the concept of muteness may indeed constitute a contrast to the importance of clearly spoken messages in prophecy). As to 12,3, once again one needs to strain oneself considerably to see any connection it might have to the body of proof. Apart from that, scholars cannot agree on the real meaning of the verse, as well as the concrete situation which triggered Paul to come up with such a statement.

## Oral Models

The stylistic feature of oral patterning associated with Hebrew expression is not missing in this section of the letter. Harvey claims that 1 Corinthians is replete with it, namely "[c]hiasmus, inclusion, ring-composition, and the ABA' pattern figure"[20]. In focusing on the section that interests us most, Fee presents a ring composition that ranges from 12,31 through to 14,1[21]. His schema is presented below, followed by what I consider to be the weakness of this layout.

---

[20] J.D. Harvey, *Listening to the Text. Oral Patterning in Paul's Letters*, Nottingham 1999, p. 156.

[21] Cf. G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Grand Rapids 1987, p. 654. Harvey states the following: "Paul uses anaphoric ring-composition in 12:31a and 14:1 to frame the "digression" about love in chapter 13. The latter verse also serves as part of inclusive ring-composition framing 14:1-39." J.D. Harvey, *Listening*, p. 290.

| 12,31 | ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ χαρίσματα | A |
|---|---|---|
| | Καὶ ἔτι καθ᾿ ὑπερβολὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῖν δείκνυμι | B |
| 13 | ἀγάπη | C |
| 14,1 | Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην | B' |
| | ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά | A' |

Fee makes a valid contribution in claiming that in chapter 12 the word χαρίσματα is used, that is, in the context of the gifts mentioned by Paul, whilst in chapter 14 he uses the term πνευματικά which is more characteristic of the Spirit's activity[22]. He corroborates his chiastic structure above firstly by referring to the phrase χαρίσματα τὰ μείζονα (v. 12,31a) and to μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε (14,1c) in relation to this pattern, secondly by hinting at the subtle meaning of τὰ πνευματικά vis-à-vis τὰ χαρίσματα, and finally by keeping the imperatives of 12,31a and 14,1b-c together and interpreting them in relation to the section on love. He thus demonstrates how prophecy has superiority over tongues. Yet, in my opinion, a different schema should be opted for, namely one that takes B, C and B' to be really a single section which offers the basis for exalting prophecy over tongues. Fee also ignores the relative length of B, C and B' in his scheme, thereby overlooking the fact that C is so much longer than B and B' (which are but one phrase each), rendering the oral effect of such a division less plausible. It is therefore more accurate to have the following arrangement:

A    12,1-31a – Περὶ δὲ τῶν πνευματικῶν
B    13 – ἀγάπη
A'   14,1b-40 – τὰ πνευματικά

Several scholars accept such a division of the text, particularly since they are wont to take chapters 12–14 as a unit[23]. This layout will prove to be very appropriate for the type of argumentation which Paul presses on with, since chapters 12 and 13 will be the groundwork (explicitly or not) for the reasoning he puts forward in chapter 14. This chapter will deal concretely with two very specific gifts. It must be noted that chapter 12 is of a theoretical nature whilst chapter 14 is of an exhortative nature furnishing concrete applications of what was mentioned earlier. Yet chapter 13 is the one that animates the

---

[22] Cf. G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 655.
[23] Cf. J.D. Harvey, *Listening*, p. 169.

chapters that sandwich it, and it does so in such a way that chapters 12 and 14 are actually buttressed by this central chapter.

| A | *a* | 12,1-11 | Various gifts | Each given some gift or other "for the common good" |
|---|---|---|---|---|
|  | *b* | 12,12-27 | Body metaphor | Absolute necessity of **unity** |
|  | *a'* | 12,28-31 | Various gifts | Not all are given the same gift/s |
| B |  | 13 | ἀγάπη | Absolute necessity of **love** |
| A' |  | 14 | Two specific gifts | Seeking *the common good* – community edification |

It must be remembered that the gifts themselves, no matter how impressive they may seem, do not occupy centre stage in Paul's rhetoric. It will suffice to point out the weight which 13,1 carries. Thus, in 12,1–14,40 Paul gradually moves from practical workings of community dynamics through two foundational and absolute conditions of Christian life and ultimately comes back to practical dynamics related to two specific gifts. Harvey claims that the words πνευματικός, ἀγνοέω, and κύριος are found in both 12,1-3 and 14,37-40, this being a further confirmation that the section must be taken as a whole unit having these parts functioning as an *inclusio*[24]. We therefore see how the main *propositio* of the letter (1,10), that which advocates for unity, as well as the subtle and overt discourse on love (genuine concern for the other) – which is found at crucial points of the letter[25] – are the backbone of chapters 12–14.

## Conceptual Analysis

A close reading of 1 Corinthians 14 supplies us with ample evidence that points to a division of the text into two main blocks as well as a further

---

[24] *Ibid.*, 169. Yet in spite of this lexicographic connection, Harvey takes it too far when he seeks to find a thematic equivalent in 12,1-3 (A) and 14,37-40 (A'), which he terms "Introduction: the gifts and those who have them" and "Conclusion: the leaders and the gifts" respectively. Such titles do not aptly describe the content of these verses. Moreover, such a constraint on the text leads J.D. HARVEY, *Listening*, p. 170, to divide 12,1–14,40 into an ABCB'A' structure which turns out to be a somewhat inaccurate way of reading the whole text.

[25] See, for instance, 8,9; 11,33; 12,31b–13,13; 14,12; 16,14.

dissection of these blocks. These two main parts are vv. 1-25 and vv. 26-40. One can perceive the theme of *intelligibility* in the former and guidelines for *order* in the latter[26]. With regards to vv. 1b-25, Barbaglio highlights Paul's concluding notion (the *what*) in putting them under the heading "Superiorità della profezia sulla glossolalia"[27] whereas Fee's entitling them "The Need for Intelligibility in the Assembly" shows that he here emphasizes Paul's *reasons* (the *why*) for his preference of prophecy over tongues[28].

Though several scholars divide our chapter according to Quintilian's rhetorical model, I here opt to follow J.-N. Aletti's lead and view it from a somewhat different perspective[29]. The model just mentioned revolves around a *propositio* which the rhetorician then sets out to prove by a number of *pisteis* which make up the *probatio*. For the sake of precision, 1 Corinthians 14 lacks a real *propositio* even though v. 5 may seem like one. Several scholars interpret it as a *propositio*, but the construction of the verse falls short of the character of a thesis as such. Though one must not preoccupy oneself excessively over the definition of one verse or so at the cost of losing sight of the whole argument, analytical rigour does demand that the function of the respective verses in relation to the whole be well understood in order to better master the logic and dynamic of the apostle's argument. Thus, we will see how chapter 14 is actually constructed with a backbone of imperatives for which a number of justifications are furnished.

The modified approach being proposed here is the following:

**14,1** Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην is a programmatic statement that sets the underlying tone of the whole of chapter 14, love having been clearly expounded in

---

[26] Cf. G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 652; C.L. de Wet, *Power and the Poetics of the Pneuma: Paul's Rhetorical Framework in 1 Corinthians 12-14*, Ekklesiastikos Pharos 94 (2012), pp. 137–157, equates the ordo naturalis with the ordo Dei and speaks of this as "an important rhetorical intersection in 1 Corinthians 14" (p. 144).

[27] G. Barbaglio, *La Prima Lettera ai Corinzi*, Bologna 1996, p. 737.

[28] A.C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle*, p. 1081 too focuses on the idea of intelligibility and upbuilding.

[29] I have been unable to identify any particular article by Aletti on this chapter as such and am partly basing myself on insights shared by him in class at the Pontifical Biblical Institute in Rome, which insights served as a springboard for the rest of my exposition.

the previous chapter. It is the subtle motif that runs through to 14,40. V. 1 consists of two imperatives, the second of which refers to two phenomena. Masalles considers this a *sub-propositio*[30], a position with which I do not fully concur since, in spite of the unity of vv. 1-5 (a section that can veritably stand on its own), vv. 2-5 are not proofs but explanations[31].

*First imperatives*

**14,1** Διώκετε τὴν ἀγάπην, ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε.

*Preliminary justifications*

| v. 2 | tongues – God is addressed | antithesis between v. 2 (ὁ γὰρ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ) |
| v. 3 | prophecy – man is addressed | and v. 3 (ὁ δὲ προφητεύων) |
| v. 4a | tongues – self-edification | antithesis between v. 4a (ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ) |
| v. 4b | prophecy – edification of the church | and v. 4b (ὁ δὲ προφητεύων) |

*Main exhortative statement*

**14,5** θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις, μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε·[32] μείζων δὲ ὁ προφητεύων ἢ ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσαις ἐκτὸς εἰ μὴ διερμηνεύῃ, ἵνα ἡ ἐκκλησία οἰκοδομὴν λάβῃ.

v. 5 functions as:

(i) a kind of *peroratio*: a conclusion of the reasoning in vv. 1bc-4 (thus the δέ of θέλω δέ is consequential and is to be translated as "then"/"therefore")[33].

_____

[30] Cf. V. Masalles, *La Profecia*, p. 184.

[31] *Ibid.*, p. 151, like many other scholars, opts to view this text in light of the classical conceptual model which I am here eschewing. "Esto nos lleva a demostrar que nos encontramos ante una tesis, a la que le llamaremos *sub-propositio*, por el hecho de que no es la tesis única de toda la sección, sino una de una serie de tesis dentro de un mismo discurso."

[32] The phrase μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε found in v. 1 and v. 5 forms a ring-composition; cf. J.D. Harvey, *Listening*, p. 172.

[33] This would undoubtedly give more weight to the importance of tongues, but Paul can allow himself to make such a statement since he will soon bring to their attention the contexts which he has in mind.

(ii) an amplification of the initial set of imperatives of v. 1, and it therefore serves as the main exhortative statement that captures the essence of the whole reasoning of 1 Corinthians 14 and is a synthesis of it.

Regular parallelism is a clear feature of vv. 2-4 (A: v. 2; B: v. 3; A': v. 4a; B': v. 4b). The use of particles to introduce vv. 2-4 is immediately noticeable. Thus γάρ (v. 2) and δέ (v. 3) are the features that make the phrases they are found in syndetic.[34] Vv. 2-3 function as two distinct preliminary explanations that Paul employs very early in the text. The first one is in vv. 2-3 and the second one is encapsulated in v. 4. These explanations – which are justifications given to support his imperatives – are based on practical evidence (tongues cannot be understood; prophecy is directly edifying) and also on a subtle hint at one's ethos (not Paul's, but the presumed good ethos of his listeners). We have pointed out that v. 5 has the function of a kind of *peroratio* that concludes the argument put forward in vv. 1-4. But this can truly be said of v. 5a and not of the whole verse, for v. 5b introduces a new element, namely the particular superiority of prophecy over tongues except when tongues is accompanied by interpretation. All this, one must emphasize, is referred to in the ambit of the ecclesial community, which is first hinted at in v. 2. The phrase θέλω δὲ πάντας ὑμᾶς λαλεῖν γλώσσαις lacks the strength of Paul's more direct imperatives for the reason that in a *peroratio* the orator appeals to the listeners' emotions to bring them on his side. Thus, one can safely say that this statement is imbued with a sense of pathos, which is employed having this end in mind, but which nevertheless compels the Corinthians to adhere to the apostle's exhortations.

To be sure, vv. 1-5 are self-contained and, for all intents and purposes, have been viewed by several scholars as a mini-model of a conceptual approach[35]. Nonetheless, in chapter 14, these verses serve a different purpose. They are an *exordium* which has as its main purpose the directing of one's thoughts to a particular subject matter, but being so clearly laid out, they function also as a preparation of themes. As a matter of fact, we already have present all the elements which will be taken up in the central section which will aim

---

[34] Cf. E.W. Güting, D.L. Mealand, *Asyndeton in Paul. A Text-critical and Statistical Enquiry into Pauline Style*, Lampeter 1998, p. 41.

[35] G. Barbaglio, *La Prima Lettera ai Corinzi*, p. 737 suggests that vv. 1b–5a are a "micro-unità". Here, one also notes that Masalles sees in vv. 2-5 a *partitio*, which is a section that contains the main elements that will then be taken up at length in the main body of the text; cf. V. Masalles, *La Profecia*, p. 189.

to corroborate the validity of the imperatives laid down in v. 1 and v. 5. The themes present are: prophecy, tongues, interpretation of tongues, self-edification and edification of the church. And because I would argue in favour of seeing vv. 1-5 as a literary unit that is a model for the rest of the argument, I am not wont to over-emphasize the division of v. 5 into v. 5a and v. 5b, since the latter (v. 5b) is necessary to complete the picture of the first 5 verses[36]. Moreover, a too rigid approach that would not allow the whole of v. 5 to function both as a kind of *peroratio* and also a main exhortative statement signals a faulty and unhealthy approach to the text.

Having laid down the centrality of v. 5, one sees how v. 6 now serves to introduce the section that will support v. 5, namely vv. 6-11 which consists of justifications based on real examples from everyday life[37]. In this regard, Thiselton alleges that very few scholars have dealt with Paul's use of analogy[38]. Indeed, our chapter is imbued with various analogies which the author creates to depict possible pictures of community life that can be worrisome or otherwise. Of particular interest is his use of the subordinating conjunction ἐάν which is used to illustrate such hypothetical situations. This conjunction is found twelve times in 1 Corinthians 14 and in most of the cases it is used to describe a negative situation – we have no less than eight occurrences with this negative implication: vv. 6a.7.8.9.11.16.23.28. The fact that Paul harps so much on the negative is a clear indication that he is refuting a particular concept. His repeated use of the technique of *refutatio* goes to show that he is proceeding by way of negative arguments.

The following four occurrences of ἐάν carry a negative connotation due to an undesired situation that is mentioned. All four examples are taken from the auricular world:

---

[36] Orr and Walther do not break up v. 5. Cf. W.F. Orr, J.A. Walther, *I Corinthians*, Garden City 1976, p. 298.

[37] With regard to the whole validation section, Mitchell speaks of a succession of appeals that are given in order to justify an advice proposed. This scheme, however, is not characterized by rigidity, but rather by flexibility. Thus 1 Corinthians, being a deliberative argument, contains various sub-arguments which "are called rhetorical κεφάλαια or "heads"" which are organized logically and topically; M.M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, p. 203. These, therefore, pertain to the same logic of the main flow of the argument but may treat different themes. It may be worth noting that the term Περὶ δέ is never used within the body of the proof but only to introduce a new theme: 7,1.25; 8,1; 12,1; 16,1.12.

[38] Cf. A.C. Thiselton, *The First Epistle*, p. 1101.

> v. 7     ἐὰν διαστολὴν τοῖς φθόγγοις μὴ δῷ
> v. 8     ἐὰν ἄδηλον σάλπιγξ φωνὴν δῷ
> v. 9     ἐὰν μὴ εὔσημον λόγον δῶτε
> v. 11    ἐὰν οὖν μὴ εἰδῶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς φωνῆς

We also have phrases held by ἐάν but which have neutral value, only to be refuted to some degree or other at a later stage.

> v. 6     ἐὰν ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς γλώσσαις λαλῶν, τί ὑμᾶς ὠφελήσω
> v. 14    ἐὰν [γὰρ] προσεύχωμαι γλώσσῃ, ὁ δὲ νοῦς μου ἄκαρπός ἐστιν
> v. 16    ἐὰν εὐλογῇς [ἐν] πνεύματι, τί λέγεις οὐκ οἶδεν·
> v. 23    Ἐὰν οὖν συνέλθῃ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ πάντες λαλῶσιν γλώσσαις, οὐκ ἐροῦσιν ὅτι μαίνεσθε;

The lexical item ἐάν is used with positive function in v. 6b and v. 24, and is out of the ambit of possible situations and examples in v. 28 and v. 30 where it is utilized to present imperatives in the context of a paranesis[39].

This having been stated, one can see how vv. 6-11 hold within them the triple use of examples in order to prove the point Paul is making. These *rationes*, as we have pointed out, are taken from the ambit of true-life realities. Thus we have the following schema:

> v. 6     rhetorical question (also used in vv. 7.8.9)[40]
> v. 7     <u>example</u> of the flute or harp in the context of music[41]
> v. 8     <u>example</u> of trumpet in the context of war

---

[39] M.M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, p. 23 points out that Stowers differentiates between *symbouleutikai* (letters of advice) and paranesis.

[40] A rhetorical question is a device whereby the answer to the question is common knowledge to both parties. The question is thus purposefully provocative. The use of rhetorical questions in 1 Corinthians 14 is a recurring phenomenon: vv. 6.7.8.16.23.36[x2]. Note that v. 15a and v. 26a are not rhetorical questions.

[41] C.B. Puskas Jr., *The Letters of Paul*, p. 13, states the following: "Figures of comparison include simile, where the comparison is expressed, and metaphor, where it is implied." Thus the mention of the flute and the harp (v. 7) and the trumpet (v. 8) must be metaphors. Paul is known for his prolific use of metaphors which he takes from several spheres of life. The number of metaphors in 1 Corinthians is indeed not found wanting. Williams presents the impressive array with an explanation of each. Cf. D.J. Williams, *Paul's Metaphors. Their Context and Character*, Peabody 1999,

v. 9       *application* to the Corinthians: οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς followed by
a **negative** implication – a *refutatio*.


vv. 10-11  example of languages of the world
v. 12      *application* to the Corinthians: οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς followed by
a **positive** implication – a *confirmatio*.


In spite of the obvious clarity of the examples Paul unfolds before his hearers, he will not proceed if he has not given a practical application of these realities to one's behaviour in the community. He thus employs the powerful phrase οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς at the end of each of these sections, that is at the beginning of v. 9 and v. 12, thereby showing that the Corinthians' state of affairs was no different. Evidently, vv. 12-13 form the practical conclusion of the first set of justifications of the chapter. Note that he does not conclude that one must avoid tongues, but rather that one should ask for the gift of interpretation – this will again be the conclusion in v. 39. In other words, he will again insist on the same attitude.

Vv. 13-19 deal with tongues and indeed do not fail to emphasise its positive aspect – Paul presents its role in praising and thanking God. One must note how Paul refers to tongues as prayer ἐὰν γὰρ προσεύχωμαι γλώσσῃ (1 Cor. 14:14 BGT) (v. 14)[42]. Too often, scholars are far too content with dismissing the importance of this gift. Yet, with reference to v. 13, Fee states:

---

pp. 278 n. 33; 30 n. 88; 29 n. 76; 218; 49 n. 76; 76 n. 88,89; 229 n. 33; 226-7 n. 12 respectively. Here we present the more salient ones:

| Metaphor | Reference | Meaning |
| --- | --- | --- |
| διώκω | v. 1 | To put to flight; to pursue (to follow) – commonly used in races. |
| οἰκοδομή | vv. 3.5.12.26 | A building. |
| οἰκοδομέω | vv. 4.17 | To build. |
| ἄδηλον σάλπιγξ φωνήν | v. 8 | The trumpet that makes an uncertain sound – in the context of war. |
| | v. 14 | Fruitless, barren. |
| ἄκαρπος | v. 20 | A young child – diminutive of παῖς |
| παιδίον | v. 20 | To be a babe – only occurrence in the NT. |
| νηπιάζω | v. 32.34 | To place or rank under (from military field); |
| ὑποτάσσω | | to subject, to subject oneself. |
| κατὰ τάξιν | v. 40 | An arranging – in a military context. |

[42] Cf. G.D. Fee, *Listening to the Spirit in the Text*, Grand Rapids 2001, p. 44.

As before, the Corinthians' practice of uninterpreted tongues is what is being challenged, not tongues as such. This is further confirmed by vv. 27-28, which again disallow uninterpreted tongues, but otherwise *regulate* the expression of the gift *when there is interpretation*[43].

A kind of *narratio* seems to resonate in vv. 23-25, which form part of vv. 20-25, not that Paul is necessarily describing a past event, but that he is rather vividly constructing a most likely scenario with which the Corinthians can identify their community experience with respect to outsiders attending their meetings. This follows the previous section (vv. 13-19) in which Paul stressed the importance of attention that must be given to the community members[44]. Here, I do not concur with the way Masalles divides the chapter into the typical Pauline three-part structure which does not apply in this section[45].

A    vv. 6-19    "inutilidad de las lenguas si no son interpretarlas"
            "utiliza **varias analogías para dimostrarlo**"
            "la necesidad de la presencia de la <u>inteligibilidad</u>"
B    vv. 20-25    "la finalidad del hablar en lenguas y en modo profético"
            "utiliza una cita del **AT para demostrarlo**"
A'   vv. 26-36    "un salto repentino hacia un nivel más bien prático"
            "la necesidad de un <u>orden</u> en el uso de las manifestaciones…"

From the point of view of lexicography, what is in Masalles' favour is the use of ἀδελφοί at crucial points in the text, namely in vv. 6.20.26.39. Each time, this vocative noun is used to mark a new aspect of the argument. This, though, might not apply so strongly to v. 39 where ἀδελφοί is present in the middle of the concluding four verses, though it does, to be fair, bear the force of a final concluding statement. Nonetheless, claiming that vv. 6-36 have an ABA' structure means that the two extremities of the text are significantly similar, whilst the central part has a quality that easily, and audibly, distinguishes

---

[43] Idem, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 669.

[44] The phrase ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ἰδιώτου (v. 16) must not be taken to refer to non-Christians, but rather to those who do not understand tongues, which therefore refers to all the community members. This point is being made to avoid the conclusion that vv. 13-19 may not be referring only to the believers.

[45] Cf. V. Masalles, *La Profecia*, p. 155. Bold, italics and underlining added.

it from the rest. Such a position would not only over-emphasize the importance of the oral model over the conceptual one, but it would also drastically disrupt the latter. Though it is clear that vv. 20-25 (which Masalles calls B) give *rationes* based on the authority of Scripture, it is more plausible to state that they are but a continuation of the chain of justifications which seek to validate the exhortations laid down in v. 1 and v. 5. It would thus seem more useful to claim that vv. 6-19 are A1 and vv. 20-25 are A2, these representing the two main blocks of the validation. In the last analysis, 1 Corinthians 14 is a clear case of an exhortative sequence – as opposed to a speech sequence characterized by argumentation that seeks to prove a thesis – in which Paul supplies his hearers with a number of well-founded justifications that support the imperatives he lays down.

The model proposed here is the following:
- Preparation of themes
  - v. 1      First *imperatives*
  - vv. 2-4   Preliminary and amphibological *justifications*.
  - v. 5      *Main exhortative statement* which also functions as the *peroratio* of vv. 1-5
- *Elaborate justifications*
  - v. 6      A rhetorical question that serves as an initial unfolding of v. 5

|  |  |
|---|---|
| vv. 7-19 | A case for intelligibility based on *analogies* and *real-life examples* |

           Two sets of *examples*: vv. 7-9 and vv. 10-12 each ending with an application to the believers (οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς)[46]
- v. 13   A conclusion (introduced by διό) which sparks off the next verses

---

[46] For this reason, the fact that vv. 20-25 are, in Fee's words, an "application for the sake of unbelievers" shows how the reason behind Paul's arguing will not be limited to private community affairs. The οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς statements of v. 9 and v. 12 will be the foundation for an outward attitude that will go beyond the bounds of the community. Schrage probably bases himself only on the thematic aspect when breaking up the text into vv. 6-11 and vv. 12-19, since Paul clearly shifts from the ambit of metaphor to discourse on the gift of tongues as such. Cf. W. Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, Neukirchen-Vluyn 2001, pp. 375f. I consider Fee's attention to the more intricate linguistic details to be safer to stand by in dividing this text.

| vv. 14-19 | Further clarifications on tongues and prophecy with v. 19 serving as a *sub-peroratio* in relation both to v. 6 and to v. 13 |
|---|---|
| vv. 20-25 | A case for intelligibility based on *Scripture*[47] |
| v. 26 | *Second main exhortative statement* [48] |
| vv. 27-28 | Paranesis concerning tongues |
| vv. 29-33a | Paranesis concerning prophecy |
| vv. 33b-36 | a *digressio* |
| vv. 37-40 | Concluding statements with vv. 39-40 being a very concise *peroratio*. |

As shown above, v. 19 serves as a *sub-peroratio* in relation to both v. 6 and v. 13. Paul knits his argument together as a genuine piece of art. He gradually proceeds to affirm and reaffirm an earlier statement, each time giving more vivid examples and practical applications that serve to drive his point home. Unfolding the relation between these three verses is but one way of showing how tactfully Paul goes about in his argument of persuasion. They are found at the beginning or the end of a section and belong to the same literary unit. These verses are a specimen of how Paul keeps harping on the same problem but also of how, at the same time, he approaches his argument from different angles. They all present tongues in an antithetical relation to that which is truly upbuilding (see the underlined nouns and verbs), which in turn is epitomized in the last of these words, namely κατηχήσω (this being the main reason why the other gifts are being set over tongues). Interestingly, our apostle presents his own example in v. 6 and v. 19, these sandwiching v. 13 which speaks

---

[47] For an excellent article on how Paul's use of Isaiah throws light on the Corinthian situation in order to substantiate his point, see D.S. Robinson, *'By the Lips of Foreigners': Disclosing the Church in 1 Corinthians 14:20-25*, Ecclesiology 14 (2018), pp. 306–321.

[48] Here, we do not have a *propositio* that functions like any other in the *dispositio* of a conceptual model. Indeed, v. 26 lacks what is necessary to make it a *propositio* in the strict sense of the word, but this will be explained below. Another point worth making is that scholars do not agree on whether the argument in the text has a real break in v. 20 (such as Talbert and Conzelmann) or v. 26 (Gillespie and Fee). The latter is being opted for here. Cf. T.W. Gillespie, *The First Theologians. A Study in Early Christian Prophecy*, Grand Rapids 1994, p. 131.

of the typical believer in Corinth. Though such examples lack his characteristic μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε (1 Cor 4,16), or statements in similar vein (cf. 1 Cor 11,1; Phil 3,17; 1 Thess 1,6; 2 Thess 3,7; and καθὼς κἀγώ in 1 Cor 10,33), they nonetheless have a dragging force compelling one and all to act like the great apostle.

| 14,6 Νῦν δέ, ἀδελφοί, | ἐὰν ἔλθω πρὸς ὑμᾶς γλώσσαις λαλῶν, | ἐν ἀποκαλύψει ἢ ἐν γνώσει ἢ ἐν προφητείᾳ ἢ [ἐν] διδαχῇ; | 1st person singular – Paul's example |
|---|---|---|---|
| 14,13 διό | ὁ λαλῶν γλώσσῃ | προσευχέσθω ἵνα διερμηνεύῃ. | Reference to the believer |
| 14,19 ἀλλά | ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ θέλω πέντε λόγους τῷ νοΐ μου λαλῆσαι, ἵνα καὶ ἄλλους κατηχήσω, | ἢ μυρίους λόγους ἐν γλώσσῃ. | 1st person singular – Paul's example |

We now turn to an analysis of the difficult section comprised of vv. 21-25, which make up the part of the *probatio* based on Scripture[49]. Supported by the authority of Scripture, Paul focuses on a specific hypothetical situation the community could experience. This is introduced by the phrase Ἐὰν οὖν συνέλθῃ ἡ ἐκκλησία ὅλη (v. 23), where Ἐὰν οὖν therefore links them inextricably to v. 22[50]. One will have noticed that no *narratio* is present after the exhortative statement of v. 5, even though Paul was often inclined to use such a *narratio* to set up his argument against a concrete background and to ground it in the context of factual realities (cf. 5,1)[51]. Interestingly, it is here that Paul

---

[49] Paul refers to Scripture very often in this epistle. The term γέγραπται with reference to Scripture occurs 8 times: 1,19.31; 2,9; 3,19; 9,9; 10,7; 14,21; 15,45 and twice in 2 Corinthians (8,15; 9,9). P. Nagel, *1 Corinthians 14:21: Paul's Reflection on* ΓΛΩΣΣΑ, Journal of Early Christian History 3 (2013) 1, pp. 33–49, focusses on the centrality of 14,21 in the light of its interpretation within the context of Isa 28,11-13, showing how a correct interpretation of the latter is imperative in order to correctly interpret the former.

[50] In spite of the numerous amount of witnesses for the use of οὖν in this phrase, Güting and Mealand contend that it must be omitted due to stylistic reasons and the use of dittography in the witnesses; cf. E.W. Güting, D.L. Mealand, *Asyndeton in Paul*, p. 43. It would seem, in our opinion, that the use of the particle de, would have been more fitting, for οὖν would fit better at the end of an argument.

[51] Mitchell states that "narrative may not be required in a deliberative argument…"; M.M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, p. 198.

employs a kind of *narratio*, having skipped this earlier by heading directly into a terse description of tongues and prophecy. But to be more precise, the *narratio* can more truly be said to be given in v. 23 – this being an occurrence that probably could have happened – whereas vv. 24-25 only speak of a hypothetical situation[52]. Vv. 22-25 lend themselves to a misinterpretation due to the apparent contradiction which Paul comes up with. Indeed, his examples in v. 23 and vv. 24-25 seem to be the exact opposite of his claims in v. 22a and 22b respectively. For if tongues are a sign for unbelievers, how is it that v. 23 says that the latter will say that those using tongues are out of their mind? And if prophecy is for believers, why is it that Paul actually uses an example proving that it is unbelievers who will be convinced by the gift?[53]

It must be noted, at the outset, that the basis for the outsiders' thinking that the glossolalists are mad is not that tongues is banal – otherwise Paul would not have quoted God as saying he would use strange languages[54]. The answer to this problem must be tackled from two different angles. The first is

---

[52] One sees, therefore, how Paul does not simply work with past historical facts but with possible future situations. Only thus can he steer his audience to reach his goal in this deliberative argument.

[53] It is rather strange that there are so many different types of interpretation of the text. One must either admit that Paul made a mistake, or else he could have transposed the sense of v. 22. Alternatively, we must accept the fact that, unlike the Corinthians who could have understood him in a particular way, we are not equipped well-enough to grasp how they perceived this message on hearing it for the first time. Even though Paul uses various types of techniques (*ethos*, *pathos* etc.), yet his discourse always led to a logical and sound conclusion. So his listeners must have been able to understand every step of his argument, and his *probatio* in a very special way, without undertaking complicated exegetical exercises leading to such diverse conclusions as are evident today. I do not mean to imply that his texts always had just one meaning, but I am here emphasizing the importance Paul gave to orality. Though, on the level of orality, his discourse was most probably often more straightforward than some scholars make it out to be, exegesis often deals with the more elaborate processes of Paul's thought, both conscious and subconscious, thereby exploring the broader frame of mind of the author behind these priceless texts and the cogitation that led him to make such choices.

[54] M.D. Goulder, *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth*, p. 144, actually claims that it is wrong to assume that μαίνεσθε (14,23) should be translated "you are mad." According to the scholar, "[t]he μάντις was an honored figure whose inspired ravings brought communication from the gods." But despite his definition of a μάντις, it is difficult to see how this fits in with Paul's argument. The apostle must necessarily have had a different interpretation of the word, and a negative one at that!

an examination of the Scripture quoted and the second is an analysis of the lexicography of v. 22:

1. Paul chose his OT passage from Isaiah 28,11which states:
   כִּי בְּלַעֲגֵי שָׂפָה וּבְלָשׁוֹן אַחֶרֶת יְדַבֵּר אֶל־הָעָם הַזֶּה
   Here, it is God himself who is addressing his people (who are, presumably, believers) "with strange speech and another tongue". And the end result is their refusal to listen. This would seem to imply that tongues addressed to believers leaves them unchanged.
2. The next explanation may seem out of the ordinary, but it nonetheless holds water. The difficulty revolves around how to interpret the following terms in 14,22: τοῖς πιστεύουσιν and τοῖς ἀπίστοις. The two parts of the phrase are as follows:
   • v. 22a: Tongues is not a sign to those who believe but to unbelievers – that is, their final state is one of unbelief; this conclusion is based on v. 21 (καὶ οὐδ᾽ οὕτως εἰσακούσονταί μου) and confirmed by v. 23.
   • v. 22b: Prophecy is not for unbelievers but for those who believe. Here too, their belief signifies their final state. Evidence that they will end up accepting the faith is based on vv. 24-25.

From the above two statements it must be deduced that the plural dative article τοῖς has, in this aspect, an overarching meaning of finality, and is not merely an ethical dative. It therefore gives the idea of a sign "*unto*" belief" and "*unto*" unbelief". Therefore the use of the dative in these two cases must imply not the initial state of those addressed but rather their final state. In other words, τοῖς πιστεύουσιν is translated "to believers" but its meaning is "unto believers", that is, "unto a resulting state of believers". The same applies to τοῖς ἀπίστοις whereby it refers to those who will ultimately be unbelievers. The phrases must therefore be understood as resultative ones.

Taking the cue from the Judaic understanding of a "sign" (tAa), Fee argues that this most probably functions as an indication of God's approval or disapproval[55]. In this respect, prophecy's positive effect on unbelievers would be a positive sign for believers proving that they should prophesy since it leads to

---

[55] G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 682. In similar vein B. Witherington III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth*, p. 285, makes use of this Jewish concept whereby he sees this tAa as an indication for unbelievers that they are not in touch with God. But if he is correct, such a sign should actually *lead* to their conver-

conversion. But it seems that his application of this understanding of a "sign" to tongues does not hold water. If, as he states in referring to tongues, "it serves to drive the unbeliever away rather than to lead him or her to faith"[56], then it would be a sign to the believer that tongues without interpretation is not approved by God. But Paul, on the contrary, states that this sign is "not for believers" (v. 22a). Thus the meaning of tongues being a sign according to Fee's interpretation remains inexplicable.

With regards to v. 22, Hodge arrives at an unhappy conclusion by confusing the analogy which he makes between the Jews of the OT and Christians. He claims that Isa 28,11-12 shows how the use of other languages by a *foreign people* was a sign of God's disfavour, and thus the use of foreign languages by Christians in the assembly is a curse and not a blessing[57]. But the scholar inversed the analogy since it is the believers and not the unbelievers who are presented as the bearers of a curse, whereas in the OT this predicament was that of the foreign peoples.

Having analysed the various sections of the first 25 verses of the chapter, what now follows is a schema which seeks to underscore the relation between imperative statements and justifications (e.g. ABA' and EFE')[58] which has some similarities to, but should be clearly differentiated from, the *prothesis--pisteis-peroratio* arrangement in a conceptual *argumentatio*.

|   | v. 1 | First imperatives |
|---|------|-------------------|
|   | vv. 2-4 | Preliminary justifications |

| **A** | v. 5 | Main exhortative statement |
|-------|------|----------------------------|
| **B** | v. 6 | A personal example |
|       | vv. 7-8 | Examples from life – *Parabolic* **παραδείγματα** |
|       | v. 9 | Conclusion |
|       | v. 10-11 | Example from life – *Parabolic* **παράδειγμα** |

---

sion, not hinder it. Fee describes this "sign" in terms of the *effect* it has on unbelievers, interpreting their continued unbelief as the very sign they receive.

[56] G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 682.

[57] Cf. C. Hodge, *1 Corinthians*, Nottingham 1996, pp. 257f.

[58] To be noted here is the typical Pauline ABA' structure that recurs several times in this chapter.

| A' | v. 12 | Conclusion in the form of an imperative;<br>Linked to v. 5 regarding importance of the edification of the church |
|---|---|---|
|  | v. 13 | Linked to v. 5 regarding need of interpretation; sparks off vv. 14-17 |

| C | vv. 14-15 | *Moral* **παράδειγμα** – what *Paul* would do |
|---|---|---|
| D | vv. 16-17 | Justification using *believers* as an example; introduced by ἐπεί |

| C' | vv. 18-19 | *Moral* **παράδειγμα** – a *correctio* and conclusion<br>(in relation to vv. 14-15) regarding what *Paul* would do |
|---|---|---|
| E | v. 20 | Imperatives using γίνομαι and νηπιάζω |
| F | vv. 21-25 | Use of Scripture to substantiate his point |

| E' | v. 26 | An explanation introduced by οὖν followed by a major imperative using γίνομα;<br>This verse is, in several ways, a replica of v. 6 |
|---|---|---|
|  | vv. 27-38 | Exhortations concerning order for the sake of intelligibility and growth of community members, with a final warning that places the previous imperatives in the ambit of divine commands |

| | v. 39 | Final imperative regarding prophecy and tongues |
|---|---|---|
|  | v. 40 | Final imperative regarding order. |

One will have noticed that the exhortative sequence that followed the main statement of v. 5 all the way up to v. 25 was not of an affective nature that tries to appeal to the emotions, but rather of an objective nature that is purely based on sound, rational convictions based on real-life analogies and on Scripture. Gillespie succinctly describes these verses thus: "…an extended initial segment in which prophecy and tongues are identified terminologically, distinguished phenomenologically, and compared theologically"[59]. Paul carefully builds his discourse with positive and negative examples, at times switching

---

[59] T.W. GILLESPIE, *The First Theologians*, p. 131.

from 3rd person singular, to 1st person singular, to 2nd person plural to create an antithetical tension that clearly shows whose choices are to be considered morally preferable. This was useful in showing that the Corinthians must exercise the gifts with attention to the impact they would have on the congregation. In this respect, Banks would have us believe that the main idea Paul is seeking to drive home is not the importance of order (τάξις), but the necessity of having a relationship with the one who distributes such gifts[60]. Though this might be an implied exhortation in Paul's argument, the text imposes a different interpretation upon us. If we focus on vv. 26-40, which Fee calls "The Ordering of Gifts," we will notice the following divisions:

- vv. 27-31 contain no less than nine practical and specific instructions as to how tongues and prophecy should be used[61].
- vv. 33b-35 contain four orders concerning women's behaviour.
- vv. 37.39-40 contain practical orders concerning Paul's words, concerning tongues and prophecy, as well as the general flow of the gatherings.

Strangely, nowhere do we find reference to a sensitivity to the Spirit's movement being stressed. But v. 37 does have strong implications that one who claims to be a prophet or to be spiritual must know how to discern the Lord's will. And one can only know the Lord's will if one knows the Lord and the way he moves among human beings[62].

Scholars often divide vv. 26-40 along the same line of thought with only minor differences[63]. Paul gradually but consistently lays down rules that are applicable to all the churches of God, thereby affirming his authority in such

---

[60] Cf. R. Banks, *Paul's Idea of Community*, Peabody 1995, pp. 105 and 107. He quotes 1 Cor 12,2 as part of his evidence to support this claim.

[61] Fee calls vv. 26-33 correctional, as opposed to instructional. Cf. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 689.

[62] In spite of Paul's use of terms such as *pneumatikos* and *psychikos*, it is not implied that Paul had a dualistic understanding of the human person. J.A. Ziesler, *Pauline Christianity*, New York 1983, pp. 10–11, says that Paul, being in line with standard Jewish understanding, believed the human being to be a totality, and not divided into the physical and non-physical. It is in this light that one can better understand his concern about concrete, daily human actions that did not bespeak a form of unrealistic asceticism.

[63] For a detailed analysis of this section, see E. Hiu, *Regulations Concerning Tongues and Prophecy in 1 Corinthians 14.26-40: Relevance Beyond the Corinthian Church*, London 2010, pp. 105–158. In his monograph, Hiu generally minimizes the influence of other cultures on Corinth, hence reducing the specificity of Paul's words and judging them valid for other churches beyond Corinth.

matters as well as the universality of his dictates. Below are the three most significant references in this regard:

7,17      καὶ οὕτως <u>ἐν ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις πάσαις</u>
11,16    ἡμεῖς τοιαύτην συνήθειαν οὐκ ἔχομεν <u>οὐδὲ αἱ ἐκκλησίαι τοῦ θεοῦ</u>
14,33b  Ὡς <u>ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις</u> τῶν ἁγίων

Having stated the above, it becomes evident that 14,33b is actually related to what follows – that is, the necessity of a woman remaining silent in church – and not to the preceding statement about God's nature which logically cannot be circumscribed within the limits of the churches. For this reason, v. 33a must be the conclusion of an argument whilst v. 33b must be the introduction of another[64].

Yet we must turn now to vv. 26-33a. It has already been claimed that v. 26 functions as a the second main exhortative statement after that of v. 5[65]. Paul is zeroing in on the actual practical use of the gifts, and he does not fail to lay down detailed rules. Yet the difference between v. 26 and v. 5 is that the latter was followed by a set of justifications whereas v. 26 is not, which therefore shows that Paul must have felt, at this stage, that he had made his point clearly enough and now only needed to give some practical directives. V. 26 succinctly expresses what must be done by means of a compelling statement governed by an imperative: πάντα πρὸς οἰκοδομὴν γινέσθω (v. 26b). Its deliberative nature is anything but obscurely present. The justifications have already been provided in vv. 6-25 and all that is necessary at this stage is to provide the concrete consequences of those explanations that should be applied by the believers. We beg to differ from Fee's division of this text who claims that it has four main parts, namely v. 26, vv. 27-28, vv. 29-31 and vv. 32-33[66]. The

---

[64] This is in line with Barbaglio's scheme. Others, like Fee, choose to see v. 34 as a whole and as pertaining to vv. 34-35 or vv. 34-36. Another factor that interlocks v. 33b to v. 36 comes to light when one takes Conzelmann's description of v. 36 seriously: H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, Philadelphia 2008, p. 246 speaks of its "ecumenical" relevance. Clearly, the same can be inferred of Ὡς ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις (v. 33b), which goes to show that here an *inclusio* is being used.

[65] Güting and Mealand opine that vv. 26-30 show a characteristic quality of Paul's writing: "A question, syndetically introduced, is taken up by an asyndetic sentence, which is a preferred pattern with Paul." E.W. Güting, D.L. Mealand, *Asyndeton in Paul*, p. 43.

[66] Cf. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 689.

problem is with his last two sections, for v. 32 fits better with the paranesis concerning prophecy, since it more directly belongs to it from the point of view of content. One cannot claim that v. 32 is part of the conclusion to this whole section but rather to vv. 29-32. This is then followed by the conclusion found in v. 33 which must be seen, strictly speaking, as a final comment directly related to the preceding vv. 29-32[67], and only inferentially can it be said to apply to vv. 27-28. The use of θεός at the end of both these sections (in v. 28 and v. 33) would substantiate this position.

One should resist the temptation to pass over the problematic vv. 33b-35 in silence by merely claiming that they are not Paul's or are a nonsensical digression. Indeed, these verses would have been more fitting within the context of 11,2-16. Balch holds that vv. 33b-36 are a later interpolation of the text by a deutero-Pauline editor[68]. Barbaglio too, like several others, claims that they are a gloss[69]. But Mitchell does not hesitate in asserting that "the call to submission and silence is fully consonant and rhetorically consistent with

---

[67] This view is also corroborated by the use of an explanatory γάρ in v. 33 which connects this verse directly to the argument being brought to a close in v. 32.

[68] Cf. D.L. Balch, *Paul, Families, and Households*, in: J.P. Sampley (ed.), *Paul in the Greco-Roman World*, London 2016, pp. 277 and 290 n. 86. Conzelmann substantiates his view that vv. 33b-36 are an interpolation by stressing that v. 37 is a clear continuation of v. 33a, not of v. 36. Cf. H. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, p. 246. Also note that most of the witnesses include vv. 34-35 where they stand in the text: ℵ A B Ψ 0150 0243 6 33 81 104 256 263 365 424 436 arm eth geo slav Origen Chrysostom Theodoret etc – cf. comment in critical apparatus in K. Aland et al. (eds.), *The Greek New Testament*, 4th edition, Stuttgart 1993 and B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*², Stuttgart 2001, pp. 499–500. C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, London 1987, p. 314 n. 1 notes that vv. 34f are placed after v. 40 by D, G and the Old Latin manuscripts. Apart from textual criticism, note the negative approach to women who are too vociferous in Juvenal's sixth satire (6.434-56), as quoted in Balch, 283.

[69] Cf. G. Barbaglio, *La Prima Lettera ai Corinzi*, pp. 732, 764–768. Fee comments on the textual evidence of extant manuscripts that support the positioning of vv. 34-35 after v. 33 or otherwise (that is, after v. 40). The scholar, basing himself on Bengel's first principle ["That form of the text is more likely the original which best explains the emergence of all the others." G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, p. 699] as well as historical reasons such as the rise of a feminist movement around half a century after the epistle was written, opts for considering the verses a gloss that was placed both after v. 33 and v. 40. Fee also rests on arguments of intrinsic probability (that is, what the author could have written) and the poor thematic relation between these verses and the rest of the chapter.

the argument for inner-group concord, with its conservative tendencies"[70]. Nonetheless, her exposition lacks sufficient proof to substantiate her position. Though she opts for the hypothesis that Paul was actually differentiating between liturgical speech and mere chatter that was not related to the main discourse of the meetings, and brushes aside the partition theory which would hold that 11,2-16 and 14,33b-36 are from different letters, views in favour of

---

[70] M.M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, p. 282. Mitchell gives a concise presentation of various approaches to the text; cf. ibid., 281 n. 536. Wire's approach is one of textual criticism, demonstrating how varied were the changes done to the Old Latin and bilingual manuscripts, therefore ascertaining that displacement of the verses cannot be outrightly excluded; cf. A.C. Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, Minneapolis 2003, p. 149–152. Also see p. 281 n. 537 and n. 538. But Wire has been rightly criticized for alleging that Paul's main contention throughout the letter was with Corinthian women prophets who, in her opinion, were seeking to exercise a newfound freedom, something that did not go down well with Paul; cf. D.G. Horrell, E. Adams, *Scholarly Quest for Paul's Church at Corinth*, in: eidem (eds.), *Christianity at Corinth. The Quest for the Pauline Church*, Louisville 2004, pp. 35–37. B. Witherington III, *Conflict & Community in Corinth*, pp. 287–288, does not even show any modicum of doubt in supporting Mitchell's and Wire's views. Also see M.Y. MacDonald, *The Pauline Churches*, Louisville 2004, p. 244 n. 35. Keener, arguing for the authenticity of vv. 34-35, gives an elaborate reconstruction of various possibilities why Paul wrote these verses. Basing himself on the fact that women were less educated than men, he concludes that "Paul's words merely *limit* speech in public settings; Paul is opposing only the irrelevant questions some women have been asking during the teaching part of the church service." C.S. Keener, *Paul, Women & Wives. Marriage and Women's Ministry in the Letters of Paul*, Grand Rapids 2013, p. 85. Also see pp. 74–88 for the whole discussion. Bristow interestingly bases his position on a linguistic analysis of the meaning of Greek words that refer to speech. Cf. J.T. Bristow, *What Paul Really Said About Women*, 1991, p. 60–64. He claims that only λαλέω can be used to refer to speech in the sense of mere "talking." And this is the word Paul uses in vv. 34-35: οὐ γὰρ ἐπιτρέπεται αὐταῖς λαλεῖν (v. 34); αἰσχρὸν γάρ ἐστιν γυναικὶ λαλεῖν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ| (v. 35). Thus Bristow claims that due to the different social opportunities men and women had, it was likely that women would engage in an empty form of λαλεῖν, therefore causing havoc in the assembly. It is *this* form of speech that Paul prohibits, and not prophecy or the like. We therefore see how Bristow's position, which seems to hold water, is further strengthened by Baumert's stance which is based not on linguistics, but on a clearer understanding of the different social roles of men and women in 1ˢᵗ century Corinth. On the other hand, W. Wuellner, *Paul as Pastor*, pp. 73-75, is surely wrong in his exposition since he overemphasizes the idea that Paul would have been referring to yet unbelieving wives, which cannot be proven from the text.

the authenticity of the verses must be taken into consideration. Foremost among these is Goulder's interpretation who notes that vv. 34-35 are present in every extant manuscript. But his main point of contention is that in 11,2-16 Paul's principal argument is that women should have their head (not simply their hair) covered. This, according to Schrage, would make it impossible for them to pray aloud or prophesy, so Paul is actually ordering women to be silent *both* in 11,5 and in 14,34[71]. But the scholar who claims that Paul was politically incorrect, and who calls him an "uncomfortable expert", undoubtedly invites his readers to solve their difficulties on 14,34-35 by resorting to a rather awkward explanation of 11,2-16. We still need to understand how covering the head with a presumably light veil is such an impediment to speech!

One must also be cautioned to question Schüssler Fiorenza's and Wire's interpretation of this text since it is evident that it is highly biased due to their feminist stance (even though this comment is not meant as a criticism of feminism as such). Fiorenza opines that one should move from *historical reconstruction* in which the letter is considered as a reliable source of information about the believers of Corinth, to a *rhetorical criticism* which holds that what is stated in Paul's letters cannot be used as it stands to recreate the Corinthian situation[72].

In light of the above, Baumert's position is noteworthy, and it is one based on the cultural context of Corinth. Unlike Mitchell, who tries to see the verses in light of the whole letter, and unlike Goulder who forces 11,2-16 to imply the complete silence of women in church, Baumert gives the background to the Corinthian situation and thus shows how various aspects of the Christian gathering were being superimposed[73]. In other words, meetings of debate and meetings of worship, among others, seem to have had become intertwined to some extent, and Paul was merely resisting women's participation in the

---

[71] Cf. M.D. Goulder, *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth*, pp. 134f.

[72] Schüssler Fiorenza seeks to achieve this by making use of distinctions between the actual author/reader and the implied author/reader. Wrong assumptions are made about the Corinthians, in her opinion, when one "follows the directives of the implied author, who is not identical with the 'real' Paul." E. Schüssler Fiorenza, *Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians*, p. 148.

[73] C.S. Keener, *1–2 Corinthians*, Cambridge 2005, pp. 118f, too correctly thinks along the same lines as Baumert in pointing out the emphasis Paul places on the idea of learning among those hearing prophecy, and in speaking about social behaviour in lecture settings.

former, basing himself on an inherited social model with which he was not particularly keen to part company[74]. Apart from the social reality to which Paul and his communities belonged, what further backs Baumert's position is the use of different terms to denote the type of speech involved: προσευχομένη ἢ προφητεύουσα – in the context of worship meetings (11,5), and λαλεῖν in the context of debates (14,34). This is further enforced by the imperative ὑποτασσέσθωσαν which, again, makes sense in the context of a debate, not of prayer. Yet, Baumert's theory may be unnecessary as a careful linguistic analysis of the text could show that Paul was not, after all, militating in favour of silence on the part of women. In this regard, MacGregor makes a strong case for a technique that seems to have been employed by Paul in these verses, namely his citation of a commonly held view followed by his rejection of it. Hence, it turns out that the belief that women should remain silent as expressed in vv. 33b-35 is then refuted in v. 36 where μόνους should be understood as referring only to men and not to women[75].

In v. 39 the coordinating conjunction is καί, which therefore lacks Paul's characteristic twist evidenced in his use of ἀλλά. The use of the latter would certainly have raised tongues to a more important level in relation to prophecy. It is in v. 40 that his use of δέ shows his eagerness to qualify his statement, yet it is noteworthy that what is qualified is not only tongues. Paul refers to all things (πάντα δέ) in his very final verse, thereby implying that excess or exaggeration is never permitted, be it tongues or prophecy. Yet, it is interesting that Paul's initial use of ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά, has now been changed into ζηλοῦτε τὸ προφητεύειν. What is particularly remarkable is that he achieved this change in perspective without really being polemical, even though through his argument transpires his distinctive way of driving a point home with relentless conviction.

One notes how Paul inverts his statement in v. 39 thereby bringing the issue to a close and forming an *inclusio* with v. 1. Yet the importance of v. 12 cannot be overlooked, for to some degree it holds these two far ends together both lexicographically and in terms of content.

---

[74] Cf. N. Baumert, *Frau und Mann bei Paulus. Überwindung eines Misverständnisses*, Würzburg 1982, pp. 178–181.

[75] Cf. K.R. MacGregor, *1 Corinthians 14:33b–38 as a Pauline Quotation-Refutation Device*, Priscilla Paper 32 (2018) 1, pp. 23–28, esp. 25.

| 14,1b | 14,1c |
|---|---|
| *Imperative* | *Qualification* |
| ζηλοῦτε δὲ τὰ πνευματικά | μᾶλλον δὲ ἵνα προφητεύητε |

| 14,12 |
|---|
| οὕτως καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἐπεὶ ζηλωταί ἐστε πνευμάτων, πρὸς τὴν οἰκοδομὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ζητεῖτε ἵνα περισσεύητε. |

| 14,39 | 14,39 | 14,40 |
|---|---|---|
| *Imperative* | *clarification* | *qualification* |
| ζηλοῦτε τὸ προφητεύειν | τὸ λαλεῖν μὴ κωλύετε γλώσσαις | πάντα δὲ εὐσχημόνως καὶ κατὰ τάξιν γινέσθω |

vv. 39-40 are a very concise *peroratio* where v. 39 sums up his argument in vv. 1-25 whilst v. 40 reflects his thoughts in vv. 26-36[76]. A word about the brevity of v. 40 is in order. In their work on the use of *asyndeton*, Güting and Mealand imply that one should not too hastily attribute short sentences to Paul whilst analysing longer texts more scrupulously: "The reader at first sight is inclined to consider the short energetical sentences as genuinely Pauline. But upon study he or she perceives that the victorious text form gains the field in two or three stages"[77]. In light of this statement as well as the compactness of the presentation of Paul's reasoning in chapter 14, one should not doubt the authenticity of any part of this text. On the contrary, what is being emphasized is that Paul could make use of different styles of writing due to his excellent literary skills.

# *Concluding Remarks*

With regards to 1 Corinthians 14, Wire attests that we see Paul "extending his argument from the common good by appeal to intelligibility, fruitfulness,

---

[76] Cf. G.D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, pp. 712f. G. Barbaglio, *La Prima Lettera ai Corinzi*, p. 52 points out that v. 39 is identical to other concluding phrases in that it starts with Ὥστε followed by an imperative (whilst in other instances there could also be a Ὥστε followed by a hortative subjunctive): 4,5; 5,8; 10,12; 11,33; 15,58.

[77] E.W. Güting, D.L. Mealand, *Asyndeton in Paul*, p. 25. Also see p. 31.

maturity, Scriptural authority, and community experience (14:1-26)"[78]. This is all held together by an impressive number of imperatives and significant hortatory advice that aid in modifying the Corinthians' aptitudes and choices. Thus, whereas chapter 12 consists in demonstrative discourse, that is a rhetorical genre of speech, chapter 14 ensures that the new categories of thought would be applied concretely by means of exhortation. Paul's shift from the theoretical to the practical ambit is unmistakably evident, as well as essential.

What is noteworthy is how, in 1 Corinthians 14, Paul uses a convincing procedure in his argumentation in order to favour intelligible over unintelligible speech, doing this in a letter which contains numerous instances where Paul gives secondary importance to speech and eloquence[79]. One must note that nowhere does Paul show the importance of prophecy to be related to its eloquence, thus for him, beauty of speech was never posited as the reason why one gift should be preferred to the other. In spite of his insistence on its being more intelligible than tongues (14,6-19), it is for prophecy's utility in edifying that he upholds it as the gift to be favoured and not for any stylistic, rhetorical, or sophistic qualities it may carry with it.

We thus see how the instances in which Paul downplays speech (1,17; 2,1.4.13; 4,19-20) pose no threat to chapter 14, nor do they create any antagonism in relation to it. Paul is clearly working with different understandings of speech and gradually moves on to affirm that noble discourse is characterized both by the truth of the Gospel as well as its immediate usefulness to its hearers. The apostle who would nearly have us believe that, somewhat like Moses, he had problems with speech, is indeed a great rhetorician who is willing to sacrifice the impression people have of his genius in the field of eloquent discourse in order to emphasize the superior quality of the source and content of his message – ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος (2,13). But Paul's method is not one in which he will downplay the relevance of any human effort rightly used. In this respect, Betz speaks of eloquence, knowledge and practice as three important

---

[78] A.C. Wire, *The Corinthian Women Prophets*, p. 140.

[79] See 1,17; 2,1.4.13; 4,19-20. In their article *Maenadism in the Corinthian Congregation*, Seminar Papers 114 (1978), p. 332, R. & C. Kroeger point out that λαλεῖν is "a word which emphasizes the sound rather than the sense of what is spoken." One notes Paul's use of some form or other of this word in chapter 14, the occurrences of which are indeed numerous: 16 specific references to tongues (vv. 2 [x3].4.5 [x2].6.9 [x2].11 [x2].13.18.23.27.39); 2 implied references to tongues (vv. 21.28); 3 specific references to prophecy (vv. 3.6.29); 1 reference to intelligible words (v. 19); and 2 references to women speaking in the congregation (vv. 34-35).

factors related to one's speech[80]. Paul will not do away with any of them, but he rather seeks to make sure that they are all present in and through his and the Corinthians' speech.

This article is dedicated to Rev. Professor Chrostowski whose whole life project has been at the service of the Church which he has always been seeking to edify in ways that go beyond the circumscribed gifts of prophecy and tongues as exercised within the context of worship. The fact that most of his works have been penned in Polish, a language I sadly do not know, may cause his voluminous works to sound like tongues to foreigners like myself. However, the small portion of his intellectual prowess that I have managed to grasp so far exudes a prophetic character which is challenging, compelling, and convincing in ways that surpass the intelligibility of language itself.

*Rev. Stefan M. Attard*

---

[80] A synthesis of the three is what Paul wants to achieve. "Only such a synthesis can be rightly called "wisdom" and even "wisdom of God" (σοφία τοῦ θεοῦ). Paul, therefore, does not attempt to talk the Corinthians out of eloquence and knowledge. On the contrary, his goal is to enable them to verify that claim by the practical life of the church." H.D. BETZ, *The Problem of Rhetoric and Theology According to the Apostle Paul*, in: A. VANHOYE (ed.), *L'Apôtre Paul*, p. 39.