

The copyright of this thesis rests with the University of Cape Town. No quotation from it or information derived from it is to be published without full acknowledgement of the source. The thesis is to be used for private study or non-commercial research purposes only.

Thesis Title

Paul's Rhetorical Use of Complex Metaphors
in 1 Corinthians 3-4

By

Suraj Kumar Komaravalli

Thesis Presented for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

In the Department of Religious Studies

UNIVERSITY OF CAPE TOWN

November 2007

DECLARATION

This work has not been previously submitted in whole, or in part, for the award of any degree. I declare that it is my own work. Each significant contribution to, and quotation in this thesis from the work, or works of other people has been attributed and has been cited and referenced.

Name: Suraj Kumar Komaravalli

Signature:

Date: 15 November 2007

University of Cape Town

To my mother, Sarala Komaravalli

and

In memory of my father, Rev. Dr. David Komaravalli

University of Cape Town

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	8
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	11
ABBREVIATIONS	12
INTRODUCTION	13
Chapter 1	
1. METAPHOR THEORY AND METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS	18
1.1. Introduction	18
1.2. Metaphor in Classical Thought and Literature	19
1.2.1. Aristotle	20
1.2.2. Cicero	23
1.2.3. Quintilian	24
1.3. Metaphor in Contemporary Thought	26
1.4. Socio-rhetorical criticism	30
1.5. Socio-rhetorical criticism and blending theory	31
1.6. Blending theory applied to interpret Paul’s metaphors	38
1.7. Conclusion	41
Chapter 2	
2. SOCIAL ELITE AND POWER: FACTIONALISM IN THE CORINTHIAN CHURCH (1 COR 1:10 – 4:21).	42
2.1. Introduction	42
2.2. Corinth	42
2.3. Corinth’s social and administrative structures	43
2.4. Oratory and Honour	44
2.5. Patronage	45
2.6. Corinthian Christians’ Social and Administrative Structures	46
2.7. Factionalism within the Church at Corinth (1 Cor. 1:10-4:21)	47
2.8. Explanations for the factionalism within the Corinthian church	48
2.8.1. – Political	52

2.9. Rhetorical genre and 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21	54
2.10. Rhetorical construction of 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21	56
2.10.1. The rhetorical sub-unit of 1:10-17	57
2.10.2. The rhetorical sub-unit of 1:18-31	60
2.10.3. The rhetorical sub-unit of 2:1-5	63
2.10.4. The rhetorical sub-unit of 2:6-16	65
2.10.5. The rhetorical sub-unit of 3:1-4	66
2.10.6. The rhetorical sub-unit of 3:5-17	68
2.10.7. The rhetorical sub-unit of 3:18-23	69
2.10.8. The rhetorical sub-unit of 4:1-5	69
2.10.9. The rhetorical sub-unit of 4:6-13	70
2.10.10. The rhetorical sub-unit of 4:14-21	71
2.11. Conclusion	72

Chapter 3

3. REASSERTING AUTHORITY: MOTHER-INFANTS COMPLEX METAPHOR IN 1 COR. 3:1-4	74
3.1. Introduction	74
3.2. Mother-infants relationship within the household in antiquity	76
3.2.1. Nursing	77
3.2.2. Dependence	80
3.3. Interpretation of the mother-infants metaphor (3:1-2)	82
3.4. Conclusion	92

Chapter 4

4. UNIFICATION: COMPLEX AGRICULTURAL METAPHORS (1 COR 3:5-9b)	93
4.1. Introduction	93
4.2. Master-Servants relationship in Antiquity	94
4.2.1. Subordination	95
4.2.1.1. Low social status	95
4.3. Agriculture: a household profession	96
4.4. Farmer/Planter-land relationship in an agricultural context in antiquity	98

4.4.1. Lower social status	99
4.4.2. Skilled	99
4.4.2.1. Tilling	100
4.4.2.2. Planting	101
4.5. One who waters-land relationship in an agricultural context in antiquity	104
4.6. Interpretation of complex agriculture metaphor in a household system (3:5-9b).	106
4.7. Conclusion	115

Chapter 5

5. HOLINESS AND DIVINE JUDGEMENT: COMPLEX MASTER-BUILDER AND TEMPLE METAPHORS IN 1 COR. 3:9c-17	117
5.1. Introduction	117
5.2. The master-builder and construction workers' relationship in antiquity	120
5.2.1. Wisdom	120
5.2.2. Hierarchy	121
5.2.3. Authority	122
5.2.4. Importance	124
5.2.5. Sincerity and responsibility	124
5.3. Temple-Community relationship in antiquity	128
5.3.1. Dedication and deities dwelling place	129
5.3.2. Holiness	130
5.3.3. Identity	132
5.4. Interpretation of the complex building and temple metaphors	134
5.5. Conclusion	148

Chapter 6

6. SERVANTS AND STEWARDS: METAPHORS ON APOSTOLIC SERVICE AND TRUSTWORTHINESS IN 1 COR. 4:1-13	151
6.1. Introduction	151
6.2. Master and servants relationship in antiquity	152
6.2.1. Subordination	153

6.2.2. Social Status	154
6.2.3. Assistance	155
6.2.4. Sincerity, Dedication and Gratitude	156
6.3. Master-Stewards Relationship in antiquity	158
6.3.1. Social Status	158
6.3.2. Trustworthiness	159
6.4. Interpretation of servant and steward submetaphors (4:1-13)	160
6.5. Conclusion	170
Chapter 7	
7. THE HOUSEHOLD METAPHOR: AN IDEOLOGICAL TOOL (1 COR. 4:14-21)	171
7.1. Introduction	171
7.2. The household in antiquity	173
7.3. Father-Child relationship in a Household in antiquity	174
7.3.1. Hierarchy	174
7.3.2. Authority	176
7.3.3. Obedience	178
7.3.4. Affection	180
7.3.5. Education	181
7.3.6. Imitation	182
7.4. Father-Guardian Relationship in a Household in antiquity	184
7.5. Interpretation of the father-children submetaphor (4:14-21)	186
7.6. Conclusion	198
CONCLUSIONS	200
BIBLIOGRAPHY	205

THESIS ABSTRACT

Title: Paul's Rhetorical Use of Complex Metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4.

Author's name: Suraj Kumar Komaravalli

Date: 15 November 2007

After Paul had established the Corinthian church, in his absence he expected that the Corinthian congregation would enrich themselves spiritually. However, he received information that dissension and factions had erupted in the church (1:11). These factions questioned and opposed Paul's authority in the Corinthian church as the socially prominent Corinthian Christians followed and supported various other leaders whom they attributed with a greater degree of sophistic wisdom than Paul. Paul is thus faced with the challenge to address the problems of authority and factionalism in the Corinthian church. Paul addresses these issues succinctly by the use of complex metaphors.

The purpose of this thesis consists of examining and discussing the manner in which Paul addresses the problems of authority and factionalism in 1 Corinthians 3-4 by the use of complex metaphors.

Three major points of the thesis reflect the method of study:

1. The use of blending theory to interpret Paul's use of complex household and building metaphors as seen through the following submetaphors:
 - i. Mother-infants relationship in antiquity (1 Cor. 3:1-4).
 - ii. Master-servants; Planter-field; and one who waters-field relationships in antiquity (1 Cor. 3:5-9b).
 - iii. Master builder-builders; temple-community relationship in antiquity (1 Cor. 3:9c-17).
 - iv. Master-servants and stewards relationship in antiquity (1 Cor. 4:1-13).
 - v. Father-children relationship in antiquity (1 Cor. 4:14-21).
2. The use of socio-rhetorical criticism to understand the social and cultural textures of the submetaphors so as to identify the features of the source domains and to

apply the blending theory to blend features of source domains onto target domains for interpretation of complex metaphors.

3. The use of Thompson's modes of operation of ideology to see how Paul ideologically re-establishes and sustains his dominance in the Corinthian church.

The study shows the following findings:

1. The cause of factionalism and questioning Paul's authority was due to the Corinthian elite finding Paul as unsophisticated in rhetoric which was the cream of affluence in antiquity. In addition, the Corinthian elite boasted of their respective leaders and this generated a power struggle just like in civic culture leading to factionalism in the Corinthian church.
2. Through the submetaphor mother-infants relationship in antiquity (3:1-4), Paul dissimulates to a nursing mother and accepts a shameful status of being identified as a woman when being a man in eyes of Corinthian Christians. This very shameful role ideologically gives him authority just as motherly authority over her children, to shame the Corinthian Christians as immature in faith. Paul through this shame again ideologically fragments the Corinthian elite from following other sophistic leaders. Finally, through mode of unification as a common parent he instructs them to rely on his teachings since they are still immature in faith.
3. Through the submetaphor, master-servants, Paul ideologically re-establishes his authority and dominance from being 'nothing' in the Corinthian church to being on the same level of Apollos. Then through the planter-field and one who waters-field submetaphors Paul claims that he is the first to establish the Corinthian church and that Apollos has a subordinate functional role to him to continue his work. Once more, ideologically Paul fragments the Corinthian elite from leaders like Apollos, again claiming through mode of unification that Apollos is merely doing an extension of his work and that both are co-workers who work for Lord.
4. Through the submetaphor, master builder (3:9c-15), Paul ideologically claims authority over the Corinthian church by underscoring that with God's commission he had established the Corinthian church and all Corinthian Christians are building their spiritual lives on his teaching. He warns that if they threaten to undermine his work they would face judgement by God. Thus,

ideologically Paul calls for unity through the use of the temple submetaphor in 3:16-17, where he metaphorically identifies Corinthian Christians as a community which is the temple of God that they are building together, where this temple has the indwelling spirit of God. Since God's temple is holy the Corinthian Christian community is also holy and thus any who defile this holiness would be harmed by God. A practical example is seen in 1 Cor. 5, where a socially prominent person has committed incest, which has Paul making a point of rooting him out of the church as the transgressor is deemed to be defiling the church.

5. Through the master-servants and stewards submetaphor (4:1-13) Paul claims his authority by stressing that both he and Apollos work as servants of Christ. Ideologically Paul subordinates the Corinthian elite by intending that neither he nor Apollos do not work for them nor are they clients of the elite. Paul, again, ideologically through dissimulating his strongly contested relationship with the Corinthian elite, claims that he is an authoritative and powerful manager of the Corinthian church because he serves a superior master, Christ, on which basis the Corinthian elite have no right to judge him and should refrain from boasting of their respective leaders otherwise the Lord will judge them.
6. Finally, through the father-children submetaphor (4:14-21) Paul ideologically dissimulates his challenge relationship with Corinthian elite with an authoritative and powerful father-like figure over the Corinthian Christians. The Corinthian Christians, thus, have no other option but to imitate his ways in Christ and not those of other leaders who are only subordinate to his ministry in Corinth. He addresses factionalism by cautioning them to acknowledge his authority over them by returning to his proclaimed gospel of Jesus Christ, or else ideologically through the mode of fragmentation he would have to discipline them like a strict father does to his children. However, Paul as father finally elicits a symbol of unity when he calls the Corinthian Christians his children, it thereby implying that they all belong to one household, the Corinthian church, in which Paul functions as their only leader and apostle.

Thus, through the complex household and temple metaphors in 1 Corinthian 3-4, Paul ideologically re-establishes his authority and sustains his dominance in the Corinthian church.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I feel more attached to God when I print these words in Telugu (one of the Indian languages), my mother tongue, “Ni krupa naaku chaalunu,” meaning “Your grace is sufficient for me.” Indeed God’s grace has been manifested in so many ways that I know I could not have been able to complete my thesis without his grace. At the threshold of God, I thank him for being merciful to me and for being the source of my strength.

I specially thank and express my gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Charles A. Wanamaker, for being a wonderful source of encouragement, always ready for insightful criticism and wisdom on my journey of being squeezed to the best of my ability to produce this thesis. His supervision is much appreciated, as he always encouraged me to be a responsible New Testament scholar. I am also grateful to Professor David Wardle for resources to classical works.

I am truly grateful to the Canadian Baptist Ministries (CBM), Canada, for granting me a scholarship and especially then Asia Representative of CBM, Rev. Dr. Frank and Mrs. Jane Byrne for their love and concern. Thanks also to Mr. David Sarma, CBM, India, for recommending me for a scholarship to the CBM, Canada. I also thank Charles and Heleen Wanamaker; my younger sister, Sunila; and younger brother Sampath, for the much needed additional finances to support my family.

I thank my church, the Convention of Baptist Churches in the Northern Circars, Andhra Pradesh, India, for releasing and recommending me to pursue my doctoral studies.

So many friends and relatives cheered me on during writing this dissertation. I need to mention my thanks to my friend, Birgit Taylor, for her support, prayers and cheer. Special thanks to my mother, Sarala, and elder sister, Suranjini for their prayers and encouragement. Finally, but not the least, I must thank my dear wife, Prasanna, two daughters – Selina, age 7 and Mounica, age 4, who have contributed immensely in giving me all the necessary support to complete this thesis.

ABBREVIATIONS

<i>BAGD</i>	:	<i>Bauer, Arndt, Gingrich, and Danker, A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature</i>
<i>BTB</i>	:	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	:	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
<i>CIQ</i>	:	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>EQ</i>	:	<i>Evangelical Quarterly</i>
<i>HTR</i>	:	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>IJS</i>	:	<i>Indian Theological Studies</i>
<i>Int</i>	:	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>JBL</i>	:	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	:	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JTS</i>	:	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>LS</i>	:	<i>Liddell and Scott, Greek-English Lexicon</i>
<i>LSJ</i>	:	<i>Liddell, Scott, and Jones, A Greek-English Lexicon</i>
<i>Nov. T</i>	:	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
<i>NTS</i>	:	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
<i>PRS</i>	:	<i>Perspectives in Religious Studies</i>
<i>S. Afr. J. Philos.</i>	:	<i>South African Journal of Philosophy</i>
<i>SBL</i>	:	<i>Society of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>SBLDS</i>	:	<i>Society of Biblical Literature Dissertation Series</i>
<i>SJT</i>	:	<i>Scottish Journal of Theology</i>
<i>SR</i>	:	<i>Studies in Religion</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	:	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
<i>TLG</i>	:	<i>Thesaurus Linguae Graecae</i>
<i>Theol</i>	:	<i>Theology</i>
<i>ThH</i>	:	<i>Théologie Historique</i>
<i>TynB</i>	:	<i>Tyndale Bulletin</i>
<i>UBS</i>	:	<i>United Bible Societies Greek New Testament</i>

INTRODUCTION

The objective of this thesis is to demonstrate Paul's application of complex metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4 as a means to address the alleged issues that had arisen within the Corinthian Christian community. These issues comprised a lack of respect and deferment to Paul's position of authority over the church in Corinth as well as factionalism that appears to have led to the splintering of the church community into various smaller groups, where each group chose a particular leader, such as Paul, Apollos and others. But why metaphors and what is so special about them in relation to speech and script? Gibbs (1994: 123) shows the importance of metaphors by stating that it is impossible to communicate without metaphors. Referring to Glucksberg, he observes that an empirical study on a sample of discourse yielded that "people used 1.80 novel and 4.08 frozen metaphors per minute." Those involved in conversation for an average of 2 hours "would utter 4.7 million novel and 21.4 million frozen metaphors over a 60-year life span." Danesi (2004: 20) underlines the significance of metaphors by recalling a study by Pollio, Barlow and Fine, which concluded that, "[s]peakers of English uttered, on average, an astounding 3,000 novel metaphors and 7,000 idioms per week." Such an obvious reality is very much evident in the First letter to Corinthian especially in 1 Corinthians 3-4. It is quite apparent that Paul depended on metaphors to such an extent that even in the first verse of the rhetorical unit 1:10-4:21 he using two metaphors – "same mind" and "same judgement." Interestingly, it seems that apart from the use of metaphors, 1 Corinthians 3-4 hardly contains any direct instructions whereby Paul would have responded to his concerns, such as to address the problems of authority and factionalism in the Corinthian church.

In the thesis, the importance of the study can be signified as follows:

1. We will discuss the manner in which Paul's application of metaphors enables him to firmly re-establish and sustain his position of authority over the church community and to address the challenge of factionalism within the Corinthian church. In order to approach this study in a systematic manner, a foundation consisting of theory and tools of analysis need to be laid out before interpreting the specifically chosen metaphors.

2. Unfortunately, the Church in India, especially churches in the state of Andhra Pradesh, is not devoid of problems similar to those seemingly experienced by the Corinthian Christians. Sadly, the issues concerning lines of authority as well as dissension and resulting factionalism are affecting the life of the Indian Church extensively. While dealing with such problems has become a weighty challenge for the ministry in the Indian Church, Paul's attitude towards the Corinthian Christians and in particular Paul's choice of metaphors in response to these issues will provide the contemporary ministry, for example in the Indian Church, with helpful information that can be appropriated in the form of pastoral ministry.

To date, except for Burke, it appears that New Testament scholars have not investigated Paul's use of metaphors in his epistles, especially in 1 Corinthians, to such an extent as to extract a theoretical interpretation pertaining to these metaphors. Williams (1999) provides an example in that although he refers to numerous Pauline metaphors, he omits to suggest that the application of these metaphors requires a particular theory by which they might be interpreted. In addition, commentators such as Fee, Collins, and Thiselton allude to Paul's metaphors and suggest an explanation for Paul's choice of metaphors, however this is done without the description or application of a specific theory. Therefore, the purpose of this thesis consists of a theoretical interpretation of these metaphors, particularly in reference to the issues of authority and factionalism in 1 Corinthians 3-4. In order to lay a theoretical foundation, in the first chapter we will discuss the meaning and interpretation of metaphors from the time of antiquity to the contemporary era, which will serve as an introduction to the application of the blending theory (Fauconnier & Turner 2003b). We will then consider how the blending theory might be a helpful tool whereby Paul's complex metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4 could be interpreted. Together with the blending theory, two further interpretive tools, which are socio-rhetorical analysis and Thompson's mode of ideology will be applied so that we can identify various aspects of the source domain and the target domain, which are elements of the blending theory.

While applying the blending theory to interpret Paul's complex metaphors, in the second chapter the context in which Paul uses the metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4 will be investigated briefly by applying socio-rhetorical criticism, in particular to the rhetorical

unit 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21. The background to Paul's rhetoric is necessary since it will enable a more thorough understanding of the need to respond to the issues in the church at Corinth. For instance, Paul's authority ought to be appreciated in the framework of Paul's absence in the church after having established it personally. Therefore, it is conceivable that Paul had expected the Corinthian Christians to remain in unity and to grow spiritually, based on the gospel of Jesus Christ which Paul had proclaimed to them when he had brought them into the Christian faith. In chapter 2, the Corinthian Christians', especially the Corinthian elite's, yearning for social prestige will be examined, in that instead of seeking spiritually enrichment, the Corinthian elite was more interested in and influenced by honour, power and social status that was possible to achieve in the social and cultural environment of Corinth. This was demonstrated by certain Corinthians, who followed leaders such as Apollos who could ostensibly preach with the display of much sophistic wisdom, in order to gain a high status level within the church community. This behaviour led to the adherents of particular groups based on following an ostensibly impressive leader, exhibiting social pride and causing competitive strife and thus a power struggle between these groups. This resulted in factionalism in the Corinthian church. Thus, the Corinthian Christians, especially the Corinthian elite, gave more credit to other leaders than to Paul, since they had judged him as displaying less social stature and sophistic wisdom than the other chosen leaders. A careful reading of the Corinthian elite's factious attitude appears to imply that Paul's authority is not just questioned but delegitimated by the Corinthian elite.

In order to address the problems of authority and factionalism in 1 Corinthians 3-4, Paul chooses two significant complex metaphors, the household metaphor (3:1-4; 4:1-13 and 4:14-21) and the building metaphor (3:9b, 3:16-17). These can also be classified as complex metaphors (Kövecses 2002: 80-84, 116-118). This complex structuring of another is possible because these metaphors are grounded in systematic correlations within our experience that involve a strong cultural basis (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 61, 68). Within the application of the blending theory, it is noticeable that the blend between the source and target domains depends on cultural codes (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003), as well as upon social institutions and social experiences, which are linked to both the source and target domains, as in the case of Paul's complex metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4.

In the subsequent chapters, we will identify and discuss the source domain, which consists of the submetaphors. However, for the target domain, Paul-his converts relationship in the Corinthian church, in addition to what we would discuss in the subsequent chapters, which would be based on the immediate text, we would identify the following categories of Paul as we see in 1 Corinthians:

1. Paul was called by God to be an apostle to the Corinthian church. Therefore, he functions as an official representative of Jesus Christ (1:1).
2. Paul's apostolic position is tied to being a witness of the risen Christ (chs. 9 & 15).
3. Paul was commissioned as an apostle to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ and not to baptise new believers (1:17; 2: 2).
4. Paul was the first to convert Corinthians to the Christian faith; therefore, he is their spiritual father, since he first preached the gospel to them and since he established the Corinthian church.
5. Since he is the founding apostle, he views himself as having a position of unique authority over the Corinthian Christians.
6. Certain Corinthian Christians request authoritative advice with respect to *περι δε* topics from Paul.
7. Based on the divided loyalty of the Corinthian Christians and their resulting impressions, Paul appears to compete with Apollos.
8. Paul supports the idea of co-workers since he worked with others missionaries in the Corinthian church such as Prisca and Aquila (16:19).
9. Paul expected the Corinthian Christians to be responsible for building themselves up as saints and thereby to grow spiritually and to develop their Christian character and to exhibit unified fellowship (1 Cor 1:2).

Similarly, the fact that Corinth was an ancient colony means that by extension the behaviour of citizens in antiquity can be likened to the behaviour of the Corinthian Christians, particular the elite before Paul's response subverts the cultural norms. Thus, in the second chapter, we will examine the attitudes and behaviour of the Corinthian Christians in the framework of their socio-cultural setting. This will enable a greater understanding of the Corinthian elite's mindset that led to the issues of authority and factionalism. Therefore, an analysis of the rhetorical construction of the rhetorical unit,

1:10-4:21, will serve to provide a context for the complex metaphors chosen by Paul in 1 Corinthians 3-4. It will become apparent that the Corinthian Christians, especially the Corinthian elite, were choosing and following leaders who used sophistic wisdom in their rhetoric. This led to the development of separate groups and inter-group strife which resulted in factionalism.

In chapter 3 to chapter 7, we will discuss how Paul applies various complex metaphors, to re-affirm and sustain his dominance, while addressing the factionalism within the Corinthian church. In order to analyse the metaphors, the blending theory supported by socio-rhetorical analysis and Thompson's mode of operation of ideology will be applied, whereby we will then interpret Paul's complex metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4.

In chapter 3, the relationship between a mother and her infant is applied as a submetaphor that belongs to the household complex metaphor by which Paul blends into himself the role of a mother and the role of the infant onto his converts as his children in the Corinthian church. Through the blending theory, it will be shown that Paul, in a role of a nursing mother, ideologically re-establishes and sustains his authority and dominance over the Corinthian church community and thereby addresses the problem of factionalism in the Corinthian church (3:1-4). Likewise, in chapter 4, Paul applies an master builder-builders relationship as a submetaphor that belongs to a complex building metaphor (3:10-15) and temple-community relationship that belongs to a complex temple metaphor. Using the blending theory, it appears that Paul blends the role of a master builder into himself, while blending the role of other builders into the various leaders within the Corinthian church to underline his response to the issues at Corinth. Further, the relationship between a temple and community in a complex temple metaphor (3:16-17) blends upon the Corinthian Christians the identity of being the temple of God and God's spirit dwells in their community, his temple, to cautions that those who defile the Corinthian Christian community would be harmed by God as the community is holy. In the remaining chapters 5-7, Paul applies the submetaphors; the master-servant and steward relationship in a complex household metaphor (4:1-13); and the relationship between a father and his children in a complex household metaphor (4:14-21), which will further highlight that Paul seeks to ideologically react to the challenges at Corinth.

Chapter 1

Metaphor Theory and Methodological Considerations

1.1. Introduction

Although metaphors have generally been viewed as decorative instances of figurative language, contemporary research in cognitive linguistics and cognitive psychology has shown that metaphors are in fact ubiquitous and fundamental in human language and human thought processes (Gibbs 1994: 120-207). Danesi (2004: 56) suggests that metaphorical thinking is the “default” form of all thinking, while Lakoff and Johnson (2003) argue that our entire human existence is structured and based upon our ability to view and process ideas metaphorically.

According to Danesi (2004: 5-6) metaphors can be defined as products of our imaginative thinking processes that enable us to evaluate and appropriate information, thereby assisting us to make sense of our everyday world. In this manner, we can unconsciously use metaphors to recognise and identify clusters of information (Fauconnier & Turner 2003b: 18). Lakoff and Johnson observe that metaphors perform crucial functions in conceptual thinking (2003) as well as in the evaluation and understanding of morality (1996), while Gibbs (1994: 169-179) notes that metaphors are also applied in the area of science. McFague (1985: 36) describes metaphors as mechanisms that facilitate us “to understand particular aspects of human existence, especially those pertaining to expression and interpretation, creation and discovery, change and transformation.” Hence, metaphors play a fundamental role in human thinking and in human communication.

A study from the 1970’s shows that English language speakers use “on average, an astounding 3,000 novel metaphors and 7,000 [metaphorical] idioms per week” (Pollio, Barlow, et al, in Danesi 2004: 20). Not surprisingly then, metaphors turn out to be quite important when constructing argumentations in rhetorical terms (Perelman & Olbrechts-Tytecha 1969: 398-410). In the course of this dissertation, we will see that the

importance of the use of metaphors is also recognised in the classical period when rhetoric played a formative role in education.

Having briefly discussed the role and importance of metaphors in general, we now turn to examine metaphors as a literary device. In 1 Corinthians, Paul brings into play over thirty major metaphors, for example, the master-builder metaphor in 3:10-15, the temple of God metaphor in 3:16-17 as well as in 6:19-20 (though in a different sense to 3:16-17), the father metaphor in 4:14-21, the athlete metaphors in 9:24-27, and the first fruits in 15:20. Paul's significant use of metaphors in 1 Corinthians reflects his rhetorical strategy and imaginative conception in addressing a variety of issues and problems such as the problem of authority and factionalism within the church at Corinth in 1 Corinthians 3 and 4. From a cognitive linguist point of view, Paul appears to choose to use a large number of metaphors not simply for artistic reasons, but for the reason that metaphors play a fundamental role in human reasoning, meaningful communication, and persuasion. In 1 Cor. 3:1-4:21 Paul refers to a number of common social and cultural topics through a series of metaphors that deal with such topics as nursing mothers (3:1-5), agriculture (3:6-9), the building of buildings (3:10-15), temples (3:9b, 16-17), household servants and stewards (4:1-5); fathers and children (4:14-21). Further discussion will show that Paul uses these metaphors in his bid to re-establish and sustain his dominance in the Corinthian church and to secure obedience from the Corinthian church, especially from those members of the Corinthian elite whom he views as those fomenting divisions within the community. Moreover, Paul's rhetorical strategy provides a platform to accept Paul's construction of his relation to the community.

An underlying question that needs to be addressed is: Why does Paul primarily use metaphors to address the problems of authority and factionalism in 1 Corinthians 3-4? In the subsequent sections of this chapter discussions regarding the function of metaphors in antiquity and contemporary metaphor theory will provide a basis to develop a theory that will strive to answer this question, as well as to undergird an interpretation of the complex metaphors that dominate the discussion in 1 Cor. 3:1-4:21.

1.2. Metaphor in Classical Thought and Literature

In this section, we will investigate various rhetorical proponents of metaphors in antiquity with respect to their definitions of metaphors and the manner in which they

described the nature and functions of metaphors. In other words, this section is concerned with the theory of metaphor in antiquity, and with how rhetoricians applied metaphor theory. As we shall see, the nature and function of metaphors in antiquity plays a significant role in the understanding of metaphors in the modern period.

1.2.1. Aristotle

It appears that Aristotle was the first person to use the term “metaphor”. The word itself had a metaphorical quality since it was derived from μετα - “beyond” and φε/ρειν - “to carry” meaning to “carry beyond” or “transfer” (*Poetics*, 21.2-8; *LSJ* 1118). Aristotle also may have been the first person who expounded upon a theoretical analysis of metaphors. This has led Kennedy (1991: 311) to call him “the father of the study of metaphor.” Unfortunately, his choice of locating metaphors under the heading λε/χιπ or style in his seminal rhetorical study, *On Rhetoric*, established a normative, though incorrect, understanding of metaphors that persisted all the way into the modern period as Perelman and Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969: 398-399) have observed.

To elaborate on Aristotle’s conclusions, it is noteworthy to take into account his analysis of metaphors in terms of the way in which they transfer content or meaning from one word or thing to another. Aristotle recommended that the transfer of meaning conveyed by metaphors should be based on the principle that “in naming something that does not have a proper name of its own, metaphor should be used, and [should] not be far-fetched but taken from things that are related and of similar species, so that it is clear the term is related” (*On Rhetoric* 3.2.12). In his *Poetics*, Aristotle phrased this idea as follows, “Metaphor is the application to one thing of a name belonging to another thing” (*Poetics* 21.5). Furthermore, Aristotle said, “from good riddling it is generally possible to derive appropriate metaphors; for metaphors are made like riddles; thus clearly, [a metaphor from a good riddle] is an apt transference of words” (*On Rhetoric* 3.2.12). Therefore, we can deduce that in Aristotle’s view, a metaphor involved the transference of a word and in particular its normal meaning to another person, animal, object, or concept. Aristotle also suggested that metaphors ought to be used in the form of a single word and not in the form of an entire sentence or discourse. Finally, Aristotle categorised metaphors into four types, classifying them “from the genus to the species, species to the genus, species to species and by analogy” (*Poetics* 21.4-6). Although Aristotle

developed the concept of metaphors, he noted that in general the reader prefers analogies (*On Rhetoric* 3.10.7).¹

Prior to Aristotle, metaphors were seen as simple decorative or as mere substitutions for a particular word. In response to this view, Aristotle argued that they are misused when they are employed for affectation because then they become unpersuasive (*On Rhetoric* 3.3.4). He believed that the use of metaphors is a characteristic of a perceptive mind since they entail observing the likeness in things that are often very different (*On Rhetoric* 3.11.5). Aristotle also maintained that metaphors as well as words in their customary usage are fundamental to good prose style (*On Rhetoric* 3.2.6). Furthermore, he noted that metaphors are particularly valuable since they provide a means of imparting additional clarity in prose style, although the writer would need to ensure that the metaphors in questions were appropriate for the situation in which they are used (*On Rhetoric* 3.2.8-9). Aristotle did observe the appropriate use of metaphors is not something that can be learned from others (*On Rhetoric* 3.2.8) since the use of metaphors implies a creative or clever mind (εὐφροσύνη) with an eye for correspondences (*Poetics* 22.9). Additionally, Aristotle wrote that metaphors can be timely, when they are used properly in prose style (*On Rhetoric* 3.11.5), convey ideas, have applications (*On Rhetoric* 3.2.13), and are context oriented which, as will become apparent in following sections, plays an important role in the contemporary understanding of metaphors. Interestingly, Aristotle added that metaphors reflect the urbane style and are particularly well suited for encouraging learning because they “bring things before the eyes” of the audience (*On Rhetoric* 3.10.1-6).

Since Aristotle was of the view that rhetors misused metaphors, he not only described the nature of metaphors but also sought to explain their functions in order to ensure that rhetors would be encouraged to use metaphors appropriately and correctly. In light of Aristotle’s aims, he constructed guidelines for the use of metaphors. For example, he argued that metaphors have to transfer meaning between related things, although the similarity between the two related things should not be too obvious if the metaphor was to be effective (*On Rhetoric* 3.11.5). Even so, Aristotle cautioned rhetors not to include metaphors that may be too far-fetched in that the relation between the metaphor and its

¹ Aristotle provides examples of each type. The space limitations of this thesis, however, do not allow me to reproduce his examples.

related concept is nebulous at best (*On Rhetoric* 3.2.11). In *On Rhetoric* 3.2.10, Aristotle wrote the following:

If you wish to adorn, borrow the metaphor from something better in the same genus, if to denigrate, from something worse. I mean, for example, since they are opposites in the same genus, saying of a person who begs that he ‘prays’ or that a person praying ‘begs,’ because both are forms of asking.

In the same section, Aristotle observed:

the source of the metaphor should be something beautiful; verbal beauty, as Licymnius says, is in the sound or in the sense, and ugliness the same; and thirdly there is what refutes the sophistic argument: for it is not as Bryson said that nothing is in itself ugly, since it signifies the same thing if one word is used rather than another; for this is false; one word is more proper than another and more like the object signified and more adapted to making the thing appear “before the eyes.” Moreover, one word does not signify the same way as another, so in this sense also we should posit one as more beautiful or uglier than another; for both signify the beautiful or the ugly, but not solely as beauty or ugliness. Or if they do, [it is] only in degree. These are the sources from which metaphors should be taken: from the beautiful either in sound or in effect or in visualization or in some other form of sense perception. It makes a difference whether the dawn is called “rosy-fingered” or “purple-fingered” (*On Rhetoric* 3.2.13).

Aristotle also articulates that similes are a form of metaphor because they work on the principle of analogy. He maintained that while similes are in fact a type of metaphor used with a particular poetic bent, they should be utilised rarely (*On Rhetoric* 3:4:1-4). Indeed, a simile is essentially an extended metaphor since it is a metaphor in nature by virtue of creating an analogy between two concepts. However, it is longer in form than a simple metaphor due to the necessary explanatory word(s) to clarify the analogy. Based on this understanding, Aristotle prefers metaphors, since according to Aristotle the reader or listener has to appreciate the analogy implied in the use of a metaphor, whereas

the analogy given in detail in the form of a simile requires less thought on the part of the listener or reader (*On Rhetoric* 3.10.3)

1.2.2. Cicero

Cicero maintained that an orator contributes three things to the vocabulary that decorate and embellish rhetoric styles: unusual words (often because they are archaic), neologisms, and words employed metaphorically (*De Oratore* 3.38.152). Furthermore, Cicero considered metaphors to have a broad application, even though originally, their use arose because of “necessity due to the pressure of poverty and deficiency” in language, but over time, metaphors came to be appreciated for their pleasant and entertaining character (*De Oratore* 3.38.155). Like Aristotle, Cicero also understood metaphors to exist at the level of individual words, as opposed to in the form of a larger unit of meaning (*De Oratore* 3.39.155, 157-158). Moreover, Cicero, in his theory of metaphors, emphasised that metaphors are often used to communicate more clearly what is intended when the proper term is inadequate for doing so. This is what he meant by metaphors arising from the poverty of ordinary words. Cicero did acknowledge though that at times metaphors did not simply arise from the poverty of ordinary words, but they often added an element of “brilliance to the style” (*De Oratore* 3.38.155-156). Furthermore, Cicero argued that there were only three reasons for using metaphors: to make the meaning of something clearer; to communicate the “whole meaning of the matter” better; and to achieve brevity of expression (*De Oratore* 3.39.157-158).

Like Aristotle, Cicero stressed that metaphors should not be far fetched since their value is in their resemblance to that which they infer (*De Oratore* 3.40.162-163). “Something resembling the real thing is taken, and the words that properly belong to it are then . . . applied metaphorically to the other thing” (*De Oratore* 3.41.166).² Cicero observed that “as perhaps the highest merit in the employment of metaphor is when the metaphorical expression directly hits our senses, one must avoid all unseemliness in the things to which the comparison will lead the hearers’ minds” (*De Oratore* 3.41.163). In a later section of this chapter, we will see that Cicero’s stress on metaphors targeting our senses plays a vital role in the contemporary thinking about metaphors.

² Cicero wrote that metaphors should “have an apologetic air so [that] it looks as if it has entered a place that does not belong to it.” This is possible with a proper introduction, so that the metaphor does not take over by storm, but looks as if it had come with permission and not forced its way in (*De Oratore* 3.41.165).

1.2.3. Quintilian

Quintilian began his discussion of metaphors by identifying them as the most attractive type of trope (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.4).³ But in introducing his discussion of tropes in chapter 6 of Book 8 he offered the startling observation that

some *tropes* are employed to help out our meaning and others to adorn our style, that some arise from words used *properly* and others from words used *metaphorically*, and that the changes involved concern not merely individual words, but also our thoughts and the structure of our sentences. In view of these facts I regard those writers as mistaken who have held that *tropes* necessarily involved the substitution of word for word (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.2-3).

While this reflects the contemporary understanding of metaphors, as we shall see, it is uncertain that Quintilian actually applied this understanding directly to metaphors. The uncertainty is because he at a later stage maintained that metaphors deal with words and not with entire sentences. Quintilian also stated that a metaphor transfers a noun or a verb from its normal place to another place where no literal expression exists or where the word that is transferred is more apt than the literal word that has been substituted (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.5). Furthermore, Quintilian, like Aristotle, classifies metaphors. However, Quintilian used a different system since he distinguished between metaphoric transfer actions as animate to animate, inanimate to inanimate, inanimate to animate and lastly animate to inanimate.⁴

Moreover, Quintilian discussed the nature of metaphors and identified a number of characteristics of metaphors. For example, metaphors provided “a name” for things that do not otherwise have a name, and they provide greater clarity of meaning than regular words, or are merely used for their “decorative effect.” If a metaphor does not fulfil any of the listed functions, then, according to Quintilian, they have been inappropriately

³ The Stoics also viewed metaphor as a trope. The Stoics, who probably created the theory of tropes, defined a trope “as a single word used in a novel way, either because the idea to be expressed had no name of its own (no ‘proper’ word) or for the sake of imagery or embellishment” (Kennedy 1994: 91 cf. Soskice 1987: 1).

⁴ For details, see Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.9-13. He also maintained that the four types of metaphor may be “further subdivided into a number of *species*,” but he expected his readers to be able to identify the species.

employed (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.5-6). At best, metaphors have the capacity to evoke emotions, enhance meaning, and make things more vivid (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.19).

On the other hand, for some people in antiquity, metaphors were perceived as a deviation from the ordinary and straightforward usage of language and were “thought to have the potential to mislead judgement and incite emotional responses when, instead, literal reasoning should prevail” (Way 1991: 2). Realising the potential for the misuse of metaphors, Quintilian sought for a proper way of using them while underlining their importance. To that end, similarly to Aristotle, Quintilian provided guidelines for the usage of metaphors and emphasised that metaphors would have to be temperate and timely without being used too frequently since over use would obscure the user’s language and weary the audience (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.14). Quintilian also supported Aristotle’s idea that a metaphor should be taken from a better class, and when used correctly and appropriately, it would be quite impossible for their effects to be dull, lowly or unpleasant (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.5). He elaborated on Aristotle’s view of metaphorical borrowing by saying that metaphors are often used when there are no literal words to express certain ideas, for example, the concept that, *crops are thirsty* (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.5-6). Quintilian cautioned that far-fetched metaphors would come across as being harsh, for example, the metaphor *the snows of the head* makes no real sense (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.17). At certain times though, a speaker would borrow a word and use it metaphorically out of necessity, for example, to enhance the meaning of what has been said. To say that a man’s anger is *kindled* enhances the idea of anger by implying that it can be compared to a fire that is being fed with fuel (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.7). However, Quintilian observed that such imports should always occupy a vacant place, or if it fills the space with something else, it should be more striking than that which it replaces (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.18).

Other writers who spoke about metaphors in the classical period more or less concurred with the views and classifications of Aristotle and Quintilian.⁵ Aristotle’s views, in particular, have influenced almost all subsequent discussions on metaphor (Gibbs 1994: 210). Aristotle’s views that metaphors involve words, not sentences, and that metaphors

⁵ Demetrius and the author of *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* discussed the nature and functions of metaphors along the lines suggested by Aristotle and Quintilian. For details see Demetrius, *On Style*, 78-84; *Rhetorica Ad Herennium* 4.36.45.

involve a transfer of meaning from one unrelated, named thing to another, and that metaphors are based on the similarity between the two named things, have become seminal in discussions about metaphors from the time of Aristotle up to the modern period. Yet Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 244) have recently argued that the legacy of Aristotle has created significant “barriers to understanding the nature of metaphorical thought and its profundity” because, among other things, metaphorical thought is not based on words but on concepts and metaphors are not simply based on similarities, since other factors are more important. Lakoff and Johnson’s understanding of metaphors and metaphorical thought processes will be discussed further in a subsequent section.

1.3. Metaphor in Contemporary Thought

Just as certain writers in antiquity held a negative view of metaphors claiming that they were merely ornamental or simply figures of speech, various scholars in the modern era share this view.⁶ For example, the famous linguist, Noam Chomsky, rejects metaphors since he considers them to be a deviation from the fundamental rules governing language (Danesi 2004: 19)⁷. However, after a long period of indifference, scholars suddenly demonstrated a recognition of the significance of metaphors in language and thought leading to different theories emerging.⁸ Within the last three decades metaphors have gained respectability as a vitally important aspect of thought,⁹ semantics,¹⁰ pragmatics¹¹ and cognition.¹²

I. A. Richards was perhaps the first scholar in the twentieth century to see the importance of metaphors, and this led him to revive studying and theorising about them. Richards in his 1936 book, *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, maintains that “we cannot go through three sentences of ordinary fluid discourse without it [a metaphor]” (1979 reprint: 92). Indeed all languages contain deeply embedded metaphorical structures that

⁶ See Danesi (2004: 13). The rationalists and empiricists saw metaphor and other rhetorical methods as decorative and superfluous means of describing what could be portrayed more accurately by plain ‘dry’ truth.

⁷ At the time of writing, the primary source was unavailable.

⁸ For an extensive discussion of various modern theories of metaphors see Gibbs (1994: 120-207).

⁹ Cf. Reddy in Lakoff (1998: 204); Lakoff & Johnson (2003: 3); Lakoff (1998: 208); Driven & Paprotté (1985: ix).

¹⁰ Cf. Soskice (1985: 19); Traugott (1985: 17); Wheelwright (1973: 71).

¹¹ Cf. Soskice (1985: 19); Traugott (1985: 17).

¹² Cf. Goatly (1997: 1); Traugott (1985: 17); Soskice (1985: 44).

covertly influence meaning. Therefore, thought, semantics, pragmatics and cognition expressed through language all assist in the understanding of the dynamics of metaphors.

The pioneering work of Richards and its development by Black, *Models and Metaphors* (1962) led to the beginning of a process in which the understanding of metaphors was reassessed. This process resulted in the seminal study by Lakoff and Johnson in 1980 entitled *Metaphors We Live By*.¹³ In this study, Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 3) reject the notion that a metaphor can be defined as “a device of the poetic imagination and the rhetorical flourish” as well as the familiar notion that a metaphor is solely a linguistic vehicle independent of thought or action. Instead they argue that a “metaphor is pervasive in everyday life, not just in language but in thought and action. Our ordinary conceptual system, in terms of which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 3).¹⁴ Their point has been elaborated by Gibbs (1994: 207) who states,

[M]etaphor is a fundamental mental capacity by which people understand themselves and the world through the conceptual mapping of knowledge from one domain onto another. The overwhelming ubiquity of metaphor in language, thought, science, law, art, myth, and culture illustrates that metaphor is an integral part of human life.

This insight has revolutionized the manner in which metaphors are understood not only in literature and everyday language, but also in human cognition. Metaphors are no longer viewed as a mere matter of words, but fundamentally they are seen to involve concepts. Equally important, metaphors are not simply based on similarity because they construct new meanings rather than simply relying on pre-existing similarity (Lakoff and

¹³ The reason for citing the 2003 edition of Lakoff and Johnson’s *Metaphors We Live By* is that it includes an “Afterword” in which the authors review the impact of their original book on cognitive science in general and metaphor research in particular. On the significance of Lakoff and Johnson’s 1980 study see Kövecses 2002: viii.

¹⁴ As is often the case with seminal studies, Lakoff and Johnson’s *Metaphors We Live By* did not appear out of nowhere. The first edition of *Metaphor and Thought* (1979), edited by A. Ortony shows that considerable progress was made in understanding metaphor between Black’s 1962 work and the appearance of Lakoff and Johnson’s work in 1980. The significance of the latter’s work was seen in that it drew together various strands of research into a coherent account of the role played by metaphor in every day language and thought, and in the process overturned the already accepted view that metaphors were largely artistic creations that operated on the principle of similarity between two words or things, a view that went back to classical times.

Johnson 2003: 244). Subsequently to Lakoff and Johnson groundbreaking work, a significant corpus of research literature has emerged to describe and explain the nature and function of metaphors in human language and thought (Kövecses 2002: 267-275).

In the contemporary metaphor theories and analyses, metaphors are viewed as consisting of two major components, a source domain and a target domain. The source domain provides the meaning that is transferred to the target domain, though not all meaning is transferred from a source domain nor is all of the meaning of a target domain used in the construction of a metaphor (Kövecses 2002: 79-91). For example, in the metaphor, *his argument was a house of cards*, the source domain contains the phrase “house of cards” while the target domain is “argument.” In this instance it is not the meaning of “house” or of “cards” as singular words that is transferred to the target domain “argument”, but rather the issue at hand is that the phrase “house of cards” has no support structure pointing to the connotation of flimsiness. The “house of cards” thus would be unable to carry any weight and would therefore collapse almost immediately under any kind of force. Thus, an argument that is a “house of cards” would be a very unconvincing argument that would not endure any form of detailed scrutiny.

As we have seen, going back to the time of Aristotle, pre-existing similarities between a metaphorical source and its target domain have been an accepted basis for appreciating the reason and the motivation for the transfer of meaning between the source domain and the target domain of a metaphor. Cognitive linguistics, however, suggest that while pre-existent similarities do affect the choice of metaphorical source domains (Kövecses 2002: 68-69), there are several other vital factors to be considered. Kövecses (2002: 76) writes:

The selection of source domains depends on human factors that reflect non-objective, nonliteral [sic], and nonpreexisting [sic] similarities between a source and a target domain. These are called the experiential bases or *motivation* of conceptual metaphors. Some of the common kinds of such similarities include: (1) *correlations in experience*, (2) *perceived structural similarity*, (3) *perceived structural similarity induced by basic metaphors*, (4) *source being the root of the target*. In this last case, the source may be either the biological or the cultural root of the target.

The type of similarities to which Kövescses refers may be described as “correspondences” and leads to the idea that a metaphor is “a set of correspondences (or conceptual mappings) between two conceptual domains where one of the domains (called the source) helps us to structure, understand and reason about the other (called the target)” (Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez 2003: 110)¹⁵. This applies to Paul’s metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4, in that Paul maps correspondences from conceptual sources such as nursing mothers, master builders, household stewards, and fathers on to himself in his role as the founder of the Corinthian Christian community. This demonstrates a further vital consideration regarding conceptual metaphors. A single target domain, in this case, Paul the founder of the Corinthian Christian community, can have a variety of source domains applied with various correspondences since no single source domain does complete justice to the complexities of the target domain (Kövescses 2002: 84), and the reasoning which Paul wishes his readers to accept.

Metaphors have differing cognitive functions. Lakoff and Johnson (2003) identify three basic types of conceptual metaphors: orientational metaphors, ontological metaphors, and structural metaphors. Orientational metaphors are normally concerned with spatial orientation of concepts by making a series of target concepts coherent, e.g., happiness is up in its orientation, while sadness is down. Ontological metaphors offer “an ontological status to general categories of abstract target concepts” (Kövescses 2002: 34). Personifications are a special type of ontological metaphor. Much more important for my purposes are structural metaphors. Structural metaphors enable us “to use one highly structured and clearly delineated concept to structure another” (Lakoff and Johnson 2003: 61). In the case of Paul, for example, the father concept, a “highly structured and clearly delineated concept” in antiquity is used to structure the concept of Paul the church founder.

Most of the metaphors that we will look at in this thesis are complex metaphors. Complex metaphors involve two or more primary metaphors that have a logical connection to one another (Kövescses 2002: 83). Thus to say that Paul as the founder of the church at Corinth was a master builder, contains within it the notion that Paul

¹⁵ At the time of writing the primary source was unavailable.

established the church and the notion that Paul has precedence over other church workers.

Fauconnier and Turner (2003b: 154-159) highlight the manner in which metaphors work through their blending theory. Blending theory itself concerns conceptual integration over an extensive range of thought and action, including metaphors (Fauconnier and Turner 2003a: 133). According to Fauconnier and Turner's understanding, blending or mental binding or conceptual integration are different forms of a mental process during which "uniform structural and dynamic properties" relate in many spheres of thought and action. This form of blending seems to be highly applicable to the use of metaphors (Fauconnier & Turner 2003a: 133).¹⁶ Blending is also related to imaginative cases such as structures (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 261), that is, "the source and the target domains ('input spaces', as they are called) are mapped onto a 'blended space' or 'blend', whose conceptual structure is not wholly derivable from both input spaces" (Barcelona 2003: 7). Thus the blending or mental space "imaginatively combines elements of at least two other mental spaces that are structured by our ordinary long-term conceptual system" (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 261).¹⁷

In order to improve on our understanding of how the blending takes place between the source and target domains, the socio-rhetorical analysis of Robbins (1996a: 18-64, 96-118, 114-174 and 1996b: 1-119) is valuable in expanding our conceptual knowledge. Socio-rhetorical criticism is particularly effective in relation to the metaphorical language of 1 Corinthians 3-4, since it allows us to see that the metaphors are not just used as a rhetorical device but result from the social and cultural environment, thereby assisting us in the areas of cognitive linguistics, thought and reason.

1.4. Socio-rhetorical criticism

Vernon Robbins' approach to socio-rhetorical criticism enables scholars to appreciate metaphors differently and to understand them holistically. Robbins' own description is as follows: "Socio-Rhetorical criticism invites social, cultural, historical, psychological,

¹⁶ Lakoff & Johnson (2003: 261) assert that blending "assumes all the structures that are called parameterizations, including mapping from source to target domains, as well as image-schemas, force-dynamic schemas, frames, prototypes, metonymic mappings, and so on."

¹⁷ For details on blending, mental spaces, and generic space see Fauconnier & Turner (2003: 40-50); Fauconnier & Turner (2003a: 133-145).

aesthetic, ideological and theological information into a context of minute exegetical activity that gathers current practices of interpretation together in an interdisciplinary paradigm” (1994: 164), that is, “socio-rhetorical criticism as an approach examines a text from different angles as though it were a thickly textured tapestry containing complex patterns and images” (Robbins 1994: 164-165). “Socio-rhetorical criticism is a form of literary analysis that invites programmatic, self-critical analysis and interpretation to bring in referents, meanings, beliefs, values, emotions and intentions to the signs of the text” (Robbins 1994: 165). In other words, socio-rhetorical criticism is concerned with both the nature of a text as well as relevant data outside the text. Moreover, socio-rhetorical criticism bridges the gap between text and the outside world by encouraging various social, cultural, ideological and religious insights to inform, reform and expand the traditional historical study of a text.

Robbins (1996a; 1996b) provides a clearly defined layout to define and further clarify his insights pertaining to socio-rhetorical interpretation. In the next section we will discuss certain features of socio-rhetorical interpretation that are relevant to our study of Paul’s metaphors, particularly to the metaphors found in 1 Corinthians 3-4.

1.5. Socio-rhetorical criticism and blending theory

Socio-rhetorical criticism comprises a number of resources that enable scholars to appreciate how the metaphorical blending between the source and target is determined. Within the scope of this thesis I will demonstrate that Paul uses metaphors in his rhetoric that produce an interactive relation to textures of various kinds such as, cultural intertexture, social intertexture, and ideological texture. Intertexture, according to Robbins (1996b: 96) pertains to “the relation of data in the text to various kinds of phenomena outside the text”. The term cultural intertexture “refers to the logic of a particular culture” (Robbins 1996b: 129), as well as the manner in which this impacts on a particular text. In the context of 1 Corinthians, Greco-Roman culture of the first century CE formed the overarching cultural context of Pauline discourse.¹⁸ Here the

¹⁸ Robbins (1996b: 129) speaks of Mediterranean culture, but this description lacks further clarification for the sake of efficacy. Since the cultures of the Mediterranean basin have changed and developed over time, for the scope of this thesis I refer to the cultural configuration that emerged in the aftermath of the Roman conquest of the eastern Mediterranean basin where the Hellenistic culture predominated. The Roman and Hellenistic cultures underwent a process of assimilation, leading to the term Greco-Roman culture. It is noteworthy that the Jewish culture was one of the elements of the wider Greco-Roman culture. As Paul’s

many cultural voices of the Greco-Roman world constitute the culture of which a number of these are in dialogue in the Pauline discourse (Robbins 1996b: 129). Thus, as will become apparent, the metaphors in 1 Corinthians draw on Paul's and the Corinthian Christians' common or shared cultural knowledge. Such cultural knowledge or intertexture "appears in word and concept patterns and configurations", as well as in values, behaviour patterns, codes, cultural systems of various sorts, and myths. Moreover, cultural intertexture appears in Paul's metaphors through "either reference or allusion and echo" (Robbins 1996a: 58). The terms "reference or allusion", according to Robbins (1996a: 58), relates to the occurrence of a word or a phrase that is connected with a "personage or tradition known to people" in a culture, either through written texts or through "oral texts". If it were a quotation then it would form what Robbins (1996a: 40-58) calls "oral-scribal intertexture". In a similar fashion, an echo occurs as a reference or allusion, that is, through a word or a phrase, "but evokes, or potentially evokes, a concept from cultural tradition" (Robbins 1996a: 60). Therefore, references and echoes interact with cultural concepts and traditions to indicate that various texts, whether written or oral, may constitute the background of Paul's specific use of metaphors (Robbins 1996a: 58-60).¹⁹

Socio-rhetorical interpretation also includes the analysis of social intertexture. Social intertexture can be observed when a discourse refers to information or knowledge that is generally available to and known by people through their everyday social interactions (Robbins 1996a: 62). Social knowledge, according to Robbins (1996a: 62) generally falls into four categories: 1) social roles (public official, priest, servant, artisan) and social identities (male, female; Jew; Greek, Christian);²⁰ 2) social institutions (synagogue; church; guild; mystery cult); 3) social codes (honour, shame, purity regulations); and 4) social relationships (patron, client, father-child, friend). In the case of the metaphors of 1 Corinthians 3-4, we will note that all four of these categories of social knowledge appear to be present and to play key roles in the metaphors that will be examined in the subsequent chapters. These investigations will also show that the

missionary and scribal activities are confined to the middle part of the first century CE, we will focus on that particular culture (made up of many sub-cultures) as well as the cultural resources of this period.

¹⁹ For a further discussion of cultural intertexture see Robbins (1996b: 129-142).

²⁰ Although Robbins puts social roles and social identities into a single category, I suggest that these two form two distinct categories.

knowledge of the social intertexture is necessary to perform a meaningful analysis of Paul's metaphors.

The blending of the metaphors depends greatly upon the social and cultural experience of both Paul and the Corinthian Christians who lived in the world of the metaphors. Therefore, blending depends on cultural codes (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 146), as well as upon social institutions and social experiences. That which appears real to Paul and the Corinthian Christians as members of a particular culture and society is a product of their social reality and the manner in which that social reality has shaped their experience of the physical world in which they lived.²¹ Hence, Paul may have highlighted specific social topics in his metaphors that may reveal Paul's religious responses to the Corinthian Christians' world in his discourses. These responses can be extracted by deducing Paul's attitudes towards the Corinthian Christian world from the text, as well as by the manner in which he demonstrates and suggests the use of alternative resources by which a great deal of changes could be instituted regarding the Corinthian Christians and their social practices. Paul suggests and implores the church members to institute these changes with the aim of destroying and re-creating social order, and the withdrawing from the dominant society in order to create the Corinthians church's own social world (cf. Robbins 1996a: 3-4, 72-74). The importance that both Paul and the Corinthian Christians give to issues like law, honour, shame, power, politics, gender, holiness, codes and ethics in society, points to further culturally significant concerns. The priority of issues varies as does the priority of values, since these are dependant on the subculture that Paul and the Corinthian Christians experience as well as on their personal values (cf. Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 23).²²

Returning to the 'blending' concept, within the scope of 1 Corinthians, blending relies on Paul's final categories such as the system of attitudes, values, dispositions and norms of his and Corinthian Christians' culture. These final categories also relate to the final categories of the discourse form of other sectors within the first century Mediterranean culture (Robbins 1996b:182).²³ In Paul's writings, the final categories of metaphors appear either to support the cultural system, or to reject it, or to allude to a life different

²¹ This idea has been developed based on the view of Lakoff (1997: 146).

²² For similar emphasis see Robbins (1996a: 3-4, 75-86); Lakoff & Johnson (1980: 24).

²³ Due to the constraints of this thesis, please see Robbins' analysis of final categories in 1 Cor. 9:17-23 (Robbins 1996b: 183; cf. 167-171; 183-186).

from the other or to introduce a contra-culture (Robbins 1996a: 3-4, 86-88; cf. Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 24; Fernandez 1977: 113).

Therefore, blending is conditioned upon Paul's own ideology. Eagleton, according to Robbins (1996b: 36) defines ideology as "the ways in which what we say and believe connects with the power-structure of the society we live in . . . those modes of feeling, valuing, perceiving and believing which have some kind of relation to the maintenance and reproduction of social power." "In other words, ideology concerns the particular ways in which our speech and action, in their social and cultural location, relate to and interconnect with resources, structures and institutions of power" (Robbins 1996b: 36). The spectrum of ideology thus occurs in the social and the cultural location of the implied author, in the ideology of power in the discourse of the texts, in authoritative traditions of interpretation, in intellectual discourse as well as within individuals and groups (Robbins 1996a: 111-113; Robbins 1996b: 193). When dealing with ideology in terms of the social and cultural location of Paul and the Corinthian Christians, further discussions will demonstrate that the rhetorical strategies of Paul and the Corinthian Christians correlate "with the social arenas of previous events, natural environment and resources, population structure, technology, socialisation and personality, culture, foreign affairs, belief systems and ideologies and political-military-legal systems" (Robbins 1996b: 194).

In the analysis of power relations in a text, Robbins (1996b: 195) applies Castelli's summary of Michel Foucault's guidelines.²⁴ However, Wanamaker (2003: 198) notes that Robbins analysis of ideology limits the work to understanding the power relations of a text and therefore fails to analyse fully the actual ideology of a text or the mode in which the ideology functions. In the context of analysing the power relations in a text, Wanamaker incorporates Thompson's work on ideology on the basis that this sharpens and improves upon Robbins' analysis of ideology. Furthermore, Wanamaker suggests that Thompson's concept of ideology is worthy of consideration and ought to be included within the framework of a general social theory (2003: 198-199).²⁵ The social phenomenon of power in a general sense "is the ability to act in pursuit of one's aims

²⁴ The scope of this thesis prevents a more detailed examination, however Robbins (1996b: 195-229) can be consulted, where he applies Castelli's analysis of power to 1 Cor. 9.

²⁵ References pertaining to Thompson's concept of ideology can be found in Wanamaker (2003).

and interests: an agent has the power to act, the power to intervene in the sequence of events and to alter their course” (Thompson 1984: 129).²⁶

Moreover, Thompson’s concept of ideology “refers to the ways in which meaning serves, in particular circumstances, to establish and sustain relations of power which are systematically asymmetrical.” In this case power is viewed as the concept of domination (Thompson 1990: 7). Thompson writes,

Relations of power are ‘systematically asymmetrical’ when particular agents or groups of agents are institutionally endowed with power in a way which excludes, and to some significant degree remains inaccessible to, other agents or groups of agents, irrespective of the basis upon which such exclusion is carried out (Thompson 1984: 130).

Moreover, Thompson identifies “five general modes in which ideology operates: legitimation, dissimulation, unification, fragmentation and reification” (Thompson 1990: 60). These are not the only possible modes or modes that operate in isolation from one another, but rather each mode is said to be associated with a number of “strategies of symbolic construction” (Thompson 1990: 60). For example, “legitimation may work through rationalization as a set of interconnected reasons are developed to justify or defend social relations” (Wanamaker 2003: 201). It is also possible that “it may work through universalization in which features of institutions which serve some people’s interests are portrayed as serving everyone’s interests” (Wanamaker 2003: 201). In Paul’s case, I suggest that his metaphors often engage in the mode labelled by Thompson as dissimulation. Concerning metaphors, Thompson (1990: 63) maintains that they

dissimulate social relations by representing them, or the individuals and groups embedded in them, as endowed with characteristics which they do not literally possess, thereby accentuating certain features at the expense of others and charging them with a positive or negative sense.²⁷

²⁶ For details on ideology in a social theory, see the discussion of Wanamaker (2003: 198-199).

²⁷ For a detailed application of the dissimulation mode pertaining to various Pauline metaphors in 1 & 2 Corinthians see Wanamaker (2003: 208-220).

However, various other Pauline metaphors appear to engage in modes of unification, fragmentation, legitimation, and reification.

Paul's use of certain specific metaphors in 1 Corinthians illustrates that in his case the 'blending' is dependant on Paul's own ideology. Moreover, Paul draws on metaphors as a mode to convey his power over the Corinthian Christians in addressing the prevailing problems pertaining to questions of authority and factionalism as well as to re-describe the Corinthian Christians' sense of reality. It appears, therefore, that the Pauline example provides a case in which a perception of reality is constructed by metaphors in order to maintain or challenge power relations in society (Goatly 1997: 155).

Paul's writing also demonstrates the persuasive communication strategy that is embedded within the metaphorical language, where Paul's modes of argument, those being *ethos*, *logos* and *pathos*, highlight the rhetorical dimension of Paul and the Corinthian Christians. Regarding *ethos*, Paul takes advantage of the metaphorical language appealing to the Corinthian Christian community by describing his "own moral character and other aspects of his own life to enhance his credibility" as a means of addressing and dealing with the problems of authority and factionalism in the Corinthian Christian community (Stamps 1995: 155 cf. Aristotle, *On Rhetoric* 1.2.3-4, 1.8.6; Cicero, *De Oratore*, 2.43.182-84; Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* 6.28-19). Furthermore, the first person singular usage in verbal forms contributes to the *ethos* a speaker seeks to create in his rhetorical argument (Collins 1999: 139) so that the discourse verbally progresses through solid personal agency (Robbins 1996b: 68). *Ethos* resides in the speaker and not only depends upon the moral character of the speaker (Aristotle *Art of Rhetoric* 1.2.3-4), but also on the efficacy of the portrayal of his moral character (Cicero *On the Orator* 2.27.115; 2.28.121).²⁸ Pertaining to *logos*, Paul uses the modes of reasoning to refer to the ideas, structure, and logic of a language evaluated in terms of its persuasive force (Mack 1990: 36). Finally, in terms of *pathos*, Paul appeals "to the emotional reaction of the audience as a means of persuasive proof" (cf. *On Rhetoric* 1.2.3, 5; *De Oratore*, 2.42.178, 2.44.185-87; *Institutio Oratoria* 6.2.20-24; Stamps 1995: 155; Goatly 1997: 158). Hence socio-rhetorical criticism is a valuable tool to appreciate

²⁸ For a discussion of *ethos* in the rhetorical theorists of antiquity, see Aune (2003a: 169-173).

how Paul sought a change in behaviour through both praise and blame (epideictic rhetoric) as well as a change in action toward a benefit in the future (deliberative rhetoric). *Pathos*, as one of the three types of proof in Aristotle's presentation of rhetorical invention, has its locus in the audience and is concerned with the emotion or emotions aroused in the hearer by the rhetor (Aristotle *The Nicomachean Ethics* 1.2.3-6). Similar to the other two forms of proof, *ethos* and *logos*, *pathos* is used as a means for persuading an audience to formulate a particular judgement or to take a specific form of action (Aristotle *Art of Rhetoric* 1.2.3-5).²⁹

Furthermore, the application of socio-rhetorical criticism through intertexture, social, cultural and ideological textures helps establish that the metaphors in 1 Corinthians do not merely function as rhetorical devices, but they are attempts to construct the world of the Corinthian Christians. The very meaning of metaphors can only be expressed through language for our reality is linked to language and if language changes our world changes (Danesi 2004: 58). As Hawkes (1972: 78), referring to Sapir (The Status of Linguistics as a Science' in *Essays on Culture, Language and Personality*), observes,

Language is a guide to 'social reality' . . . human beings do not live in the objective world alone, nor alone in the world of social activity as ordinarily understood, but are very much at the mercy of the particular language which has become the medium of expression for their society. It is quite an illusion to imagine that one adjusts to reality essentially without the use of language and that language is merely an incidental means of solving specific problems of communication or reflection. The fact of the matter is that the 'real world' is to a large extent built up on the language habits of the group We see and hear and otherwise experience very largely as we do because the language habits of our community predispose certain choices of interpretation.

²⁹ For a discussion of *pathos* in the rhetorical theorists of antiquity, see Olbricht (2001) and Aune (2003: 339-342).

In other words, ideas, concepts, feelings, characteristic social behaviour and thoughts are embedded involuntarily within speech and writing³⁰ (Danesi 2004: 66). In writing, words become the vehicle by which the transfer of thoughts from one person to another is secured. In support, Richards (1979: 131; cf. Reddy 1997: 170) adds,

Words are the meeting points at which regions of experience which can never combine in sensation or intuition come together. They are the occasion and the means of that growth which is the mind's endless endeavour to order itself. That is why we have language. It is no mere signalling system. It is the instrument of all our distinctively human development, of everything in which we go beyond the other animals.

Therefore, language is intertwined with our understanding of the cultural world at a particular given time (Way 1991: 126). The function of language is to provide data for knowledge and beliefs whereby language can lead to general principles of understanding that involve entire “systems of concepts rather than individual words or individual concepts. Such principles are often metaphoric in nature and involve understanding one kind of experience in terms of another kind of experience” (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 116). In other words, a metaphor “is essentially a means of exploration and expansion of the potentialities of the language used by societies” (Hawkes 1971: 71). In this manner, the chief use of metaphor is to extend language and since language essentially represents reality, metaphors function as an expansion of any perceived reality. This means that metaphors are in fact a function of language. In this sense, as will be underscored in the following chapters, Paul and the Corinthian Christians' experiences of life were based on their social, cultural and ideological understandings. They appear to have been conditioned to a certain extent by the nature of the particular language that they spoke, and in whose terms they appreciated and understood their world.

1.6. Blending theory applied to interpret Paul's metaphors

In the blending of a metaphor, socio-rhetorical criticism helps to choose by highlighting, downplaying, and hiding some of the features that are a function of the direction of the attribution of metaphors. In this manner metaphors function in such a way that the

³⁰ Ramsey (1972: 164) uses the word ‘contexts’ to generate an unspecifiable number of possibilities of articulation.

abstracted attribute features of the source domain are placed on to a common ground from where the metaphors utilise that ground to choose the features that are appropriate of the target (cf. Way 1991: 129-130; Gibbs & Gerrig 1989: 151,152; Newmark 1985: 2). Thereafter, the hearer will notice and accept those blends that are appropriate and subconsciously mask those that are incompatible (Lakoff & Johnson 2003: 140-141). We may recall that both Aristotle and Quintilian emphasised that metaphors should not be far fetched. Although Aristotle and Quintilian may not have considered the concept of cognition, yet they had identified this vital aspect in laying hold of that which seemed appropriate from the existing format of the metaphorical theory. Hence, metaphors convey various indeterminate, nonpropositional meanings where the blend is constrained by the context³¹ by certain shared beliefs that are held by both the speaker and listener as well as the patterns of inference used by the hearer when determining the speaker's meaning. The significance of context yet again reminds us of Aristotle's observation regarding the context as being a crucial aspect of the theory of metaphors. Hence, our experience of metaphors can be likened to a form of reverberation through the entire network of blends that awakens and connects our memories of our past experiences to other experiences and which furthermore serves as a possible guide for future experiences. Thus it appears that metaphors have several multidimensional properties. It seems that our own concepts of objects, events and activities, can be identified as multidimensional gestalts in which case these different dimensions emerge from and are developed spontaneously by our own experiences in the world (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 121). For example, the metaphor "fake gun" has a "perceptual (look) while it alludes to motor activity, as well as exhibiting a number of purposive and functional properties" (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 121). Blending shows these properties through the language used in the expression, since the properties are not inherent in the gun as an object and a single word, yet they arise from the manner in which the reader or hearer blends with real guns (Goatly 1997: 2, 7; Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 11, 121).

³¹ This understanding rejects many theories which do not consider context or pragmatic factors like context, speaker's intention and reference. One such example of neglecting context is Beardsley's Controversion or Verbal-opposition theory. Beardsley (1972: 74) claims that "when a predicate is metaphorically adjoined to a subject, the predicate loses it [sic] ordinary extension, because it acquires a new intention – perhaps one that it has in no other context". Inherent tensions, or oppositions, within the metaphor force the twist of meaning itself (Beardsley 1972: 74). Many scholars argue that the reader or hearer ought to first evaluate the literal meaning of a word or expression, before attempting an interpretation of the possible metaphorical meaning (Glucksberg & Keysar 1997: 403). However, this view precludes the vital consideration that metaphors are extremely context dependant (Way 1991: 123-124, 129).

Metaphors then operate by “confusing the established logical boundaries for the sake of detecting new similarities which previous categorization prevented our noticing” (Richards in Vanhoozer 1990: 64; cf. Nöth 1985: 11-12; Driven & Paprotté 1985: xi; Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 152). The blending process encourages and creates a sense of intimacy between the speaker and the hearer when the hearer recognises the meanings specifically intended by the speaker. This process allows the speaker and hearer to realise that they share a number of experiences, interests, sensibilities as well as the ability to call upon that information when interpreting the meaning of the metaphor (Gibbs & Gerrig 1989: 153).

Therefore, metaphors are not only situated in the deepest and most general processes of human blending with the reality of both the speaker and the hearer in assimilating and adapting to the world, but they appear to challenge the ordinary conceptions of reality by shattering and yet increasing our sense of reality through language. Metaphors challenge us to move from known ideas and familiar concepts to new and unknown ones. If metaphors surprise us they do so because they point to a relationship that our way of life has already presupposed but which has not before been brought out. Whatever we consider ourselves to know about the world is based on our constructive activity and through the “distorting” influences of cognition and language. Our knowledge is therefore relative to this constructive activity where metaphors have enabled a construction of the conceptual world with its own laws (Driven & Paprotté 1985: viii). Consequently metaphors enlarge our vision of the world by expanding the ‘real’ to include the ‘possible’. In this manner metaphors can be appropriate and helpful since they concern themselves with our interpretation of our world, how we make sense of our reality, how and why we sanction actions and justify inferences, as well as providing assistance in goal setting, which leads to a creation of a ‘surplus’ of meaning (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 5; Fernandez 1977: 104; Vanhoozer 1990: 64). In this light, it appears that metaphors re-describe³² our world and also that of both Paul and the Corinthian Christians.

³² Unlike Ricoeur, Soskice argues that the word ‘re-describe’ should be changed to ‘describe’ as metaphors are described for the initial time (Soskice 1987: 89-90). However, I concur with Ricoeur according to whom metaphors allow a change in the thought and living pattern of the people as readers are encouraged to rethink and to re-describe themselves.

1.7. Conclusion

In order to interpret Paul's metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4 we have introduced the concept of metaphors and briefly discussed the understanding and application of metaphors in antiquity. In antiquity, mainly through Aristotle and Quintilian it has become evident that although metaphors seem decorative, they do carry certain qualities of ideas. Metaphors are life giving and filled with action. They impact on human emotions and enhance meaning. Aristotle and Quintilian's works pertaining to the nature and function of metaphors has influenced contemporary scholarship a great deal, especially with respect to thought and reason, since they form the basis of modern metaphorical thinking. Given that the recognition of metaphor in linguistics and cognition only took place in the twentieth century, the earlier sections discussed contemporary scholarship. In contemporary metaphor theory metaphors are viewed as aspects of thought, semantics, pragmatics and cognition that are expressed through language. Furthermore, metaphors involve a source domain and a target domain that are connected through correspondence. In cognition the human mind blends the correspondences from the source domain with the correspondences of the target domain. It is this blending or mapping process that generates metaphorical meaning. It has also become apparent that socio-rhetorical analysis is valuable in providing cultural and social knowledge necessary for understanding metaphors within a particular cultural and social context. Finally, metaphorical blending moves from known ideas and familiar concepts to unknown ideas and concepts to make sense of a known/experienced reality. Metaphorical blending also aids in the sanctioning of actions, setting goals and therefore providing a surplus of meaning.

Chapter 2

Social Elite and Power: Factionalism in the Corinthian Church (1 Cor 1:10 – 4:21)

2.1. Introduction

Paul makes use of various complex metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4 in order to deal with a socially complex community which in his view had been faced with the problem of factionalism. The underlying causes of factious behaviour threatened to undermine the message of the gospel that Paul had presented to the Corinthians, as well as to undercut Paul's apostolic authority in the Corinthian Christian community. In order to appreciate the manner in which Paul applies complex metaphors to reconstruct and sustain his authority and to address the problem of factionalism, we will first examine the probable grounds for the factionalism within the Corinthian church before re-constructing the rhetorical argument of 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21.

2.2. Corinth

Various social, cultural, economic as well as religious factors and conditions contributed to the environment in Corinth that predisposed the Christian community to a behaviour that led to factionalism. Corinth was established as a Roman colony by Julius Caesar in 44 BCE on the site of the previous city that had been destroyed hundred years before in a revolt against Roman rule. The initial population of Roman Corinth was largely comprised of "freed slaves veterans of war,³³ urban business people, skilled workers and labourers" (Strabo *Geography* 8.2.23; Plutarch *Plutarch's Lives: Life of Caesar* 57.5; Thiselton 2000: 3). The mixture of people settled in Corinth and proceeded to develop the economy of the city through industry and trade (Thiselton 2000: 1-6, 10-12; Clarke 1993: 10-11; Horrell 1996: 65; Braxton 2000: 72). The city developed into a key commercial transit point within the Roman Empire by connecting Italy with Asia through its harbours on the west and the east (Strabo *Geography* 8.6.20), as well as connecting the northern and southern parts of Greece by road. Internal activities, such as the hosting of the Isthmian Games, which were reinstated during the reign of Augustus,

³³ Murphy-O'Connor (1983: 66) feels that the veterans were a small minority.

further contributed to Corinth's economic prosperity (Strabo *Geography* 8.6.20; Clarke 1993: 17).

The economic prosperity of Corinth enabled a number of individuals and their families to accumulate considerable wealth that then empowered them to climb the social ladder of success in Corinth as freedmen (Clarke 1993: 10). Corinth also attracted numerous entrepreneurs in the early period, who were seeking economic opportunities. Consequently, their cultures, traditions and religious thought influenced the Corinthian society (Thiselton 2000: 4). From the East came the mystery cults of Egypt and Asia with their "many lords" while the Greek and Roman pantheons had their "many gods" (1 Cor. 8:5) who had been there since Julius Caesar re-established Corinth as a Roman colony (Fee 1987: 3).³⁴ The remains of a synagogue indicate that Jews had also been present in Corinth.³⁵ Furthermore, similar to many other Roman colonies in the eastern Mediterranean, Corinth had become fully Hellenised since the majority of its inhabitants originated in the Greek speaking parts of the empire and had maintained their Greek cultural ties through religion, philosophy and arts.³⁶

2.3. Corinth's social and administrative structures

While the geographic location of Corinth had certainly attributed to its level of prosperity, the wider social, economic and political system of the Roman Empire influenced greatly Corinth's economic success since it was linked to Corinth's social and administrative structures. However, we possess limited information pertaining to the social stratification within the Corinthian society, which is based mainly on the geography of Corinth and the mixture of inhabitants. Therefore, we will briefly examine the social stratification in the wider Roman Empire and extrapolate those findings onto the Corinthian society since it played a significant role within the Roman colony.³⁷

³⁴ For archaeological evidence alluding to pagan cults in Corinth, see Collins (1999: 22).

³⁵ For archaeological evidence on a fragmentary inscription of a synagogue of the Hebrews and Philo's writing about a Jewish colony in Corinth, see Collins (1999: 22-23). Thiselton (2000: 3-4) supports Wiseman (1979: 497) in his claim that the immigrants from the East also included Jews and Syrians. Also, see Horrell (1996: 91-92) for the Jewish presence.

³⁶ For epigraphic and numismatic evidences regarding Corinth organised according to Roman customs see Collins (1999: 22). Also, note Thiselton (2000: 5), for details on culture in Corinth being predominantly Roman as opposed to Greek.

³⁷ For details, see Clarke (1993: 9-39). For the population as a mixture of people see Collins (1999: 22) and Fee (1987: 2).

As Horrell (1996: 65) points out, a small group of social elite mostly controlled the social structure of Corinth.³⁸ Most were freedpersons (Dio Cassius, *Roman History* 8.20.136), though some came from the ranks of the well-born and were proud to display their nobility (cf. Dio, *Orationes*, 39.1).³⁹ The well-born strived for good education and proper training to acquire wealth, moral excellence, happiness, and honour (cf. Plutarch *Moralia: The Education of Children* 5.C-D). A great number of those were given positions of honour within the civic structures and beyond such as *duoviri iure dicundo*, *duovir quinquennalis*, *aediles*, *agonothetes*, *curator annonae*, *praefectus fabrorum*, and *hellenodikai* (Clarke 1993: 48-56).

Although birth, legal status, place of origin, and high social standing were important, possession and spending of wealth played a major role in gaining high social positions, receiving public approval and obtaining social advancement (Clarke 1993: 127; Horrell 1996: 65-66). Honour was sought in the public arena by the members of the social elite, while public shame or humiliation was associated with dishonour. Positions conferring civic honour required the incumbents to provide for the needs of people within the city (Clarke 1993: 25-26).⁴⁰ The elite extended the public display of their wealth, which attributed social honour to them by erecting a number of new buildings and renovating older structures, providing hospitality to athletes, demonstrating generosity as benefactors to the city and its people, and so forth. As an example of honour ascribed to the elite, it is noteworthy that benefactors to the city were often acknowledged in the form of civic inscriptions, which would possibly even attract the respect of the emperor (Kent 1966: 18; Clarke 1993: 11-13). The competitive striving for honour within the socially prominent members of the Corinthian society indicates that their personal ambitions had constituted an intense desire to increase in both popularity and power.

2.4. Oratory and honour

The power to persuade by deliberation or as “speakers of words” was another way to obtain a personal reputation (Plutarch *Old Men in Public Affairs* 792.D, Plutarch *Moralia: Precepts of Statecraft* 801.E, 802.E; Clarke 1993: 37-38). Clarke (1993: 19)

³⁸ For details, see Horrell (1996: 65, fn. 9).

³⁹ For details on the attitude of well-born towards slaves and women see Dio, *Orationes*, 74.9 and for well-born males avoiding cohabitation with non well-born women see Plutarch, *The Education of Children* 1.A-B.

⁴⁰ For example, Tiberus Claudius Dinippus acquired social honour for his largesse, see Clarke (1993: 18-19).

recounts that Marcus Valerius Taurinus “was honoured by vote of the city council for being a philosopher, a good orator, and having a fine character”. Therefore, citizens in antiquity emphasised that leaders that are to be respected would be required to possess traits such as wisdom, eloquence and good character (Clarke 1993: 20).⁴¹

2.5. Patronage

Climbing the social ladder often depended upon friendships or on a patronage from one’s social superiors. In the case of a friendship between social equals, the friends generally engaged in acts of reciprocity while in the case of social superiors and inferiors the relationship was classified as patron-client relationships. Friendships were maintained through generous flows from both sides that normally depended on wealth (Chow 1992: 31).⁴² Garnsey & Saller (1987: 148) suggest that this form of patronage was beneficial to the society as a whole since it “eased tensions and conflicts provoked by divisions and inequalities.”

Patron-client relationships, which were modelled on the hierarchical character of the household in which the *paterfamilias* occupied the position of dominance, were created and encouraged between unequals, in which case the patron held a socially superior status to his or her clients. Even in this unequal relationship, there existed a bond to bind relationships in human society. The purpose of the client-patron relationship was two-fold, in that the poor depended on monetary assistance from the rich whereas the rich encouraged and commanded the faithful support of the poor (Clarke 1993: 33).⁴³ For example, a patron may have granted manumission to a slave, while rather providing the daily “*sportulae* as *beneficia*” to freedmen (Saller 1982: 24).⁴⁴ In return, the slave might be forced to continue to serve his/her master, and the freedperson might support his/her patron in his/her daily activities in order to assist the patron “in gaining greater honour and reputation while also eagerly awaiting to benefit from the patronage” (Saller 1982: 205; Horrell 1996: 66-67).⁴⁵ Therefore, a patron-client relationship meets the

⁴¹ For another example of honour pertaining to an orator, see Plutarch *Moralia* 723.

⁴² For details, see Chow (1992: 30-36); Clarke (1993: 32).

⁴³ Clarke (1993: 35) notes that “[t]he key words in the patron/client relationship are *patronus*, *cliens*, *amicus*, *beneficium*, *meritum* and *gratia*. More often the last four words are used, since *patronus* and *cliens* imply social inferiority and therefore would tactfully have been avoided in inscriptions” (see fn. 74).

⁴⁴ Saller (1982: 24) refers to *Digest* 38.2.1 in support of this claim.

⁴⁵ For a further discussion on the emperor as a patron, see Saller (1982: 71); Chow (1992: 41-51); Garnsey & Saller (1987: 151).

needs of the clients while the patron's ambitions were achieved in acquiring honour, reputation and praise over against other patrons of similar social standing.⁴⁶

2.6. Corinthian Christians' social and administrative structures

Even though we possess somewhat more information regarding the social positions of some members of the Corinthian church than at the outset of our discussion, at this point we lack the understanding necessary to identify with certainty which social locations were held by the church members, especially by the socially elite (Theissen 1982: 73-83; Meeks 1983: 72-73).⁴⁷ First Corinthians 1:26 is widely thought to provide significantly helpful information pertaining to the social stratification of the Corinthian Christian community. Those described as "not many wise according to human standards, not many powerful, not many well-born" in 1 Cor. 1:26 seems to indicate that some Corinthians were viewed as being wise according to human valuing, and that some were socially influential, and also that some were of noble birth. For example, Stephanas (1:16; 16:17), Gaius (1 Cor. 1:14, cf. Rom 16:23), Chloe (1 Cor. 1:11) and Erastus (Rom. 16:23) maintained households and could thus be described as persons of some means.⁴⁸ At the same time, the "not many" in 1:26 shows that the majority of the community were economically poor (Horrell 1996: 95).⁴⁹ The context of 1 Cor. 1:11 suggests that Chloe's people were slaves or dependent freedpersons (1:11).⁵⁰ Nonetheless, this does not lead to the conclusion that the Corinthian church consisted only of economically rich and economically poor members. It appears, for example, that the church's membership includes those who were of the retainer class, who can be described as those that were directly dependent to various degrees upon a member of the socially elite. Often those belonging to the retainer class were artisans or freedpersons who possessed certain skills that were required by the elite (Murphy-O'Connor 1983: 66-68; Lanci 1997: 27).

⁴⁶ For further details on how patrons received honour and praise from clients, see Dio *Orationes* 4.118-9.

⁴⁷ For a short list of other scholarly works on the social status of the Corinthian community, see Horrell (1996: 93-95).

⁴⁸ For details on Gaius see Horrell (1996: 96). Also, 1 Cor. 11:17-34 and 2 Cor. 8:2, 14 refer to some of the Corinthians as having enough wealth to dine plentifully and to being able to meet the legal charges referred to in 1 Cor 6:1-8 (Horrell 1996: 95).

⁴⁹ For details, see Horrell (1996: 95, 98, fn. 207). Also cf. 1 Cor. 11:17-34 pertaining to the "have nots".

⁵⁰ For details, see Horrell (1996: 98, fn. 209). The church community will have included slaves who depended upon Paul's guidance in 1 Cor. 7:21ff (Horrell 1996: 98).

The social relations within the Corinthian church were probably similar to those of the wider society in antiquity. For instance, the same type of patron-client relationships that existed in the civic society of Corinth, existed in the church community (Chow 1992: 83ff). This would indicate that the social competitiveness of patron-client relationships existing in civic society would therefore also be prevalent within the Corinthian church. Social competitiveness surely must have been the root of the factionalism within the Corinthian church (Welborn 1987a: 93-101),⁵¹ from which it can be deduced that those responsible for dissensions can be characterised as having emerged from within the ranks of the wise, powerful and noble born (1 Cor. 1:26). These Corinthian elite placed great value on human wisdom (sophistry) and knowledge, which stood in contrast to the spiritual wisdom and knowledge that Paul possessed and wished to impart (1 Cor. 1:17; 2:4, 6-7). Their socio-culturally superior positions lead to their assertions that they had received “a richer endowment” than others had from their respective leaders (Meeks 1983: 117). Thus the Corinthian elite, who distinguished themselves from the “unendowed” through their social status and sophistic wisdom, exercised power and control within the Corinthian church. In order to gain a clearer understanding of the factionalism referred to in 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21, we will examine the nature of factionalism and the social context of the Corinthian church in greater detail in the next paragraph.

2.7. Factionalism within the Church at Corinth (1 Cor. 1:10-4:21)

In keeping with his practice of establishing churches in major urban centres, Paul chose Corinth as a mission site and spent some time founding the church. After his departure, he expected the Corinthian Christians to take up the responsibility for continuing their own development in Christian character, fellowship and spirituality (1 Cor. 1:2). However, he received a personal report from Chloe’s people that ἐριδερ (1:11) had arisen in the Corinthian church. Alluding to the political context in which ἐριδερ was regularly used, Welborn (1987a: 87) interprets ἐριδερ (1:11) as referring to a heated dispute in which emotions were inflamed due to the intense rivalry which caused the rise of an intolerable situation.⁵² In 1:10-11 Paul links the ἐριδερ to the σξί/σματα. The noun, σξί&σμα (vs. 10) refers to a rip or tear, as of a piece of cloth (cf. Mk. 2:21), or

⁵¹ Cf. Thiselton (2000: 12-16).

⁵² For details, see Welborn (1987a: 87). Welborn (1987a: 87 n.10) also refers to the following examples of the use of ἐριδερ: Thucydides 6.35; 2.21; Appianus *Bella. Civilia* 2.2.6; 3.86.357; Josephus *Antiquitates Judaicae* 14.16.1 para 470; Plutarch *Caesar* 33.

the ‘ploughing’ of a field in which the soil is “ripped” or “torn” open (BAGD 805; LD 787). The verb, σξί&ζειν, means to divide, separate, rend, or tear (BAGD 805; LD 787). Given that the similar meanings of both noun σξί&σμοα and its verbal form σξί&ζειν were regularly used in a metaphorical sense to refer to political factionalism and divided communities.⁵³ This is also the sense in which Paul is applying the term σξί/σμοατα in his rhetoric. The source term σξί/σμοατα indicates that the Corinthian church was being torn apart and therefore destroyed like a garment was torn, due to the formation of social factions among the members of the community. For this reason, Paul employs another set of metaphors that emphasise unity and engender a common purpose by which he exhorts the Corinthian Christians to refrain from any further divisive behaviour in 1:10.

2.8. Explanations for the factionalism within the Corinthian church

Since at least the time of F. C. Baur, attempts have been made to explain the factionalism at Corinth in terms of theological differences between the groups that appear to be mentioned in 1 Cor. 1:12.⁵⁴ Baur (in Horrell 1996: 112) locates a reference to two competing types of Christianity in 1:12, namely, Pauline Christianity that was associated with Paul and Apollos, and Petrine Jewish Christianity that was connected to Cephas and Christ. Baur believes these two groups have been antithetical to one another and that they exhibited clear theological differences. In support of Baur, Lüdemann (1989: 79-80) argues that the Cephas party forms the locus of an anti-Pauline Jewish Christianity.⁵⁵ In contrast, Munck (1959: 152), Watson (1986: 81-87), and Fee (1987: 57) suggest that there is no evidence of any Judaising activity at Corinth since there is neither a clear-cut ‘Petrine’ theology present nor does Paul indicate that those belonging to a Cephas party held a distinctive theological position (1:12; 3:22). To support this argument, it appears that 1:12 and 3:22 provide the only two occasions in 1 Corinthians, at which Cephas is mentioned in connection with the divisions among the Corinthians, and these passages do not provide further information pertaining to the distinctive positions held by the Cephas party (Horrell 1996: 113).

⁵³ Herodotus *Persian Wars* 7.219; *PLond.* 2710.13. References are taken from Mitchell (1991: 72). For details, see Mitchell (1991: 72-73, fn.37, 39).

⁵⁴ See Baur (1831) for his discussion of 1 Cor. 1:12. Unfortunately, this work has not been available to me in South Africa.

⁵⁵ See Hurd (1965: 97-107).

The work of W. Lütgert (1908)⁵⁶ (in Schmithals 1971: 121-122), offers an alternative theological interpretation to that of Baur. He maintains that those associated with Christ in 1 Cor. 1:12 represented a group of spiritual enthusiasts, who radicalised Paul's teachings on the Spirit and thereby came into opposition with Paul and those associated with him in Corinth.⁵⁷ Lütgert and others such as Schmithals (1971) label these spiritual enthusiasts as Gnostics,⁵⁸ however others such as Thiselton (2000: 131-133) accept the idea of spiritual enthusiasts without linking them to Gnosticism. Nonetheless, the fact that Paul does not directly link the Christ party to the πνευματικοί/ of 2:13, 15; or 3:1 strongly argues against this position and avoids making the fundamental mistake of seeing theological differences as the source of the factionalism. As Munck (1959: 138-139) observes, the divisions did not appear to have been based on theological reasons, but they seem to reflect the tendency of church members to identify exclusively with one or other of the "teachers" (1:12).⁵⁹ Therefore, the evidence points to the conclusion that the factionalism was rooted in the social situation, and not in a particular theological conflict (Marshall 1987: ix). A different view can be found in the work of Schneider (1970: 85) who considers the root of the factionalism to be an erroneous evaluation of others, and an unhealthy amalgamation between how the Corinthians perceived Paul and how they viewed the Gospel to the point of substituting the preacher with that which is preached. Schneider (1970: 86) describes this as, "Gott und Mensch verwechseln".

Meeks (1983: 117); Hyldahl (1991: 25); Ker (2000); and Smit (2002: 240ff) argue that Paul's principal concern in 1 Corinthians 1-4 is the rivalry that had emerged between partisans of Apollos and himself in the church at Corinth. When Paul attacks human wisdom in 1 Corinthians in 1:17-2:16, his attack seems to be aimed at the supporters of Apollos who disparaged Paul's preaching because it had not been presented with eloquent words nor was it deemed to have been on a par with the sophisticated wisdom of antiquity (2:1-6). This position is supported by the fact that Apollos is portrayed as an eloquent and powerful rhetor who appeared to have been well versed in the use of the

⁵⁶ This work has not been available to me in South Africa.

⁵⁷ For a discussion of those holding some form of this position, see Thiselton (2000: 131, 133).

⁵⁸ Schmithals (1971:120-122) criticises Lütgert for not going far enough in his analysis of the origins of the Gnosticism in Corinth.

⁵⁹ Munck (1959: 136-139) rejects the idea that factions existed in the church at the time 1 Corinthians was written. Cf. Fee (1987: 54). His views are based on a very specific understanding of factions as an eschatological phenomenon based on 1 Cor. 11:19 rather than as a sociological phenomenon. What he refers to as 'divisions' appear to rather have been factions in a sociological sense.

Jewish scriptures according to Acts 18:24-30. A further support is in Paul's criticism of the form of wisdom associated with rhetorical sophistication (Given 2001: 95-103). Paul on the one hand embraces Apollos as a fellow worker in 1 Corinthians 3-4, but consistently places himself in a dominant role in relation to the Corinthians (Ker 2000), and implicitly in relation to Apollos as will be demonstrated in our following analysis of the metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4.

Winter (2002) has taken a step further the idea that factionalism arose between the partisans of Paul and Apollos. He argues that Paul's Corinthian converts "formulated a sophistic conception of 'discipleship', which in turn exposed the churches to the inevitable problems of dissension and jealousy associated with the secular movement" in which eloquent rhetoricians, as well as disciples who paid to be taught by a sophist, attracted large partisan followings (Winter 2002: 141). Winter (2002: 141) also suggests that the dissensions in Corinth were exacerbated by "the *modus operandi* of Apollos" who came to Corinth, subsequent to Paul's departure. In Acts 18:24-28, Apollos is portrayed as a powerful and persuasive rhetorician, who publicly debated with the Jews regarding Jesus' messiahship (Winter 2002: 177-178). His debating skills and rhetorical eloquence impressed Paul's converts to the extent that a number of the church members identified with him similarly to the same way in which followers of sophists attached themselves to these various sophists in secular society (Winter 2002:172-179). Thus the factionalism appears to have resulted on the basis of secular practices associated with sophists and their disciples that had been brought into the church (Winter 2002: 178-179; 2001: 31-43).

Winter's explication of the factionalism within the church at Corinth seems plausible for several reasons. First, he locates these issues within a given social context, namely, the rivalry between the partisans of competing sophists. Second, he offers a cogent interpretation of much of the content of 1 Corinthians 1-4 based on his analysis of the situation. An example of Winter's interpretation will illustrate the general cogency of his arguments. In 1 Cor. 3:21-23 Paul forbids the Corinthians to boast and to demonstrate conceit on the basis of the socio-cultural reputation and standing of their human leaders, which was the general behaviour of partisans of sophists at that time, thereby creating ζηλον and εριον, jealousy and strife (Winter 2002: 196; cf. 1 Cor. 3:3). Paul demonstrates an outcome of the Christian counterculture by stating

emphatically that he, Apollos, and Cephas, as well as everything else, belongs to the Corinthians as opposed to the other way around. As such, “Paul radically reverses the μαθητη&ω/σοφιστη&ω perception by which the congregation measured its relationship to the teachers, for the secular Corinthian precedence was totally inappropriate in the church” (Winter 2002: 195).

Other possible reasons for factionalism point to the behaviour of the Corinthian elite. Theissen (1982) convincingly helps us to trace social divisions back to the relationship between the missionaries and the baptised.⁶⁰ Paul actively discourages any personal attachments between those having been baptised and those having baptised them (1:12-17). It is possible, by extrapolating Paul’s concerns, that the formation and the standing of the relationship between the missionaries and the baptised could be linked to the congregation and the itinerant apostles and thus function as a foreshadowing of the Corinthian dissensions.⁶¹ Theissen (1982: 54) highlights this by stating, “who within a congregation would enter into a special relationship with the itinerant apostles?” He observes:

Naturally, nobody wishes to spend money for a second-class missionary; for that reason all regard as the most important missionary the one they have supported (and by whom they have surely been influenced theologically). What is more, if the missionary were important, so would his followers within the community be. Thus the disagreement among different parties may be a matter of scrapping for position within the pecking order (Theissen 1982: 54-55).

It appears that few in the Corinthian church that belonged to the dominant social classes were from the ‘wise, powerful and noble born’ (1:26). From this background, it is appealing to understand that Gaius and Stephanus both might have belonged to higher strata and may have been patrons of Paul. It may well be that Paul not only baptised his patrons but their entire household, which includes their immediate family as well as freedpersons and the various slaves connected to their households (Rom. 16:23; 1 Cor.

⁶⁰ For details, see Theissen (1982: 54-55).

⁶¹ Horrell (1996: 116-117) supports Theissen and establishes a similar reason for the dissensions leading to the factionalism.

16:15-18) (Theissen 1982: 55). Such forms of practices and relationships would have been commonplace between the wealthy, that is, the Corinthian elite and respective leaders in the Corinthian church to whom they attached themselves. It also appears that recruitment and baptism may have begun with the prominent person, thereafter moving to his or her household, as well as to persons in close contact with the household, and creating the basis for a house church. The formation of several such house churches in the community may have led to the kind of rivalry that seems to lie at the root of Paul's statement about divisions within the church community and the need for unity as pointed out in 1 Cor. 1:10-12. Therefore, patronage with popular missionaries was a system whereby the socially elite could establish and maintain their popularity and dominance within the Corinthian church.

Similarly, Pogoloff (1992: 100-104) applies a social and ethical perspective and suggests that the dissensions leading to the factionalism arose based on competition for status. Based on this understanding, we can observe that the Corinthian elite gladly offered their patronage to Paul, Apollos and other missionaries, since this was according to their mind-set an acceptable and even laudable way of gaining honour and prestige within their society and church (Pogoloff 1992: 178). Having in all likelihood hosted other spiritual leaders in a similar fashion; it follows that the socially elite would had grounds for taking pride in the leader that they had hosted. Therefore, it seems apparent that Apollos who was described as displaying a greater sense of sophistication in the area of rhetoric, would have been compared to Paul's ostensible unskilled rhetoric, leading to a superiority complex amongst Apollos' patron and supporters. Although this form of pride based on the patronage system attributed honour and power to the patron, as Mitchell (1991: 91-92) observes, a number of negative results arise, such as envy (Plutarch *Moralia* 539D, 546D; 1 Cor. 3:3), glory seeking (Plutarch *Moralia* 540D; 1 Cor. 4:10; 12:23), and comparative judgements in which others are belittled (Plutarch *Moralia* 540B; 1 Cor. 4:1-5). These negative outcomes appear to have been paralleled within the factious situation of Corinth.

2.8.1. Political

Finally, we will discuss the political background of the Corinthian church, since this may well have influenced the causation of the factionalism. The earlier sections show that competition for power was a daily occurrence in antiquity. Welborn (1987a: 91)

extends the work of Gelzer and Syme by discovering that Roman antiquity was characterised by personal alliances that were often driven by friendship, kinship and patronage relationships, which in turn were used by powerful figures rivalling for status and power.

Welborn (1987a: 88-89) observes that Paul addresses the entire church community by choosing a lingual style that denotes a political background (σξί/σματα, ε!ριδεφ, ζη~λοφ, μερι/φ). To underline this argument, Welborn (1987a: 90-93) compares the slogans that Paul quotes in 1:12 with declarations of personal allegiance in the realm of politics (cf. Mitchell 1991: 68-91). He recalls that political parties were named after the individuals whose interests they served (Welborn 1987a: 91; Collins 1999: 79). The relationships within political parties can be described in Welborn's words, "throughout antiquity personal adherence is the basic relationship from which party identification developed, as personal enmity is the social reality behind the concept of the opposing faction" (Welborn 1987a: 90). Mitchell (1991: 65) builds on Welborn's argument and suggests that 1 Cor. 1:10 not only "contains technical language derived from Greco-Roman political oratory and treatises" but such treatises are concerned with political unity and disunity.⁶²

Nonetheless, Welborn's evidence is relevant only to the extent of providing the background to the slogans but not the form of the slogans. Mitchell (1991: 67-68) criticises Welborn by observing that no parallels in Greek literature to the form of the slogans found in 1 Cor. 1:12 have come to light. She argues that it is inappropriate to view the slogans as slogans of political parties since Paul does not employ the normal secular form of a political slogan in his letters (Mitchell 1991: 84). The slogans function merely to express a dependence of a certain faction upon its leader (Mitchell 1991: 84). In support of Mitchell's argument, it is reasonable to suggest that if the Corinthian groups could be compared to political parties, their leaders would have guided and encouraged their supporter to win over the other party even at the cost of accusing and laying charges against the other. However, in the Corinthian church, it seems clear that

⁶² Mitchell (1991: 65-66) takes the lead from Meeks and Theissen and suggests that the whole of 1 Corinthians deals with political oratory and political unity, whereas many scholars limit this likelihood to 1 Corinthians 1-4. Mitchell uses the word "political" in the sense that the church community at Corinth formed a political body, "a body of citizens." In this manner, they operate as a political body that functions much as other political/social entities in antiquity.

only the various patrons and their respective supporters were engaged in power struggles and were therefore the only ones causing factionalism. Thus, the missionaries were not the instigators of any dissension within the Corinthian church.

From the discussion above, the form of the “I am” slogans that Paul uses in his rhetoric to address factionalism in the Corinthian church clearly reflect the secular society. It appears then that within secular society, the conventions of patronage viewed in the broader context of ancient political parties and the sophistic loyalty between pupil and teacher, correspond to the issues leading to the factionalism in the Corinthian church. Therefore, the factionalism has not occurred based on Gnostic theology or infectious Judaistic propaganda but because of human and worldly behaviour involving social status, rivalry, jealousy and strife among the followers of various leaders (Clarke 1993: 95). Welborn (1987a: 87), frames it as a “power struggle” and Theissen (1982: 89) as, “a struggle for position within the congregation”. Given that 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21 is widely, though not universally, viewed as the first rhetorical unit of the letter, a key issue concerns the way in which Paul’s rhetoric in 1:10-4:21 addresses the problem of factionalism. However, before investigating into this matter, we will consider the rhetorical structure and genre of 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21.

2.9. Rhetorical Genre and 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21

Some diversity is found among scholarly opinions as pertaining to the rhetorical genre of 1 Corinthians as well as to the extent of the various rhetorical units of the letter. Wuellner (1979: 184-185), for example, suggests that 1 Corinthians functions as epideictic rhetoric.⁶³ Unlike a majority of scholars, who claim that the first argumentative section ends at 4:21 (e.g., Mitchell 1991: 197-224; Wanamaker 2003a: 121-122), Wuellner maintains that the first argumentative unit ends at 6:11. In the rhetorical unit 1 Cor. 1:1-6:11, Wuellner notes that Paul uses 1:19-3:21 as a digression to strengthen loyalty to values that the Corinthian Christians should follow for appropriate action to be taken in the present. This is clearly an epideictic or demonstrative function and is based on Wuellner’s digressions that are often used as a means of persuasion within epideictic discourse. Furthermore, Paul’s reference to himself as a role model for

⁶³ For details on epideictic rhetoric see Aristotle, *Art of Rhetoric*, 1.3.3-4; 1.9.1, 6, 40; Quintilian *Institutio Oratoria* 3.7.2; Cicero *Partitiones Oratoriae*, 20.69; Cicero *De Inventione*. 2.59.177; Vickers (1988: 56-67).

the Corinthian Christians to imitate in 1 Cor. 4:16 is another example of epideictic rhetoric. Wuellner (1979: 184) bases his conclusion on the work of Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969: 50) and notes that Paul's reference to his "ways in Christ" serves as "an example, a paradigm of the values lauded," and functions "to increase adherence to these values on the one hand and on the other hand to strengthen the disposition towards action". Hester (1994: 9) agrees with Wuellner, in that 1 Corinthians is described as functioning as epideictic rhetoric, and in that the first unit ends in 6:11. Hester (1994: 16) writes, "the argument serves to *censure* and to *educate*, to re-align loyalty to a gospel received and believed by the Corinthians." Hester (1994: 17) continues with the statement that the "letter to Corinthians is primarily educational in nature, seeking to secure adherence to shared and accepted values" ⁶⁴

The assertions of Wuellner and Hester, which state that the first argumentative unit, like the letter as a whole, is epideictic in character, does not seem to take adequate account of the argument in 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21. Mitchell (1991: 20-64) sheds further light on the subject by demonstrating that the letter as a whole is deliberative in character. Traditionally, deliberative rhetoric was set in the context of the public assembly. Therefore, it is appropriate for Paul to address his church community as a special type of assembly, as the εὐκκλασι/α του~ θεου~ suggests. ⁶⁵ Furthermore, deliberative rhetoric is partly exhortative and partly dissuasive (Aristotle *Art of Rhetoric* 1.3.3). It deals with recommending or advising an audience to adopt the better measure and to avoid the worst (Aristotle *Art of Rhetoric* 1.3.5). The function of the audience is to either approve or reject the recommendations for an action in the future (Aristotle *Art of Rhetoric* 1.3.4-5). ⁶⁶ Welborn (1987b: 335) points out that Paul's advice to the Corinthian Christians appears to be a deliberative type of discourse that is normally described as περι& ο(μονοι/αφ. In περι& ο(μονοι/αφ discourse, statesmen or philosophers seek to conciliate rival factions by dissuading them from strife (ε)ριτω) and exhorting them to concord (ο(μο&νοια). As Welborn (1987b: 334-340) demonstrates,

⁶⁴ Fiorenza (1987: 391) argues that Wuellner's 1979 attempt to define epideictic in terms of its educational function, depends heavily on the work of Perelman & Olbrechts-Tyteca (1969: 51), and that Hester (1994: 5-6; 16-18) has appropriated the educational nature of epideictic from Wuellner's conclusions.

⁶⁵ The term εὐκκλασι/α was the generally used Greek term to refer to an assembly of the citizens of a city.

⁶⁶ In deliberative speeches, it is less worthwhile to state matters foreign to the subject. Moreover, deliberative speech admits less of malicious sophistry than judicial pleading, but is more widely interesting (*Art of Rhetoric*. 1.1.10). Example suits deliberative because a decision is made by arguing of the future from what has gone before (*Art of Rhetoric*. 1.9.40).

this appears to reflect a major feature of the discourse in 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21. Paul thus exhorts the Corinthian Christians to unify by urging them to have the same mind and same judgement (1:10). Paul reinforces this in 4:16 where he appeals to his readers to imitate him, and in 4:21 he calls on his readers to take a decision about their future behaviour (Fiore 1985: 86-87). Since the first argumentative unit of the letter indicates that a decision is to be made concerning the Corinthian's future behaviour, Paul's overall argument is similar to deliberative rhetoric (Wanamaker 2003a: 123) whereby his readers are persuasively coerced to decide whether or not to accept his authority. These factors point to the fact that 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21 is deliberative in character.⁶⁷ That 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21 is deliberative, calling for concord and a decision to accept Paul's authority, does not mean, however, that epideictic material cannot be included within the argumentative section that is essentially deliberative as Cicero, *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 3.8.15 shows. This may help to explain why Wuellner and Hester, as well as Mitchell (1991: 207-255), suggest that the opening section is epideictic in character.

2.10. Rhetorical construction of 1 Cor 1:10 – 4:21

The father-son combination of Hester (1994: 9) and Amador (2000: 7) yields the view that 1 Corinthians is a rhetorical unity in which there are several major rhetorical units including an introduction (1:1-10); four argumentative units (*1:11-6:11*⁶⁸; 6:12-11:1; 11:2-14:40; 15:1-58) and concluding remarks (16:1-24). Unlike, Hester, Amador, and Wuellner, all three of whom define the first rhetorical unit as 1:11-6:11, most scholars argue that 1:10-4:21 constitutes the first rhetorical unit. For example, Mitchell (1991: 184-185) notes that 1:10 provides the thesis statement for the argument, while 1:11-17 contains a statement of the facts of the case and 1:18-4:21 produces the first section of proof.⁶⁹ Castelli (1991: 111) maintains that “the call to unity in 1:10-17 and the call to imitation in 4:14-21” strengthen the views that the section 1:10-4:21 is one rhetorical unit.⁷⁰

⁶⁷ Mitchell (1991: 207-225) views the first proof section (1:18-4:21) as largely epideictic on the grounds of Paul's censure of the Corinthians, particularly in chs. 3-4. Her work lacks the necessary attention to the issue that the whole of the letter's persuasiveness as deliberative rhetoric hinges on whether the readers accept Paul's authority based on his argument in 1:10-4:21 or not; an argument that culminates with his demand for a decision accepting his authority by the readers in 4:21.

⁶⁸ Sections in italics indicate the diversity shown by scholars with respect to the extent of chapters and the verses to be considered as a rhetorical unit.

⁶⁹ Plank (1987: 12) also sees 1 Corinthians 1-4 as a rhetorical unit.

⁷⁰ For details, see Castelli (1991: 98-111). Also, see the article of Smit (2002) on 1 Cor 1:10-4:21 as a rhetorical unit.

In addition, the following evidence argues for 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21 constituting a singular rhetorical unit. First, the repetition of *παρακαλω* in 1:10 and 4:16 functions as an *inclusio* to bind 1:10-4:21 together. In 1:10, Paul exhorts his Corinthian readers to unity, and later in 4:16 he implores them to imitate him in order to restore unity to the Corinthian Church (Wagner 1998: 281-282). Secondly, just as in 1:11, where Paul refers to a report that he had received earlier on, Paul introduces in 5:1 a new and distinct issue regarding the sexual immorality of one of the members of the community based on a further report he had apparently received (Wanamaker 2003a: 122). Moreover, Paul moves from a general discussion in 1:10-4:21 to the case of a specific individual whose behaviour has been shown as unacceptable in 5:1. Thirdly, Paul responds to the factionalism and its effects on distorting the gospel and social relations within the church community in 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21. In 4:6 Paul clarifies that his main concern is revolved around the factionalism that has emerged between his own supporters and those of Apollos who had become arrogant (*φυσιοῦσθε*), scornful and overbearing towards one another. Paul concludes with a warning (4:18-21) to those who had become arrogant (*εὐφυσισίωθησα*) that he would return shortly and that he would then test their power, which was independent of any rhetorical skills they might possess thereby completing his initial response to the factionalism first mentioned in 1:12. Lastly, 1:10 can be considered as the rhetorical *prothesis* for the entire the letter, as Mitchell (1991: 198-200) suggests, which, as Given (2001: 93-94) observes, appears to be particularly relevant for the rhetorical unit 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21:

Before Paul can set about to restore harmony (*οἰμολογία*) through addressing the wide range of divisive behaviour at Corinth, he must first re-establish his authority among those elements of the community that have come to regard him as weak and inferior on the basis of *his initial appearance* among them.

2.10.1 The Rhetorical sub-unit of 1:10-17

The deliberative argument in 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21 consists of several rhetorical sub-units. The first sub-unit consists of 1:10-17, where the overall pattern of first person singular verbs in the sub-unit indicates that a form of verbal transaction occurs in a discursive

movement, which manifests itself as a shift from a singular person, Paul, to Corinthian Christians addressed as υ(μα~φ (1:10). The discourse strategically incorporates the Corinthian Christians in an arena defined as those persons enjoying a personal relationship with Paul as α)δελφοι/ (vs. 10) and α)δελφοι/ μου (vs. 11). Merely based on the authority of Jesus Christ, Paul uses *pathos* (1:2) in his appeal to the Corinthians as his own brothers and sisters (kinship language) to include these Corinthian Christians to experience a similar relationship with him (cf. Collins 1999: 71).

Paul's repetition of the first person singular and second person plural in verbal forms reflect an act of communication between Paul and the Corinthian elite which emphasises the *prothesis* or *propositio*, which is the thesis statement of the case. Paul's *prothesis* serves to introduce the subsequent rhetorical argument, which contains his plea for unity within the Corinthian church (Mitchell 1991: 198-200). In his *prothesis* he urges the factious church to dwell in unity by using the terms the "same mind" (αυ)τω?~ νοι%) and the "same opinion/judgement" (αυ)τη~? γνω&μη?) that can be viewed as synonyms. Moreover, the repetition of the term αυ)το/π, η/, ο/ also has the rhetorical effect of highlighting Paul's purpose of unity (cf. Collins 1999: 69). Thus, Paul's *propositio* expects the future restoration of the Corinthians as a reflection of their earlier situation that incorporate an apparent unity of mind and purpose within the community.

While Mitchell (1991: 200-202) maintains that 1 Cor. 1:11-17 is a *narratio* or statement of facts that explains the nature of what is disputed, it is perhaps better simply to see these verses as Paul's rationale for his exhortation in 1:10 with amplification, though as we will see, 1:17 has another rhetorical function.

In 1 Cor. 1:11-13 Paul sets out the situation that demands the corrective advice in 1:10 that as an entity can be read as providing the thesis statement for the entire letter. Paul indicates that he believes based on a report from Chloe's people, that there are contentions (ε!ριδεφ) among the Corinthian Christians that are destroying the unity of the community (1:13; 3:1-3; 11:17-22; 12:12-27). Although Strüder (2003: 436) argues that "[a] competition between teachers for merely rhetorical reasons is hardly plausible and might not be sufficient for the formation of groups or parties within a Christian

community”⁷¹, the following discussion seeks to demonstrate that the Corinthian Christians were engaged in factious behaviour among themselves instead of maintaining group solidarity (1:12) (Litfin 1994: 182). To address this situation, Paul deals with the issue of ἐριδιεφ by raising a series of rhetorical questions in 1:13: “Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptised in the name of Paul?” (Fee 1986: 59-60; Mitchell 1991: 86; Thiselton 2000: 134).⁷² It appears that Paul elicits negative responses from the Corinthian Christians that would put them on the defensive (Collins 1999: 81-82). However, Paul’s rhetorical questions also remind them of the need for unity and its basis, which is Christ alone who had been crucified for their salvation and in whose exclusive name they had been baptised.

Paul’s listing of those whom he had baptised at Corinth in 1:14-16 suggests that one of the criterion for belonging to a particular group may have been by whom a person had been baptised. Similarly Paul’s assertion that his initial preaching had been οὐκ εἰς σοφίαν/λόγον, “without rhetorical skill” in 1:17 indicates that rhetorical eloquence was probably a criterion for some in choosing to which missionary, almost certainly Apollos for those wishing to be identified with rhetorical eloquence (cf. Acts 18:24-28), they attached themselves and therefore to what group they belonged (cf. Winter 2002: 187). Paul explains within the context of 1:14-16, particular in vs. 17, why he had not been concerned with whom he had baptised since this was not the task with which Christ had charged him. However, 1:17 serves as the transition to 1:18-31, where Paul discusses the nature of his preaching of the cross and the divine intention in the way in which he had preached the cross.

Within the rhetorical structure of 1:10-4:21, 1:17 serves to introduce the topic of Paul’s first main argument in 1:18-31. Although 1:17 is linked to what has preceded by the denial that Paul was sent to baptise the Corinthians, Paul is more concerned with the nature of his apostolic preaching, which is introduced in 1:17, where Paul presents the

⁷¹ Strüder (2003: 447) suggests that the grammar within 1Cor 1,12 indicates “a competition of preferences”. Therefore, in his view, “[t]he Corinthian quarrels are not between parties but among the members of the community themselves, and they become visible in the mutually exclusive preferences that each one pronounces”.

⁷² The verb μεριζεῖν and its cognate noun μεριζή are also used as political vocabulary to describe factionalism in antiquity (Welborn 1987a: 87). For details on μεριζή in relation to the statement “has the body of Christ been split into parties?”, see Welborn (1987a: 87). Similarly, see Mitchell (1991: 86) on μεριζή.

thesis that he had been commissioned by Christ to preach the gospel $\text{ου)κ ε0ν σοφι/α| λο/γου}$. According to Litfin (1994: 188),

[t]he qualifying phrase $\text{ου)κ ε0ν σοφι/α| λο/γου}$ specifies the manner in which this assignment [the preaching of the gospel] was not to be conducted. In other words, Paul states that his assignment from Christ included not only the command that he should preach the Gospel; it also involved some implicit or explicit indications regarding the form of manner of that preaching.

Furthermore, Paul asserts that his preaching should be $\text{ου)κ ε0ν σοφι/α| λο/γου}$. The use of a certain form of sophistic rhetorical skill in preaching Christ would appear to render the cross of no effect ($\text{κενωθη|}=\text{}$), thus Paul avoids rhetorical sophistication in his preaching so that the cross of Christ would be allowed maximum effect (1:17c). According to Winter (2002: 188), Philo recognised that the rhetorical methods of the sophist, which mainly concentrated on the means to persuade an audience, could easily obscure the content of the message being presented, thereby subverting the critical judgment of the audience. In Paul's case his claim that Christ had not mandated the use of rhetorical skill when he initially preached to the Corinthians, may well have been intended to address one of the fundamental criticisms levelled against him by some of the Corinthian elite who overvalued rhetorical skill and argued that Paul lacked these sophistic qualities (Litfin 1994: 187-192). However, 1:17 also represents a radical challenge to the cultural importance given to rhetorical eloquence and the social status associated with it since the shame associated with the cross implicitly overwrites the honour associated with eloquent speech (Pogoloff 1992: 119).

2.10.2. The Rhetorical Sub-unit of 1:17-31

While the reasoning of 1:17 provides a conclusion to 1:10-16, or perhaps more accurately vss. 13-16, Paul introduces his first main argument in 1:17 by suggesting that "sophistic means of persuasion are unsuitable for securing belief in the gospel" (Winter 2002: 164). The reason that the rhetorical eloquence associated with the sophistic tradition was wholly inappropriate to the subject of Paul's preaching - the cross of Christ - was that this appeared base in character as it dealt with a subject that had been

determined as unmentionable in the sophisticated society of the elite in the Roman world (Welborn 2005: 129-131). A message of divine salvation based on the crucified Christ was viewed as a *non sequitur* as crucifixion was a slave's form of death in Paul's world, a form of death reserved for persons of no social or cultural value (Welborn 2005: 132). The overriding question was therefore: how could someone who suffered a slave's death be a source of divine salvation for all humanity? This illustrates Paul's motivation for arguing that his rhetoric is not cultured, nor is it wise or powerful. Indeed, to have applied powerful and eloquent rhetoric would have endangered the message of the cross. Unfortunately many Corinthians might have appropriated the message of Christ crucified for the wrong reasons if the culturally expected form of rhetoric were allowed to minimise the scandal and foolishness of the cross. This is why, according to Paul, the $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\phi$ or message of the cross, which can be viewed a metonym for the whole message of salvation associated with Christ, represents utter foolishness ($\mu\omega\rho\iota/\alpha$) to those who are perishing, but to those who are being saved it can certainly be viewed as a source of divine power (1:18). Plank (1987: 18-19) suggests that the word of the cross actually "enacts the *dynamis* of God which destroys the sage's wisdom and thwarts the cleverness of the clever (1:18-19)." Wilckens (1959: 215) underlines this by maintaining that wherever the cross is preached, God is clearly referred to, since the crucified Christ embodies and demonstrates God's power and wisdom.

The whole of 1:18-25 rhetorically functions then to subvert the value system of the Corinthian elite through inversion (Carter 1997: 60). The wisdom they value, the wisdom associated with rhetorical education, God deems as foolishness according to Paul. The scandal and foolishness of the cross, as proclaimed by Paul, is God's chosen means for bringing salvation to those who trust in and are loyal to Christ (vs. 21). Paul appears to set up a rhetorical dilemma for those who view his preaching as unsophisticated by identifying his own preaching of the cross of Christ, as God's humanly foolish means of salvation. Rhetorical eloquence that hides or obscures the utter foolishness of the cross in human terms obscures and subverts the true power of the cross according to Paul. Thus Paul's rhetoric can be perceived as 'clever rhetoric' in its own right as it downplays the eloquent wisdom that the Corinthian wise were interested in.

Noticeably Paul applies a different line of reasoning in 1:26, in that he reminds the Corinthians that a significant portion of the church members had not emerged from within the ranks of the wise, the prominent, and the noble born,⁷³ which represent those who would have been members of the local oligarchy in Corinth (Welborn 1987a: 97). This was a deliberate action on Paul's part, since in vss. 27-28 he indicates that God chose to invert the social value system of antiquity. God chose the foolish, the weak, and the despised and those of no account,⁷⁴ the "nothings" (τα.: μη.: ο!ντα).⁷⁵ God did so to shame the wise and the powerful, and to bring to nought those who were socially and politically prominent. The divine purpose in preferring the "nothings" or nobodies of society, while humbling the socially prominent, was in order to prevent human boasting before God (1:29), the very kind of boasting that apparently was leading to the divisions within the church (cf. 1 Cor. 4:6). Verses 26-28 demonstrate that members of social elite represented the real objects of God's intention to humble and bring to nought, according to Paul. God's intention underlines Paul's own rhetorical intention, through the inversion of values in 1:29-30, to denigrate those of high social status whose flaunting of their education and social prominence was the cause of divisions in the Corinthian church (Pogoloff 1992: 130), while identifying himself "directly with the socially disadvantaged in Corinth to win their loyalty" (Carter 1997: 61).

Welborn (1987a: 96) views such social valuing system in Corinth having similarities in antiquity and identifies them as,

The supporters of oligarchic government are referred to as the "wise" (σοφοι& or φρο&νιμοι), the "powerful" (δυνατοι&), the "nobly-born" (ευ)γενει<φ, γεννα<οι, or γνω&ριμοι) all substitutes for "the rich"; while "the poor," the supporters of democracy, are styled in antithesis the "vulgar"

⁷³ Theissen (1982: 70-73) describes the wise, the powerful, and the noble born as three separate categories of people. This classification seems unlikely, since the terms represent three different characterisations of the same group of people, namely the socially prominent members of the society who were rhetorically educated, had social influence, and came from families that had held positions of prominence over several generations. See Munck (1959: 162-163) on the possible connection of the wise, the prominent, and the well-born to circumstances of human life.

⁷⁴ In 1 Cor. 1:27-28 the neuter plural forms of the adjectives refer to a group of persons and emphasises their general qualities. See Blass, Debrunner & Funk (1961, sect. 138 (1)).

⁷⁵ See Fee (1987: 81) for scholars' works on τα.: μη.: ο!ντα.

(μωροί or βαναυσοί), the “weak” (ἀσθενεῖς), the “lowly-born” (ἀγενεῖς or δημοτικοί).⁷⁶

Paul’s categories of analysis pertaining to the divisions in the community thus reflect those of Aristotle, who recognised that “. . . oligarchy is defined by birth (γενεα), wealth (πλοῦτος) and education (παιδεία), the democratic characteristics are thought to be the opposite of these, low birth (ἀγενεα) poverty (πενία) and vulgarity (βαναυσία)” (*Politics* 1317b39-41; *Art of Rhetoric* 1.5.5).

2.10.3. The Rhetorical Sub-unit of 2:1-5

In 1 Cor 2:1-5 Paul does not introduce a new concept, however he applies an *expolitio* (refining and embellishing) in order to amplify the theme of 1:17, as Pogoloff (1992: 129-131) demonstrates.⁷⁷ Paul’s argument in 2:1-5 is skilfully set forth by the repeated treatment of first personal singular verbs, ἦλθον (vs. 1), ἐκρίναμι (vs. 2), ἐγενόμην (vs. 3) and first person singular pronouns κἀγώ (vss. 1, 3), and μου [vs. 4 (x2)], along with the inclusion of the second person plural pronouns ὑμεῖς (vs. 1), ὑμεῖς (vs. 2), ὑμεῖς (vs. 3), ὑμεῖς (vs. 5). These clearly indicate a verbal transaction between Paul, represented in the first person singular forms of the verbs and pronouns, and his immediate auditors, the Christian community of Corinth, portrayed by the second person plural pronouns. The repetition of the first person singular verbs and the first and second person pronouns thus creates a progression through the verses. In 2:1, by returning to the first-person singular, which is last used in 1:17, Paul forewarns the Corinthians Christians of his return within the theme of 1:17 in which he had first mentioned that his own preaching to the Corinthians was not based on their idea of sophistic eloquence (Pogoloff 1992: 130). This time Paul recounts the approach or “stance” that he took to preaching the gospel when he arrived in Corinth (Winter 2002: 156). He uses the “mysteries of God” as a synonym for the gospel message to emphasise that the gospel of Christ crucified is the secret wisdom of God that the world cannot grasp in its supposed wisdom and sophistication (cf. 2:6-8). Paul states that he had not approached the Corinthians with “high-sounding rhetoric or a display of

⁷⁶ Welborn (1987a: 96-97 fn. 52) gives further references to Greek usage - Loenen, *Stasis*, 7-10; R.A. Neil, *Aristophanes’ Knights*.

⁷⁷ Pogoloff (1992: 130) refers to *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.42.55 when elaborating on the nature and use of *expolitio*. Since his quote stems from 4:42:54, his given reference is incorrect.

cleverness” (Thiselton 2000: 208) since he had desired to preach exclusively concerning Jesus Christ and his death on the cross (2:1-2). This clearly reformulates that which Paul had communicated earlier in 1:17b. However, 2:12 also serves as amplification since sophists would certainly refrain from mentioning virtues of such a crude nature, for example a public crucifixion. Thus, Paul’s message was incongruous with the eloquent rhetoric that the wise and powerful in the community preferred (Winter 2002: 157).

In 2:3, Paul extends his message beyond 2:1-2 in his self-portrayal as the antithesis of the sophist. He claims that since he does not have the impressive and powerful eloquence of the sophists, rather he came in weakness, fear and with much trembling. Given (2001: 98) argues that Paul’s choice of the aorist εθῆνε/μην underlines this particular style of preaching, which was based on the circumstances at Corinth, and not on any rhetorical inadequacies on Paul’s part.⁷⁸ Paul adds a closely connected thought in 2:4 when he maintains that his speech and public proclamation were not rhetorically persuasive instead he asserts that the power of his proclamation is demonstrated by the presence of the Spirit and by power, both of these being non-rhetorical in nature regarding means of persuasion. The concluding verse of the paragraph, vs. 5, offers Paul’s explanation of his anti-sophistic mode of preaching, in which he clarifies that his choice of counter-cultural means of rhetoric was based on the desire, that the Corinthian’s faith might reside in the power of God, and not in the rhetorical eloquence enjoyed by the sophists. As Winter (2002: 155) suggests, “Paul’s choice of rhetorical terms and allusions show that his *modus operandi* was a calculated anti-sophistic stance adopted to replace conviction derived from sophistic rhetorical wisdom with confidence in the power of God”.

What needs to be considered in relation to 2:1-5 is whether Paul’s presentation of his initial stance in preaching at Corinth accurately reflects what really happened. Paul’s claim that he lacked rhetorical finesse may itself be an ironic overstatement of the situation in response to unfavourable comparisons with Apollos. Pogoloff (1992: 136) develops this notion in that he argues that Paul’s protestations were affected to gain the

⁷⁸ Welborn (2005: 92) offers an alternative explanation of Paul’s self-description in 2:1-5, since he suggests that Paul portrays himself in terms of the “well know figure in the mime: the befuddled orator”. For details on this explanation, see Welborn (2005: 90-99). Unfortunately I only gained access to this book in the final proofreading stages of my thesis, and therefore I have not been able to include a detailed discussion and evaluation of the book in this thesis.

support of his audience as recommended by Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* 4.1.8-10). However, in the context of 1:17 to 2:16 this seems unlikely since Paul's emphasis is on the lack of his own rhetorical sophistication in order to ensure that the message of the gospel remained the foundation of and motivation for the Corinthians' faith in Christ (1:22; 2:5). Therefore I submit that Given's analysis is the more likely one. Given (2001: 99) argues that Paul "wants the Corinthians to know that he could have appeared to be much more rhetorically sophisticated, spiritually wise, and scripturally learned [like Apollos] had he wanted to do so", but that Paul had simply decided on this occasion not to exhibit his rhetorical power (2:2).⁷⁹ This is underlined by Paul's admonishment of the Corinthians, since he blames the Corinthians themselves (3:1-4) for the fact that he "*appeared* to be lacking in spiritual power, wisdom, and eloquence on his first visit because of his condescension to their elementary level" (Given 2001: 101). This, according to Given, constituted and exhibited Paul's cunning rhetorical strategy.

2.10.4. The Rhetorical Sub-unit of 2:6-16

Scholars have encountered exegetical and theological hitches while interpreting 2:6-16 (Welborn 1987a: 104).⁸⁰ When examining the phrase εἰς τοὺς τελειοφ (2:6), it is noteworthy that Welborn (1987a: 105, fn. 95) writes, "τελειοφ is one who 'completed' his initiation into the mysteries and is thus 'perfect'." In philosophical tradition, τελειοφ throughout Greek literature was given to those holding positions in society and who are influential (Welborn 1987a: 105, fn. 98). The same vagueness attaches to the term οἱ ἀρξόντες (2:6, 8) that Paul uses to characterise those from whom God has hidden his wisdom.

Based on Paul's ironical remarks in 2:6-16 and on his choice of the terms ἐγνώκεν, ἐγνώσαν (2:8), ἐγνώκεν (2:11), γινώσκειν (2:14) and ἐγνώ (2:16), it seems

⁷⁹ For details, see Given (2001: 95-103).

⁸⁰ For example, scholarship has recognised that there is a contradiction between Paul's statements that "he knows and preaches nothing except the crucified Christ and his claim in 2:6-16, that he can impart hidden wisdom to the spiritually perfect" (Welborn 1987a: 104). Scholars have referred to this section as a "digression," and an "interlude (Weiss in Welborn 1987a: 104 fn. 88)," as "polemical" (Bultmann, *Faith and understanding*, 71-73) and as "an interpolation" (Welborn 1987a: 104). For details on 1:19-3:21 as a digression, see Wuellner (1979: 184-187). Thiselton (2000: 224-226) suggests that the unusual vocabulary in 2:6-16, like τελειοφ, μυστηριον, πνευματικοφ, and ψυξικοφ, consists of a reworking of the Corinthian language which Paul uses to proclaim his gospel. However, I concur with Wanamaker (2003a: 128) in that the section 2:6-16 rather appears to have an ideological function. For details, see Wanamaker (2003a: 128-129).

that the Corinthian elite considered themselves to be both ‘spiritual’ and ‘perfect’ and that they had separated themselves from those whom they considered to be ‘fleshly’ (Barclay 1992: 61-62). In 2:6-3:3 we are provided with clues that appear to be suggesting strongly that those who claim to be “spiritual” and to possess “knowledge” are to be identified with the Corinthian elite, who comprised of those members causing the formation of various different parties within the church (Welborn 1987a: 106). Paul begins his argument in vss. 6-7 by highlighting the contrast between the wisdom of God, hidden in mystery, which is portrayed as positive, and worldly wisdom, which is described as negative (2:6) (Hunt 1996: 77). Paul cautiously responds to the Corinthian elite’s impression of his supposed lack to expound on God’s secret and hidden wisdom (2:6-7) (Welborn 1987a: 103). To further clarify this, Paul highlights his authority by bringing in hidden wisdom in his rhetoric based on proposing a hierarchical wisdom, a secret and hidden wisdom that is from God alone and he and his people alone have access to it (2:10, 12).

As in earlier examples in Paul’s rhetoric, the high status of the *τε&λαιοι* is reversed. Notwithstanding the Corinthian church members’ status as believers,⁸¹ as the elite of the society, their worldly wisdom provided cultural strength, as opposed to spiritual strength, in that they could not receive gifts of the Spirit of God (2:14). Since only a spiritual person supposedly can judge all things, the unspiritual Corinthian elite are deemed unable to have the right to judge Paul. Hence, as spiritual persons, Paul and his people possess the right to judge the unspiritual Corinthian elite (2:15), thereby confirming Paul’s authority in the Corinthian church. Paul’s insightful use of rhetoric thus distinguishes between those who possess the wisdom of God as a community of believers in the crucified Christ, and those who strive after sophistic wisdom and are subjected to God’s judgement (Hunt 1996: 77). Above all, Paul seems motivated to make the Corinthian elite aware of their factional behaviour and its effects and to move them to re-experience unity within the Corinthian church society (Carter 1997: 50).

⁸¹ As Christians the Corinthian church members had received the indwelling Spirit of God, although this does not automatically lead to the Christians having received and appropriated all the available gifts, talents and teaching from the Spirit of God. (cf. 1 Cor. 3:1)

2.10.5. The rhetorical sub-unit of 3:1-4⁸²

From the rhetorical argument in which Paul and his people, as “we”, claim a spiritual status over the Corinthian elite who are deemed as unspiritual (2:6-16), he returns to the usual verbal progress moving from himself to the elite to stress that they are not *τελειοι* rather *νηπιοι* (3:1-4) by using personal pronouns and pronouns embedded in the verbs, *καγω* (vss. 1), *υμι=ν* (vss. 1, 3), *εποτισα* (vs. 2), *υμα~φ* (vs. 2), *εδυνασθε*, *δυνασθε* (vs. 2), *εστε* [(x2) - vss. 3, 4] and *περιματει=τε* (vs. 3). The repetitive textures of the negatives play an important role towards the progression throughout the rhetorical sub-unit. The negative words, *ουκ* (vss. 1, 4), *ου* (vs. 2), *ουδε* (vs. 2) and *ουξι* (vs. 3) tell the Corinthian elite that they cannot be fed with the gospel of the crucified Christ because of their behavioural attitude. In fact, Paul argues very skilfully using a submetaphor, mother-infants relationship in antiquity under the structural household metaphor, and the words, *αλλ* (vss. 1, 2) and *γα_ρ* [vss. 2, 3 (x2), 4], to connect and speak of the Corinthian elites’ status as mere humans craving for worldly power.

The metaphors, *νηπιοι* (babes), *γαλα* (milk), and *βρωμα* (solid food) (3:1-2) that link to the structural nursing mother metaphor, as we shall see, shame the Corinthian elites’ conduct in a fine rhetorical manner and bring honour to Paul’s role among the Corinthian church. The Corinthian elite are Christians but their present behaviour endangers their own self-understanding as *πνευματικοι*. Paul, as we shall see in detail in the chapter 3, metaphorically uses harsh words such as calling them *σαρκι/νοιφ, νηπι/οιφ εν Ξριστω~?* (vs. 1), feeding them with *γαλα* (milk), and not *βρωμα* (solid food) (vs. 2), to defame the Corinthian elite so they realise to be spiritual in Christ. This argument of Paul seems to parallel with Isocrates who talks about reconciliation with harsh terms against the Lacedaemonian state, not with the intention of defaming her in front of others, but in order to bring about a change of heart in the Lacedaemonians (Isocrates *Panegyrius* 129).⁸³

In 1 Cor. 3:1-4 Paul seeks to demonstrate by shaming that factionalism has blocked the Corinthian elite to reach a status as *τελειοι* and *πνευματικοι* and kept them back on

⁸² The rhetorical sub-units of 1 Cor. 3:1-4 and 3:10-17 will be dealt briefly as these units will be dealt extensively in chapters to follow.

⁸³ For details on harshness language, see Isocrates *Panegyrius* 125-128.

the level of *νη&πιοι* and *σαρκικοι&*. The Corinthian elite's claim to special access to the mind of God demonstrates a contradiction to their claim to a superior way in to God (Hunt 1996: 95). In 3:3, Paul combines *ε!ριφ* with *ζη>λοφ* to describe the source of the Corinthians' divisive behaviour where *ζη>λοφ* in particular was considered the gnawing, unquiet root of civil strife according to Lysias (2.48).⁸⁴ As a result of *ε!ριφ*, jealousy and strife developed among the Corinthian congregation who were claiming allegiance to different leaders and causing *σξι/σματα* in the Corinthian church. Thus, in 3:3 Paul refuses to address the Corinthian elite as "spirituals" but instead as *νη&πιοι* and *σαρκικοι&* (Carter 1997: 54, 60).

2.10.6. The rhetorical sub-unit of 3:5-17

Paul carries forward dealing with the Corinthian elites' allegiance to different leaders who were proud of being *τε&λειοι* and *πνευματικοι&* and caused factionalism in the Corinthian church. Paul in 3:5-9 discusses who the leaders really are (vs. 5) and questions whether the Corinthian elite should really maintain such kind of an allegiance. Paul links himself and Apollos to particular roles through the agricultural structural metaphor (vs. 6). The conjunctions *α)λλα_* (vss. 6, 7), *ω3στε* (vs. 7) and *γα&ρ* (vs. 9), speak of the purpose and goals of the discussion of the status of both Paul and Apollos. Both *α)λλα_* (vss. 6-7) and *ω3στε* (vs. 7) indicates the result or conclusion to be drawn from what Paul says in vs. 6 especially about his, Apollos' and God's roles. In an argumentative way through the complex agricultural metaphor that is related to household system in antiquity, Paul places himself in the role of a planter and Apollos in the role of one who waters. It is the role of God that unites their work and therefore calls forth unity in the Corinthian church just as unity exists between himself and Apollos as servants working together and contributing to the divine purpose of increasing the community (vs. 5). Although Paul seems to place himself and Apollos on a similar footing in the saving activity of God, his choice of metaphors allows him to reiterate in a subtle manner his own pre-eminence as the one who starts the process.

From 3:10-17, the building and temple structural metaphors, the pronoun, *μοι* (vs. 10), the first person singular in verbs (vss. 10-17) and the language in third person singular in

⁸⁴ Also cf. Philo *In Flaccus* 41; Plutarch *Lycurgus* 4.2-3; Cicero *Tusc. Disp.* 4.8.17. References taken from Welborn (1987a: 87, fn.11).

the rest of the verses (vss. 10-17) bring in a verbal communication from Paul to the Corinthian leaders and elite. The words, γὰρ (vss. 9, 11, 13, 17), δε_ [vss. 10 (x2), 12, 15 (x2)], οὐτι (vss. 13, 16) in the building metaphor, display a progressive texture. According to Pfammatter (1960: 21), the word οἰκοδομη& (v. 9) can refer to both a finished building as well as an unfinished construction in the process of being completed. The progressive texture reveals in the discourse Paul's particular purpose (οὐτι and δε) to restate his authority through the claim to have established the Corinthian church by laying the only foundation, Jesus Christ (vss. 10-11) (Hainz 1972: 50). Others leaders have no other way but to continue the ministry along the lines that he had proclaimed the gospel of Jesus Christ. Paul connects his authority to the various tasks and achievements of the Corinthian Christians and the subsequently warns them of God's judgement to which he is excluded (vss. 12-15). Paul closes the unit by using the word γὰρ (vs. 17) to give the reason as to why the Corinthian elite need to be responsible and accountable in building the church properly as they are the temple of God and thus holy.

2.10.7. The rhetorical sub-unit of 3:18-23

The unit 3:18-23 develops and sharpens the metaphors in the metaphorical section of 3:1-17 (Collins 1999: 162-163). First Corinthians 3:18-23 reinforces what has already been said in 1:18-2:16. The unit forcefully calls the Corinthian elite to seek the wisdom of God (3:18) and avoid their futile ways of going after worldly wisdom that is only concerned about self-centred power, social status and honour. In particular, 3:18-21a recapitulates the basic thrust of 1:18-2:16. "The imperatives εἰσαπατα&τω and γενε&σθω in 3:18 and καυξ&σθω in 3:21a" along with the scriptural citations portrays Paul's authority over the entire Corinthian church in the form of warning the Corinthian elite to note his instructive orders (Wanamaker 2003a: 133).

2.10.8. The rhetorical sub-unit of 4:1-5

First Corinthians 4:1-5 continues from the earlier units where Paul asserts that the unspiritual people cannot judge Paul (2:15). From η(μα~φ (vs. 1) he changes to first person singular, ε)μοι_ (vs. 3), α)νακρι/νω, α)νακρι/νω (vs. 3), ε)μαυτω?~ συ&νοιδα (vs. 4), to speak about himself. The second person plural, υ(μω~ν (vs. 3), κρι/νετε (vs. 5) along with the first person singular once again reveals a

verbal development from Paul to the Corinthian church. At 4:1, he resumes an argument that began in 3:5 through two submetaphors υ(πηρε&ταφ and οι)κονομουφ (vs. 1) that link to the household structure to describe his and Apollos' ministerial tasks. Therefore, in 4:1-5 Paul once again through judicial language addresses the Corinthian elite who pointed a finger at his credentials (Welborn 1987a: 107).

The repeated negatives, ου)δε_ (vs. 3), ου)δε_ν (vs. 4), ου)κ (vs. 4) and μη_ (vs. 5), lead to a smooth progression. On the surface Paul seems to be saying that it is a matter of indifference to him whether they wish to judge him since it is the Lord who is his judge according to vs. 4. The negatives in this section inform the reader that Paul is not subjected to judgement according to the human system of judgement. First Corinthians 4:2 then not only serves to tell the Corinthians that he is trustworthy but also paves the way to highlight in the following verse that the Corinthian Christians themselves are not in a position to judge him (4:3).

The unit closes with the word, ω#στε indicating that the Lord will reveal the hidden and secret things of the heart when he comes to judge and each will receive commendation accordingly. There surely is a warning to the Corinthian elite to refrain from their judgemental attitude otherwise their very own hidden secrets will be relived by the Lord himself (vs.5). Thus, Paul's rhetoric, which makes use of metaphors and judicial language,⁸⁵ warns the Corinthian elite against premature judgement and through such a rhetorical move reiterate his trustworthiness among the Corinthian Christians as their founding apostle (Plank 1987: 13-14; Collins 1999: 171).

2.10.9. The rhetorical sub-unit of 4:6-13

Paul continues to use the first person singular, μετεσξημα&τισα (vs. 6), η(μι=ν (vs. 6), and second person plural υ(μα~φ (vs. 6), φυσιου~σθε (vs. 6), σε (vs. 7), ε!ξειφ, ε!λαβεφ (vs. 7), quite frequently to continue his challenges to the Corinthian elite. The pronouns and verbs lead to a smooth progression by which Paul for the sake of the gospel contrasts himself with the Corinthian elite with respect to the status (vss. 6-8). In 4:6, the meanings of the verb μετεσξημα&τισα, and of the phrase

⁸⁵ Collins (1999: 167) says that the words "judge (vs. 3, 4, 5), found trustworthy (vs. 2), anything against oneself (vs. 4), acquitted (vs. 4), bringing to light (vs. 5), disclose the purposes (vs. 5), commendation (vs. 5), the day (vs. 5)" speak of a courtroom language.

το_μη_υ(περ_αε_γε&γαπται⁸⁶ have received careful examination (Fiore 1985: 85-102; Hall 1994: 143-149). It can be said that Paul is admonishing the Corinthian elite to learn from his and Apollos' example and not to engage in factional rivalry. Paul illustrates how factional rivalry has affected the Corinthian elite by articulating several rhetorical questions in vs. 7 and then elaborating on them in vss. 8-13. Welborn throws more light to such a factional rivalry background. Welborn (1987a: 88) says that, φουσιου~σθαι in antiquity⁸⁷ "is all too familiar to the student of political history as the caricature of the political windbag, the orator inflated at his success, the young aristocrat, the aspiring tyrant, filled with a sense of his own power".⁸⁸ Being puffed up on behalf of one person against another, perhaps by claiming allegiance to and finding identity in one leader over against the others, the Corinthian elite were creating factions in the church (Carter 1997: 54). Similarly, for Paul, καυξα~σθαι of fellow human beings in 1 Cor 3:21 and 4:6 was causing factionalism in the Corinthian church (Wagner 1998: 282-283; Tyler 1998: 98). Thus, for Paul both the words φουσιου~σθαι and καυξα~σθαι describe divisive behaviour.⁸⁹

First Corinthians 4:8-13 exhibits a pronounced rhetorical style. From Paul's perspective, some of the Corinthians were wrongly claiming a proleptic experience of eschatological glory probably based on their social prominence in civil society to give them even a higher "social prominence" in the kingdom of God (Barclay 1992: 64-65). Paul resorts to irony in attacking the pretentious self-understanding of the socially prominent who claimed a higher status than he himself did in spite of his own far more impressive commitment to the Kingdom of God. He compares between his own experience as an apostle of Christ and the social experience of his interlocutors (vss. 8-13; cf. 1 Cor 1:27-28) (Lassen 1991: 135; Hunt 1996: 98; Welborn 1987: 107). The arguments in vss. 8-13

⁸⁶ Welborn (1987b: 341) notes that such the phrase το_μη_υ(περ_αε_γε&γαπται was normally used in the context to avoid discord such as a abiding by certain laws. Whenever laws did not apply between conflicting cities, the factions were encouraged to abide by written peace treaties, in other words, not to go beyond what both factions have written. Also, see Welborn (1987b: 320-346); Wagner (1998: 279-287); and Tyler (1998: 97-103).

⁸⁷ Welborn (1987a: 88) refers to Ps.-Plato *Alcibiades* 2.145e; Plutarch *Cicero* 887b; Epictetus *Discourses* 2.16.10. For further understanding see *LSJ*: 1963-1964 (φου~σα&ω and φου~σι&ω); BAGD 869.

⁸⁸ Welborn (1987a: 88) further refers to Alcibiades and Critias in Xenophon *Mem.* 1.2.25; Gaius in Philo *Leg. ad Gaium* 86.154; Pausanias in Demosthenes 59.97; Thucydides 1.132.1-3; Dio Chrysostom 30.19; 58.5, Demosthenes 19.314; and Philo *Leg. ad Gaium*, 69.255.

⁸⁹ Mitchell (1991: 95), acknowledging that Weiss was the first, observes that Paul uses φουσιου~σθαι in 4:6 in a manner virtually identical with the use of καυξα~σθαι in 4:7. Boasting and being puffed up are often used in a cyclic way in ancient Greek texts and well as by Paul in 4:6-7 (cf. Philo, *Cong.* 107, 127; *Vit.Mos.* 1.6.30; Plut. *Dem. and Cic.* 2.1-3; 1 *Clem.* 21:5) (Mitchell 1991: 95).

deal with the themes of wisdom, foolishness, honour, disrepute, social weakness, social strength, and boasting. The themes are turned on their head in relation to the Kingdom of God where the normal virtues from Hellenistic culture are ironically dismissed as inimical to the true servant of God.⁹⁰ Therefore, Paul by taking up a shameful life (4:9, 13) clearly indicates that he not only rejects the values of the society but also the basis of the Corinthian Christians' rejection of him (Carter 1997: 67).

2.10.10. The rhetorical sub-unit of 4:14-21

Paul continues the interplay between first person pronouns [μου in vss. 14, 16, 17 (x2), 18), and verbs, [γρα&φω (vs. 14), επεμυα (vs. 17), ελευσ&σομαι (vs. 19), γνω&σομαι (vs. 19)]; and second person pronouns [υ(μα~φ (vss. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19), υ(μι=v (vs. 17)] and verbs, [ε!ξητε (vs. 15), θε&λετε (vs. 21)] to indicate a communication from him to the Corinthian elite. In vss. 11-13, Paul appeals to *pathos* (1 Cor 4:11-13) that changes from first person plural to first person singular to constitute a rhetorical progression. The contrasts that Paul uses, ουκ (vs. 14), ου) (vss. 15, 19, 20), μη_ (vs. 18), speak of changing the Corinthian elites' direction from considering others as their fathers (leaders) to imitate him like their father (4:15), since he is their only father who fathered them through the gospel of Jesus Christ (Carter 1997: 68, 107; Lassen 1991: 136; Brant 1993: 294-295).

Paul continues to reiterate his father like authority in an argumentative way by giving a series of reasons: γα_ρ [vss. 15 (x2), 20]. The call to imitate (1 Cor 4:16) goes back to 4:1-13 where Paul basically asks the Corinthian Christians to follow his meek and humble behaviour in response to factious behaviour of the Corinthian elite (Mitchell 1991: 222). Paul, further, makes things easy for them in the process to imitate him by sending Timothy to remind them of his ways in Christ (vs. 17) all towards the unity in Corinthian Church and the caution of his impending return to the church. Interestingly, Paul not only sets up an *ethos* appeal as a good counsellor and prototype to be followed through his fatherly like relationship with the church but also draws attention to his unique and permanent authority in the church. As such, in 4:18-20 he threatens with corporal punishment if they persist in their challenges to his authority, just like a father would discipline aberrant children.

⁹⁰ These themes reverse the normal values extolled in epideictic rhetoric.

Paul finally closes the rhetorical unit with the word $\gamma\alpha\rho$ (vs. 20) to take up the powerful symbol, the kingdom of God (vs. 20) to state that power does not come in the form of eloquent speaking rather it comes from a divine source. By such a warning Wanamaker (2003a: 136) rightly notes that, “Paul legitimates and intensifies his own authority by subtly suggesting that his power is derived from the divine sphere, not the human sphere, unlike those whom he threatens.”

2.11. Conclusion

At the outset we can conclude that factionalism was caused by the influence of secular society in clearly reflect the secular society in the Corinthian church. A blend of patronage, sophistry, sophistic loyalty between pupil and teacher all have strong parallels with the situation in the Corinthian church. As such, human and worldly behaviour involving social status, rivalry, jealousy and strife among the followers of various apostles in the name of power struggle brought in factions in the Corinthian church. Further, the rhetorical construction of the unit, 1:10-4:21, which we have seen in rhetorical sub-units, provides a basis to understand the Paul’s use of structural metaphors in his bid to address factionalism, reconstruction, and to sustain his dominance over the Corinthian church.

Chapter 3

Reasserting authority: Mother-Infants Complex Metaphor in 1 Cor. 3:1-4

3.1. Introduction

One of the first and most significant aspects within the relationship between a mother and a new-born infant occurs when the mother nurses or breast feeds her child with milk. Modern research has shown that breast milk is indeed the best source of nourishment for these newborn infants, particularly during the early stages of growth due to both the nutritional content as well as transmitting elements which raise the level of the infant's immunology considerably (see, e.g., <http://www.4woman.gov/breastfeeding/index.cfm?page=QandA>). Although there are various milk supplements available, it has also been medically proven that babies nurtured with breast milk, and especially with that of their biological mothers, tend to be healthier and more robust than those who have been nurtured with the aid of milk supplements and substitutes (see, e.g., <http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/tp/brfouttp.htm>). This is not a recent discovery since it was common knowledge in antiquity where various ancient medical writers have recorded this information. According to Garnsey (1991: 59-61) writers in antiquity within the medical sphere noted that a mother's milk is more hygienic for the nursing infant than other supplements. Thus in antiquity it was the responsibility of a nursing mother to nurture her young children, and to ensure that her offspring developed in the areas of health and strength. Understandably then, the role of the nursing mother provided a metaphorical source for various other types of nurturing relationships. Paul also adopts the role of the nursing mother in 1 Cor. 3:1-4 as part of a complex metaphor system derived from the household, which functions as the foundational element of all forms of social structure in antiquity.

As discussed in the previous chapter, throughout 1 Corinthians 1-4, Paul addresses the issue concerning the apparent loss of his authority within the Corinthian church, particularly pertaining to certain socially prominent members of the community and the supporters of these prominent agents of rebellion. These newly formed groups within the church seemed to compare in their judgement Paul's ostensibly lacking rhetorical

skills with the impressive skills of Apollos and possibly others like Apollos, who had been rhetorically trained (cf., 2 Cor. 10:7-11). Neyrey (1990: 213) puts it rightly as Paul is confronted by “a state of rivalry with other preachers indicating a persistent problem . . . with legitimate roles and status.” We can deduce from Paul’s response that this situation had contributed to the factionalism experienced within the church because various socially prominent members chose a particular leader above another, for example some supported Paul and others supported Apollos, and so forth (cf., 2 Cor. 11:1-15). In response, Paul “must first re-establish his authority among those elements of the community that have come to regard him as weak and inferior on the basis of *his initial appearance* among them” (Given, 2001: 94, his emphasis). Thus in 1 Cor. 1:17-2:16 Paul focuses on his initial preaching to the community since he seeks to demonstrate that he preached true wisdom, even if it was done in a way that lacked rhetorical sophistication. He therefore states that the nature of the message required him to present it without rhetorical eloquence (1:17; 2:1-5). At the same time, however, Paul asserts that his preaching was demonstrated by manifestations of power and the Spirit to ensure that the faith of the Corinthians was engendered by the power of God and not by human rhetorical power (2:4-5). In 2:6-3:1 he offers a proof to show that he possesses a deeper wisdom than he had been able to impart to the Corinthians at the time of his initial ministry. As Winter (2002: 201) suggests, it appears that Paul blames the impression of the dissenters that he was unable to discourse at a deeper level of wisdom as Apollos had apparently been able to do on the immaturity of those Corinthians. This argument leads Paul to a series of complex metaphors whereby he elaborates on his relation to the church in Corinth, as well as on the relationship of other missionaries, especially Apollos, to himself and to the church.

In 3:1-4, Paul’s rhetorical strategy consists of the choice of an everyday social and cultural *topos* in the ancient society, namely the household, and using one of the relationships within the household to describe metaphorically his own relationship with the Corinthian Christian community. When applied metaphorically, the household becomes a complex metaphor combining a number of primary metaphors that constitute mappings within the complex metaphor (cf., Kövecses 2002: 116-118). The ancient household thus provides Paul with a complex source from which he draws several different metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4. In this manner Paul’s source domain, the nursing mother, is derived from one of the primary relationships within the household,

which is the maternal nurturance of offspring (3:1-4). This relationship presupposes a giver, who is dominant in the relationship, and a receiver, who is dependant in the relationship, where this particular relationship forms the key aspect in Paul's application of the metaphor.

Having described the Corinthians as "people of the flesh" and as "babes in Christ," whom he therefore could not address as "people of the spirit" (3:1), Paul in the next verse reminds the Corinthian Christians that he has nourished them with milk and not with solid food. Interestingly, Paul's use of the nursing-babes metaphor extends these assertions into the multiple social and culture textures of the target domain.

In the following section, the understanding of the relationship of the nursing mother to her children in the ancient world will be explored by employing a socio-rhetorical analysis. As stated earlier, socio-rhetorical analysis requires social and cultural knowledge of the world of the text in order to assist in understanding the possible meanings of the language of the text. While the use of the nursing mother and her dependent child as a metaphorical source might have very different meanings in various cultures, a culturally relevant understanding of the source domains of this relationship in antiquity will foreground the aspects of the relationship that Paul has applied to his target domain. The metaphors involved will be interpreted through blending theory. Thus, socio-rhetorical analysis becomes an important tool for understanding Paul's rhetorical usage of the nursing mother-child metaphor in re-establishing and sustaining his authority in the Corinthian church as part of his attempt to address the problem of factionalism. In this process, Paul's metaphor enables a creation of a "systematically asymmetrical" relation of power (Thompson 1990: 151) pertaining to his converts. The intended goal of this metaphor is to re-assert his dominance over his Corinthian converts.

3.2. Mother-infants relationship within the household in antiquity

The mother-child relationship between blood members of a family constituted one of the primary relationships within the households in antiquity since mothers were responsible for the care of infants and young children (DeSilva 2000: 188; cf. Osiek & Balch 1997: 42; Gardner 1997: 35; Corbier 1991: 129). Although the mother-child relationship in the households of antiquity encompasses numerous aspects, we will focus on the nursing

relationship between mothers and infants to appreciate Paul's metaphorical application of this relationship in 1 Cor. 3:1-4. On the one hand, the father, who carried absolute authority, expected his children, more especially his sons, to endure certain hardships in the form of discipline and training to ensure that they would become good citizens.⁹¹ On the other hand, mothers were idealized as the primary protectors of their children, who wished them "never to be unhappy, never to cry, never to toil" (*De providentia* 2.5 in Eyben 1991: 117). Of the many characteristics in the relationship between a mother and her infant in the ancient culture, we shall identify those of nursing/nurturance and dependence as the keys whereby we can thus unlock Paul's metaphor in 3:1-4, which can be examined by applying blending theory.

3.2.1. Nursing

As mentioned above, nursing and thus the method of nourishment constitutes one of the most important aspects of the mother-infant relationship in antiquity. Hallett (1984: 218) notes "the emotional bonds between Roman mothers and their children of both sexes appear to have been far stronger, ideally and in reality, than those between most Roman wives and their husbands." Most of the mothers within the Roman elite considered maintaining and managing a home and nursing their own children in their "lap and bosom" as important, which is why they generally avoided the hiring of nurses (*Dialogus de Oratoribus* in Hallett 1984: 7), even though they would have been able to employ wet nurses for their infants. Mothers thus nursed their own children because not only they had an affectionate attachment to them, but also because they desired that their infants should develop into healthy children who would eventually contribute to the family, the society and the state as adults. For example, Plutarch recorded that Cato's wife nursed her son with her own milk, so that her child would be healthy and thereby able to receive and appropriate a proper education (*Cato the Elder* 20.4-7; Rawson 1991: 15).⁹²

The role of a mother nursing her own infants was also regarded highly by many men as a noble task and an invaluable contribution to the future of the state. In the cases when a

⁹¹ For a more extensive discussion of the father-children relationship, see the chapter 7.

⁹² Another example is found in *ILS* 8451. The reference from Plutarch is taken from Gardner & Wiedemann (1991: 102).

woman was so tired after delivery, that her mother sought to hire a nurse to spare her daughter from the “burdensome business of nursing,” the philosopher Favorinus said,

I beg you, woman, let her be a complete mother of her own son in every respect. What kind of unnatural, incomplete and half-category of mother is it, to have given birth and then immediately to cast the child away? . . . not to feed with your own milk a living human being whom you see, who is crying for his mother’s help! Are you one of those who think that nature gave women their nipples to be like large-size beauty spots decorating their breasts rather than in order to feed their children? (*Aulus Gellius*, 12.1 in Gardner & Wiedemann 1991: 104).

In antiquity, mothers nursed their children by establishing a clearly defined feeding pattern. Garnsey (1991: 62) refers to guidelines that enabled mothers gently yet firmly to use certain foods to wean their children, which did medical writers such as Soranus and Galen lay out. Garnsey (1991: 63) notes that Galen prescribes milk alone until the infants received his/her first teeth, usually sometime around the seventh month. This feed was irrespective of mothers giving the infants supplementary foods. In other words, phasing out of breast milk in favour of solid food at the initial stage would undermine the child’s health. It was generally recommended that only after the seventh month gradually solid food should be given to the infants (*Hygiene* 9.29, 10.31). Soranus (in Garnsey 1991: 63) states, however, that when the child is six months old, solid food should be given to him or her together with cereal. Only when the teeth of the infant are evident should the infant be given more solid things (*Gynaecology* 2.46-47). Soranus (in Garnsey 1991: 62) observes that the weaning stage starts with “crumbs of bread softened with hydromel or milk, sweet wine, or honey wine,” and later with “soup made from spelt, a very moist porridge, and an egg that can be sipped” (*Gynaecology* 2.46). Galen prescribes “first bread, and then vegetables and meat and other such things” from around the ninth month (*Hygiene* 10.31).

Epictetus and Philo utilised the infants’ dietary imagery, based on the mother’s provision of a nutritional diet for her $\nu\eta\&\pi\iota\omicron\omega$, to describe the notions of education and philosophical training (Hunt 1996: 102). Epictetus, in *Discourses* 3.19.1-6, depicted little children as experiencing the need to be taught to attain and develop an educated

life. In *Discourses* 2.16.25-26, he contrasted the child, who is persuasively influenced by a biscuit, with the true philosopher and intelligent human being, who is influenced by true judgement.

Children, indeed, when they cry a little because their nurse has left, forget their troubles as soon as they get a cookie. Would you, therefore, have *us* resemble children? . . . [W]e should be influenced in this way, not by a cookie, but by true judgements (*Discourses* 2.16.25-26).

This conception depicts the mentally undeveloped stage of an infant. Since an infant generally lacks a mature and discerning mind, the infant can be distracted easily. In a similar way, Philo uses the diet of the νη&πιοι as a metaphor for education in the upbringing of children. For example, in *On Husbandry* 9, he writes:

But seeing that for babes (νη&πιοι) milk (γα&λα) is food, but for grown men (τε&λειοι) wheaten bread, there must also be soul-nourishment, such as is milk-like suited to the time of childhood, in the shape of the preliminary stages of school-learning, and such as is adapted to grown men (τε&λειοι) in the shape of instructions leading the way through wisdom and temperance and all virtue.

In addition, in this case, Philo and Epictetus used the dietary change between the food of νη&πιοι and the food of meat-eating adults as a method of referring to the changes necessary to engage in philosophical training. Philo in *Every Good Man is Free*, 160, says:

but souls which have as yet got nothing of either kind, neither that which enslaves, nor that which establishes freedom, souls still naked like those of mere infants, must be tended and nursed by instilling first, in place of milk, the soft food of instruction given in the school subjects, later, the harder, stronger meat, which philosophy produces.⁹³

⁹³ Other examples from Philo may be found in *Preliminary Studies* 19; *Migration of Abraham* 29; *Dreams* 2:10 and from Epictetus in *Discourses* 2.16.39; 3.24.9.

Furthermore, the dietary needs of infants were extended to religious applications as metaphors. In Stoic thought, the term *νη&πιοφ* usually referred to that state which is to be abandoned in favour of seeking true virtue. Similar to Epictetus, Philo demonstrated interest in religious knowledge in addition to philosophical education. The social status described by the term *νη&πιοφ* was thus discarded and superceded by seeking out advanced instruction in the pursuit of virtue. This education, with its related gradation in difficulty, constituted a process that slowly led to the attainment of virtue (Hunt 1996: 104).

In sum, a mother nursed her child by establishing and enforcing a set feeding pattern, which was considered as an active role and the proper responsibility for a mother in antiquity. This role was also highly respected in society since mothers were expected to demonstrate their dedication by ensuring the proper nurturing of their infants and young children. As discussed earlier, the aim of the nurturing process was to develop good citizens that served as an asset within the ancient society.

3.2.2. Dependency

A further crucial aspect of the mother-infant relationship is illustrated by the dependency of infants and children on their mothers. When a child is born, he/she is utterly dependant upon others for comfort, security, and most importantly, food. In the earliest stages of development the child's mother is his/her sole source of food, especially if she is breast feeding the child. Human children develop more slowly than the offspring of any other animal and as a result, children remain dependant upon their parents or other caregivers for many years until they have the physical, emotional and intellectual ability required to take responsibility for their own lives. Therefore, the mother plays a vital role in the survival of her child by protecting the child and by directing the child from its immature state towards physical, emotional, and mental maturity. The mother thus also has the responsibility, as well as the authority, to guide and control her young children, so that their ability to create havoc, to harm themselves or to behave inappropriately is limited as far as possible.

Indeed, acts of folly were often metaphorically linked to those who behaved like *νη&πιοι*. For example, Plutarch equates an adult to a fool if he or she lacked the ability

to discern things properly (*Concerning Talkativeness* 505D). The act of a father who sacrificed his children to the gods was considered childlike folly. In this example, the father blindly followed the tradition of sacrificing his child without realising that the “changed in form is the son beloved of his father so pious”. This father may want to be faithful to the tradition, but seems to lack the ability to make mature and responsible decisions (Plutarch *A Letter to Apollonius* 171 C). Aristotle also equated such foolish acts to the behaviour of $\nu\eta/\pi\tau\iota\omicron\iota$ when he quoted the maxim, “Foolish he who, after killing the father, suffers the children to live” (Aristotle *The Art of Rhetoric* 1.15.14).⁹⁴

Generally, children are unable to appreciate fully what is in their own best interest, since their sense of judgement has not been developed to a level of maturity yet. Dio Chrysostom, for instance, informed the Nicomedians and the Nicaeans that they were behaving like “children” ($\pi\alpha\iota\delta\iota/\omicron\iota$) in the eyes of their Roman governors because they had acted as ignorant children who cannot tell baubles from things of real worth in their disputes over titles (*Orationes* 38.37).

From the above discussion of the cultural knowledge regarding the nursing mother and her infant within the household structure of ancient society, the source domain, the mother-child relationship, and the target domain, Paul and his converts in the Corinthian church, can be identified as follows:

Source domain	Target domain
Mothers and their infants within ancient society.	Paul and his converts within the Corinthian church community.
Mothers nursed their young children.	Paul as one who established the Corinthian church nurtured his Corinthian converts.
Infants were completely dependant upon their mothers.	The Corinthian Christians are instructed to have a dependant relationship with Paul.
Mothers established a set dietary pattern pertaining to the nourishment of their infants to enable these to develop in a healthy manner.	Paul has the responsibility to decide what the Corinthians are capable of comprehending and give the gospel of Christ in a manner that they can grow in

⁹⁴ The same maxim is also cited in Aristotle *The Art of Rhetoric* 2.21.11.

	number and faith.
Mothers nurse their infants since these are still undeveloped physically and mentally.	Paul takes care of the Corinthian Christians as his converts, for instance in shepherding and teaching them since they have not yet fully achieved Christian maturity.

3.3. Interpretation of the mother-infants metaphor (3:1-2)

In 1 Cor. 3:1-2 Paul introduces the first of an extended series of metaphors that contain much of the rhetorical proof given in chs. 3-4 as he seeks to reassert his authority over the Corinthians. To this end, he introduces a primary metaphor from the complex household metaphor system, which implicitly refers to the nursing mother, her infant, and the relationship between the two. This can also be viewed as a double metaphor since it compares Paul to a nursing mother, and the Corinthians to nursing infants. Closely related to this double metaphor is another one that involves the nurturing milk given by a nursing mother, whereby Paul illustrates that his initial teaching to the Corinthians is akin to milk (γάλα), and not yet to be portrayed as solid food (βρωμα). Paul thus employs this set of metaphors to construct his interpretation of his relationship with the Corinthian Christians, while also transferring responsibility for any supposed inadequacies of his instruction to the Corinthians' themselves.

Nevertheless, the text does not explicitly identify Paul as a nursing mother. However, Paul's assertion that he could only speak to them $\omega(\tau\ \nu\eta\pi\iota/\omicron\iota\tau\ \epsilon)\nu\ \Xi\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omega$ and that he gave them γάλα to drink ($\epsilon\theta\pi\omicron/\tau\iota\sigma\alpha$) and not βρωμα, generates the image of Paul as a nursing mother. Particularly the first person singular form of the verb in the context of feeding infants creates this impression (Gaventa 1996: 105-106). The implied nursing mother metaphor creates, what Kövecses (2002: 80-84, 116-118) calls a complex metaphor. With the introduction of the nursing mother metaphor, Paul initialises a rhetorical move that seeks to re-establish his authority. Thus, the universal experience of the nursing mother is correlated with Paul's claim that he has the authority to guide and control the development of the Corinthian Christian community. The correlation between human experience and cultural norms holds together a number of

major metaphors in chs. 3-4 whereby Paul seeks to re-establish his authority over the Corinthian Christians.

The nursing mother metaphor, as also a number of the significant metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4, needs to be viewed in relation to the attitude of the Corinthian elite, as portrayed by Paul in 2:1-16.⁹⁵ Conzelmann (1975: 57-60) locates two groups of Christians in 2:6-16, namely a superior group which he designates as “pneumatics” who are ostensibly spiritually mature, and the majority who demonstrate a lack of spiritual insight. Chester (2003: 288), however, rejects the notion that the Corinthians were divided into two classes of Christians in favour of the idea that the Corinthian Christians, as a single group, believed that they had already become mature or perfected Christians, and saw themselves as πνευματικοί/ who possessed a superior discernment to comprehend the mysteries of the gospel. According to Chester, the Corinthians considered themselves to possess a higher or spiritual knowledge regarding the divine gifts (2:12), and an ability to comprehend spiritual instructions (2:13), as well as to have the capability to judge all things (2:15).

In light of the work of scholars such as Winter (2002) and Given (2001), the views of Conzelmann and Chester appear to be somewhat out of date. Instead of Conzelmann and Chester’s mirror reading of the text by which they construct spiritual enthusiasts as the target of Paul’s remarks in 2:6-16,⁹⁶ Given (2001: 100) argues that Paul is sincere “when he speaks of having a deeper wisdom reserved for the more advanced” in 2:6-16. The Corinthian elite and their supporters were attracted to the rhetorical eloquence and intellectual sophistication of Apollos. Compared to Apollos, Paul projects an image of an incompetent speaker whose message lacks the intellectual virtuosity of Apollos’ preaching. As Garland (2003: 108-109) observes, the Corinthians considered Paul’s preaching to be “bland and elementary,” rendering it, therefore, as unattractive to listeners who expected rhetorical sophistication from those addressing them. Thus, Paul argues in 2:1-16 that he has a far more sophisticated understanding of divine wisdom and in 3:1 Paul portrays the Corinthian Christians as σαρκίνοι who could not be addressed as πνευματικοί=. Therefore the contrast between those who are spiritually mature, and the Corinthians, who remain immature in their Christian development,

⁹⁵ For details on this section, see chapter 2 above.

⁹⁶ The claim that Paul confronted spiritual enthusiast in Corinth goes all the way back to Lütgert (1908).

results in Paul to calling them *νηπι/οι* or infants. He reasons that he is compelled to treat them as spiritually immature because they still appear to be locked into their pre-conversion state of “fleshliness”. Hence, in the context of the argument in 2:1-16, Paul blames the Corinthians for his inability to produce his latent rhetorical sophistication because their level of immaturity prevented them from understanding a more sophisticated message (Given 2001: 95-103). It is apparent then, that the allusion to the Corinthians’ infant-like status in Christ is metaphorical in character because it projects onto the Corinthians the intellectual and spiritual immaturity characteristic of young children. The *νηπι/οι* metaphor further implies that Paul has to carry the responsibility given to parents over their children, thereby deciding at which level to aim his preaching so that the ‘infant-like’ Corinthians would understand his message. Thus, 3:1 provides the context for a metaphorical elaboration by Paul on the nature of his preaching to the Corinthians, and carries with it the implication that his relationship with his converts was analogous to that of a nursing mother with her infant.

In his rhetoric, Paul places himself and his converts in the Corinthian church as the target of the nursing mother and child metaphorical source domain. Even though Paul does not use the Greek word *μη/τερ* in 3:1-2, the blending of the source and target domains provides sufficient evidence to indicate that Paul represents his relation to the Corinthians in terms of the nursing mother to her dependant offspring. First, when Paul writes, “*γα/λα υ(μα~φ ε)πο/τισα*”, this means idiomatically, “I fed you with milk” or perhaps, more literally, “I gave you milk to drink” (vs. 2). The blending between the source and target also suggests that the primary meaning of *ε)πο/τισα* refers to the role of the nursing mother.⁹⁷ Paul thus blends his Corinthian converts into this concept by claiming that his instruction to them was comparable to the way in which a nursing mother feeds her infant breast milk. Second, Paul addresses the Corinthian Christians with the words “*ω(φ νηπι/οιφ ε)ν Ξριστω|~*” (vs. 1). The blending between the source and target domains show that the primary reference of the term *νη&πιοι* is to very young children, and, in the context of 3:1-2, where the giving of milk to the young child is portrayed, the image of the nursing mother, or possibly that of the wet nurse, is clearly

⁹⁷ Paul’s use of maternal metaphors is not unique to this passage. In 1 Thess. 2:7-8 Paul compares himself to a nursing mother or a wet nurse, and in Gal 4:19 he likens himself to a mother in labour. In Rom. 8:22, he refers to the created order waiting for its redemption as analogous to a woman in labour. According to Collins (1999:141), Paul regularly employs the maternal image in that it “evokes Paul’s pastoral care, his devoted nurture of those he has evangelized”.

invoked (Gaventa 1996:105-106). Likewise, Paul blends his Corinthian converts into this concept by implying that they are his own young offspring, *νη&πιοι*, in Christ, since the source concept, the nursing mother, includes the idea of determining the appropriate diet for her children. The element of deciding the appropriate diet for the Corinthians implied in the relation of the nursing mother to her child offers a strong reason why it is unlikely that the idea of wet nurse is part of the implied source domain: mothers, and not wet nurses, decide when their children are ready for solid food.

The *νη&πιοι* concept in 3:1-2 might imply a further metaphor, namely, that Paul was the birth-mother of the Corinthians when he brought them to faith through the gospel of Jesus Christ. This, however, is not placed in the foreground, meaning that it is a potential feature of the metaphor involving the nursing-mother and her infant which does not appear to be drawn upon in the process of blending the source domain with the target domain. Nonetheless, Paul blends his converts into the infant source domain which has significant implications for their relationship with him. It appears that Paul implies a familial relationship with the Corinthian Christians by acting similar to a mother with regard to her infants towards them (3:2) (Collins 1999: 143). The tenderness associated with mothers may also serve to dull the criticism levelled at the Corinthians, for example Paul's description of the Corinthians as infantile. As Crocker (2004: 87) suggests, Paul offers his criticism out of maternal concern for the Corinthians' spiritual welfare. In this sense, Paul's nursing mother and infant metaphors represent a good example of what Aristotle and Quintilian viewed as a metaphor that stems from the better class and applied to the lesser class.

By identifying with the social role of the nursing mother, Paul is concerned with the manner in which the Corinthian Christians would receive his message. What would they make of a male speaking of himself in an unmistakably feminine idiom? Gaventa (1996: 109) notes that in the burgeoning literature on gender-construction in the ancient world, Thomas Laquer has identified a "one-sex" model of sexuality that dominated the ancient world, a model in which women are understood to be "inverted" males. Furthermore, Gaventa (1996: 109) states that the one-sex model dominated not only the various understandings of physiology, but also every aspect of appearance and behaviour. However, it should also be noted that "[a] male who transgresses the boundaries in dress, behaviour, deportment, even in physical features may be accused of 'going AWOL from

[his] assigned place in the gender hierarchy” (Gaventa 1996: 110). The metaphorical source, “I fed you with milk,” which implies that Paul was like a nursing mother, would then conceivably cause the Corinthians to suspect Paul’s masculinity (Gaventa 1996: 110). Interestingly, Paul “effectively concedes the culturally predisposed battle for his masculinity,” (Gaventa 1996: 110), which enables Paul to portray himself in a shameful position in comparison to the socially elevated and culturally acceptable positions which various Corinthian Christians considered as their own station within Corinthian society (Gaventa 1996: 110-111; 2004: 96).

Therefore, Paul’s choice to portray himself as a nursing mother in relationship to the Corinthians subverts the normal basis of male honour. It is noteworthy that honour relates differently to males than to females. Honour also serves to elevate the status and conceived sense of worth in the public sphere, as well as influences the citizen’s public and social recognition. Honour is based on the public adherence to the shared values of the group to which one belongs. Since honour is viewed as a public phenomenon, it relates mostly to men, because they occupy the public domain. Failure to maintain the necessary values associated with honour, values such as “wisdom, courage, strength, and generosity” (Plevnik 1993: 96), is dishonourable in men and, therefore, brings shame to the men and by transference to their households. Unlike honour, shame has both a negative and a positive connotation, since shame “refers to a person’s sensitivity about what others think, say, and do with regard to his or her honour” (Robbins 1996a: 76). Men, for instance, experience shame when their honour is impugned or undermined in the public sphere, in which case shame carries a negative connotation. When applied to women, however, shame becomes a positive virtue that encourages women to maintain their own honour and the honour of their families through sexual purity, social reserve, and privacy in their affairs (Plevnik 1993: 96). In the light of Paul’s identification with feminine attributes, he could conceivably have undermined the culturally approved masculine role, while rendering himself susceptible to be attacked by the Corinthian Christians as weak and ineffectual. Thus, by taking up the role of a woman, while being a man, the nursing mother metaphor places Paul in a position that probably appeared as shameful in the eyes of the Corinthians.

Paul draws on yet another feature of the mother-child relation in his metaphorical construction: mothers have authority over their infants and may, if necessary, discipline

them. The blend of the metaphorical source, the mother, with the target, Paul as the founder of the church, invests Paul with the authority and power associated with the source domain. Similarly, the source domain of infants, when blended onto the target domain of the Corinthian Christians challenges their self-evaluation and their tendency to be puffed up with pride based on their inter-group striving (cf. 4:6). It seems likely that Paul sought to shame the Corinthian elite when, presumably along with other members of the community, he portrayed them as “fleshly” (σαρκι/νοι) and as infants (νηπι/οι). Furthermore, he maintains that based on their infantile status, he was unable to feed them with any other form of nourishment than milk (vs. 2). Paul’s capacity and ability to make this decision undergirds his authority over the Corinthians. Paul thus implicitly argues that those who sought to teach them more sophisticated doctrines, as Apollos presumably did, were, if not wholly wrong, then at least ill-advised to do so given the delicate spiritual state of the Corinthians.

As implied in the previous paragraph, Paul uses the terms milk (γα/λα) and solid food (βρω~μα) as metaphors describing two very different levels of teaching. One type of food, γα/λα, represents basic sustenance for the spiritually immature, whereas the other more substantial sustenance for the spiritually mature.⁹⁸ The food metaphor was widely used in antiquity to indicate the level of education that people were capable of receiving based on the level of their intellectual maturity. The blending of the source domain, milk given to an infant to drink, with the target domain, the Corinthian Christians, underlines Paul’s humiliating assessment of the Corinthians as infantile pertaining to their spiritual development. What was true of them in the past remains true in the present according to Paul (vs. 2). In 3:3, he explains his evaluation, that their immaturity is evident since they still appear to be enslaved to the flesh or to their unredeemed humanity in their orientation to life, or, as Thiselton (2000: 289, 292-293) suggests, they seem to be “centered on the self”.

⁹⁸ Garland (2003:107-109) argues that milk and solid food should not be understood as relating to different levels of teaching by Paul. Instead, the difference is supposed to indicate different levels of attitude displayed by the Corinthians towards Paul’s teaching, in that they do not appear to recognise it for what it is. This is certainly not the impression created by 2:2 where Paul asserts that he took a decision to limit his preaching to Christ crucified, implying that he could have taken some alternative approach, and also by 2:6-16 where Paul argues that he possesses a deeper wisdom for the spiritually discerning. In 3:1 Paul seems to blame the Corinthians for not offering a more spiritually profound message. More importantly it is not what the metaphor in 3:2 suggests. It seems clear that Paul decided what the Corinthians were capable of understanding and therefore gave them the food appropriate for the spiritually infantile. Cf. Given (2001: 97-98).

It is seldom recognised, that the terms σαρκινος (3:1) and σαρκικο/ω (3:3) have also been used metaphorically, which is noticeable in the blend. The source domain of the conceptual metaphor, “that which is of the flesh or fleshly” when mapped on to the target domain, which refers to the spiritually immature Corinthians, creates the sense that the behaviour of the Corinthians is consistent with their behaviour prior to Paul’s initial preaching of the gospel. Hence, they appear so similar to their non-Christian fellow citizens, that they could not be identified as believers, as the latter part of 3:3 suggests, where Paul confronts them and states that they are living according to human ways (και.: κατα_ανθρωπον περιπατει=τε), and not like spiritually transformed people (3:1). As evidence for their apparent untransformed lives⁹⁹, Paul points to their social interaction which is characterised by jealousy (ζη~λωω) and strife (ε1ριω) (3:3; cf. 1:11), both of which are terms that often referred to political discord in antiquity (Mitchell 1991: 81-82). Hence the reported factionalism within the church community demonstrates the untransformed lives of the Corinthian Christians (3:4). By highlighting their inappropriate behaviour, Paul appears to seek to shame them (Welborn 1997: 57-58).

Paul employs the terms νη&πιοι and σαρκι/νοι (3:1) metaphorically to describe the behaviour of his Corinthian converts, particularly the elite, as immature and unspiritual.¹⁰⁰ With regard to Paul’s use of the term νη&πιοι, Thiselton (2000: 289) questions whether Paul refers to “the image of children who need to grow, or that of infantile adults who need to adjust their attitude.” Although Thiselton recognises that the term νη&πιοι is metaphorical and that it is used in “semantic contrast to τε/λειοιω” in 2:6 to characterise the Corinthian Christians, he neglects to fully analyse the manner in which the metaphor functions. The image of immature children needing to grow up (the source), appears to be mapped on to the Christians (the target) due to their behaviour which according to Paul is unacceptable. This leads to the blend of the Corinthians who are yet immature in their faith and need to develop spiritually in order

⁹⁹ Paul refers to unspiritual people (1 Cor. 3:1), these being (cf. 1:4-6) converts who have the indwelling Spirit of God, but have yet to appropriate spiritual teachings and gifts, thereby still being unspiritual.

¹⁰⁰ Paul uses two metonymies, πνευματικοι/, spiritual people, and σαρκι/νοι, fleshly people, to contrast the essence of the Corinthians behaviour with the goal that they should have obtained. Thus, he implies that the Corinthians are σαρκι/νοι people who have not lived by the dictates of the spirit, but are still controlled by “natural, human impulses” (Garland 2003:106).

to behave in an acceptable manner with the concept of the immature infant. Fee (1987: 125) affirms this view and observes that the Corinthians' progress is not linked to different stages in the gospel, but that the Corinthian Christians seem to be behaving like "adults of the wrong kind" due to their infantile behaviour.¹⁰¹ Likewise, it was not that Paul's initial message regarding the cross was like the milk infants need, and that the Corinthians' immaturity preventing him from giving them the more advanced instruction of the gospel (Garland: 2003, 107); rather, the message that Paul addressed to the mature (2:6) was apparently identical to the gospel that he spoke when he first established the church in Corinth. Thiselton (2000: 291) expresses this thought as,

[it] is not so much a call to maturity (although this may well be an implicate [sic] of these verses), but a warning that the *self-centered competitive naïveté which characterizes young children* who have not yet learned to respect the interests of the Other will lead to *misjudgments about the quality and required methods of Christians proclamation and teaching*.¹⁰²

In his efforts to engage the Corinthians, particularly the elite, toward an adjustment in their behaviour, Paul addresses them with a maternal authority characteristic of a nursing mother towards her own $\nu\eta\&\pi\iota\omicron\iota$ (vs. 1). As Martin (1995: 64) suggests, the description, $\nu\eta\&\pi\iota\omicron\iota$, attributes a low social status to the elite, and thus demonstrates Paul's displeasure with the dissensions and resulting factionalism within the church community (3:3-4). Paul's re-establishment of his authority over the Corinthians is evident in the blend between the implied source, the nursing mother, and the target, Paul, the founder of the church. In a mother-infant relationship, in which the $\nu\eta\&\pi\iota\omicron\iota$ were decidedly immature and hence unable to demonstrate developed discernment and to make wise judgements, the mother had to exercise necessary authority over her $\nu\eta\&\pi\iota\omicron\iota$, which included evaluating their dietary needs depending upon their level of physical maturity and resultant ability to eat solid foods in addition to the initial milk, which was directly imparted by the mother. If the infants desired, however, to act independently, their actions would lack good judgement, where these could even be described as foolish, since infants simply do not have the knowledge or wisdom to

¹⁰¹ For details, see Fee (1987: 124-126).

¹⁰² Italics by Thiselton. Garland (2003: 106) also shares this view.

determine what they are capable of doing nor are they able to evaluate what they should be eating.

The blending between the source and the target demonstrates that the authority of a mother over her child is blended onto Paul's relationship with the Corinthians. Therefore, in 3:2 Paul explains to the Corinthians, "I gave you milk ($\gamma\alpha/\lambda\alpha$) to drink, not solid food ($\beta\rho\omega\sim\mu\alpha$), for you were not able to eat solid food, and even now you are not able". The blend suggests a nursing mother's reaction to her child trying to eat solid food when the child was unable to do so, and it transfers the authority of a nursing mother to the target, Paul, the apostle, and projects on to him the authority of a mother towards her children. The present issue concerns the right of Paul as an apostle to teach his converts the gospel of Jesus Christ in a manner appropriate to their level of maturity. The tendency of the Corinthians, perhaps especially the Corinthian elite, to over-value rhetoric, illustrates that the significance of the message could be easily be substituted by the medium, in this case the rhetorician. In terms of Quintilian's analysis, as discussed briefly in the first chapter, this metaphorical usage of Paul is action oriented, since human interaction forms the basis of the metaphorical source and its application to the metaphorical target.

Having re-asserted his authority, Paul alleges that the Corinthian elite's claim to be spiritual is unfounded. Rather, they are still behaving in an infantile manner because they do not fully grasp or appreciate that the message of the gospel cannot be made subject to its rhetorical performance. Moreover, their attachments to Paul, Apollos and possibly various other leaders (1:10-12; 3:4) based on their supposed skills as sophistic orators, underline their immaturity. Thus, the Corinthian Christians and, more so, the socially elite members of the community, exhibited the behaviour of the secular elite within the Corinthian society. Their desire for rhetorically eloquent teachers created and fostered jealousy and strife, upon which members of the community developed into factions, with divided loyalties (3:3) towards Paul, Apollos and probably various other teachers (Winter 2001: 31-43).

The nursing mother metaphor, therefore, enables Paul to transfer aspects of the mother source domain onto his relationship with the Corinthian Christians, which then provides certain connections between the role of the mother and her responsibilities in the

household, and Paul himself. Similarly, via the infant metaphor, Paul transfers details of the infant source domain onto his Corinthian converts. Consequently, the mother-infant metaphor complex allows Paul to portray his own authority as natural, since his role in making the earliest converts and founding the Christian community in Corinth established his primacy over the community as the one who first nurtured them within the gospel of Jesus Christ. Wanamaker (2003: 130) observes that this “reflects the common ideological strategy of dissimulating social relations through metaphors which endow people with characteristics which they do not really possess.” The Corinthian elite is thus portrayed as infantile and as lacking mature faith, which highlights Paul’s “own dominance and control of the relation with his readers” (Wanamaker 2003: 130). Hence, the authority and disciplinary powers associated with real mothers in that world, which are transposed to Paul, apply to his Corinthian converts who are likened to infants in antiquity. With this rhetorically achieved authority, Paul attempts to separate or fragment the Corinthian Christians from interloping teachers like Apollos since the metaphor complex implies that Paul alone can decide when they are ready for more substantial teaching in their new faith. At the same time, calling the members of the community *νη&πιοι* and *σαρκι/νοιφ* seems to carry the intention of shaming the Corinthians, particularly members of the community who considered themselves superior to their fellow believers (cf., 4:6). Paul thus reduces all the members of the church community, whether socially prominent or socially inferior, to the same low status, while his own is portrayed as higher, although counterculturally he had presented himself as abased. Rhetorically this serves to challenge any authority claimed by elite members of the community based on potential superior wisdom, knowledge, or spirituality as evaluated by the secular society.

Nevertheless, by using the nursing mother-child metaphor complex, Paul desires to achieve another result. Since the complex metaphor ideologically alludes to the reunification between himself and the Corinthians Christians,¹⁰³ Paul offers himself as a force towards engaging and maintaining unity, because he has re-established himself as the common parent of the entire church community. Through the nursing mother metaphor, Paul reiterates that he cares for the community and that it remains his responsibility to rear them in the Christian faith. Ideologically, Paul appears to create a

¹⁰³ See Thompson (1990: 64) for a discussion of the ideological move involved in social reunification.

viable basis from which to solve the problem of factionalism caused by the Corinthian elite (cf. Wanamaker 2003: 135-136).¹⁰⁴ The ideological richness of the use of metaphors is evident: Paul is able to dissimulate his role through his use of the mother-child metaphor, in order to re-establish and sustain his dominance in the Corinthian church (Thompson 1990: 63). Fragmentation, dissimulation, and unification are modes of ideological interaction that facilitate the reassertion and legitimacy of Paul's authoritative role in the Corinthian church by choosing the mother-child metaphor complex which clearly draws its meaning from the relationship of mothers and infants within a household structure in antiquity.

3.4. Conclusion

From the above discussion, we are able to discern that in order to address factionalism in the Corinthian church community; Paul uses a complex metaphor system involving the nursing mother and her infants that is located within the complex metaphor domain of the ancient household. This is an extraordinary method of ideologically re-establishing and sustaining Paul's dominance and authority in the Corinthian church. Through the nursing mother-child complex metaphor, Paul claims an authoritative position by which he decrees how the gospel of Jesus Christ ought to be transferred and explicated to his Corinthian converts. Similarly, his argument seeks to limit the influence of rhetorically sophisticated interlopers such as Apollos by reuniting the community around himself and his role as the primary authority in the community. Paul also invokes a sense of shame within the community which reduces the socially prominent to the same level as the socially less prominent members of the community. By this process, Paul provides and encourages an alternative to the current divisive factionalism within the Corinthian church community.

¹⁰⁴ However, 2 Corinthians 10-13, written after 1 Corinthians, gives a strong indication that Paul's rhetoric in 4:14-21, as well as in 1:10-4:13, did not achieve its desired effect.

Chapter 4

Unification: Complex Agricultural Metaphors (1 Cor 3:5-9b)

4.1. Introduction

In 1 Cor. 3:1-2 Paul began with a complex household metaphor in which he identifies himself with certain features of a nursing mother in antiquity and the Corinthians with dependent infants to claim that he had brought them up in Christian faith with an element of authority and domination in the Corinthian church. This is continued in 3:5-9, where he continues to address the issues of authority and domination in the Corinthian church along the lines of being the first to bring them to Christian faith (Collins 1999: 142). Paul once again applies metaphors in order to respond to the Corinthian situation. In 3:6, Paul identifies himself and Apollos as servants of the Lord and then asserts himself as the planter of God's field and Apollos as the one responsible for watering God's field with God giving the increase in the field (3:6). Then in 3:9, he identifies the Corinthian Christians as θεοῦ ~ γεω&ργιον, God's field or cultivated land. Paul's use of metaphors such as servants, planter, one who waters, field and growth speak more than the assertions itself as these metaphors are related to common and social *topos* in antiquity – household structure and agriculture that is also related to household. That is, the metaphors exists as submetaphors, master-servant in a household system; planter/agriculturist-Paul, the founder; one who waters/worker-Apollos, the one who continues Paul's message of Gospel; Growth of plantation-act of God alone; and earth/God's land-Corinthian church as God's building in agriculture practises. In a wider sense, agriculture could also be related to a household system, as will be discussed in subsequent sections. Therefore, as servants of the household both Paul and Apollos were involved metaphorically in farming which was a normal practise of households in antiquity. According to Kövecses (2002: 80-84, 116-118) both the household systems and agriculture practises are complex household metaphor in 3:5-9b.

Behind the household complex metaphors in 1 Cor. 3:5-9 lies the problem of σξι/σματα or disunity within the church spawned by the kind of political rivalry between leaders that characterised the civic politics of Corinth and other cities in the

Roman Empire (Welborn 1987a: 86-87, 90-92; Winter 2001: 4). The Corinthian elite considered Apollos to be the superior leader since he demonstrated sophistic eloquence (cf. 2 Cor. 10:7-11). This alliance of the elite with Apollos had brought to nothing Paul's authoritative position in the Corinthian church (cf. Carter 1997: 55-56). Paul, in this midst of this, has to thus engage in action that which would establish a ground upon which he would be able to re-assert his own position of pre-eminence over the community and deftly subordinate Apollos to himself in the eyes of his readers. To do this, as I will demonstrate in what follows, Paul engages in the ideological strategy of unification through the complex household metaphor that he employs. Similarly to an earlier application, socio-rhetorical analysis would help in looking at the social and cultural intertextures of the complex household metaphor, to pull out social and cultural dynamics for interpreting the metaphors through blending theory. The blending theory between the source domain and target domain in the submetaphors shows that Paul ideologically claims his authority back in the Corinthian church places other leaders like Apollos secondary to himself and encourages the Corinthian Christians to re-construct their own reality in such a way that the $\sigma\zeta\iota/\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ are overcome.

In order to see how Paul through the complex household metaphor addresses the power of his authority and $\sigma\zeta\iota/\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$ in the Corinthian church, we would first look at the dynamics of the relationship between a master-servants in a household system in antiquity. Thereafter we will examine the manner in which Paul metaphorically applies the functional role of $\delta\iota\alpha\&\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$ to himself and to Apollos in order to reconstruct and sustain his domination and authority in the Corinthian church.

4.2. Master-Servants relationship in Antiquity

Within chapter 6, we will examine how a servant functioned as part of a household structure where a servant normally was involved in working as a bonded labourer to the master of the household with a social status that reflected that of his or her master but with no hierarchy and authority in the household system (DeSilva 2000: 173-174; Saller 1996: 80; Osiek & Balch 1997: 41-42; Gardner 1997: 35; Corbier 1991: 129).¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ For details on these lists, see Saller (1996: 80-88).

In a master-servants relationship in antiquity, we can identify two aspects that are important for Paul to make metaphorical claims over the Corinthian Christians. They are subordination and lower social status.

4.2.1. Subordination

The relationship between a master and his servants in the household in antiquity depended upon unambiguous hierarchical relationships in which servants were subordinate to their masters. The role of δίακονοί referred to various kinds of people functioning in subordinate roles by assisting someone else, where the servant role included the need to obey commands of the master. As such, some δίακονοί served as assistants (Plato, *Laws* 763A),¹⁰⁶ as serving-men (Demosthenes, *Private Orations: Against Neaera* 33), as agents who were capable of making proposals (Dionysius, *The Roman Antiquities* 20.2), as henchmen (Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 6.52), and as obedient and loyal helpers (Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 7.224).¹⁰⁷

4.2.1.1. Low social status

Whatever social status they had was in relation to the person that they serve. The function of δίακονοί was indicative of their lower status as they did not have any authority in the household. For example, the reference to, among others who slept with Neaera, the word ‘even’ in the phrase “even the serving-men of Chabrias did so” supports the notion that the δίακονοί were of a lower status (Demosthenes, *Private Orations: Against Neaera* 33). Naturally, in matters of authority, servants had no right to judge any person. Epictetus, when talking about the faculties of sight and vision, metaphorically equates these faculties to servants who have been appointed to minister without the authority to judge. He stresses that unlike humans, to whom God gave the gift to “pass judgement upon them [the faculties of sight and vision],” the faculties of sight and vision cannot judge because they were appointed as servants or helpers.

Did you ever hear the faculty of sight say anything about itself? Or the faculty of vision? No, but they have been appointed as servants

¹⁰⁶ Also, see Dio, *Orationes*, 49.10; Philo, *On Abraham* 115; Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 11.188.

¹⁰⁷ Hanson in Thiselton (2000: 300), also makes a similar note of the understanding of servants in antiquity.

(δίακονοι) and slaves to minister to the faculty which makes use of external impressions [the mind]. And if you ask, what each thing is worth, of whom do you ask? Who is to answer you? How, then, can any other faculty be superior to this which both used the rest as its servants (δίακονοι), and itself passes judgement upon each several thing and pronounces upon it? For which one of them knows what it is and what it is worth? (Epictetus, *The Discourses*, 2.23.7-8).

From the above discussion, we can conclude that δίακονοι were those people who functioned in subordination to their master and belonged to a lower status with no say in the household.

Paul, by applying the submetaphor, δίακονοι, as the source domain, and Paul and Apollos, as the target domain, has a number of features of the source domain, which are to be transferred onto the target domain, and all this depends upon the context. Servants serve their masters exclusively in subordination in various functional roles such as clients, serving men, agents, and helpers. The social status of a servant depended upon the social status of the master. If the master had a high social status in the society, there is a possibility for a servant to have a higher social status but surely less than that of his/her master. During the course of this chapter, we will examine the manner in which the features of the source domain transfer onto the target domain through the blending theory.

4.3. Agriculture: a household profession

Agriculture gives food to survive and thus happened to be the chief occupation of the people and a main resource of means in antiquity (Cary & Haarhoff 1940: 107) although the origin of agriculture is ironically linked to a Greek myth. In the myth,

Prometheus, Adam's counterpart in Greek myth, through his act of stealing fire from heaven, brought upon the human race the harsh necessity of agricultural labour, without which the seed, sunk in the earth by a vengeful Zeus, could not be converted into an edible plant. Agriculture was a punishment imposed upon mankind, and a diet of cereals a drastic

comedown from the divine menu of nectar and ambrosia, or from the free produce of the Garden of Eden (Garnsey 1999: 1).

Agriculture could be seen to be evident in the context of a household where the master who possessed land had his household members to do the farming and if needed hired workers. An example of the peninsula of Methana of Greece based on a fieldwork in early 1970s illustrates that household members were mainly responsible for farming (Forbes & Foxhall 1995: 72). The household tilled the land, lived on the production, fed their animals and either stored or sold the rest depending upon the need of the hour (Forbes & Foxhall 1995: 75). The common agricultural products were “wheat, corn, barley, wine, olives, vegetables and nuts” (Plutarch, *The Unchangeableness of God* 95; Wilkins 1995: 8; cf. Garnsey 1999: 120-122).¹⁰⁸

A profession in the agricultural arena was considered to be amongst the highest levels of occupation in antiquity. Xenophon noted the discussion of Socrates and Kritobolos in which both agreed that agriculture was the best occupation of a human being. In this regard, Xenophon stated,

We came to the conclusion that for a gentleman the best work and the best science is agriculture, from which men obtain what is necessary to them. For this work seemed to be the easiest to learn and the pleasantest to work at, to give to the body the greatest measure of strength and beauty, and to leave to the mind the greatest amount of spare time for attending to the interests of one’s friends and city. Moreover, since it makes the necessary things grow and nourishes measures them outside the walls, agriculture seemed to us to stimulate in some measure those working with it to become able defenders. And so this way of making a living appeared to be held in the highest estimation by our states, because it seems to turn out the best citizens and most loyal to the community (*Oeconomicus* 6.8-10)

¹⁰⁸ Also, see ε)φ)υτε)σ)αμεν in reference to vine (Dio, *Orationes* 7.46); κατεφ)υτε)σ)αφ in reference to vineyards and olive-yards (*On Flight and Finding* 176).

Furthermore, in Roman period farmers were considered to possess “qualities such as diligence, determination, and constancy” to be recognised as “traditionally Roman virtues” (Shelton 1988: 153).

From the cultural knowledge of master-servants relationship in a household in antiquity, the source domain, servants, and target domain, Paul and Apollos, could be identified as follows:

<u>Source Domain</u>	<u>Target Domain</u>
Servants in antiquity	Paul and Apollos
Servants belonged to a low social status.	Paul and Apollos as servants of the Lord belonged to a high social status as they served a high Lord but according to the social structure in Corinth, they both belong to a low social status.
Servants functioned in different assisting capacities and in subordination and obedience to their master	Paul and Apollos function as servants of the Lord in subordination and obedience through whom the Corinthians came and were enriched in Christian faith.

4.4. Farmer/Planter-land relationship in an agricultural context in antiquity

Unfortunately, we do not have much information as to functional roles of people involved in agriculture. A possible reason for this might be the lack of clear ancient references to peasants in ancient Greece and Rome (Garnsey 1999: 1; Forbes & Foxhall 1995: 70). However, there are technical treatises on the subject of agriculture that we believe could give us information to an implied role of a farmer/planter in antiquity. Prominent among the work on farming in antiquity are those of Cato, Varro, Columella and Palladius (Garnsey 1999:1).¹⁰⁹

In a master-farmer relationship in agricultural practices in a household system in antiquity, we are able to identify two characteristic features: lower social status and

¹⁰⁹ For details, see König (2006: 439-440).

skilled. The relationship and characteristic features of a master-farmer/planter in antiquity would help Paul for the features of the source domain, master-farmer/planter, to transfer onto the target domain, Paul, to reconstruct his authority and domination in the Corinthian church.

4.4.1. Lower social status

Agriculture was considered an art form in antiquity. Socrates taught Ischomachus “the whole art and mystery of agriculture could be learnt by watching men at work and being told about the skills of planting” (Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 15.10). However, it is useful to establish who within ancient society had the skills to apply agricultural knowledge as an art form. Xenophon, for instance, termed such a skilled worker/farmer in Athens as a *georgos*. Xenophon neglected to elaborate on this term *georgos* with respect to social status but noted that such a worker had the expertise and knowledge to till the land. Xenophon when referring to Ischomachos who was a landowner “awards him the title of *georgos* primarily because he understood the art of agriculture and takes an active part in farming, yet first and foremost as if he were a commanding officer” (5.16.1-2). In some places, Xenophon called such skilled workers *douloi* or *oiketai*, meaning that they were slaves (Isager & Skydsgaard 1992: 153; cf. Pobjoy 2006: 106). At other instances, *Georgos* labelled them as freedpersons (cf. Aristotle, *Politics* 1329a; and inscriptions from about 330 BC, discovered on the Acropolis in Isager & Skydsgaard 1992: 153). Likewise, Varro, *On Agriculture* 1.17.2-3 (in Shelton 1988: 159) sees such workers to be either freedmen or slaves or even both. About freedmen as skilled workers in the farm, he wrote,

[f]ree men were either (1) those who till their own fields, as many poor people do with the help of their families. Such families some times may rent land to farm. Wealthy people did not till their own fields, or (2) those who are hired when the major farming operations, such as vintage and haying, are performed with the assistance of hired free men, or (3) those who are working off debts.

4.4.2. Skilled

Being skilled implies having wisdom and knowledge, that is, knowing the art of agriculture in a theoretical way. The skill of a worker on a farm could be seen in the practises of tilling and planting.

4.4.2.1. Tilling

Based on what has been noted earlier, a skilled worker on a farm in antiquity could imply to a farmer/planter who knew the art of agriculture, that is, the theoretical knowledge of farming (cf. Pobjoy 2006: 106). Common knowledge of Indian village farming scenario could help us to understand the roles of a farmer/planter as it appears to be very close to that of the farming in antiquity. In Indian village farming context, a farmer with theoretical knowledge plans out how the plantation should be done, that is, taking into account, how the rows and columns need to be ploughed and if using ox to plough, the art of controlling an ox drawn cart. Also, the distance between each seed, the phases and stages to change the crops to an open area, if it is paddy, and water flow to the whole field are some of the important factors that the planter would take into consideration. Further, using the right kind of agricultural tool with necessary knowledge of its usage is utmost important.

A farmer/planter in antiquity with theoretical knowledge, like a master builder examines the construction site for a proposed building, does similarly regarding land before ploughing. Socrates observed that the quality of soil ($\gamma\eta\sim$) is very important in the growth of a plant and one needs to know what to plant or what to sow (*Oeconomicus* 16.2). Generally, an experienced farmer knew knowledge regarding the quality of the land (*Oeconomicus* 16.7). Ischomachus stated that such knowledge of the soil can be learnt by watching what the neighbour's plant and by what the soil yields (*Oeconomicus* 16.3). The neighbouring farmer is the source of knowledge and the land itself must be watched closely for knowledge of it.

For you are not likely to get a better yield from the land by sowing and planting what you want instead of the crops and trees that the land ($\gamma\eta\sim$) prefers. If it happens that the land ($\alpha\rho\gamma\iota/\alpha\nu$) does not declare its own

capabilities because the owners are lazy, you can often gather more correct information from a neighbouring plot than from a neighbouring proprietor. Yes, and even if the land lies waste, it reveals its nature. For if the wild stuff growing on the land is of fine quality, then by good farming the soil is capable of yielding cultivated crops of fine quality. So the nature of the soil can be ascertained even by the novice who has no experience of farming (*Oeconomicus* 16.4-5).

Moreover, Theophrastus advised that there should be a separate “treatment of light and heavy types of soil and digging and hoeing as an alternative to ploughing” (*De Causis Plantarum* 3.20.1) and suggested that farmers should use such techniques in ploughing (Isager & Skydsgaard 1992: 24). As such, farmers/planters were involved in plantation and season played an important factor. In spring, a farmer/planter had an important task ahead to prepare the land for plantation that began with preparing the soil for plantation. Xenophon in *Oeconomicus* 16.10 observe that in spring the land should be ploughed to make it loose just before grass and weed sprout so that it turns out to be good manure for sowing of seeds. In addition, in spring, the farmer “ploughed the land with a shallow ox-drawn plough and again after the first autumn rains” (Cary & Haarhoff 1940: 107). In summer, the farmer tilled the land as often as possible as to avoid soil to become friable due to the effect of sun (Isager & Skydsgaard 1992: 24). Such ploughing prevented the soil from removing “the sod and conserving moisture and retarding evaporation under summer sun” (Cary & Haarhoff 1940: 108). In autumn and winter, the land was left unploughed, that is, after the crop cut (Cary & Haarhoff 1940: 107).

4.4.2.2. Planting

Just like tilling, plantation also signified expertise. Both tilling and planting were part of the role of a farmer/planter. Much care and hard work had to go into plantation. For example, if the farmer was planting grain, according to Hesiod (*Works* II. 462ff) sowing of the seed was done only after the third ploughing (Isager & Skydsgaard 1992: 22). In spring, if it had to do with the cultivation of corn, a farmer had to “hoe and weed the ground between the rows of sprouting corn”. In June and July, the harvest months, “the ears were cut off near the top of the stalk by means of a hand-sickle, and were threshed with sticks, or under the hooves of oven” (Cary & Haarhoff 1940: 108). At the beginning of the rainy season and in the autumn grain that give a good harvest are sowed

in rich land and less on in substandard soil (Isager & Skydsgaard 1992: 24). Making use of and conserving the soil moisture many varieties of food crops such as cereals and pulses were cultivated (Purcell 2006: 124; Cary & Haarhoff 1940: 107),

Concerning fruit plantation, vine involved lot of work and skilful tending (Cary & Haarhoff 1940: 111). Xenophon gave instructions as to proper plantation of vine that surely a farmer/planter executed. “The size and depth of the hole designed for the plant should be in relation to the natural moisture of the soil. In dry earth the hole should be deeper than in moist soil, and the bottom should be covered by well-tilled earth” (*Oeconomicus* 19.12 in Isager & Skydsgaard 1992: 27).

Planting involving theoretical knowledge is also evident in the way Lysander is surprised of Cyrus possessing this special wisdom and knowledge of a farmer/planter. When Cyrus was showing Lysander his paradise at Sardis, Lysander was especially fascinated by the “beauty of the trees in it, the accuracy of the spacing, the straightness of the rows, the regularity of the angles and the multitude of the sweet scents that clung round them as they walked” (Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 4.21). When Lysander enquired as to who had created such a wonderful work, Cyrus confirmed that he himself had done it. It seems to have been common knowledge, and Lysander must have known, that those who did planting as a profession normally came from a lower class, performing hard manual labour for their survival. As such, Lysander was “marking the beauty and perfume of his (Cyrus) robes, and the splendour of the necklaces and bangles and other jewels that he was wearing:” and noted with surprise, “what Cyrus . . . did you really plant (ε)φύ&τευσσας part of this with your own hands?” (Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 4.23).

The work of the planter meant growth to the plantation. Plutarch also used αὐ)χ&α&ν&ων (noun form αὐ)χ&α&ν&ω or αὐ)χ&ω) in the same sense when talking about the increase to the orchard-plot (*Table-Talk* 745A). Growth of plantation meant great benefit to the needs of people. The act of planting initiated the growth of plants, which was used for various purposes when necessary (cf. *On Colours* 795a.20). Therefore, for example, Aristotle described how a wild olive was planted to give growth to branches by which victorious crowns were made for athletes.

a wild olive at Pantheon called the ‘beautiful crown’ olive. . . . they put out branches like the myrtle suitable for crowns. Taking a cutting from this Heracles planted it at Olympia, and from it crowns are given to the victorious athletes. This is by the river Ilissus, about 60 stades away from the river; it has a wall round it and there is a heavy penalty for anyone who touches it. Taking a cutting from this the Eleians planted it at Olympia, and gave crowns from it (*On Marvellous Things Heard* 834a. 10-21).

The awareness that a planter plants and the earth gives growth was also used metaphorically in the context of a human being raising up another. In one instance, growth was seen in the way that Medea raises up (φύτευ&ωv) brethren unto her sons (Euripides, *Medea* 878).¹¹⁰ Again, (αv)χα&vovται was used in a positive sense in the case of animal growth (Aristotle, *History of Animals* 595b, 19). Furthermore, when youths gained courage and power, this development was viewed metaphorically as growth (αv)χα&vovται (Plutarch, *Moralia: Old Men in Public Affairs* 795A-B), which was viewed as the development of a plant, animal or human being.¹¹¹

From the functional roles of a farmer who is involved in tilling to planting allows us to identify features that paves way for Paul to see a transfer of features from the source domain, planter, to Paul as the target domain, through the blending theory. The features could be that planters possessed the theory to till and plant involving techniques and skills. This wisdom and knowledge allowed them to first study the condition of the land depending upon the weather to decide upon the kind of crop to be planted. The main aim of a planter was to see there is growth or in other words, a harvest. Since the planter possessed the art of agriculture, it was implied that he was the apex of the hierarchy among the workers involved in farming. Thus, Paul as a planter had been assigned by the Lord to function as the only apostle to establish the Corinthian church, as he possesses the art required to analyse the Corinthians in terms of their social structure, social status, and thought pattern.

¹¹⁰ Also, see a similar metaphorical usage of φύτευ&ωv in Euripides, *Alcestis* 662.

¹¹¹ Collins (1999: 146), sees “the image of growth in the realm of creation.”

From the cultural understanding of planter-land relationship in an agricultural context in antiquity, we can highlight the source domain and target domain as follows:

<u>Source Domain</u>	<u>Target Domain</u>
Farmer/planter in antiquity	Paul and the Corinthian church
A farmer/planter has the theoretical knowledge of agriculture and along with other workers normally belonged to a household where they worked for the master.	Paul was equipped with the knowledge of the gospel of the crucified Christ and worked for the Lord.
A farmer/planter belongs to a low social status	Paul as servant of the Lord belonged to a low social status according to the social system in Corinth.
A farmer/planter had to examine the land before deciding planting any specific crop.	Paul had to examine Corinth and the cultural and social structures of the people.
A farmer/planter depending upon the season cultivated the land with a thorough knowledge of using agricultural tools.	Paul ministered the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the Corinthians and established the Corinthian church.
A farmer/planter was considered hierarchical over other workers on the farm since he understood the theory of agriculture.	Paul was the person who like a father established the Corinthian church and thus stood hierarchically over others who simply have to continue his ministry.

4.5. One who waters-land relationship in an agricultural context in antiquity

As mentioned earlier, we do not come across information to the role of a person who waters plants. From common knowledge in Indian village farming scenario, which even according to current practices should be very close to farming practices in the Mediterranean, one who waters is normally a lower category servant who does not need much expertise like a planter or farmer. Therefore, such a person does not have to possess the art of agriculture. Basic common knowledge or a certain amount of skill is enough for a person to water plants. The person watering would need to take note of how water should reach the crop. Normally there is a channel dig to create values to

each subdivided square of land containing the crop. The person who waters should take special care that water reaches every corner of the square land in order to water the entire crop. If needed this person would need to manually work by using agricultural instruments that would allow free flow of water to the crop. Sometimes one needs to watch over the crop. Thus in relation to the planter, the one who waters has a subordinate role to a planter as he/she continues to look after the work of the planter.

At times, a poor farmer is both a planter and one who waters and even then, the functional roles of being a farmer/planter and a person who waters clearly show that the a farmer/planter needs expertise and not so for a person who waters. When a rich farmer is involved in cultivation, he/she is normally the planter and has workers to do the watering. Even if the rich farmer is not physically involved in planting, he is physically present at the field to instruct, supervise the plantation, which is similar to a master builder who has many contractors and subcontractors under him.

In antiquity, the act of watering generally meant giving drink (ἐπιποτίσειν) (Plato, *Phaedrus* 247E).¹¹² In an agricultural context, it meant giving water (ἀφιχονταί) to the plants, naturally with the intention of nurturing them (Philo, *The Posterity and Exile of Cain* 176). Metaphorically, the same sense is seen in Rebecca, who functions as one who waters (ποτιζουσα) her pupil not with gradual progress like Hagar, but with perfection (*The Posterity and Exile of Cain* 132). When

she went down to the spring and filled her pitcher and came up. And the servant ran to meet her, and said, Give me to drink (πιποτισοῦν), I pray thee, a little water out of thy pitcher. And she said, Drink, sir. And she hastened and let down her pitcher on to her arm, and gave him drink (ἐπιποτίσειν), until he ceased drinking (*The Posterity and Exile of Cain* 132).

In addition, Rebecca's act of giving water was interpreted as acts of kindness and generosity (*The Posterity and Exile of Cain* 147).

¹¹² Also, see Philo, *On Drunkenness* 166, where ἐπιποτίσαν is also used with the same meaning and sense.

From the above discussion, we could say that the one who waters performs the acts of giving drink and nurturing plants. Status wise he/she is subordinate to the planter due to lack of knowing the theory of agriculture. Likewise, the land that gives growth to plants is due to the joint effort of the farmer/planter and one who waters. Growth is positive especially in the growth of a plant, animal, development of human beings in courage, power, physical, emotional, spiritual maturity and life giving.

Similarly from the cultural knowledge of one who waters-land relationship in agriculture in antiquity the source domain and target domain could be identified as follows:

<u>Source Domain</u>	<u>Target Domain</u>
One who waters in antiquity	Apollos and Corinthian church
One who waters has basic knowledge of agriculture and is thus considered to be subordinate to the farmer/planter.	Apollos could preach in eloquent wisdom much sort after in Corinth he was called to function to continue the work of Paul. Therefore, Apollos is considered subordinate to Paul functionally in the Corinthian church.
One who waters belongs to a low social status	Apollos who functions along with Paul as servants of the Lord and is thus of a lower social order according to the social system in Corinth.
One who waters is concerned watering the plantation and seeing that all crops gets watered.	Apollos is called to see that the Corinthian church continues to be taught the teaching on the Gospel of Jesus Christ that Paul had earlier taught to them with the expectation that they grow in number and faith.

4.6. Interpretation of complex agriculture metaphor in a household system (3:5-9b).

Paul in the sub-rhetorical unit, 1 Cor 3:5-9b, uses metaphors with metaphorical connection to the roles in the household structure and related agricultural system in

antiquity to continue to address the $\sigma\xi\iota/\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$. $\Sigma\xi\iota/\sigma\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$, as we have noted in earlier chapters, were caused by the Corinthian elite's allegiance to their different leaders and their craving for power in the Corinthian church. The agriculture metaphor in a household functions as complex metaphor Kövecses (2002: 80-84, 116-118) to provide Paul a basis to claim hierarchical position in the Corinthian church by his use of submetaphors that speak of relationship in the household system and agriculture practises. The submetaphors are the master and servants relationship in the household; and planter, one who waters and field relationship in agriculture that also belongs to the household system.

In 1 Cor 3:5 Paul raises the rhetorical questions: "What then is Apollos? What is Paul?" The most likely purpose is to counter the Corinthian elite's attitude of boasting about their respective leaders' unique quality of sophistic wisdom. The rhetorical questions in themselves raise the question as to whether Paul puts emphasis on the persons (himself and Apollos) or on their respective works. Clarke (1993: 119) and Collins (1999: 145) note that Paul uses the particle $\tau\iota$ /, rather than the more personal $\tau\iota/\varphi$, emphasising "what is Paul", and "what is Apollos" rather than "who are Paul and Apollos". Therefore, the rhetorical questions emphasise the leaders' particular functional roles, rather than their identity (Thiselton 2000: 299; Winter 2002: 196; Welborn 2005: 235). The second part of vs.5 speaks about the functional roles of both Paul and Apollos. Paul metaphorically equates himself and Apollos to $\delta\iota\alpha\&\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$, a well-established role in the household structure in antiquity. In fact, he claims that the Lord himself has assigned the roles of $\delta\iota\alpha\&\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$ to him and Apollos, and it is through these roles that the Corinthian church has come to believe in Christ (3:5) (Collins 1999: 145; Barrett 1987: 84; Thiselton 2000: 300).

The complex household metaphor, as will be discussed in subsequent sections, gives Paul an ideological possibility to claim for a respectable position in the Corinthian church from earlier being considered nothing. The submetaphor master-servants as source domain through the blend allow features to be transferred over to the target domain, Paul and Apollos in the Corinthian church. Paul sees himself and Apollos in a complex household structure and blends upon himself and Apollos, the target domain, the functional role of $\delta\iota\alpha\&\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$, which implies that they function to serve just like any

other *δίακονοι* in antiquity (Welborn 2005: 234-235). Paul makes it clear that they function as servants of the Lord alone and like serving-men serve the commands of the Lord alone in obedience and as loyal helpers (3:5).¹¹³ The blend shows a relationship between Paul and Apollos as being servants of the Lord and this very status shows a relationship of both Paul and Apollos with the Lord (Collins 1999: 145). Here ideologically Paul claims to fragment the Corinthian elite by the asserting that he and Apollos work for the Lord alone and have no client-patronage relationship with the Corinthian elite. Paul further blends upon himself and Apollos the target domain, the features of the source domain, *δίακονοι*, in a household structure in antiquity of both he and Apollos as servants of the Lord are of a low status in terms of the perceived social values of the Corinthian elite. Paul propagates an alternative culture by inverting the social structure that gives greater importance to being strong, eloquent, and powerful (Welborn 2005: 235; Carter 1997: 59). By claiming to be servants to the Lord, he uplifts social behaviour that signifies lowliness in the church.¹¹⁴ For this reason, Paul's argument can be seen as a countercultural argument that seeks to undermine the views held by the Corinthian elite regarding leaders, namely, that a leader should possess sophisticated wisdom and belong to an honourable social class (Horrell 1996: 135). Indeed the Corinthian elite were carried away with their cultural values quite easily (Carter 1997: 51). Hence, Paul fragments the relationship between the elite and Apollos and brings his positions in par with Apollos in the Corinthian church. This is indeed an ideological climb for Paul from being considered nothing to being on equal level with Apollos (cf. Carter 1997: 53).

Paul's use of a countercultural argument has a specific purpose. The blend reveals that Paul intentionally dissimulates not only his position, but also especially that of Apollos to fragment the Corinthian elite. Fragmentation would personally affect the Corinthian elite's loyalty towards Apollos. In fact, the Corinthian elite's allegiance to Apollos clearly implies that Apollos was viewed as a 'broker' between God and the Corinthians. Likewise, Paul was viewed in a similar fashion. To say, "I belong to Paul" was

¹¹³ Cf. Plato, *Laws* 763A; Demosthenes, *Private Orations: Against Neaera* 33; Dionysius, *The Roman Antiquities* 20.2; Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* 6.52; 7.224.

¹¹⁴ Clarke (1993: 119) shares the same view. He states that "Paul deliberately inverted the Greco-Roman scale of values: those who are being looked up to as patron figures, he is describing rather as their servants (3:5)." Likewise Garland (2003: 111) notes "the metaphor may have been offensive to them by inverting cultural codes and values attached to their notions about leaders and their stature."

tantamount to saying that I belong to the faction that has Paul as its broker. This is not the same thing as saying that Paul was viewed as a patron.

The Corinthian elite generally would have thought that adherence to brokerage of Apollos, for his eloquence, would inflate their honour, power and status in the Corinthian church.¹¹⁵ Naturally, the Corinthian elite maintained relationships with different "missionaries" by cashing in on, and taking pride in their respective leaders' public performance (Clarke 1993: 119; Thiselton 2000: 301). In contrast, Paul was seen as lacking such rhetorical skills and the honour and status that went with such skills (Winter 2002: 200; 183-185). Allegiance to Paul meant identifying oneself with shame and weakness in the Corinthian church (4:8-13) (Chow 1992: 104; Pickett 1997: 53, 194). Paul does confirm his deficiency of rhetorical skill and depicts himself as one of shameful status, that is, if this judgement is based on his reaction to rhetoric (1:17; 2:1-5) and wisdom (2:6-3:3), in which some of the Corinthians were interested and through which Apollos had probably preached the gospel, excelling in his rhetorical skills. Thus, when Paul metaphorically equates Apollos to a δίακονος, blending between the source and target domains transfers upon the elite, the non-ownership of Apollos, that is, as their leader (Fee 1987: 129). As we know Apollos had the rhetorical gifts that gave him an elevated status in the eyes of the elite (cf. Acts 18:24-28; Given 2001: 93). They want to claim Apollos as their client¹¹⁶ and possibly their servant, but Paul counter claims that both he and Apollos are not the servants of the community, but the servants of Christ and that the community cannot own them. Instead, Apollos, just like Paul, works for the Lord, according to Paul (Carter 1997: 59). The assumed relationship of the elite with Apollos stand contrary to the status boasted of and indulged in by the Corinthian elite in their effort to establish the same position of power in the church as they enjoyed in civil society. This is contrary to the cultural understanding in antiquity that servants belong to a lower status.¹¹⁷ For this reason, Paul and Apollos were viewed as brokers between God and the Corinthians rather than as patrons. This position stands contrary to Thiselton (2002: 302-303) who claims that Apollos and Paul were patrons to the church and the elite were seeking benefits associated with being clients of influential

¹¹⁵ For details on Apollos as a persuasive speaker see Wire (1990: 209-210); Pogoloff (1992: 181-187); Chow (1992: 104); Liftin (1994: 228, 231-232). For a discussion on patronage refer to chapter 1 above.

¹¹⁶ See 2 Cor. 11:1-13 where this appears to be the issue between Paul and the interloping missionaries.

¹¹⁷ For the Corinthian elite, Paul's metaphorical equation as a servant status, as seen earlier, may parallel to the servants in antiquity where Epictetus' mentions that servants cannot pass judgement on another's worthiness because they depend upon each other (*The Discourses*, 2.23.7-8).

people. This does not seem to fit Paul very well since in 4:8-13 he claims that he and those like him are of low status compared to the elite in the church. Paul rejected the notion of factions, similar to those that occurred in civic politics, forming around himself, Apollos, and Cephas (Carter 1997: 53). Paul and Apollos were used in ways that neither of them intended by powerful figures who sought to gain status and power within the community by association with Paul, Apollos, Cephas who they used to symbolically represent their interests in their physical absence. It is true that faction leaders normally were patrons since they had an interest in their supporters putting them forward for political office. In the Corinthian Christian situation, the faction leaders were being used for goals that they may not have approved of and therefore the key issue is that the supporters or adherents of the various leaders were interested in their own influence in the community rather than the influence of the person to whom they notionally adhered (cf. Carter 1997: 55). Alternatively, Paul argues that he and Apollos are not faction leaders in competition with one another, even though those who adhere to the groups identified with their names used them in a competitive way (Welborn 1987a: 93-101; cf. Welborn 1997: 74-75). They do not work for the Corinthian elite but rather for the Lord. It is the Lord and not the Corinthian elite who has assigned both Paul and Apollos to preach the gospel, and this is evident in the Corinthian Christians coming to faith in Christ (3:5) (Fee 1987: 131; Carter 1997: 59).

Ideologically, through dissimulation and unification Paul claims unity between himself and Apollos. For example, the growth metaphor suggests that Paul and Apollos are not faction leaders, from Paul's perspective, but that they are unified in trying to achieve the same goal that God has for the community, namely, its growth (Wanamaker 2003b: 213; Fee 1987: 130, 133; Horrell 1996: 113). Paul asserts that he and Apollos are the only brokers through whom the Corinthian Christians received the gospel. In other words, he claims that both he and Apollos have the same status and neither one is over the other. Ideologically through unification of being on an equal plane, Paul now claims that both he and Apollos have an enhanced status because of God as their master who they serve and are directly related to him by being his servants alone. Also, Paul's claim that both he and Apollos are chosen to be $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$ of the Lord shows a co-operation that signifies a unity between them. Mitchell (1991: 213) precisely says that Paul "uses their relationship as a paradigm for Corinthian unity rather than a cause for division (3:4, 8, 22; 1:12; 4:6; 16:12)." Since both Paul and Apollos work as $\delta\iota\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$ of the Lord, the

Corinthian Christians should refrain from showing loyalty to any one particular leader, as neither is superior to the other, both being equal.

Paul after portraying himself and Apollos to be on an equal level by using the submetaphor, $\delta\iota/\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$ as source domain and Paul and Apollos as target domain, he then takes this equality to address the Corinthian elite, in order to reclaim his position of authority in the church. As we shall see, Paul actually asserts his superiority over Apollos with complex agriculture metaphor (Carter 1997: 59). The submetaphor, planter, as source domain and Paul as the target domain provides a basis for sustaining his domination over Apollos and the Corinthian church. Nevertheless, why does Paul have to claim superiority over Apollos and re-establish or sustain his authority in the Corinthian Church? At an earlier stage, Paul might not have thought of spelling out his authority within the church. However, some of the Corinthian elite had discredited him and thus his only option was to re-assert his authority in relation to the community in an attempt to end the factionalism by re-unifying the Corinthians around his ideological position. As discussed earlier regarding the submetaphor, $\delta\iota/\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu\omicron\iota$, as source domain and Paul and Apollos as target domain in a household system where Paul re-asserted his dominion and authority by claiming equal status with Apollos when he was ‘nothing’ in the site of the Corinthian elite.

In line with the rhetorical questions in 3:5, Paul continues not to speak about his and Apollos’s identity in 3:6-7, but rather, highlights the work of each leader. We shall see in 3:6-8, that Paul, while saying that both he and Apollos are equal, does stress the underlined message that their respective works are not. To underscore such a work distinction, Paul blends upon himself, the target domain, the features of the source domain, planter, of being the originator, the father of the Corinthian church, just as being a planter is the one who first plants a seed (Malina & Pilch 2006: 74). Paul is also seen as a father of the Corinthian church, the one who was the source of their birth as a church by means of his seed, the gospel of Christ Jesus that he first proclaimed to them. As such, Paul ideologically dissimulates his role as a planter to claim that he has established the Corinthian church and thus addresses the attack on his status as an apostle of Jesus Christ by some of the Corinthian elite (Castelli 1991: 105; Gaventa 1996: 111). Just as a planter in antiquity had the theory of agriculture towards examining land to check its suitability to cultivate the right kind of crop with use of

agriculture tools and with a workforce to assist him, there occurs a blend between the source and target domain. Paul, the target domain blends onto him the features of the source domain, planter, to portray himself as one who finds the Corinthians suitable to receive the gospel of Christ Jesus. Paul surely must have analysed the social structure of the Corinthians, their social status as well as their thought patterns. Knowledge of such an environment was of utmost importance, so that Paul could preach the gospel in such a way that the gospel would lead to growth in the Corinthian church in terms of numbers and maturity in Christ. Unquestionably, taking into consideration that the Corinthians were new to Christian faith, Paul fed them with a simple gospel of the crucified Christ (3:2). Thus, through the blend Paul as mentioned earlier claims to be the first to proclaim the gospel to the Corinthians, like a father through whose seed/seed they were born into a church. Indeed Paul ideologically legitimises his claim to be the first to establish the Corinthian church through the submetaphor, planter that belongs to the household system.¹¹⁸

After Paul ideologically constitutes his role in the Corinthian church as the only apostle to establish the Corinthian church, he alleges superiority over Apollos through the submetaphor, one who waters, as a source domain and Apollos as target domain in the context of complex agricultural metaphor (3:6). The blend allows a transfer of features from the source domain, one who waters, to Apollos, the target domain. The blend shows that Apollos' role is that of continuing to enrich the Corinthian Christians with the gospel that Paul had proclaimed to them just like one who waters, continues to the water the plantation that was done by the planter. Fee (1987: 132) suggests that Apollos just continued the teaching ministry that Paul had started in the Corinthian church. (Malina & Pilch 2006: 74) also stress that Apollos must have ministered as a teacher or prophet. As a functional role Apollos does not need much skill for this task in comparison to that of a planter. A person who waters is only required to perform the function of watering with perfection and commitment.¹¹⁹ Therefore, the blend shows that for Apollos, a general knowledge of how to preach the gospel to the Corinthian church is sufficient to create an environment for growth in the Christian faith (cf. Xenophon *Oeconomicus* 16.2-7). Judging by his following, Apollos clearly did preach with such perfection and commitment. His ministry did create a situation that was conducive to a God-given

¹¹⁸ Carter (1997: 59) shares a similar view.

¹¹⁹ Cf. Philo, *The Posterity and Exile of Cain* 132, 147.

growth of the Corinthian Christian community (vs.7). Thus through the blend, Paul claims that Apollos' role is subordinate to his in the Corinthian church.

The above discussion demonstrates that Paul rates Apollos' function as lower than his own in the Corinthian church. Apollos' task of continuing Paul's work requires less skill than that of Paul himself, who had initiated the process (Barnett 2003: 317). Paul intentionally shows a difference in the tasks undertaken by himself and Apollos in order to differentiate between the Corinthian elite and the true followers of Christ. He shows that in displaying allegiance towards Apollos, the elite were actually supporting the man with the lesser authority. This step goes beyond the equality function, as *δια&κονοι*, which he stresses earlier (vs. 5). Unwrapping the metaphorical language, one could say that Paul claims to be the first to evangelise with the gospel of Jesus Christ to the Corinthians, while he sees Apollos as the one who arrived later to continue to minister the gospel that Paul had already proclaimed (3:5-9) (Thiselton 2000: 302). Paul develops this idea in the subsequent sub-rhetorical unit 3:10-15. With his strong language in 3:10-15 he claims that he has laid the only foundation. No other foundation can be laid. All that can be done is to build on that foundation. Thus, Paul climbs the ladder of authority in the Corinthian church. To begin with, he is in the position of one discarded by the Corinthian elite in favour of other leaders like Apollos. He then claims to be equal with Apollos, to claim finally superiority over him. Utilising this position of superiority, Paul warns the Corinthian church to listen to him and not to any other leader. Thiselton (2000: 302-303) rightly says that “. . . [the *δια&κονοι* status of both Paul and Apollos] provides a crushing rejoinder to those who sought reflected honour and status by means of association with some esteemed public leader, after the style of patronage and 'friendship' in [the] secular world of Paul's day.”

Paul, after ideologically establishing his authority in the Corinthian church, goes on to discuss the source of the growth of the Corinthian church, which the Corinthian elite had placed in their respective leaders (3:7). By applying the submetaphor, growth on field as source domain and God-Corinthian Christians as target domain, Paul reverses this understanding. Through the blend between the source and target domains, Paul also sees the transfer of features from source to target domain in the form of God should be given credit to be the only one who could bestow growth to the Corinthian church just as the field itself gives growth to a crop. Paul's understanding of God's gift of growth in an

agricultural context easily finds its parallels within the cultural knowledge in antiquity.¹²⁰ Paul compares his function to that of a planter, and that of Apollos to that of one who waters, but stresses that these are not the source of growth (vs.7). In support, Barrett (1987: 85) remarks that “[t]he creation and nurturing of faith is the work neither of preacher nor of hearer, but of God”. By placing the emphasis on God as the source of growth, Paul again destabilizes the Corinthian elite’s basis for their adherence to Apollos. As indicated earlier, some of the Corinthian elite considered Apollos to be the source of the growth of the Corinthian church and implying especially the elite in spirituality. In this sense, the verse on reward becomes clear (3:8b). Paul and Apollos work for the Lord and, whereas Paul has a higher authority than Apollos, the Corinthian elite have no right to judge or discredit Paul for it is only God who judges them.¹²¹ Hollander (1994: 96) supports this view by stating:

all builders, all authorities in the Corinthian community, are servants of God, whose works cannot be approved or disapproved by the members of the church. The Christians in Corinth are not in a position to judge apostles and missionaries. It is God who, at the Final judgement, will disclose their work and will administer justice to each of them individually.

Since it is God who gives growth and God who judges, Paul metaphorically equates himself and Apollos to God’s fellow workers (3:9) (Collins 1999: 142). The expression “God’s workers underscores that the workers and the results of their work belong to God” (Collins 1999: 146; Byrne 1987: 177). θεου~ γαρ& εθμεν συνεργοι/, does not mean that Paul and Apollos are co-workers with God as some have argued (Ker 2000:

¹²⁰ Cf. Aristotle, *On Colours* 795a.20; Plutarch, *Table-Talk* 745A; Aristotle, *History of Animals* 595b, 19; Plutarch, *Moralia: Old Men in Public Affairs* 795A-B; Philo, *On Flight and Finding* 176.

¹²¹ This is contrary to Liftin and other scholars. Liftin (1994: 224) argues that reward “is a reminder that it is God’s evaluation that Paul must be concerned about and not the Corinthians. Their worldly evaluations are thus inappropriate.”¹²¹ Chow (1992: 107) argues that it is not sure why Paul took up this reward language and does not develop this idea. He says that says that reward distinction between Paul and Apollos is parallel to the reward the rival apostles receive in 9:6, 12a, as material benefits, such as financial aid to Paul who is rewarded with is the boast that he preaches free of charge (9:17-18). Barrett (1987: 86) argues that Paul’s use of reward or being paid underlines their responsibility to their Master. Fee (1987: 133) notes that it may be an echo to the idea that Paul and Apollos are nothing before God and can only hope for a reward from God if the work of each is acceptable (3:13-15), or it may emphasise that Paul and Apollos work under another who determines their pay (4:1-5) (Fee 1987: 133). Conzelmann (1975: 74) sees reward to interrupt the train of thought. However, Conzelmann feels that “the fellow-worker certainly does not have any merit of which he can boast, but he can hope for a reward, in keeping with his eschatological responsibility for his achievements. Once again the accent falls both on the distinctive character of each individual’s work and on the unity in the joint work.”

87; Morris 1958: 66) but rather that Paul and Apollos are co-workers who work with one another while belonging to God as the possessive genitive suggests (Thiselton 2000: 305-306; Fee 1987: 134; Garland 2003: 113).¹²² The functions of Paul as a planter and Apollos as one who waters, thus complement each other to bring in a sense of teamwork, solidarity and accord between them (Thiselton 2000: 303-304; Garland 2003: 111; Burke 2003: 111; Winter 2001: 160; Welborn 1987b: 326; Welborn 2005: 238).¹²³

Having ideologically established his authority within the church, Paul finally speaks directly to the Corinthian Christians, in particular to the Corinthian elite. He calls them “God’s field and God’s building” (3:9) to communicate that just as he, Paul, and Apollos belong to God, as active agents, the Corinthians belong to God but as passive objects upon whom Paul and Apollos work together. Thus, the description of Corinthian Christians as God’s field and construction underscores God’s ownership of them. The blend between the source domain, God’s field and God’s building, and the target domain, Corinthian Christians, transfers God’s ownership of the Corinthian Christians just as crop has to be attached to the soil to receive growth. God uses Paul and Apollos to function in different roles, in order to generate growth among the Corinthian Christians (cf. Collins 1999: 147). With this statement, Paul sets the stage for the transition from agricultural imagery to the building metaphor in 3:10-17, while at the same time legitimising his authority over the Corinthian church.

4.7. Conclusion

At the outset, Paul depends upon both complex household and complex agriculture metaphors to metaphorically make connections through submetaphors within these systems to ideologically re-assert his dominion and authority in the Corinthian church. Paul through complex household submetaphor *διὰ&κονοι* addresses the problem of being considered ‘nothing’ especially in site of Apollos in the Corinthian church by ideologically claiming to have same functional roles like Apollos as both of them are nothing but servants of the Lord through whom they received the gospel. Based on this new functional role, Paul then uses complex agricultural submetaphors like planter-Paul, one who waters-Apollos, growth-God gives and field-Corinthian church. By applying this particular metaphorical language, Paul ideologically asserts superiority over Apollos

¹²² Cf. Carson (1993: 76).

¹²³ Also, see Carson (1993: 76; Horrell 1996: 113; Collins 1999: 146).

on the basis that as a planter of the Corinthian church he was the first to proclaim the gospel to the Corinthians, that is, first to establish the church. On the other hand, Apollos simply continued the work that Paul had begun in Corinth. In relation to Apollos, Paul moves from a position of below, to equal to superior in his authority over the Corinthians. This is achieved by the ideological metaphorical use of, first, “servant”, and then “planter and one who waters”. Paul's move is one of unification by embracing Apollos' work as merely an extension of his own work. Paul is therefore attempting to overcome the fragmentation that the elite of the community had caused by choosing to support different outside apostles and missionaries in order to gain an advantage for themselves.

Again, although Paul may be superior to Apollos in terms of function, they both work together to be called God's co-workers (vs. 9). As co-workers they work to create a situation for God to bestow growth on the Corinthian church in terms of spirituality as well as numeric growth. Just as Paul and Apollos belong to God, so do the Corinthian Christians, who are God's field and God's building (vs. 9). Since all belong to God, they are united. Thus, Paul through rhetorical argumentation believes that the Corinthian elite could reconstruct their reality by abstaining from passing judgements on the true leaders as it shows of their mistake in basing their allegiance on values of worldly wisdom, such as power and status, thinking that this is based on honour, while it is, in fact, based on shame.

Chapter 5

Holiness and Divine judgement: Complex Master-Builder and Temple metaphors in 1 Cor. 3:9c-17

5.1. Introduction

In 1 Corinthians 3, Paul moves from the agrarian based metaphor in 3:5-9b to a more urban oriented metaphor in 3:9c-17. The agricultural metaphor of 3:6-9b pertains to the work of Paul and Apollos while the master-builder metaphor in 3:9c-17 identifies Paul as ἀρξίτεκτων, or master-builder, while other leaders are linked to builders under Paul's supervision. The transition is signalled by Paul's metaphorical conception of the Christian community as a building belonging to God: "You are God's building" (3:9c). In each case, the metaphor is used to focus attention on Paul's own role in founding the Christian community in Corinth, as well as on the activities of others who have engaged in developing the work begun by Paul. The claim that the Corinthian Christians are God's building (vs. 9b), eventually leads to Paul metaphorically describing the Christian community in Corinth as God's temple (3:16-17).

The metaphorical dimensions of 3:9c-17, as has been discussed elsewhere, are not mere rhetorical elaborations, but they are conceptually fundamental to Paul's argument since he uses a set of metaphors derived from the domain of architecture in antiquity to allude to the nature of his own work in Corinth and the relation of the work of one or more other leaders to his work. Furthermore, Paul applies metaphorical thought derived from this domain to conceptualise the nature of the church community in Corinth and its relation to God. Thus, in terms of Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 246), Paul makes use of conceptual metaphors in his argument in 3:9c-17 and in Kövecses' (2002: 80-84, 116-118) terms, complex metaphors. Paul portrays himself as the ἀρξίτεκτων or master-builder of the Corinthian church and interlopers such as Apollos, as well as the Corinthian leaders, as the builders who are building the Corinthian Christian community on the foundations that he had laid. Lanci (1997: 59) records that Burford observes in his book, *The Greek Temple Builders at Epidaurus* (1969), that the ἀρξίτεκτωνεω

“were not usually architects of a building in the modern sense; they resembled modern civil engineers. An ancient architect was a technical advisor, and usually not the designer of the building to be constructed.”

From time immemorial, humans have been builders. Initially they built simple shelters for their families and structures to shelter and constrain their animals as well as to protect themselves from the elements (Hall 1996: 10-11). As societies became more complex, humans developed their building techniques, resulting in more elaborate structures such as temples, palaces, sanctuaries, tombs, theatres, gymnasia, and various large public buildings. By the time of antiquity, construction, particularly of public buildings, had become a complex process involving the requirement of suitable land, finance, vast amounts of cheap labour and a variety of different people such as rulers and public benefactors who commissioned the construction of buildings. Master-builders, stone cutters, transporters, and various craftsmen worked together, often over several generations, as was the case regarding the building of the second temple in Jerusalem (see John 2:20), to complete a building project. When Paul invokes the metaphor of the Corinthian Christian community as “God’s building” in 3:9, the metaphorical adoption, is appropriate and timely, reflecting the nature of metaphor as observed by both Aristotle (*On Rhetoric* 3.11.5; *On Rhetoric* 3.2.12) and Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.14). This will be discussed in greater detail in subsequent sections. Paul applies the metaphor to create a conceptual metaphor that structures a series of related metaphors from the domain of ancient architecture, and in particular temple architecture (3:16-17).

Paul introduces the σοφο_φ α)ρξίτε&κτων, ‘a skilled master-builder’ (3:10), as a metaphorical source, while targeting himself and his apostolic work among the Corinthians as the recipient of the transfer of meaning. This metaphor then structures the series of building related association that follow. First, Paul asserts that he had laid the foundation of Jesus Christ according to the grace of God that had been imparted to him (3:10-11). By claiming that he conducted his mission work “according to the grace of God that was given to him” (3:10a) Paul invokes a further metaphorical conception, that of the patron and his commissioning charge (see Thiselton 2000: 308-309). The implied patronal metaphor conceptually explains God’s involvement in Paul’s architectural work because master-builders enjoyed the benefactions of their patrons when they were commissioned to build a building. Interestingly, Pfammatter (1960: 23)

observes that an architect is responsible for the entire building, whereas in this case, each individual is responsible for the specific part entrusted to him or her. Along this line, Paul claims responsibility solely for the laying of the foundation¹²⁴. Therefore, having ostensibly received God's patronal favour relates to the fact that Paul was divinely commissioned to lay the foundations of the metaphorical 'building of God' that the Corinthian community constituted. It is apparent that Paul makes it a point to use the metaphor of the master-builder from a better class as Aristotle (*On Rhetoric* 3.2.13) has suggested, by employing another metaphor, the foundation of God's building, Jesus Christ, of which he is the ἀρξίτεκτων (3:10-11). In this context, "Jesus Christ" is not only the target of the "foundation" source, but the very name has its own metonymical character since the name of Christ stands for the totality of Paul's message regarding salvation.¹²⁵ As the divinely commissioned and skilled master-builder is responsible for the foundations of "God's building", Paul cautions the Corinthian Christians that there is no other alternative but to build on the foundations that he has laid. Those Corinthian Christians, who do not, will be subjected to testing and judgement (3:11-15).

Paul's use of ἀρξίτεκτων and the building workers metaphor extends beyond the assertions made above which could be seen in the questions that need answering. What is the conceptual connection between Paul, the person who first preached the gospel of Jesus Christ to the Corinthian church, and the source domain in the master-builder metaphor? Likewise, why is there a threatened judgement in relation to those who are the metaphorical builders of the Corinthian church? Furthermore, what is the connection between Paul as a master builder erecting a building to the Corinthian Christians as a community called the temple of God? Questions like these will demonstrate that the whole of 1 Cor. 3:9c-17 is ideologically charged since Paul is using a variety of culturally determined aspects of the master-builder and the construction worker functions in order rhetorically to reconstruct and sustain his authority over the Corinthians, to re-claim their obedience towards him and to create a platform for the Corinthian Christians to redescribe their reality on his terms.

¹²⁴ Pfammatter (1960: 23) observes that elsewhere Paul functions as one laying the foundation as well as one building on that foundation (cf. Rom. 15:20; 1960: 23 fn. 13).

¹²⁵ See Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 35-45) who discuss metonymy in relation to metaphors.

In this chapter, as implied earlier, through socio-rhetorical analysis, we will attempt to discern the relationship between master-builders and ordinary builders in antiquity and master-builders and temple in antiquity. Robbins' approach to socio-rhetorical criticism is a useful method by which metaphors are viewed differently and appreciated holistically. Socio-rhetorical analysis serves to identify the blend of the source domain, master-builders, in the complex building metaphor. The analysis of the social and cultural texture of the source domain, ἀρχιτεκτων and ordinary builders in antiquity, then becomes a significant step in blending with the target domain, Paul and the leaders in the Corinthian church, to interpret Paul's use of the complex building metaphor in 1 Cor. 3:9c-17.

5.2. The master-builder and construction workers' relationship in antiquity

Buildings from antiquity represent one of the most prominent features of their heritage. The secret behind such magnificent structures, as noted earlier, was the effective work of master-builders and their subordinates. In the following sections, we will discuss the identification of certain aspects of the relationship between master-builders and their subordinates within a complex building's structural features. The aspects relevant to understanding Paul's use of complex of building related metaphors can be listed as follows: wisdom, hierarchy, importance, authority, and sincerity and responsibility.

5.2.1. Wisdom

In antiquity, master-builders were referred to as those people who were related to the construction of buildings and other structures including aqueducts, bridges, walls, harbours, arsenals, coliseums, temples and houses (see Plutarch *Dinner of the Seven Elite Men* 156 B).¹²⁶ The master-builder's work involved specialisations leading Aristotle to explain the basis for distinguishing master-builders from ordinary builders. He says that the master craftsmen (ἀρχιτεκτοναφ) in every profession “know the reasons of the things which are done” and “possess a theory and know the causes.” It is for this reason, master craftsmen are “wiser than the artisans” (*Metaphysics* 1.1.11). Whereas builders function on the basis of repetitive work, resulting in operating habitually without being cognitively aware of each action (*Metaphysics* 1.1.11-12).¹²⁷

¹²⁶ Plato (*Politics* 5.9.4-5) and Demosthenes (*Against Androtion* 13) are two writers in antiquity who have highlighted structures built by master-builders and ordinary builders in antiquity.

¹²⁷ For details, see Aristotle, *Metaphysics* 1.7-10.

For example, according to Plutarch, when Alexander was assured in a dream of the importance of the place Pharos by Homer, Alexander physically visited the site to appreciate its natural advantages after which he, as “a very wise master-builder (σοφω&τατοφ α)ρξίτε&κτων), ordered the plan of the city to be drawn in conformity with this site” (*Alexander* 36.4). Socrates also noted that α)ρξίτε&κτωνεφ, because of their skill, were considered to be master-builders and were entrusted with building (οι)κοδομη&σεωφ) walls or constructing harbours or arsenals (*Gorgias* 455B). Thus, α)ρξίτε&κτωνεπ were distinguished from normal builders due to their impressive wisdom and understanding in the sense that they understood the reasons for the building process and the theory of the science of construction whereas the experienced construction workers merely knew the facts but not the theory and the reasons behind the building process.

Since a master-builder in a master-builder-construction worker relationship was considered wiser or more skilled than the other workers involved in the process of building formal structures, the α)ρξίτε&κτων concept was used in several different metaphorical constructions in antiquity. For instance, Aristotle metaphorically equated a political philosopher to the α)ρξίτε&κτων or master-craftsman. Aristotle observed that just as a master-builder has superior knowledge of building theory in laying a standard by which the quality of the construction is judged good or bad, the political philosopher is considered to be superior to others in knowledge of philosophy when it comes to examining the nature of pleasure and pain (*Nicomachean Ethics* 7.11.1).¹²⁸

5.2.2. Hierarchy

Since master-builders were thought to be wiser and more intelligent than the workers who actually built the structures, the other rulers entrusted them with oversight in building projects. This created a hierarchical socially prominent, especially kings and relationship of domination by the master-builders over the actual builders since the α)ρξίτε&κτωνεπ functioned as advisors, directors and co-ordinators over the actual builders in order to ensure that a proper structure was built. For example, Heracleides, as α)ρξίτε&κτων, was acknowledged for his skill and was put in-charge of some repairs

¹²⁸ Socrates, *Gorgias* 455B, confirms this mode of appointment as he argues that in each appointment we have to select the most skilful person.

that were to be made in the wall of a fort (*Histories* 13.4.6).¹²⁹ In addition, Pliny considered master-builders to be advisors and requested them to determine if a lake was above sea level and to undertake the repair of aqueducts and a theatre (*Ep.* 10.37; 10.39; 10.41). Likewise, Archon Pytharatus in mentioning the role of Demochares as one who had supervised the building of walls added that he was “a good ambassador, a proposer of legislation, and a statesman” (Plutarch *Decrees* 851.D), all roles in which Demochares was placed in a dominant position. In another instance, Plutarch stated that Polycrithus, the ἀρχιτεκτων, had the hierarchical status to speak against the fortifications of Poemander because of his importance and value as a master-builder (*The Greek Questions* 299C). Aristotle used the concept of the ἀρχιτεκτων being wiser than the builders who worked for him in order to maintain that a building can only take proper shape when the workers submit to the hierarchical authority of the master-builder. Aristotle then metaphorically equated the ἀρχιτεκτων to prudence performing a similar action when she enjoins virtues (*Magna Moralia* 1.34.28-29). The ἀρχιτεκτωνεσ, thus, because of his knowledge of the science of construction, held a position of dominance over the actual builders.

5.2.3. Authority

Another important characteristic of the ἀρχιτεκτων in a master-builder relationship with other builders in antiquity was his exercise of authority. One way of exercising authority was in the master-builder’s very role of laying a foundation. Stable and solid foundations are the secret to the historical structures that we see today from antiquity. To stand properly and survive over time a building or other structure requires strong and stable foundations. The laying of the foundations for ancient buildings was the responsibility of the master-builder who authoritatively directed the workers in laying the necessary foundations. For example, it is implied that master-builders with engineering skills, working at a king’s behest, used builders to create the foundations for a temple on a hill by building retaining walls, filling the space between the walls with earth and levelling the ground surrounding the hill so that it became suitable for

¹²⁹ Some jobs employed more than one ἀρχιτεκτων, especially for large buildings works. Coulton in Lanci (1997: 59) notes that four master-builders worked on the original foundations and stylobate of the Olympieion in Athens, while two laid out the Hellenistic temple at Didyma. According to Lanci (1997: 81, n. 14) Coulton mentions that by the fourth century BCE hierarchical relationships existed between ἀρχιτεκτωνεσ and υ(παρχιτεκτωνεφ with one ἀρχιτεκτων supervising several υ(παρχιτεκτωνεφ.

constructing temples (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *The Roman Antiquities* 3.69.2).¹³⁰ One may have dreams of magnificent structure but unless the master-builder designs a “blue print” and lays a sound foundation, in this case, by first levelling the ground, the structure cannot stand.

The strength and stability of a foundation laid by the skill of a master-builder and his authority in directing his builders was used metaphorically by writers in antiquity. Apollonides, for example, spoke of the ‘foundation’ (θεμελιον) as the basis upon which the subject of catoptrics can exist. That is, if there is no equality of the angles of incidence and reflection by streams of light that flow from the moon upon the earth then the subject of catoptrics does not exist (Plutarch *The Face on the Moon*, 930A). Foundation as success is further conceptually understood when Polybius spoke of θεμελιον as a position; a strategic position held by the soldiers from where they attacked their enemies to achieve victory (*Histories* 1.40.10).¹³¹ Thus, the most important goal of a master-builder in laying a foundation was to create a foundation that would last and hold the structure that was to be built on it.

Common knowledge in antiquity included the recognition that just as strong foundations held superstructures; weak foundations would lead to the collapse of the superstructure. This practical and theoretical knowledge was used metaphorically in various contexts in antiquity. Epictetus used this conceptual understanding to encourage people to make sound judgements and to change them if they were irrational. Metaphorically, he equated a firm foundation to making sound decisions and with a firm resolve to proceed with the structure of determination. Unsound decisions he equated to rotten and crumbling foundation. Thus any big ideas on unsound decisions cannot go ahead but lead to failures just like the bigger and the stronger superstructure falls quicker when it has been built on a weaker foundation (*Discourses*. 2.15.8).¹³²

¹³⁰ Furthermore, Philo used θεμελιον in a figurative sense. He characterised the heart as the θεμελιον of the rest of the body, which is built upon it; the soul is the θεμελιον of God’s house; all that is learned is a superstructure built upon the θεμελιον of a nature receptive to instruction (*Legum Allegoriae* 2.6; *Cher.* 101; Philo *De Mutatione* 211). Frequently it designates the foundation of a building. Paul’s usage is compatible both with the concrete image of a building and with the foundational nature of his ministry (Lanci 1997: 64).

¹³¹ For details, see Polybius *Histories* 1.40.1-16.

¹³² Also, see Epictetus *Discourses*. 2.15.6, 9 for details.

Likewise, Plato metaphorically related the concept of a foundation to the concept of the security of a state. For Plato, the security of a state lay in the rich being kind enough to give to the poor, partly in order to moderate the circumstances of the poor and partly in the belief that poverty exists because of the greed of the rich. If the rich are understanding then a change is possible so that a civil society can be built (ἐποικισθῆναι). However, as Plato continued, if the rich do not change, then the security of the state is built on a rotten foundation with any political actions proving very difficult to achieve (*Laws* 736E).

Thus, in antiquity, the master-builder was considered the most important person on any construction job, and it was his responsibility to direct the builders to lay strong foundations in order to give the building project security, longevity, and success. A weak foundation, on the other hand, brought failure. This important conceptual understanding was used metaphorically to speak about life decisions in making a right decision and rectifying the wrong. The well-being of a state that models its governance on the family household also needed to realise that the basis of good governance is like the foundation of a house: it must be strong if the state is to prosper.

5.2.4. Importance

Society in antiquity valued people according to their importance in society and in particular on the basis of their qualifications and contributions to society. Among those considered important were ἀρχιτέκτονες. They gained their importance not simply because of their skill and knowledge of the art of construction that gave them hierarchical domination over the builders who worked under them, but also because they were very scarce in society. For example, when Livy wanted to get the marble roof of the temple of Juno Lacinia in southern Italy repaired, which had been stripped by one of the censors in 173 BCE, he could not find any master-builders capable of doing the job (Livy, 42.3.1-11). Likewise, in Roman Bithynia, Pliny (the younger) due to a shortage of properly trained ἀρχιτέκτονες noted that the building projects were badly executed or abandoned. Furthermore, when Pliny requested a master-builder from Rome to inspect the buildings, the emperor informed him that he himself was in need of good surveyors in Rome (Pliny, *Letters* 10, 40).¹³³

¹³³ For details on the shortage of skilled workers from c. 500 B.C.E onwards see Burford (1972: 62-67).

5.2.5. Sincerity and responsibility

Another essential aspect of the master-builder and ordinary builders relationship in antiquity was that builders were required to work with sincerity and responsibility. The builders' sincerity and responsibility manifested in the outcome of a building with regard to its durability and fulfilment of its purpose.

The character of sincerity and responsibility of the ordinary builders in building structures was also used metaphorically in antiquity. Aristotle when discussing the principle of movement and the concept of motion metaphorically related it to a process of construction that leads to a building:¹³⁴ the movement which the generator set going “. . . is the movement resident within <which causes it to move>, just as the activity of building causes the house to get built (οι)κοδομησιφ)” (*Generation of Animals* 2.1.17). Similarly, motion results when the complete reality itself exists potentially and completely real and actual. For example, “when the ‘buildable’ (οι)κοδομητο&ν) in the sense in which we call it such exists actually, it is being built (οι)κοδομει=ται); and this is the process of building (οι)κοδομησιφ)” (*Metaphysics* 1065b. 15). Aristotle, further highlighted the builders' sincerity and responsibility in the usage and potentiality of materials in the act of constructing a building, metaphorically equated it to the nature of movement. He wrote,

the building materials (οι)κοδομητο_ν) are functioning *as materials for building* (οι)κοδομητου~) only as long as they are in process (οι)κοδομητο&ν) of being built (οι)κοδομησι/φ) with; for as soon as the edifice (οι)κοδομησιφ) itself is actually raised, the functioning (οι)κοδομητου~) of what were materials for a house is merged in the functioning of the house itself; but as long as they are being built (οι)κοδομει=ται) with, they are functioning (οι)κοδομητο&ν) as materials for a house. The act of building, then, is the energizing or bringing into actuality of the potentiality of the materials of a house into the texture of the house itself, so long as it is in progress (οι)κοδομησιφ), is their

¹³⁴ For other references on the process of building leads to a structure see Aristotle *Metaphysics* 9.8.12-13; *Parts of Animals* 640a, 646b.

‘movement’ *qua* materials of building (οικοδομησις). And this is the theory of all the other ‘movements’ equally (*Physics* 201b. 5-10).¹³⁵

Hence the role of builders was to take all necessary care to construct a quality building. The builders, who showed sincerity and responsibility, would use the right materials and naturally the outcome of the building would be strong. Those builders, who did not show sincerity and did not act responsibly, would choose poor quality materials, resulting in shabby buildings. Plutarch had a similar understanding that builders’ positive attitude and using the right material would result in a sound structure. He furthermore metaphorically equated the sincerity and commitment of the builders in the act of building to “progress in virtue.” A behaviour of builders contrary to the previous descriptions would result in unfaithfulness to their job, insincerity and lack of commitment. Using these general descriptions, Plutarch metaphorically equated the insincerity of the builders in constructing a building to irresponsible and careless people. He wrote,

. . . to imagine that nothing can cause any great disgrace, or can even be of any great importance, makes men easy-going and careless about little things. True enough, it makes no difference, when men are building (οικοδομηματις) some rough wall which is to have a coping, whether they throw into the foundation a chance piece of timber or a stone picked up from the ground, or whether they put into the lower courses a fallen slab from some tomb, the same sort of thing that moral slovens do when they bring together promiscuously and accumulate actions and conduct of every kind . . . (*Progress in Virtue* 86A).

¹³⁵ The same idea with a more literal translation is seen in Aristotle *Metaphysics* 1069b.1-5.

For everything may sometimes be actual, and sometimes not; for example, “the ‘buildable’ (οικοδομητο/ν) *qua* ‘buildable’ (οικοδομητο/ν); and the actualization of the ‘buildable’ (οικοδομητου~) *qua* ‘buildable’ (οικοδομητο/ν) is the act of building (οικοδομησις). For the actualization is either this – the act of building (οικοδομησις) – or a house. But when the house exists, it will no longer be buildable (οικοδομητο/ν); the buildable (οικοδομει=ται) is that which is *being* built (οικοδομητο&ν). Hence the actualization must be the act of building (οικοδομησις), and the act of building (οικοδομησις) is a kind of motion.

At other places, Aristotle explored the process of building more extensively. “[B]uilding material is actualizing the potentialities in virtue of which we call it ‘building material’ when it is in the act of being built (οικοδομησις) into a structure, and this act is the process of ‘movement’ of ‘building’. . .” (*Physics* 201a. 15).

From the above discussion, it is apparent that in the master builder and builders relationship in antiquity, the wisdom and authority of the master builder and the sincerity and responsibility of the other builders contributed significantly to the success of constructing a building. In contrast, when the master builder and the ordinary builders under him built a structure hastily, it was understood that this would result in poorly constructed buildings.

Thus, from the cultural understanding of the master builder and the ordinary builders relationship in the building metaphor in antiquity, the following source and target domains can be distinguished in relation to Paul's relationship with the leaders of the Corinthian Christian community:

Source domain	Target domain
Master builder	Paul the Apostle
Master-builders (ἀρχιτε/κτονεω) were very scarce.	Apostles were scarce and Paul in establishing the Corinthian church was the only founder apostle of the Corinthian church.
Master-builders (ἀρχιτε/κτονεω) were entrusted to build great structures.	Paul as apostle sent by God was entrusted to establish the church of God in Corinthian.
Master-builders (ἀρχιτε/κτονεω) functioned in authoritative roles over ordinary builders.	Paul, who established the Corinthian church, expected other leaders to continue his work.
Master-builders (ἀρχιτε/κτονεω) possessed the art of construction that ordinary builders did not have.	Paul by the grace of God was appointed an apostle while other leaders were not.
Master-builders (ἀρχιτε/κτονεω) were privileged and important.	Paul as an apostle was the only one to establish the Corinthian church.
Master-builders (ἀρχιτε/κτονεω) lay the	Paul established the church at Corinth at

foundations of structures at the behest of prominent people or kings.	the behest of God.
Master-builders' (α0ρξίτε/κτονεω) main job was to set out and build a solid foundation that would hold the intended structure.	Paul as an apostle had the main task of establishing a community through his preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ.
Ordinary builders were under the authority of a master-builders (α0ρξίτε/κτονεω) and built according to his master-builder plan.	The leaders were under Paul's authority in the sense that they could only work for his ministry in Corinth.
Ordinary building workers were required to exhibit sincerity and to act responsibly in building structures otherwise their structures would collapse.	The leaders of the church community are expected to be sincere and responsible in their role of building upon Paul's work.

5.3. Temple-Community relationship in antiquity

Common knowledge of sacred places in India informs us that sacred sanctuaries and temples enable groups of people to form a common or shared social identity through sharing a common sacred space. At the same time, sanctuaries and temples create places at which worshippers as a community can identify themselves, as they believe feeling the presence of the deity and as such consider the place sacred. In this regard, people revere the temple's holiness and protect it from defilement with utmost importance.

When early Christianity emerged, temples and other forms of sacred sanctuaries were a common social and cultural phenomenon in the urban environment. This enabled Paul to employ the temple *topos* as part of the complex building metaphor that dominates the rhetoric of 1 Cor. 3:9c-17 in his effort to restore unity in a divided community based on the authority that he ideologically acclaimed, as seen in 3:9c-15.

Although it is far from easy to deal with the issues of authority and factionalism, Paul's rhetorical response to the issues hinges on his use of metaphors that are intended to structure the Corinthians self-understanding as a community. In 3:16-17, Paul applies a fourth metaphor, having used the metaphors of infant and milk in 3:1-3, and the concept

of planting and watering these plants in 3:4-9b, and the master-builder and contractors in 3:10-15. This fourth metaphor takes up the metaphor in 3:9c, in which the Corinthian Christians are described as God's building, which essentially means the temple of God. This temple metaphor is alluded to in 3:9c where Paul refers to the building of God, which serves as the governing conceptual metaphor for the whole of 3:9c-17.

Paul deftly uses the understanding of the temple in antiquity by comparing the Corinthian Christian community to the temple of God in which God's spirit dwells in 3:16. Paul also cautions that the community must not be damaged ($\phi\theta\epsilon\iota/\rho\epsilon\iota$) by anyone in 3:17. The treatment of the temple as a metaphorical source provides Paul with what Kövecses (2002: 80-84) terms the complex metaphor. The use of the temple metaphor also creates a submetaphor: the temple as source domain and the Corinthian Christians as a target domain that belong to the relationship of temple and people in antiquity. Since Paul's application of the temple metaphor goes well beyond the statements in 3:16-17, he adds a variety of culturally established characteristics of the relationships between the worshipers and their deity within the framework of the temple in antiquity.

In this chapter, the temple-community relationship in antiquity will serve to highlight that the source domain, the temple, has a number of features which would transfer onto the target domain, Corinthian Christians as a community, through the blending theory. The features to be identified can be listed as follows: dedication and deities dwelling place, holiness, and identity.

5.3.1. Dedication and deities dwelling place

The temples in antiquity were built for a variety of reasons, but their commonality was the need to dedicate them to, for example, victories over enemies ostensibly given to imperials by various gods (Plutarch *Caius Marius* 17.5; *Livy* 9.46), or to ratify vows taken by generals and emperors in battle (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 51.1.2), or in commemoration of a merger of religious and civil acts,¹³⁶ or as a means of propagating

¹³⁶ For example, the temple of Jupiter Tonans (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 54.4.1), the temple of Quirinus (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 54.19.4) and the temple of Mars (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 55.1.3-6) had been similarly dedicated. In addition, temples were often built with political agendas (*Aristides* 11.6), such as to signify unity between two kings (Plutarch *Romulus* 20.5).

an imperial ideology (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 44.4.4-5; 44.6.4; 56.46.3-4)¹³⁷, or also for other purposes such as to create concord and to establish peace (Plutarch *Camillus* 42.3-4). A dedicated temple thus alluded to the presence of gods and goddesses in these temples. This was understood as having occurred from the period around 800 B.C.E.¹³⁸ Our oldest literary source, Homer's *Iliad* describes Hecuba offering a valuable gift to the statue of Athena in the temple of Athena on the Acropolis (6.285-311) to refer to the perceived presence of the goddess Athena within the temple.

The physical structure of temple buildings evolved over time. Until about the ninth century B.C.E. the temples were described as having embodied the presence of gods and goddesses, made with mud bricks, wooden colonnades and stone.¹³⁹ The Greeks often extended the perceived and desired presence of their gods and goddesses from their homes and temples to the public sphere by parading the statues representing the gods and goddesses through the streets (North 2000: 37).

5.3.2. Holiness

The ascribed sanctification and state of holiness of temples is a fundamental part of community. For example, when Xenophon built a temple with sacred money the community considered this temple as sacred (*Anabasis* 5.3.9). The community regularly exhibited their obedience to the sacredness of the temple, as can be seen from an inscription on a tablet adjacent to the temple: "THE PLACE IS SACRED TO ARTHEMS. HE, WHO HOLDS IT AND ENJOYS ITS FRUITS, MUST OFFER THE TITHE EVERY YEAR IN SACRIFICE . . ." (*Anabasis* 5.3.12).¹⁴⁰

The antithesis to holiness was impurity or defilement. The severity towards holiness was seen in safeguarding temples from impiety (Parker 1983: 149). For example, at

¹³⁷ Likewise, a temple was also built in the honour for Gaius/Caligula (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 58.9.6; 59.28.2-3).

¹³⁸ Witherington (1995: 134) claims that the meaning of $\nu\alpha\omicron\phi$ was understood to indicate the presence of a god or gods within the temples.

¹³⁹ By the eighth century B.C.E architects exhibited an increasing pride in their work by erecting larger and more refined and ornate temples (Price 1999: 47). These improvements led to rivalry among the architects and builders (Bremmer 1994: 27, fn. 2). Some temples had apparently remained roofless. For details, see Bremmer (1994: 27, fn. 3).

¹⁴⁰ Capitals by Xenophon. The architecture of the temples was at times so striking that Herodotus (3:60) included the temples of Hera as the three architectural wonders. For details, also see Zaidman & Pantel (1994: 58).

Athens, temples were closed on “impure days” and “nobody would begin any serious undertaking” (Xenophon *Hellenic* 1.4.12). When believers were allowed to enter the temples, lustral basins of holy water were situated at the entrance to purify themselves before crossing into the sacred space (Zaidman & Pantel 1994: 56). Events like giving birth, making love or dying in a sanctuary (Zaidman & Pantel 1994: 56), rituals and figural representations, temple robbery, the murder of supplicants (Antiphon, *Minor Attic Orators: Antiphon* 5.81-83), misuse of temple treasury (Plutarch *Demosthenes* 24.121) and entering temples at a time when it was prohibited or entering a sanctuary while in a polluted or impious condition (*Antiphon* 5.81-83) were considered defiling the temple. Impiety, or $\alpha)\sigma\epsilon/\beta\epsilon\iota\alpha$, was understood as polluting the holiness of a temple, for example, by causing unacceptable damage to the property of the gods (Plutarch *Demosthenes* 24.121). Another example is seen in the uprooting of Athene’s sacred olive trees that was labelled as an offence by the Areopagus council (Zaidman & Pantel 1994: 11; Mikalson 1987: 27). Likewise, Athenian troops camping in the sacred precinct of Delion warranted a serious charge of defilement (*Thucydides* 4.97.3).¹⁴¹

Those who defiled the temple were not allowed to enter into a temple and such people were doomed to be punished (Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 1645; Plutarch *Leg.* 917b; Parker 1983: 147). As such, Sophocles (*Oedipus at Colonus* 466, 490-492) cautioned that those who polluted temples and defiled the gods should perform acts of purification for the dishonoured deities, since in his view such defilement ultimately endangers the impious worshipper and threatens his safety rather than the deities involved.

The gods and goddesses were understood to be directly or at least indirectly involved in expressing their anger towards those who had ostensibly defiled the sanctity of their temples and the sacred images. The indirect repercussions consisted of legal actions, in that the citizens treated defilement as a crime, which could result in the accused being interrogated and even condemned and sentenced in a court. For example, Socrates was executed on the charge of innovation to the gods (Bremmer 1994: 5).¹⁴² In Athens, temple-robbers were treated like traitors, to whom burial in his native land was denied. Moreover, in many Greek states the method of execution might have consisted of the accused having been thrown to his or her death over a cliff (Aeschines *Epistulae* 2.142,

¹⁴¹ Reference of classical literature is taken from Parker (1983: 149).

¹⁴² For details, see Bremmer (1994: 5, fn. 21).

Plutarch *Praec. Reip. Ger.* 825b), or merely into the sea, (Diodorus *Epigrammaticus* 16.35.6), which automatically removed the necessity for any form of burial (Xenophon *Hellenica* 1.7.22, cf. Diodorus *Epigrammaticus* 16.25.2). Temple-robbers were put into the same category as murderers, as can be seen in Alexander's famous 'recall of exiles' decree in 324, which only excluded temple-robbers and murderers (Diodorus *Epigrammaticus* 17.109.1 in Parker 1983: 170).

The assumed direct punishment by the deities was described as divine anger: for instance, when Miltiades tried to enter the temple of the goddess, Demeter Thesmophoros on Paros for malicious reasons, he was prevented from completing his malevolent mission when he suddenly experienced a panic attack upon entering the temple.¹⁴³ Moreover, he wrenched his hip as he fled the scene and died from an infection that entered the wound. These occurrences were understood as a direct intervention by the goddess, Demeter. In another case, when Battos of Cyrene insisted on viewing Demeter's forbidden mysteries, the goddess's priestess tricked him by exhibiting mundane articles and records, while the female celebrants overpowered him and emasculated him. In both cases the goddess was seen to have prevented the act of impiety by punishing the perpetrator while preventing the perpetrator from gaining access to the sacred (*Herodotus* 6.134-6).¹⁴⁴ Likewise, Valerius' Juno appearing as a stern goddess took vengeance on Quintus Fulvius Flaccus for stealing marble from her temple (1.1.20) (Muller 2002: 21).

In the Roman period, deities and human higher authorities openly punished anyone performing acts of impiety towards temples or their deities. For example, when Marcellus started to build a temple against the wisdom and desire of the priests, he was struck by a number of calamities and detained at Rome (*Marcellus* 28.2-3). In other examples, people were punished in reaction to their attitudes for such things as introducing foreign deities, creating conspiracies, factions, and cabals in the empire, thereby distorting the ruling religion and subverting hierarchical control. In reaction to

¹⁴³ For other examples of deity shows their anger on those who defile temples or them, see Aeschylus *Agamemnon* 338-42, 527, *Persius* 809-15; *Herodotus* 1.19.1-2, 8.33, 53.2, 109.3, 129.2-3, 143.2; *Herodotus* 5.85.1-2, Plutarch *Demosthenes* 24.121.

¹⁴⁴ References are taken from Parker (1983: 179). Valerius' Juno, also, appeared as a stern goddess who is described as having taken revenge on Quintus Fulvius Flaccus for stealing marble from her temple (1.1.20). Parker (1983: 171) provides further examples such as those described by Diodorus *Epigrammaticus* 14.63.1-2, 70.4, 76.3-4, 77.4.

such subversive behaviour, Caesar meted out punishment according to instructions given to him by Agrippa (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 52.36.2).

5.3.3. Identity

The identity of people in antiquity was seen in the way what the temple meant to them. They felt belonging to a particular group in the religious sphere. The intrinsic importance of identity with temples is evident when group of people moved to different areas the temple was dismantled and transported in order to remain with them. For example, the relocation of the temple of Ares to an area adjacent to the Athenian agora illustrates the significance of the temple as a part of the city's identity (Lanci 1997: 95-99). Shrines and sanctuaries in their neighbourhood or even adjacent to their houses served to help form their sense of identity. Corinthians' relationship with Aphrodite is one such example. Lanci (1997: 98), referring to Charles K. Williams, states that "the sanctuary of Aphrodite on Acrocorinth was put up by the Bacchiads as a state cult and unifying symbol of the dissimilar villages newly included into a single political entity."

Where the Greeks were affected deeply by the characteristics of their gods and goddesses as well as the mobility of their statues, during the Roman period, the identity of people was formed by their connection to the temples based on the construction and maintenance of their temples. Since the temple structures were crucial to the Romans in the formation of their own identity, they emphasised the building of new temples and the maintenance of existing temples (North 2000: 41).¹⁴⁵ The neglect of temples was considered as abhorrent and required immediate attention from community. This concern can be seen clearly in a well known ode of Horace (3.6) which states, "[h]owever innocent a Roman yourself, you will pay the penalty for your fathers' failures, until you have restored the collapsing temples and the images foul with black filth."¹⁴⁶

<u>Source domain</u>	<u>Target domain</u>
Temple metaphor	Corinthian Christians

¹⁴⁵ See list in table 4, North (2000: 41).

¹⁴⁶ When political structures such as the government seemed to have collapsed and subsequently repeated warfare broke out between the various armies of Rome in the civil war period, the need to maintain the temples developed into a primary concern of the people.

Temples are dedicated to gods and goddesses and thus have the presence of deity in temples and thus are holy	Corinthian Christians are building the temple of God which they are. Since God's spirit dwells in Temple, the spirit dwells in them. The Corinthian Christians are thus holy.
Temples required holiness; therefore unholiness was unacceptable and viewed as acts of defilement.	The Corinthian Christians were required to lead holy lives.
The unholy and impious was seen as having been punished by the gods and goddesses.	If the Corinthian Christians defy the temple of God then they are punished by God in the present.

5.4. Interpretation of the complex building and temple metaphors

First Corinthians 3:9c and 3:17 form an obvious *inclusio* that frames Paul's use of the complex building metaphor. In 3:9c Paul describes the Corinthian Christians as God's building (θεου~οι)κοδομη/ε)στε),¹⁴⁷ and he concludes his discussion in 3:17 by saying that the Corinthians themselves are the holy temple of God (ο(γα_ρ ναο_ω του~ θεου~ α(/γιο/ω ε)στιν, οι(·:τινε/ω ε)στε υ(μει=ω), that is, God's building. It is the metaphorical reference to the Christian community in Corinth as God's building in 3:9c that prepares for Paul's elaboration on the complex building metaphor in 3:10-17 in which he uses the building process and the relationships between builders in order to conceptualise his involvement in the origins and development of the church in Corinth (Welborn 1987b: 337; Barnett 2003: 314; Derrett 1997: 129-130; Kitzberger 1986: 68-69). The complex building metaphor in 1 Cor. 3:9c-17 allows Paul to employ several submetaphors and make metaphorical connections with the Corinthian Christians, especially with the leaders in the church. It furthermore provides Paul with a conceptual model for the hierarchical social relations he wanted to enforce on the church that he had established in Corinth. In 3:9c-17, the first submetaphor is the master builder as source domain and Paul and the Corinthian church as target domain, in the

¹⁴⁷ Mitchell (2003: 350) argues that in the post-Pauline tradition the building of God (οι)κοδομη_ του~ θεου~) was "reconceptualized" as the household of God (οι)κοω του~ θεου~) by the author of 1 Timothy.

context of the relationship between master builder and builders relationship within the complex metaphor of constructing structures.

The most obvious submetaphor in the complex building metaphor involves the transfer of meaning from the concept of the σοφο_π α)ρξιτε/κτων in antiquity to Paul as the founder of the community. The idiomatic expression ω(π σοφο_π α)ρξιτε/κτων¹⁴⁸ serves as a source domain, and Paul provides the target domain to which the meaning transfer occurs in the metaphor. What we see here is Paul adopting what Aristotle and Quintilian referred to as an appropriate and timely metaphor to communicate his interpretation of his relationship to the Corinthian Christian community. Paul, in 3:10, projects himself into the building metaphor by identifying himself as a wise master-builder (σοφο_π α)ρξιτε/κτων) thereby transferring the features of the source domain, master-builder, qualified by the adjective “wise,” to his role in the creation of the church community, the “building of God” in Corinth. The adjective, σοφο/π, intensifies the meaning of the word, α)ρξιτε/κτων, since it has the sense of “skilful” or even “learned” (BAGD 767, 112; LS 738, 122), which is already implied in the term α)ρξιτε/κτων. However, Collins (1999: 155) also maintains that the σοφο_π α)ρξιτε/κτων idiom “functions as a pun used ironically”, noting that “some of the Corinthians think that they are wise (3:18), but it is Paul who is ‘wise’.” Winter (2002: 141-202) argues that the ironic pun should be seen as directed towards the Corinthians’ preference for sophistic eloquence that Paul attacks in 2:1-5 since the word σοφο/π was used of the skill and eloquence of sophists, whose very name derives from the term.

Drawing on the way patrons and rulers appointed master-builders to oversee construction projects, Paul indicates that he was not self-appointed in his role as the wise master builder of the Corinthian community, but worked on a commission given to him by God (Fee 1987: 137-138; Malina & Neyrey 1996: 195). The expression κατα_τη_ν ξα&ριν του~ θεου~ τη_ν δοθει~σαν indicates that Paul’s commission as a master-builder of the Corinthian Christian community, like that of a normal α)ρξιτε/κτων, was bestowed on him by an act of patronage. In this case the

¹⁴⁸ On the idiom in classical usage see Collins (1999: 155) who says that the word σοφο&π, in the idiom, “has the sense of ‘master,’ ‘skilful,’ or ‘experience.’”

commission was derived from divine patronage (Malina 1993b: 84). This claim by Paul is an element of his appeal to his own apostolic *ethos* since his self-understanding is that he was commissioned by God to be an apostle to the Gentiles (Gal 2:7-8).

Verse 10 emphasises the role that Paul played as σοφο_π α)ρξιτε/κτων when he asserts that his task as a wise master-builder was to lay the foundation (θεμε/λιον ε)/θηκα) so that others could build on the foundations that he had laid (α)/λλω δε.: ε)ποικοδομει=). The complex building metaphor is extended by Paul identifying his missionary work as consisting in laying a foundation on which others could build.¹⁴⁹ The foundation metaphor transfers meaning from the source domain, the physical foundations necessary for strong and durable buildings, to the target domain which Paul identifies in vs. 11 as Jesus Christ. In this metaphoric mapping of meaning, Christ is seen as the sound, structural basis upon which the Christian faith is constructed, but in vs. 11 the expression “Jesus Christ” is a metonymy for the saving event associated with Jesus Christ, as well as the announcement of that saving event that was made by Paul when he initially came to Corinth. As a master-builder appointed by divine patronage Paul’s work cannot be superseded or replaced according to vs. 11. In effect, this claim to the position of master-builder gives Paul’s preaching a precedence over any later teaching by other leaders. As we have already begun to see, Paul prioritised himself and his own work in a consistent pattern by the metaphors chosen by Paul in 1 Corinthians 3-4.

Since Paul is the wise master-builder, according to vss. 10b and 12, any leader appearing in the Corinthian church as a leader, such as Apollos, is building on Paul’s foundation (Shanor 1988: 465). As Shanor (1988: 465) observes, these other leaders can be compared to contractors (ξειροτε/κναι) who worked on public buildings, such as a temple, and who worked under the supervision of the α)ρξιτε/κτων on a day to day basis. In terms of metaphorical analysis, the contract workers on building projects, the ξειροτε/κναι, or artisans, constitute the source component of the metaphor and the leaders addressed in the passage are the target component of the metaphor.

¹⁴⁹ Ford (1973/74: 139-142) says that Paul might have adapted the metaphor from the ritual of the feast of the Tabernacle and the building of a ‘Sukkah’ (cf. V.12).

The combination of the master-builder and contract worker metaphors enables Paul to conceptualise the relation between himself and the other leaders involved with the Corinthian community in terms of the hierarchy that functioned in large scale public building projects in antiquity. This conceptual blending of the two metaphors enables Paul to portray the other leaders at Corinth in a subordinate and dependent position vis-à-vis himself. That Paul metaphorically claims divine patronage for his own role as the wise master-builder, strengthens his own position in the hierarchy established by the blending of the two metaphors (see Neyrey 1990: 99). Thus, the manner in which Paul depicts the other leaders in relation to himself constitutes a metaphorically driven argument that the other leaders ought to be recognised by the Corinthians themselves as subordinate to him. This is the conclusion to which the blended metaphors lead, and the one that Paul hopes the community will accept since it would effectively re-establish his authority over the whole of the community (Neyrey 1990: 52-53, 94, 210).

Other aspects of the ἀ)ρξίτε/κτῶν source domain inform Paul's role in relation to the Corinthian Christian community. The term ἀ)ρξίτε/κτῶν, for example, was associated with the initiation of a project (BAGD 112; LS 122). Thus the source domain, ἀ)ρξίτε/κτῶν, transfers to Paul as the target domain the sense of primacy as the initiator or founder of the community (Wanamaker 2003a: 132). Argumentatively, this element of the source domain projects Paul's relationship onto the community as that of founder/initiator in a way that is parallel to his role as the mother in 3:2 and as the planter in the agricultural metaphor in 3:6-9a. In all three instances, Paul's role takes precedence over the role of other leaders, such as Apollos, by virtue of being the source or initiator of the community (Collins 1999: 155; Horsley 1998: 64).

From the above discussion, it is clear that Paul's status as a master-builder of the Corinthian church allows him to assert a hierarchical domination over other leaders, and this permits him to make a number of connections in the sense of his authority and disciplinary power in the Corinthian church (Horsley 1998: 64-65).¹⁵⁰ Paul thus claims to have authority over the leaders who are like contract workers under him. The blend between the source domain and the target domain reveals that in the understanding in antiquity, a master-builder had a standard by which good and bad work could be

¹⁵⁰ Castelli (1991: 105) also observes a clear hierarchical separation between the apostles and the community.

determined, just like a political philosopher could examine the nature of pleasure and pain to establish what was good and what was bad.

The metaphorical construction implies that the Corinthian leaders are analogous to contract builders who cannot act as master-builders to build another foundation to replace the one laid by the master-builder, Paul. Therefore, Paul asserts hierarchical authority over the Corinthian leaders, who were merely required to teach the church a message that was in conformity with the one that Paul had preached initially when he led the Corinthians to the Christian faith. Thus any subsequent leaders were not allowed to proclaim a different or altered gospel based on sophistic wisdom and selfish power (3:11).¹⁵¹

Paul thus uses the master-builder metaphor to establish his authority over those leaders who followed him, while reiterating his hierarchical domination over the Corinthian leaders. His claim to an authoritative status through the conceptual blending of the source domain with the target domain of the master-builder metaphor, places him in the position of director, advisor and co-ordinator of the church, and contrasts with what appears to have been the Corinthian view of Paul as an unsophisticated person (1:17; 2:1-4).

Paul choose the metaphor, ἀρξίτεκτονες, who were considered highly cultured people in their society. By claiming to hold a privileged and honourable position through the analogy imposed by the metaphor, Paul implicitly challenges the charge that may have been laid against him of being unsophisticated.¹⁵² The implied status of the Corinthian leaders as contract workers, on the other hand, illustrates that they are only qualified to do repetitive actions that are learned and then repeated without thought or creativity, and without realising the reasons and consequences of their work (cf. 3:10-11, 15). This denigration of the Corinthian leaders once again strikes at their personal sensibilities around their own supposed superior status.

In the discussion thus far, we have examined a series of submetaphors connected to the complex building metaphor. These metaphors function ideologically to legitimate

¹⁵¹ Neyrey (1990: 96) shares a similar view.

¹⁵² This is in line with how the Corinthian elite pictured themselves (1:17, 21-24, 26; 2:6).

Paul's authority over the community as the founding apostle and over the leaders within the community as well as interlopers like Apollos, who inevitably could merely build on the foundations that Paul had already laid. Through the ideological mode of dissimulation, which Thompson (1990: 63) associates with metaphors, Paul asserts that he holds a privileged and honourable position through the transfer of meaning from the expression σοφο_ω α)ρξίτε/κτων to himself. The metaphor, however, obscures "the true nature and the real limits of his power in dealing with the Corinthian elite and their supporters within the community" (Wanamaker 2003b: 210). Simultaneously, the metaphorical presentation of other leaders as dependent workers in terms of the ordinary builder metaphor rhetorically empowers Paul in relationship to them by de-legitimizing any of their possible claims to equality with Paul, but this too obscures the real relationship between Paul and other leaders. Paul had no power to impose his view of the relationship on other leaders. Rather, he had to rely on his rhetoric to persuade the Corinthians to accept his construction of the relationship with a view to ending the factionalism that was disrupting the building of the Christian community in Corinth.¹⁵³

Since the hierarchical domination is contained within the α)ρξίτε&κτων metaphor, Paul implicitly asserts that he has the power to discipline the Corinthian leaders who were undermining his authority through what Paul seems to portray as an unhealthy emphasis on sophistic eloquence. Paul makes special reference to his job, which is laying the foundation of the community and doing it rightly by preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ (3:10). Rather than discussing the possibility of other foundations being laid by other leaders, Paul emphatically states that there is no other foundation, no other basis for the Christian faith, than the one he has already laid (1 Cor. 3:11), namely, Jesus Christ and him crucified (1 Cor. 1:23).¹⁵⁴ Similar to the manner in which builders diligently construct their buildings to be sturdy and durable, the Corinthian leaders are required to build the church community to become sturdy and durable while remaining based on Paul's foundational preaching of Christ Jesus, according to 1 Cor. 3:10b-c. Argumentatively, Paul couches this point in the form of an imperative, "βλεπε&τω", "beware" (vs.10c). His position allows him to be clear and emphatic since as the σοφο_ω α)ρξίτε/κτων Paul carries the responsibility to oversee what other leaders are

¹⁵³ 2 Corinthians 10-13 suggests strongly that Paul did not succeed in imposing his views on the whole of the Corinthians' congregation, at least initially.

¹⁵⁴ Barnett (2003: 317) notes that even Apollos, who Paul refers to in the earlier sub-rhetorical unit 3:5-9, does not have a role in laying the foundations of the community.

building on the foundations that he has laid. Therefore, he seeks to dissuade other leaders from behaving in a cavalier or competitive manner (cf., Welborn 1997: 57 n.66). All leaders should thus be careful of a superficial attitude when preaching the gospel since their intention should be to enrich the Corinthian church (3:12), otherwise, they would be subjected to judgment on the Day of Judgement (3:13).

In 3:12-13 Paul introduces another component of the complex building metaphor when he refers to the quality of the builders', or sub-contractors', work and its testing through fire. This is reflected by the βλέπετω of 3:10c since he sets out to explain why those building on his work are to exercise extreme caution. In vs. 12 he employs two groups of three materials each. The first group consists of three non-flammable materials: gold, silver, and precious stones.¹⁵⁵ These substances are not only non-flammable, but they are also intrinsically valuable. The second group is comprised of three flammable substances: wood, hay, and straw. These substances are not only flammable, but they are also of little intrinsic value in construction, though this is perhaps less true of wood than it is of the other two. These substances, or perhaps more accurately the two classes of substance (Fee 1987: 140), constitute metonymic expressions since Paul provides mental access to the quality of work done by the other leaders of the community through the related entity of the quality of material that they use in building the community up.¹⁵⁶ This is exactly what Kövecses (2002: 144) defines as metonymy since the building material as an entity is related to the entity of the builders' work in installing the building material. In Paul's metonymy, the part, the choice of building material, represents the whole, the quality of the construction work. The cognitive value of this is clear, since the equation of quality of building material is a useful shorthand for what would otherwise require a much more elaborate explanation, namely, what makes the work of some better or more valuable than the work of others. However the building materials also serve a secondary purpose. Paul invokes the theme of divine judgement, which is traditionally associated with fire because fire, as a metaphor for divine judgement, carries the dual significance of divine displeasure, or wrath, and destructive

¹⁵⁵ Polybius, *The Histories of Polybius* 10.27.12 recorded a palace constructed with silver and gold bricks. North (2000: 42) notes that the building of a great temple to the new *Divus*, was made impressive by its stone and marble work. Also, see Xenophon *Anabasis* 5.3.12. Thiselton (2000: 311) favours the notion that λιθουσι τιμιουσι in 1 Cor. 3:12 refers to "costly stones" with marble being the example par excellence.

¹⁵⁶ Garland (2003: 116) makes a similar point without recognising that he is actually talking about metonymy.

force (Exod. 15:7; 2 Pet. 3:7-13; Rev. 19:1-3; 21:8; Malina & Pilch 2006: 74).¹⁵⁷ The metonymy between the building materials and the quality of the workmanship rhetorically functions to enable Paul to threaten the leaders and whoever else within the community is responsible for building the community with divine judgement should their workmanship prove inferior, particularly in relation to the foundation that he laid, since anything done in secret will be publicly exposed on the day of God's judgement.¹⁵⁸ It also enables him to distinguish between the Christian promise of salvation for believers and the divine condemnation of Christian leaders' activities if they do not stand up to divine scrutiny (see Lanci 1997: 66-69).

The testing of the builders' work on the day of judgement closely parallels the secular tradition, since the final payment for nearly all public, private and sacred construction was withheld pending final inspection (Burford 1972: 98), that is, until the commissioners of the work and their approved inspector were satisfied that the work had been done according to the terms stated in the contract (Burford 1972: 147). Shanor (1988: 469) argues that the word μισθοῦ in 3:14 should retain its normal meaning of 'wages', and the verb ζημιθησεται in 3:15 should retain its normal meaning in the context of construction work, namely, 'to fine' a contractor for failure to meet his contractual obligations. By this means, Paul preserves the metaphorical elaboration of the complex building metaphor so that work that stands the test of fire will receive its fair wage and work that fails the test of fire will be penalised. This, however, is not all Paul has to say about this matter as will become apparent in the discussion pertaining to 3:16-17.

Paul carries a master-builder-like authority and considers the quality of work of the builders by the use of judicial language, thereby subordinating the Corinthian leaders to his own authority. Gaventa (1996: 111) neglects to mention this point in her statement,

¹⁵⁷ Fishburne (1970: 109-115) observes that Paul's idea of God's judgement does not depend on the OT or Jewish apocalypticism but is closest to the *Testament of Abraham* 13 since the judgement scene, language and wording are similar.

¹⁵⁸ The Greek expression η(μερῶν is another instance of metonymy since it encompasses all of the activities associated with the final judgement of God. Hollander (1994:96) argues that by placing the judgement of the church leaders at the final judgement the members of the community are not able to approve or disapprove of their work.

Paul is not the authoritative ruler, then, but the servant commissioned by the proprietor, a servant who stands under the threat of destructive judgment should that possession be violated. The issue at stake in this passage is not who is active and who is passive, but to whom the Corinthians belong and to whom Paul and Apollos are accountable.

Nevertheless, Paul clearly subordinates the other leaders in the church to himself by the master-builder metaphor and the implied contract builder metaphor. The contract builders are to be evaluated on the basis of what material they build with and how they build on Paul's foundation. Paul, however, is not subject to the same evaluation as the contract builders who work on the foundation that he has laid. This leaves Paul in a dominant position vis-à-vis Apollos and other leaders within the community (Wanamaker 2003a: 132).¹⁵⁹

The power to subordinate the Corinthian leaders further enables Paul to discipline those who were responsible for causing factionalism in the Corinthian church. Paul thus blends the builders' limited wisdom in the science of construction with the Corinthian leaders. The blend creates a connection between the Corinthian leaders and acts involving moral slovens in antiquity. Instead of preaching the gospel of the crucified Christ, the Corinthian leaders appeared to have been preaching a gospel with sophistic wisdom that allowed and even fostered competition and strife among the elite, leading to a power struggle in the Corinthian church. Paul's rhetoric through the blend delegitimizes the Corinthian leaders on the basis that he exhibited sound judgement in laying the foundation, Jesus Christ, while the Corinthian leaders' displayed unsound judgement for depending upon sophistic wisdom that in turn led to factions in the church.¹⁶⁰ Paul thus claims that his ministry exclusively creates the grounds for successful projects or works thereafter and the Corinthian leaders are under obligation to build on his work in a responsible manner or face the consequences of failure.

From the above discussion, the master-builder metaphor that belongs to the complex building metaphor allows Paul, with a master-builder-like authority to discipline the

¹⁵⁹ Collins (1999: 149) makes a similar observation. Hollander (1994: 96), however, looks at it slightly differently. He argues that "all builders and all authorities" in the Corinthian church are servants of God and they cannot "judge apostles and missionaries" since it is only God who can judge.

¹⁶⁰ Cf. Epictetus, *Discourses*. 2.15.8 as seen earlier.

Corinthian leaders. By his rhetoric, Paul seeks to subordinate the Corinthian leaders to his authority. Ideologically, this move by Paul can be identified as dissimulation in that Paul ideologically fragments the Corinthian elite by stating that they, the elite, are following leaders who are subordinate to him and work under him. Furthermore, the leaders' work is subjected to judgement but not his, and this ideologically de-legitimizes the ministry of leaders and legitimates his authority in the Corinthian church.

Paul's intention with the master-builder metaphor in 3:9-15 may be to promote concord (Welborn 1987b: 337), but it is concord under his authority. Paul ideologically speaks of unification through the *symbolisation of unity* (Thompson 1990: 60, 64) implied by a single θεμελιον on which the community has to be constructed. The theme of unity is even more strongly underscored in 3:16-17 when Paul is concerned with the building of which Paul reinforces that he is the master-builder and the other leaders function as contract builders. Together they are building the ναοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ in which τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ. Thus, in 3:16 Paul returns to the theme of 3:9c, the community as the οἰκοδομη/θεοῦ, but now he explicitly applies the metaphor of the temple of God to the community.

The submetaphor, temple, stands as the source domain and Corinthian Christians, the target domain in the context of temple and community relationship within the complex temple metaphor (see Horsley 1998: 66). Fauconnier and Turner (2003b: 126-131) would describe the temple and the Corinthian Christians as a 'single scope metaphor'. Paul uses the complex temple metaphor in 3:16-17 to complete the progression from the laying of the foundations in 3:10-11, to the building of the structure on the foundations in 3:12-15 (Wolff 1996: 70). Paul's tone in 3:16-17 reminds the Corinthian Christians that they are not building any ordinary building but the temple of God which they are (3:16).

Applying the blending theory, the blend between the source domain, temple, and the target domain, Corinthian Christians, illustrates that Paul is able to identify the Corinthian Christians as the temple of God. The blend also demonstrates that the Corinthian Christians are dedicated to God through the ministry of Paul who had established the church, just as temples were built and dedicated by people to deities in

antiquity. In antiquity, when temples were consecrated to deities, deities were thought to dwell within the temples. This religious understanding is mapped onto the target domain, Corinthian Christians, in such a way that God through his spirit dwells in the temple (vs.16) which the Corinthian Christians are building, that is, they are building themselves as a community which is the temple.¹⁶¹ Moreover, this feature is evident in the case of physical temples in the ancient world where community had the presence of the divine in the temples to which people belonged (cf. McKelvey 1969: 100). Therefore, the community is the building of God because collectively the people of God form God's dwelling place where God's spirit resides (Thiselton 2000: 316). This implies that the identity of the Corinthian Christian community is a single entity and not a group of competing factions, the more so because God's spirit dwells in the community (vs. 16) (Gaventa 1996: 111; Kitzberger 1986: 68-69; Murphy-O'Connor 1996: 226). This view is contrary to Neyrey (1990: 95) who argues that 3:16-17 implies ". . . builders are arrogantly distorting the architect's plans for a new temple" and Chester (2003: 279) understanding that believers viewed themselves as living spirituals. Both Neyrey and Chester may have missed the point because Paul blends the concept of the temple of God into the Corinthian Christians (vs.16). Accordingly, the statement in vs. 16, "do you not know who you are", serves to remind the Corinthian Christians of something that they already knew. Specifically, they are requested to recall that they are the temple of God which they are also building, shown by the blend. Subsequently Paul's rhetorical inclusion of 3:9c and 3:16 highlights that the building is in fact the temple of God.

The rhetorical situation as seen above is an ideological move by Paul. Paul through the mode of unification emphasises unity in the Corinthian church. Paul ideologically claims that since he is the only master builder and the only one to lay the only foundation, Jesus Christ, all the builders, the Corinthian Christians, ought to singularly build the temple of God on this foundation alone. The act of the Corinthian Christians building together on one foundation implies the unity that Paul is metaphorically relating to the Corinthian Christians. Furthermore, the underlining point of unity is when Paul through the blend indicates that the very building that the Corinthian Christians are

¹⁶¹ Gartner (1965: 58-59, 95) suggests that the belief that God dwells within the faithful and thereby renders the faithful as holy was influenced by the practises understood to have occurred at Qumran. McKelvey (1969: 100) disagrees with Gartner's view, since he claims to find no parallels between Paul's description and application of the temple of God and that of the community at Qumran.

building is not just a structure of the temple of God but rather the Corinthian Christians themselves who are one entity, one community. Thus, ideologically, the temple functions as a symbol of unity for the Corinthian Christians.

This meaning is transferred from the temple as a metaphorical source to the community as metaphorical target is enhanced in 3:17. The blend between the source domain, temple, and the target domain, Corinthian Christians, shows the feature of holiness being transferred onto the Corinthian Christians because they are the temple of God. Since God dwells among them, Paul characterises the temple/community as ἁγίον, holy or worthy of God's presence through his spirit (3:17). Merk (1968: 84) observes that the temple is not linked to the building in that he writes, "Die Korinther sind der Tempel Gottes, in ihnen wohnt der Geist Gottes. Und diese Aussage wird nicht unter dem Gesichtspunkt des Bauens gemacht - ναὸς und οἰκοδομεῖν Θεοῦ sind niemals Objekt des οἰκοδομεῖν bei Pls, [...], sondern unter der Heiligkeit." Thus Merk attributes holiness to the temple metaphor.

Paul uses the temple and its holiness through the presence of the spirit as a symbol of unification in relation to the community and in relation to disruptive persons in an ideological sense. From the discussion above, it appears that the whole of the building metaphor from 3:9b onwards is concerned with unity, one building built on the foundation of Christ, as laid by Paul, of course. In 3:16-17 this unification strategy reaches its conclusion since the building that Paul has been building is identified as the temple of God, but the metaphoric source of the temple, is clearly blended with the target, the Christian community in Corinth. This creates a symbolic representation of unity that has the capacity for unification of the factions (Collins 1999: 153-154; Crocker 2004: 46; Mitchell 1991: 90, 103-104). This is an attempt to attribute power to Paul, yet the implication is subtle since it hinges on the community identifying those opposed to Paul as corruptors, spoilers, or destroyers of the fabric of the community. The community is thus sacralised by the presence of the divine spirit, which results in divisiveness being equal to the destruction of the dwelling place of God's spirit. Thiselton (2000: 316-317) adds that "[i]t is sacrilege because in sinning against 'consecrated persons' who are corporately God's temple, it defiles the joint sharing in the Spirit who consecrates the temple (fellowship)." Thus the rhetorical statement, "do

you not know that you are God's temple" (3:16) may have been used to exhort the Corinthian Christians to apply the knowledge of an unexpected implication based on the transfer of meaning from religious temple to the community, such that they could view themselves as a holy community since the temple of God is holy. Paul's main problem was a suitable response to those leaders who engaged in social rivalry based on the pursuit of honour, which at best had a limited application (Ascough & Cotton 2006: 138; Garland 2003: 121; Thiselton 2000: 315; Mitchell 1991: 103) although this form of social rivalry was endemic in the civic culture in Corinth and the rest of ancient society. Therefore these had generated a similar political factionalism within the church as in civic society (Welborn 1987a: 90-93; Mitchell 1991: 68-91), which resulted in defiling the church just as impure acts corrupted the holiness of the temple and defiled the temple in antiquity (Zaidman & Pantel 1994: 56; Plutarch *Demosthenes* 24.121; Zaidman & Pantel 1994: 11; Mikalson 1987: 27; Thucydides, *Thucydides* 4.97.3).

Paul issues a second warning to those who have defiled the holiness of the community as a temple¹⁶², by directing his response at those leaders whose intra-community rivalry threatened to damage the unity of the church: anyone causing φθει/ρει will himself be φθερει~ by God. Wilckens (1959: 7) considers this warning to be addressed to the entirety of the split church community. The rhetorical statement, "do you not know that you are God's temple" (3:16) appears to imply that persons harming the community are comparable to persons damaging a temple, on the basis of which these are to expect divine retribution. The Corinthian Christians further appeared to have questioned the motivation and means pertaining to God's actions described as φθερει~ in response to a person who has caused φθει/ρει. Scholars have discussed φθει/ρει and φθερει~ to great lengths resulting in unfortunately a small group achieving positive results. Those unable to interpret this section with a prevailing sense of hopefulness include Horsley (1998: 66) who assumes that the Corinthian offender is "destroyed and cannot be saved." Garland (2003: 120-121) concurs with Horsley and views vs. 17 as a "severe warning predicting a very real destruction." Mitchell (1991: 213) extends this by arguing that it would be more in the form of God would "destroy" him or at least cause "harm" to him.

¹⁶² The leaders in 3:16 appear to be same individuals as those mentioned in 3:15, in that 3:16 does not seem to refer to suffering "the punishment of eschatological ruin" (Collins 1999: 161).

However, the Greek word φθειρω has more nuances than merely referring to destruction since it can mean generally “destroy, ruin, corrupt, spoil, seduce, harm, and to cause deterioration of the inner life” (BAGD 865). Scholars like DeSilva (2000: 293) and Shanor (1988: 470-471) get it right. DeSilva (2000: 293) thus argues that anyone planning to or actually “harming” the Christian community comes under God’s interdict (3:16-17). Along the same line, Shanor suggests that the translation of φθειρω as “destruction” overstates what is intended on the basis of the normal meaning of the word and on the basis of an inscription from the temple of Athena at Arcadian Tegea. The inscription indicates that builders who damaged (φθηνον) the temple while working on it were to be fined an unspecified amount based on the damage they caused.¹⁶³ He argues that this is how we should interpret 1 Cor. 3:17. Paul takes up this concept of damage to a temple, by workmen working on the project, to intensify his previous warning in 3:14-15. In 3:17 damage is threatened for the one causing damage to the holy community. God is unable to tolerate impiety and desecration of his sacred community. The Corinthian Christians who disrupt or otherwise damage the community are placing themselves in danger because they are showing disrespect towards the “place” where God’s spirit dwells. The blend between the source domain, temple, and the target domain, Corinthian Christians, shows that dishonouring God means expecting severe reprisal from God, just as temple desecrators in antiquity were threatened with retribution from the offended deities (Bremmer 1994: 5; Aeschines *Epistulae* 2.142, Plutarch *Praec. Reip. Ger.* 825b; Diodorus *Epigrammaticus* 16.35.6; Xenophon *Hellenica* 1.7.22; Herodotus 6.134-6; Plutarch, *Marcellus* 28.2-3; Dio Cassius *Roman History* 52.36.2). Paul describes that this damage is clearly directed to any who create divisions and engage in rivalry that destroys the unity of the community.

How and when does Paul say that a person who defiles the Corinthian Christians is punished? Käsemann (1966: 66-68) views God’s judgement upon the defiler in the final judgement. It seems that God’s judgement is not to be viewed as eschaton but as judgement taking place in the present. First Corinthians 5 provides a clear case of the fragmentation strategy directed at a person of high social status who has violated the appropriate norms of the community by engaging in incest, thereby corrupting the community (Clarke 1993: 77-80). Garland (2003: 120) observes that “Paul assumes that

¹⁶³ For details see Shanor (1988: 461-462) where he cites the work of Buck (1955: 201-203).

the community can be destroyed by insiders, not by outsiders.” While the perpetrator in ch.5 would have been of “high status”, he would have been “important in the church” and a “prominent patron” since this seemed to have prevented others from challenging his immorality while continuing to boast of him (Clarke 1993: 85-87; Wanamaker 2006: 351-353). Having ideologically re-established his authority and dominance in the Corinthian church (3:10-15), Paul exhibits his concern about this form of behaviour by daring to demand that this immoral man must be rooted out of the Corinthian Christian community to protect the holiness of the community (5:1-2, 6-7) (Wanamaker 2006: 350-351, 357-360). Paul knows that his demand cannot be based on sophistic wisdom; hence he uses other means such as checking his morality. Moreover 3:17 targets this kind of person. Arguably 3:17 forms the ideological justification for the demand in 5:1-5 in that 5:5 refers to the future reality of the experience referred to in 3: 17, while both cases are situated in the time of Paul’s writing rather than being eschatological.

Therefore the master-builder metaphor enables Paul to call forth the Corinthian leaders to evaluate their unsound judgements in creating intra-group rivalry. It also invites the readers to see their leaders as needing to continue his initial work among them in order to avoid factious behaviour and power struggles within the Corinthian church (3:1-4, 10c).¹⁶⁴ Ideologically, the term *θεμελιον* as a symbol of unity brings with it the notion of working together on the foundation that Paul had laid (3:10) (Lanci 1997: 130). If the Corinthian leaders continue Paul’s work, it would mean that they could together do one work, thereby bringing about unity.¹⁶⁵ Schrage (1991: 295) rightly points out that for Paul it is not the individual that is the church; rather it is the congregation that incorporates the individual into the church. Thus, God dwells in the Corinthian Christians through his spirit and it is obligatory to keep the community holy since God is holy. Any defilement to the community would mean calling forth for God’s judgement in the present. With this authority, Paul ideologically re-establishes and sustains his dominance in the Corinthian church and hopes to solve the problem of the factionalism caused by the Corinthian leaders and their patronage by the elite (cf. Wanamaker 2003: 135-136).

¹⁶⁴ See Collins (1999: 150).

¹⁶⁵ Mitchell (1991: 99-105) stresses that there is an aspect of unity in the building metaphor (3:10-17). However, except for *Or.* 23.31, her other references to classical literature deal with unity in the *topoi* of political and social unification, and not basically finding out such significance within the metaphorical language, σοφο_φ_α)ρξιτε&κτων, θεμελιον and ε)ποικοδομει= which Paul uses in his building metaphor (3:10-17).

5.5. Conclusion

The manner in which metaphors create a new understanding through the transfer of meaning from the source domain to the target domain is very much in evidence in 1 Cor. 3:9c-17. Paul has employed the complex building metaphor in order to show both the relationship between himself and other leaders, probably most notably Apollos, though possibly also leaders associated with the apostle Peter,¹⁶⁶ and the relationship between their work with respect to the creation and development of the church community in Corinth. Paul's choice of metaphors, particularly the master-builder metaphor and the implied contract builder metaphor from the complex building metaphor group, asserts his dominance over other leaders in the Corinthian church, and in doing so is clearly ideological in nature. The key use of metonymy in which types of building material encompass the quality of the workmanship by various leaders active after Paul's departure, enables Paul to threaten those who undermine his work with a divine penalty on the day of final judgement. Paul himself, however, stands outside the threat because the quality of his work in laying Jesus Christ and him crucified as the foundation of the community is unassailable. By metaphorically viewing the Christian community's origins and development in terms of building metaphors, Paul is able to inculcate unity within a factious situation. This becomes clear in 3:16-17 when Paul identifies the community as the ναὸς τοῦ θεοῦ in which τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ οἰκεῖ. This is yet another powerful building metaphor in which Paul explicitly transfers the holiness (ἁγιωσύνη) associated with ancient temples to the community and threatens those who do damage to the community with harm from God whose temple/community they injure.

What is apparent from the above discussion is that metaphors and metonymy play a crucial role in Paul's rhetorical argument, by which he asserts his own authority and primacy within the life of the Corinthian Christian community. Paul warns and threatens leaders who fail to follow the direction he had set for the development of the community or even worse damage the work that they began. He inculcates unity within the community as the original founder of the community by stressing the common

¹⁶⁶ 2 Corinthians 10:12-11:29 suggests strongly that there were rival apostles who Paul viewed as interlopers. It seems possible that these interloping missionaries were already present and creating factions at the time 1 Corinthians was written. The description of these interlopers in 2 Cor. 11:22-23 strongly suggests that they were Jews from the Jewish homeland, and therefore they may have been part of a Petrine mission to Corinth that competed with Paul and Apollos' work (cf. 1 Cor. 1:12 identifies an Apollos faction, a Peter faction, and a Pauline faction, as well as a Christ faction).

foundation upon which the community is built. Similarly, Paul exhorts unity through the image of the community as a holy temple in which God's spirit resides. In sum, he seeks to overcome factionalism within the community through the power of his metaphors and metonymy.

Since Paul has no other means but his rhetoric to persuade the community and its leaders to comply with his views, the discourse in 3:9c-17 takes on a powerful ideological character, as Paul seeks to re-establish his authority and control over the church community. The choice of metaphor and metonymy for this rhetorical task reflects the fact that they dissimulate social relations in useful ways when claims are being made to asymmetrical relations of power as Paul makes in 1 Corinthians 3 and 4. Metaphors in particular are thus useful since they dissimulate

social relations by representing them, or the individuals and groups embedded in them, as endowed with characteristics which they do not literally possess, thereby accentuating certain features at the expense of others and charging them with a positive or negative sense (Thompson 1990: 63).

Thus Paul's master-builder metaphor, which had some basis in his position as the founder of the Christian community in Corinth, masks his underlying claim to authority over his competitors for leadership within the community. The metaphor dissimulates not only by portraying Paul in the most prominent position in the building process, but also by subordinating other leaders to him since they can only build on the foundations he has laid. At the same time, they will be evaluated by God on the basis of how and what they have built on Paul's foundation of the crucified and resurrected Jesus Christ. It may well be that the foundation of the crucified Christ laid by Paul, the σοφοῦ ἀρχιτεκτονῶν, is intended by him to preclude the sophistic eloquence that seems to have been favoured by some of the socially prominent within the community (1 Cor. 2:1-5) since his gospel message was μωριᾶ to the Greeks and σκαῦδαλον to Jews (1 Cor. 1:23). Paul's inversion of the dominant social values in 1 Corinthians 1 and 2 potentially means that what other leaders thought was ξυμφορῶν and ἀγαθῶν,

namely, rhetorical eloquence, was in reality little more than $\xi\omicron/\rho\tau\omega$ and $\kappa\alpha\lambda\alpha\&\mu\eta$ (1 Cor. 3:12).

University of Cape Town

Chapter 6

Servants and Stewards: Metaphors on Apostolic Service and Trustworthiness in 1 Cor. 4:1-13.

6.1. Introduction

Paul changes his literary surroundings and backdrop by moving from a community based religious environment (1 Cor. 3: 9b-17) to a family based household¹⁶⁷ situation in 4:1-13, to continue to address the problems of authority and factionalism within the Corinthian church (cf. 3:18-23). How does Paul respond to these concerns since the Corinthian elite continued to support their respective leaders, and especially since they appeared to position themselves against Paul by discarding both his teaching and authority (Fee 1987: 156; Pogoloff 1992: 220-221; Chow 1992: 172-173)? Paul finds an answer in metaphors. He decides to address the problems of authority and factionalism by using complex metaphors, a common social and cultural *topos*, namely, the household as a metaphor and especially highlighting the submetaphors of servants and stewards relationship with their master in a household environment (4:1-13). Although Lakoff and Johnson (2003: 61-68) label the household as a structural metaphor, as explained earlier, we will classify the household as a complex metaphor (Kövecses 2002: 83-84, 116-118). Nevertheless, the household metaphor appears to function as a structural concept, as the source of the metaphor, as well as the target concept in this case, since both Paul and Apollos belong to the household in question. This complex household metaphor leads to further submetaphors, those being the relationship between master-servants and stewards, and the relationship between God-Paul and Apollos in the Corinthian church (Horsley 1998: 67).¹⁶⁸

In 4:1, Paul refers to himself and Apollos as υ(πηρε&ταφ Ξριστου~ και_οι)κονο&μουφ μυστηρι&ων θεου~. This shows that Paul, via the household complex metaphor, blends himself and Apollos into the roles of

¹⁶⁷ Household in Greco-Roman society will be dealt with in detail in the next chapter.

¹⁶⁸ On the contrary, Mitchell (1991: 105) sees stewards (4:1) as part of God's building.

servants and stewards to the leaders of the community, which can be seen in 4:6.¹⁶⁹ This section is underlined by comparing his own role within the Corinthian church to that of a father like authority in a household.¹⁷⁰ It is noteworthy, that Paul's use of the master-servant and steward relationship extends beyond these assertions. Paul includes a variety of culturally determined aspects of the master's relationship with his servants and stewards in his rhetoric, in order to address the problems of authority and factionalism in the Corinthian church. In this sense, Paul's rhetorical challenge is ideologically loaded.

In this chapter, as in the earlier chapters, I will apply a socio-rhetorical analysis, by which the relationship between master-servants and stewards in antiquity can be explored. The investigations of the household in antiquity would demonstrate the manner in which Paul employs it metaphorically. As such, the master-servants and stewards relationship in household serves as the source domain of the submetaphor. The analysis of the social and cultural texture of the household serves to inform Paul's rhetorical usage of the household metaphors to interpret the submetaphors in 4:1-13 through the blending between the source and target domains.

6.2. Master and servants relationship in antiquity

The Greek οἰκοφ, οἰκία, the Hebrew *tyiba* and the Latin *domus* could point to the physical building, although more often the terms refer to a household (Osiek & Balch 1997: 226, n.4). In antiquity, the household of the elite included not merely the married couple and the immediate blood family, but also their stewards, servants, slaves as well as their various material goods (Aristotle *Politics* 1.2.1-21). The household functioned under an authoritative head, mostly the father of the household who carried the legal power (*patria potestas*) resulting in the subjugation of the members of the household to his authority (see Osiek & Balch 1997: 52, 226, 226, n. 4; DeSilva 2000: 173; White 2003: 457; Rawson 1991: 21).¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁹ In contrast, Collins (1999: 176) perceives that εμαυτο_ν και/ 0Απολλω_ν is a rhetorical ploy to covet an allusion and that the expression does not literally refer to Paul and Apollos. For Collins, Paul refers to himself and to Apollos as leaders in order to portray their unity as an example to be followed without mentioning those who were deemed as having been the instigators of the factionalism in the Corinthian church (4:6).

¹⁷⁰ Collins (1999: 170-1) views these metaphors as unusual but he does not appear to formulate a reason for this observation. Cf. Clarke (1993: 122).

¹⁷¹ The complex household will be examined in detail in the next chapter.

These master and servant relationships, which formed a vital part of antiquity, began under a single roof where the role of a servant (υπηρε&τηφ) was always to serve the will and goal of his/her master (Bradley 1991: 88; Rengstorf 1972: 532). Within the relationship between a master and the servant in antiquity, the categories of subordination and ministrations can be identified. These two categories lead to further sub-categories through which the servants served his or her master in a number of different modes of emotion, such as obedience, sincerity, eagerness, dedication and gratitude.

6.2.1. Subordination

Within a master and servant relationship in antiquity, the servant performed various roles of subordination to the master (Philo, *Sacrifices* 44; Barrett 1987: 99). Servants were expected to serve¹⁷² their respective master or superior, for example, by obeying their orders (Plutarch *Sulla* 37.3),¹⁷³ understanding commands and prohibitions (Epictetus *Discourses as Reported by Arrian* 3.24.98);¹⁷⁴ and assisting in a given task (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *The Roman Antiquities* 4.38.5). In antiquity, these acts of servitude and obedience were not limited to individual households. Within the political framework, citizens, obeyed and served various persons in positions of authority and power with an attitude of servitude (Xenophon *Cyropaedia* 6.2.2).

In antiquity, several different examples of relationships exhibited the nature of subordination. For example, certain construction workers functioned as servants working in a system of subordination (Philo, *Posterity* 50) and as attendants (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 44.17.3; 60.12.2). Subordinate positions were also held by assistants¹⁷⁵ (Hdt., V, 111, 4; Thuc., III, 17, 3; Plato *Laws* 4,720a; Plato *Laws* 9. 873b in Rengstorf 1972: 531); Plato, *Politics* 291A; Aristotle, *Politics* 1253b30ff; 1254a8-9; Dio Chrysostom *Orations*, 7.120; Dio Cassius *Roman History* 26.87.5); underlings (υπηρε&τηφ, υπηρε&ταφ)

¹⁷² For further examples, see Xenophon *Anabasis* 1.9.18; 7.7.46; Dionysius of Halicarnassus *The Roman Antiquities* 19.14.3.

¹⁷³ For further examples, see Polybius *The Histories* 11.22.4; Xenophon *Cyropaedia* 5.3.52; 7.5.18.

¹⁷⁴ For example, a good and excellent man who wished to depart from this world as a free person is metaphorically equated to a servant (υπηρε&τηφ) who has perceived the commands and prohibitions of God (Epictetus *Discourses as Reported by Arrian* 3.24.95-98).

¹⁷⁵ One instance shows Calvinus ordering the assistants (υπηρε&ταφ) to complete various tasks (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 48.42.6). In a further instance, Viriathus was “his own assistant (υπηρε&τηφ) as well in every undertaking . . .” (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 22.73.4).

(Demosthenes *Against Zenothemis* 32.4; Dio, *Orationes*, 4.97);¹⁷⁶ ministers (υπηρε&τηφ)¹⁷⁷ (Plato *Laws* 12.967D-968A); “ministers (υπηρε&ταφ) of God”¹⁷⁸ (Xenophon *Memorabilia* 4.3.14); “messenger (υπηρε&τηφ) of the gods” (Aesch. *Prom.*, 954); and guardians (υπηρε&ταφ) of the laws (Aristotle, *Politics* 1287a21ff).

6.2.2. Social status

The wide range and types of services servants rendered to the masters in antiquity often indicated their social status. From the positions that the servants held and the roles that they performed, it appears that they could come from a lower to higher strata in antiquity. Those who belonged to low status groups did not possess the skills, qualities and experience to function at a higher level of the society. For example, a person who functioned as a minister (υπηρε&τηφ) to other magistrates had mostly been chosen in the subservient position to the magistrate since such person did not have all the qualities expected of a magistrate. The magistrates, on the other hand, had attributes such as knowledge concerning souls, grasping reason, observing the connection “of musical theory and [how to] apply it harmoniously to the institution and rules of ethics,” and giving rational explanations when required (Plato *Laws* 12.967E-968A).

From the time of Plato, the role of the υπηρε&τηφ was applied to people who enjoyed a position of a higher social status. For instance, skilled clerks and other educated men performed certain services in public offices which belonged to a higher social stratum than the one from which they had come, which is the reason for the designation υπηρε&τηφ (Plato, *Politics* 290B-C). Yet, we also have a record of various people who functioned as in the capacity of administrators of the empire. Such people were chosen from the knights (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 52.33.5). These individuals were actively involved in decision-making and management that eventually made them quite powerful. Dionysius of Halicarnassus notes that υπηρε&τηφ became

¹⁷⁶ Zenothemis was an underling to Hegestratus, the ship owner (Demosthenes *Against Zenothemis* 32.4).

¹⁷⁷ Also see examples of servants as ministers in Plutarch *Lucullus* 26.6; Euripides *Ion* 986; Dio *Orationes* 3.40.

¹⁷⁸ “. . . Jacob was re-named by an angel, God’s minister (υπηρε&τηφ) . . .” (Philo *On the Change of Names* 5.87).

“overseers of sacred places or aediles, and their power is no longer subordinate to that of other magistrates, as formerly; but many affairs of great importance are entrusted to them, and in most respects they resemble more or less the *agoranomoi* or “market overseers” among the Greeks” (*The Roman Antiquities* 6.90.2-3).

Having discussed the roles and functions as well the social standings of the servant in antiquity and master or superior relationship, we will now examine the general characteristic of the servant that being obedience in subordination. This characteristic is crucial in the blending of the source, master-servant, with the target, God-Paul and Apollos, which creates an appreciation of Paul’s metaphorical usage of the submetaphor, master-servant relationship, in 1Cor. 4:1-13.

6.2.3. Assistance

In serving their masters, the servants often assisted them in their respective enterprises, which encompassed various divine, political, medical and judicial duties. For example, ministers (υπηρε&τηφ) under God’s legislation served wholeheartedly in subordination to God by assisting their masters in rewarding those judged as good and punishing those deemed as evildoers (Philo *The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain* 132-133). In the political sphere, lictors (υπηρε&ταφ) served the consuls by assisting in governance (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *The Roman Antiquities* 5.2.1). Plutarch records that certain lictors were commissioned within their own political context to capture young men, humiliate them, torture and execute them (Plutarch *Publicola* 1.6.2-3).¹⁷⁹ Yet within their role as assistants to their masters, they even served compliantly to the extent of facing a number of hardships, such as being beaten up when fulfilling an order (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *The Roman Antiquities* 9.48.2).¹⁸⁰ The service of υπηρε&ταφ is also evident in the way Clearchus was willing to take up the role of a υπηρε&τηφ who served “not merely for the sake of pay, but also out of the gratitude” (Xenophon *Anabasis* 2.5.14). Similarly, in the civil arena, a servant assisted his

¹⁷⁹ This was one of the exercises in which Brutus took action against his sons who did not want to defend their denunciation. Through such acts, Brutus is known to have founded and established his particular form of government.

¹⁸⁰ A further example describes assistants (υπηρε&ταφ) helping owners/patrons attend to “. . . the decrees of the states and the petitions of private individuals, and for all other business which belongs to the administration of the empire . . .” (Dio Cassius *Roman History* 52.33.5).

employer, for example a physician, by carrying out minor medical tasks when instructed. Often such experiences enabled the servant to gain sufficient knowledge and experience whereby later he could take on the position of a physician rather than that of a *famulus* (Plato *Laws* IV, 720a). A similar instance of learning through assistance is evident in cases where servants of judges sentenced the convicts based on the sentences given out by the judges (Plato *Laws* IX, 873b in Rengstorf 1972: 531).

6.2.4. Sincerity, Dedication and Gratitude

Another key quality in the servant and master relationship can be discerned in cases where servants demonstrated the degree of their obedience by perceiving commands and prohibitions of their masters. Further examples will illustrate that obedience can be further sub-categorised as obedience through sincerity, obedience through dedication and obedience through gratitude, where these characteristics operate in all forms of positions and employment within the public sphere. Interestingly, Prometheus (Aesch. *Prom.* 954 in Rengstorf 1972: 530) is recorded as claiming that as a servant, “a messenger of God sincerely executed the divine will of Zeus and with a dedicated mind held the power and authority of Zeus as chief of gods.” Similarly, the people of Delphi were out of gratitude (υπηρε&ται of Apollo as they asserted his will (Soph. *Oed. Tyr.*, 712 in Rengstorf 1972: 530). In the political context, clerks (υπηρε&ταφ) were also expected to listen in obedience to the commands of their authority (Demosthenes *Against Timocrates* 162, 197). Similarly, *aides-de-camp*¹⁸¹ (υπηρε&ταφ), upon an order from Scipio, obediently passed on a message to the tribunes and soldiers (Polybius *The Histories* 11.22.4). Furthermore, *aides* (υπηρε&ταφ) were instructed by Cyrus to “[get] into the dry channel of the river and [since] it was possible to march in the bed of the river” to enable the generals to pass through (Xenophon *Cyropaedia* 7.5.18). At another instance, an assistant (υπηρε&τηφ) exhibited obedience to the extent of receiving a blow when attempting to fulfil an order given by Laetorius to forcibly extract Appius from the forum (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *The Roman Antiquities* 9.48.2).¹⁸² In a familial context, Cyrus portrayed the service motive of servant by constantly serving his sick grandfather (Xenophon *Cyropaedia* 1.4.2). The servitude attitude of a servant

¹⁸¹ These were officers who functioned as military assistants.

¹⁸² At other instances, the tribunes benefited from the obedience of the assistant (υπηρε&ταφ) who received blows and were badly hurt for assisting these tribunes’ needs and listening to their commands (Dionysius *The Roman Antiquities* 10.33.6).

was also used metaphorically in contexts that reflected obedience and commitment. Plato suggested that the characteristics of a servant serving in obedience, dedication, and responsibility formed the basis of certain principles that served as a guide for any person desiring to develop into a virtuous person (Plato *Laws* 7.822E).

The above discussion thus illustrates that servants in antiquity displayed the qualities of obedience, dedication, commitment and responsibility in serving under the authority of their masters. For the purpose of our discussion, it is not significant to which social strata the servant belongs to or even which level of functions he performed. We are concerned with the manner in which the servants served in subordination to their master or superior irrespective of their status. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that the type of functions performed by the servants occasionally impacted on the level and authority and power given to the servants (Rengstorf 1972: 532).

From the discussion on the cultural knowledge of the servant in a household *topos* in antiquity the source, which is the servant, and the target, in this case Paul and Apollos, can be identified as follows:

Source domain	Target domain
Master-servant relationship in antiquity.	Jesus Christ-Paul and Apollos relationship in Corinthian church.
Servants belonged to a household.	Paul and Apollos belonged to the Corinthian church.
A father or master of the household had authority over servants.	God who called and sent Paul and Apollos has authority over them.
Servants were expected to serve their master in subordination.	Paul and Apollos served their master, Jesus Christ, in subordination.
Servants performed a variety of functions.	Paul and Apollos served as ministers of God.
Servants assisted and obeyed their master.	Paul and Apollos assisted and obeyed in spreading the gospel of Jesus Christ.
Servants held both high and low status.	

Now we will also discuss the cultural context of a steward in antiquity to lead to an identification of the source, namely, the master-steward relationship in antiquity, and the target, namely, the God-Paul and Apollos relationship, in the Corinthian church.

6.3. Master and steward relationship in antiquity

As mentioned earlier, stewards belonged to the household structure and were under the authority of the master of the household. As such, a steward operated as a manager of an estate (Plutarch *On Compliancy* 532A), a housekeeper, whose functions includes supervision, administration and organisation of the household (Aristotle *Generation of Animals* 2.6.15) 744b.16-19).¹⁸³ Dio Cassius (*Roman History* 56.3.3) observed that one of the good virtues of a housewife was described as being a good housekeeper (οἰκονομῶσα). In some instances, one of the merits of a good man was having the skills of a householder (οἰκονομῶσα) in the context of the management of a household (Philo *On Reward and Punishments* 113-114; Plato *Politics* 1282a.21). In the following chapter, the manner in which household management influenced imperial governance and the functions of stewards of the state and civic officials will be examined (Theissen 1982: 76-79; Reumann 1958: 343).

6.3.1. Social status

Having seen that stewards functioned in various capacities, we will discuss the status of the steward in antiquity. The status of a steward could range on a continuum from low to high; those of a low status generally emerged from the ranks of slaves and freed persons in the Roman period.¹⁸⁴ As is commonly known, although the social status of a slave or freed person might be low, their roles were quite important and some were financially well off in the society resulting in a high level of socio-economic status. For example, Landvogt (in Theissen 1982: 76-77)¹⁸⁵ notes that, in Roman times, people who functioned as stewards often had sufficient means to erect steles and pillars in tribute to provincial governors as well as to provide funds for cultic offerings. Such stewards held

¹⁸³ Ramsaran (1996: 35) views household stewards as gnostic maxims.

¹⁸⁴ There is a debate as to whether Erastus (Rom 16:23) was considered a οἰκονομῶσα by Paul (Collins 1999: 168).¹⁸⁴ Erastus is a city treasurer but as a city officer Erastus seemed to occupy a high position in the hierarchy of the city and functioned as a οἰκονομῶσα with a high social status Theissen (1982: 75-76, 83). However, keeping in mind that the meaning of οἰκονομῶσα changed from time and place (Theissen 1982: 79), Thiselton (2000: 336) suggests that it is an open question whether the stewards at Corinth were “person[s] of elevated social status” or not.

¹⁸⁵ Also, see Martin (1990: 16).

high official positions and the power to manage city finances (Reumann 1958: 342). The functions of these stewards often extended to performing cultic duties, such as remunerating priests, and buying bulls with the city finances for sacrifices (Reumann 1958: 343). An inscription at Ephesus dating from 302 BC, states that the city treasurer, who was termed a steward (οἰκονομῶν), was to provide and pay for sacrifices on certain state occasions such as the visit of a foreign dignitary.¹⁸⁶ At other instance, together with the priests and the priestess, the οἰκονομῶν was then to sacrifice to Artemis for the message brought by a visiting patron. Since the offices in which these civic officials served were important for the well being of the city and for the quality of the city's amenities, the stewards of a city were required to be trustworthy.

6.3.2. Trustworthiness

As concluded above, only those who were trustworthy were empowered as stewards, although trustworthiness appeared to have been an implied prerequisite for the duties and the position of a steward in antiquity. Plato (*Politics* 1314b.5-9) gives the example within the political context, of a steward who would have protected a government by managing public funds diligently, thereby avoiding unnecessary spending. Similarly, we saw previously that, at a level of housekeeping it meant only a sincere steward could maintain the household (Aristotle *Generation of Animals* 2.6.15). This example as again noted earlier, of such household stewardship demonstrates that the householder had skill rightly to manage a given household. For this reason, Philo considered household management to be a necessary training for the statesman (*On Reward and Punishments* 113-11; cf. Aristotle *Politics* 1282a.21).

Metaphorically, οἰκονομῶν was used for a good businessperson who through his wisdom and knowledge of business management overcame all opposition to achieve victory (Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 3.4.11-12). Indeed one needs to be trustworthy to business management to achieve such success.

In summary, stewards functioned mainly on a managerial level in antiquity, where their level of status depended on duties and capabilities, such as managing city finances, with a view, for example, to provide funds for sacrifices (cf. Reumann 1958: 349). However,

¹⁸⁶ *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum*, London: 1874-1916, III/2, No.448.5ff in Reumann (1958: 342).

regardless of their level of status, the most important characteristic of a steward was their trustworthiness, based on which the stewards were given their various roles and positions.

The following table of comparison demonstrates the differences and similarities between the source, namely, stewards in a household *topos* in antiquity, and the target, namely, Paul and Apollos in the Corinthian church:

Source domain	Target domain
Master-steward relationship in antiquity.	Jesus Christ-Paul and Apollos relationship in the Corinthian church.
Stewards operated under the authority of a master in the household structure.	Paul and Apollos operated under the authority of God.
A master employed a steward based on his or her level of trustworthiness.	Paul and Apollos were expected to be trustworthy leaders in Corinthian church.
Significant positions were attained by stewards based on the extent of their trustworthiness.	
Stewards functioned within both high and low levels of social status.	

6.4. Interpretation of servant and steward submetaphors (4:1-13)

In 4:1-13, Paul by the application of a complex household metaphor, includes submetaphors to make metaphorical connections to his own role and that of Apollos in the Corinthian church. For example, in 4:1, Paul exhorts the Corinthian Christians to regard him and Apollos as υ(πηρε&ταφ Ξριστου~ και_οι)κονο&μουφ μυστηρι&ων θεου~. However, it is curious that Paul applies the servant role to himself and to Apollos. It appears though that Paul intentionally avoids decoding the servant metaphor, to enable the Corinthian Christians to apply their cultural knowledge of the social function of servants to their understanding of Paul's communication by blending their own usage into Paul's choice of the master-servant submetaphor. This goes to show how the blending between the

source, master-servants in antiquity, and the target, God-Paul and Apollos, addresses the problems of authority and factionalism in the Corinthian church. It also has to be noted that only certain aspects of the master-servant and master-steward relationships in antiquity allow themselves to be blended into the target, which is the Christ-Paul and Apollos relationship in the Corinthian church. This means that the categories which blend, are identified depending upon their context. This aspect of metaphor recalls Aristotle observing this very significance in his work on metaphors.¹⁸⁷

In Paul's application of the blending between the source domain, master-servants in antiquity, and the target domain, Christ-Paul and Apollos, Paul and Apollos are both thrust into the role of servant in antiquity, where the crucial significance of the servant concept is seen in the subordinate relation of the servant to his or her master. Crocker (2004: 82) by means of the submetaphor argues that Paul inspires the elite in the Corinthian church, who thought of themselves as spiritual, to develop themselves into servants of Christ, which meant that they were to emulate Paul and Apollos (4:6). It would, however, be better to observe that the focus of Paul's statement is to enable the Corinthian Christians to realise how they should understand the roles of leaders in the Corinthian church. By engaging the servant concept through the process of blending, Paul demonstrates that both he and Apollos have a subordinate relationship with their master, Jesus Christ, and that they obey his every given task (4:1). In antiquity, it was customary for servants to be entrusted with a wide range of tasks. In this case, the blending indicates that both Paul and Apollos have the same role. They are not just equal in their ministerial activities to the Corinthian Christians, but also work together to show that there is unity between themselves (4:1), which is quite evident throughout 4:1-5, and which the blending process confirms (Mitchell 1991: 220, n.185; Given 2001: 93; Winter 1994: 189).

This rhetorical strategy of Paul paradoxically goes contrary to the Corinthian elite's much sought after honour in the name of boasting of their respective leaders over against the others as having the best sophistic worded gospel. As Cicero (*De Oratore* 3.41.163) noted in our earlier discussion, Paul's usage of complex metaphor hits the senses of the Corinthian Christians in the sense that their leaders, especially Apollos, who they

¹⁸⁷ For details, see chapter 1.

followed for his sophistic wisdom are, in fact, of low status. Quintilian's (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.19) understanding of metaphor enhances meaning is quite apparent in revealing the reality of the leaders who the Corinthian Christians followed. The leaders are unassuming servants of Christ, which means that following such leaders would not result in a higher social recognition or in gaining honour (Horrell 1996: 135; cf. Pickett 1997: 194). Following them only points out that their master is not Christ, but rather the purveyors of sophistic wisdom, whom they serve in subordination for in order to obtain social status and power in the Corinthian church (cf. 3:19).¹⁸⁸ Paul's rhetoric underlines the view that a continuation of sophistic wisdom as a basis for preaching would result in a disqualification of the role of a servant of Christ (Fee 1987: 156).

Based on the above discussion, the blend between the source and the target domains allows Paul to claim authority over the Corinthian Christians in the same manner that in which he and Apollos are servants of a much greater master, Jesus Christ. In this case, both Paul and Apollos belong to the Corinthian church as self-designated servants of Christ. They are assigned to Christ exclusively, meaning that they could not function as clients nor become accountable to certain Corinthian Christians, who claim to be their patrons within the community.¹⁸⁹ Lampe (2003: 500) notes that "[o]nly to Christ and God did [Paul] feel responsible and accountable as a servant and steward, that is, only in this relationship was there a vertical subordination that could be compared to patron-client structures". Therefore, just as servants in antiquity served their master in different positions, Paul and Apollos as servants of Christ function as personal assistants, supporters, and helpers of Christ. In this capacity, both Paul and Apollos play a mediating role between Christ and the Corinthians. Since Paul and Apollos serve only Christ, Paul suggests that they have a higher level of status with God than they would have had notwithstanding socially based claims of a noble birth and the possession of eloquence (cf. 1:26; 4:8-10), which according to the Corinthians automatically would have situated Paul at a high level of status based on socio-cultural norms.

Therefore the argument that Paul and Apollos do not work for and therefore owe no allegiance to the Corinthian Christians, in which case they may have been legitimately

¹⁸⁸ The emphasis on human eloquence has also been referred to in chapter 2.

¹⁸⁹ Fee (1987: 156), suggests that Paul and Apollos are not the Corinthian elite's servants and thus the Corinthian elite cannot judge Paul and Apollos who are actually another's, that is, God's servants. In other words, both Paul and Apollos are not accountable to the Corinthian elite (Fee 1987: 158).

manipulated by the Corinthian church, annihilates the Corinthian elite's idea of patronage in respect of various leaders. At the same time, Paul's explication shames the elite since Paul deftly subverts the patronage system built up by the elite and their leaders. Nevertheless, Paul does not reject the system of patronage or disregard what had been viewed as honourable, advantageous, and authentic within the Corinthian society. He, however, rejects the assumed right of those Corinthian Christians who held a high level of social status and who were thus socially powerful, to place him and Apollos in conventional client relationships. Paul achieves this by the blend, which attributes a higher status with respect to Christ to both himself and Apollos, which simultaneously reverses the Corinthian elite's perceived honourable relationship with Apollos. The text indicates that certain church members even attributed a greater level of authority to Apollos than Paul, based on their admiration of Apollos' level of eloquence, which is an example of cultural evaluation as opposed to Pauline hierarchical structures.

Furthermore, the blend between the source and the target demonstrates that Paul highlights the functions of a servant, as understood within the concept of a master-servant relationship in antiquity, applying this to his and Apollos' relationship with Christ. Therefore, both Paul and Apollos are described as obedient and sincere servants of Christ. Thiselton (2000: 336) describes servants as having been "*faithful to the wishes and instructions* of the owner of the estate or employer." In reference to earlier sections, we can paraphrase the servanthood of Paul and Apollos as follows: based on their obedience and sincerity, Christ acknowledges their subordination to serve, and furthermore, since their master deems them to be trustworthy in executing his will, he elevates them to the position of steward of the mysteries of God (4:1-2; Malina & Pilch 2006: 76)).¹⁹⁰ Scholars such as Collins (1999: 172), Fee (1987: 159), and Thiselton (2002: 336) omit the significance of Paul's reference to his promotion to stewardship based on his trustworthiness. Nevertheless, how does Paul claim that he and Apollos portray trustworthiness, so that Christ entrusts them as stewards of the mysteries of God? The answer lies in the blend based on the master-stewards relationship in antiquity into the target domain of Paul and Apollos in the Christ-Paul and Apollos relationship in the

¹⁹⁰ Ramsaran (2003: 431) sees 4:2 as a gnomic sentence in which Paul's "expression of recognised wisdom based on general observations or decrees of judgement" is set forth.

Corinthian church. Paul blends into himself and Apollos the character of trustworthiness through the steward submetaphor.

In antiquity, similar to the role of a servant, the concept of a steward evokes images of the social reality in the form of functions and characteristics that speak of trustworthiness. For example, stewards occupied high positions of trust, when controlling a house, an estate, a city or a cult's finances (cf. Thiselton 2000: 336). Paul blends into himself and Apollos that same trustworthiness as mediators of the mysteries of God, since the positions of mediation required the management of the church, just as stewards managed the household and the estates of their employers or as high officials managed the finances of the city in antiquity. Likewise, Paul and Apollos execute Christ's will and hold the power and authority of Christ over the Corinthian Christians (4:2), just as a messenger of Zeus executed the will of Zeus, and carried the power and authority of Zeus. Since Paul and Apollos have proven themselves as trustworthy servants, their sincerity and good household maintenance bring success to their master, Christ. In the case of Paul and Apollos, their trustworthiness resulted in a higher level of authority within the household of God due to their having been entrusted by God's own son to manage the Corinthian church as his own household, which means that Paul and Apollos were in the position to assert authority over the Corinthian Christians.

In order to appreciate the stewardship of Paul and Apollos better, we will examine the nature of the mysteries of God. The expression, $\mu\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\&\omega\nu\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\sim$ (4:1) seems to be an allusion to Paul's earlier discussion in chapters 1 and 2.¹⁹¹ Paul had been entrusted to proclaim a divine wisdom, a secret and hidden wisdom that comes from God alone, and his own people who have exclusive access (2:10, 12). These mysteries, as we shall soon see in the next paragraph, speak of Christ who was crucified for their salvation, and it is in his very name that they had been baptised (1:13). Fee (1987: 160) describes $\mu\sigma\tau\eta\rho\iota\&\omega\nu\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\upsilon\sim$ as "the revelation of the gospel, now known through the Spirit and especially entrusted to the apostles to proclaim." Collins (1999: 172) suggests that Paul had the ministry of the word in mind. Michel's (1968: 150) work is helpful in strengthening our understanding of the nature of the mysteries of God since he observes that the mysteries of God comprise of the treasures of the Gospel, which is the corpus of

¹⁹¹ For details, see chapter 2 above.

knowledge that attests to God's salvation for humankind. However, for Jews and Gentiles these mysteries of God, the crucified Christ, was *μωριάν* and *σκα&νδαλον* (1:23). The leaders of the Corinthian church sought to proclaim a gospel that could be preached with the sophistic wisdom which was honoured in that day. Juxtaposed to this situation, Paul explains that he did not come to preach in *σοφι&α? λο&γου* (1:17), that is, not like the sophists in antiquity who depended upon their rhetorical skills (Winter 2002: 187-188).

By setting the cross in antithesis to worldly wisdom (1:22), the mysteries of the wisdom of God become a counter to those leaders who claim to be “spiritual” and possess “knowledge” (1 Cor 2:6-3:3).¹⁹² The *λο&γοφ* of the cross that is folly to the wise is the *δυναμιφ* of God and is contrasted to the wisdom of the wise (vs. 19) and *την συ&εσιν τον συνετων* (vs. 19) (Plank 1987: 18-19). Indeed, the accepted and applied system of thinking of the Jews and the Greeks could not accept the Christ, that is, the Messiah, dying on the cross since only criminals are crucified. Thus power as weakness and weakness as power (1:18, 24-25) is *μωριάν* and *σκα&νδαλον* in the eyes of the world (1:23) (Lampe 1990: 119, 121-122). In this manner, God chooses this foolishness, weakness, to teach spiritual truth, namely, that his wisdom is manifested only in the cross (1:27-28). In the cross “faith discovers wisdom and power in a different way: not in status but in selflessly laying it aside” (Furnish 1990: 151). Therefore, the wisdom of God is contrasted to the generally imparted wisdom that is not of the wisdom of the world and the wisdom that the rulers of that time sought (2:6 cf. 1:23). This result in a radical reversal of the cultural importance of eloquence and social status, by the rhetoric of shame associated with the cross that overwrites the honour associated with eloquent speech (Pogoloff 1992: 118-119). Indeed, Paul views the cross as a symbol of reversal. It inverts the codes of honour and shame practised by the Corinthian elite (Barton 1982: 15-16). By the application of this reversal, Paul therefore prevents worldly wisdom from being the overriding value system of Christian society, and subsequently fortifies the boundaries of the Corinthian church from within the wider society in which it was located. As a steward of this mystery, Paul confirms and upholds the ultimate mystery of God, the cross, and not the strength of human eloquence, as the power and wisdom of God for those who have been saved and those who are called by

¹⁹² For details, see chapter 2.

God, by which the church is to be built up (1:18, 24-25) (Winter 2002: 239; Stuhlmacher 1987: 338; Roon 1974: 223).

Since Paul explains that his and Apollos' elevation to be stewards of the mysteries of God was based on characteristics such as sincerity, skill and good management, Paul through the blend implies a further level of authority. By implication, the attributed power and authority to the mysteries of God underlined his and Apollos' positions of power and authority over the Corinthian Christians since both Paul and Apollos, as managers and stewards, seemed to have exclusivity pertaining to the impartation of the secret and hidden wisdom of God (cf. Carter 1997: 58). As in an earlier section, Paul and Apollos' achievements and successes in their stewardship of the proclamation of the mysteries of God, reflect well on their master, Christ. Similarly, the success of a trustworthy steward in antiquity would reflect well on his or her master.

Rhetorically Paul claims a status with Christ which remains a symbolic reality as opposed to the social life of the Corinthian Christians. Paul confronts the Corinthian elite and enhances his authority on alternative grounds, namely on a divine mandate to which he claims exclusive access to being an οἰκονομῶν (Pogoloff 1992: 217; Collins 1999: 172).¹⁹³ By such a claim, Paul gains the acknowledgement of the Corinthians for his authority and power to be socially effective. Without this, he cannot get the Corinthians to do what he will ask them to do in 5:1-5. Therefore, the Corinthian Christians must accept his gospel and by accepting it, they would be accepting Paul as the true agent of Christ (cf. Carter 1997: 57-58).

Since Paul claims that he possesses a higher authority by working for Christ, and that the prominent Corinthian Christians' expectation of leaders is nothing in the sight of Christ, he downplays the Corinthian elite's judgements upon him, since "it is very small thing that I should be judged by you or by any human court" (4:3) (Welborn 1997: 37; Pickett 1997: 172; Fee 1987: 156).¹⁹⁴ He uses this judgemental language with the intention to

¹⁹³ Paul's appeal is based on his apocalyptic understanding of reality, which stands in judgement over the normal social assumptions of the Corinthian elite (2:1, 7; 15:51).

¹⁹⁴ Collins (1999: 173) sees the human court as a secular court. Although the term court does not appear in the Greek, the word ἡμέρα in the context of 1 Cor. 4:3 refers to a specific day on which a court session will take place.

deny the Corinthian Christians the ability to pass a verdict on him (4:3) (Fee 1987: 161; Fitzgerald 1988: 128n. 28).

From 4:4 onwards, the rhetorical argumentation moves to an *ethos* appeal. Paul presents himself as an example to the Corinthians. Collins (1999: 170) writes, “. . . it is a typical ploy for rhetors to portray themselves as put upon, to argue their innocence so as to make an appeal.” Paul openly appeals both to his conscience and to God as his two witnesses against the Corinthian Christians (Theissen 1987: 65). Paul reiterates that he has been found as trustworthy in his role of preaching the mysteries of God, and confesses that he is not οὐδεὶς γὰρ ἐμαυτῶ σὺννοιδῶ (4:4). What Paul meant by his ‘conscience’ and how it is related to judgement is contestable terrain. For example, Chester (2003: 118) argues that “Paul here not only rejects his own competence to judge himself, but also clearly raises the possibility of him having sinned without realising it” (vs.4a).¹⁹⁵ It may not be proper to speak of the possibility of sinning and not realising it but rather proper to speak about Paul implying that a person cannot be justified by one’s own conscience but rather by the Lord alone who is the master (Barrett 1987: 102; Martin 1995: 181; Chester 2003: 200-201; Keck 1996: 4, 8). By being subjected to judgement, like a steward is judged by his or her master, Paul gives the credit to the Lord, who as his exclusive master, has the right to judge him and not the Corinthian Christians, since Paul does not serve them nor is he employed to them (4:4).¹⁹⁶ Paul had to emphasise that the Lord is the sole judge because the Corinthian elite was obsessed with worldly judgements and had judged Paul based on their own criteria, similar to those applied in secular courts (Watson 2003: 97; Mitchell 1991: 91-92; 219; Welborn 1997: 37; Witherington 1995: 137). Thus, based on his conscience Paul claims a higher authority over the Corinthian elite who were pointing fingers at him for his lack of authority in the church.

Paul continues his rhetorical strategy with the challenge to the Corinthian Christians that if they do not believe that he acts according to his conscience, which had portrayed the role of a trustworthy steward of Christ in preaching the mysteries of God, they will have to believe in God’s judgement (4:5). By the emphatic, ὠστὲ (4:5), Paul instructs the

¹⁹⁵ For details see Chester (2003: 195-199).

¹⁹⁶ This view is also shared by Martin (1995: 6); Thiselton (2000: 339); Chester (2003: 118); Garland (2003: 126); May (2004: 222); and Fee (1987: 162).

Corinthian Christians not to judge before the day (cf. Fitzgerald 1988: 183). “The day”, as we have seen in the chapter 4 speaks of the eschatological day when the Lord comes again to judge humankind (Chester 2003: 199-200).¹⁹⁷ By citing the eschatological judgement, Paul strengthens his own position of authority by demonstrating to the Corinthian elite that it would be quite impossible to be judged by them, because ο(δε_ α)νακρι&vων με κυ&ριο&φ ε)στιν (vs.4b).¹⁹⁸ It seems that Paul’s directive to the Corinthians not to judge may have been a further attempt to annihilate the existing divisive basis by suggesting that a number of the Corinthian Christians misunderstand the issue concerning the time of the Lord’s coming (Collins 1999: 171). Collins (1999: 170) comments that these judgements had eroded the solidarity of the Corinthian community to the extent that Paul’s relationship with the community had become controversial and a source of disunity.

Paul cautions the Corinthian Christians that if the Corinthian elite are unable and unwilling to recognise his authority and unless they change their attitudes, pertaining to the judgement of others before “the Day” has come, the Corinthian elite would come under God’s judgement. Paul discloses that God in his judgement is able to bring to light the secret motivations of the human heart (4:5) (cf. Fee 1987: 163-4; Neyrey 1993: 41). Thiselton (2000: 342-4) defines these secret motivations as “[t]he hidden motivations of our lives and include every aspect of human agency, and not only its feeling, theoretical thought, or capacity for decision and action”.¹⁹⁹ Clearly, Paul’s intention is to threaten the Corinthian elite within the framework of an apocalyptic world judgement, which Paul uses as an ideological tool since it implies the possibility of expurgation. In Paul’s view, those Corinthian Christians who had been untrustworthy based on their divisive attitude are subjected to condemnation by God (4:5) (Sampley 2003: 12). Rhetorically Paul’s “words on the eschatological judgement (4:3-5) stand in relationship to the servant and steward metaphorical motif (4:1-2) much in the way that the words on judgement (3:14-17) stand in relationship to the construction metaphor of 3:10-13” (Collins 1999: 170). Nevertheless Paul exhorts the Corinthians to change while there is still time. “Each person” (4:5) calls for the Corinthians to come clean by self-judgement, while ceasing unnecessary adulation of praising others but rather by

¹⁹⁷ For details, see chapter 4 above.

¹⁹⁸ This view is also shared by Welborn (1997: 37); Fee (1987: 163-4); and Thiselton (2000: 343).

¹⁹⁹ Fee (1987: 163-164) observes that, “Paul is using the language of his Jewish heritage in the form of a semitic parallelism – nothing can be hidden from God.”

each one fulfilling the task the Lord has assigned to them (Mitchell 1991: 265; Garland 2003: 129). When the Lord comes, they are also candidates to receive praise from God (Fee 1987: 164; Garland 2003: 129).

Since Paul and Apollos function as the servants of Christ and the stewards of the mysteries of God, Paul entreats the Corinthian Christians to learn from their examples and to emulate them. Taking into consideration 4:6, as discussed in the chapter 2 and in the present chapter, namely, that both Paul and Apollos hold a higher authority than the Corinthian elite as exclusive clients of Christ and that they are both in the exclusive employment of Christ, the Corinthian Christians should not look beyond Paul's and Apollos' respective roles (Fitzgerald 1988: 127). Therefore, some of the Corinthian Christians should not engage in boasting in Paul and others in Apollos, as having a higher authority in worldly terms (vs.6) (Winter 2002: 196, 253; Neyrey 1990: 138; Neyrey 1993: 90; Horrell 1996: 113; Witherington 1995: 136).²⁰⁰ Any such claims based on worldly concepts of authority and power, leading automatically to rival camps, were to be checked immediately (vs.6), since Paul clearly rejects these forms of hierarchical values of the society and thereby also the basis of the Corinthian Christians' rejection of his authority in the Corinthian church (vss.8-13) (Carter 1997: 67; Forbes 2003: 151, 155).

Consequently, the sub-metaphor master-servants and stewards relationship in a complex household metaphor in antiquity allows Paul to connect his own and Apollos' roles to the Corinthian Christians. Through the master-servants submetaphor, Paul engages in a chain of reasoning ideologically to dissimulate his real relation to the Corinthian Christians. He first lays claim to a shared platform with other leaders on the basis that all are servants of Christ and none is superior over the other. This ideological move differentiates the Corinthian Christians from their patronage to other sophistic leaders whom they considered to be superior. Based on the role of a trustworthy steward, Paul claims the required authority to proclaim the mysteries of God, which the others are not deemed to possess. Christ is described as his only master, which means that the Corinthian elite would not be in a position to judge him in any way since they are not his masters. Ideologically, it is evident that Paul, by assuring the Corinthian elite that they

²⁰⁰ For details, see chapter 2.

cannot judge him and that they should also abstain from such judgements, re-introduces unity and legitimises his domination over the Corinthian church. With this authority, Paul ideologically not only re-constructs and sustains his dominance over the Corinthian church, but he also addresses factionalism in the Corinthian church.

6.5. Conclusion

Paul's dependence on metaphors is demonstrated in 4:1-13, where he takes up a complex household metaphor and blends himself and Apollos into the roles of servants and stewards from the submetaphor, of master-servants and stewards relationships in antiquity. Through the master-servants and stewards submetaphor, Paul builds his authority to a common level with other leaders as servants of Christ, and then claims an inaccessible position by being judged only by his master, the Lord. Paul subordinates the Corinthian elite by saying that neither he nor Apollos work for them nor are accountable to them as their clients. Surely, this would not have been possible without the dynamic use of metaphors. The metaphor itself was ideological pregnant since it dissimulated Paul's real relationship with the Corinthians, a relationship that was complex and had been strongly contested within the church's elite. Paul thus presents himself as an authoritative and powerful manager of the Corinthian church, in order to address the problems of factionalism that some of the Corinthian Christians were causing in the church. He claims serving a superior master, Christ, on which basis Paul argues that the Corinthian elite have no right to judge him. Paul even advises them to refrain from boasting of their respective leaders, because they should be worried of God judging them. In this manner, Paul re-constructs and sustains his authority in the Corinthian church. He also provides an opportunity to the Corinthian Christians to re-construct their reality on his own terms by requesting and urging them to abandon seeking leaders with sophistic wisdom. He argues that the Corinthian Christians ought to accept a person such as Paul himself, who preaches the crucified Christ, who brings unity into their factious life. A new reality such as the one described via Pauline metaphors cancels out all opportunities for power struggles, and judging others on human terms based on the socio-cultural system of that time, and divisions in the church.

Chapter 7

The Household Metaphor: an Ideological Tool (1 Cor. 4:14-21)

7.1. Introduction

In India there is an old saying found in many Christian homes “a family that prays together lives together”. This is interpreted as emphasising obedience, common values, cooperation and good relationships, especially subordinate relations to the head of the family, in order to help the family members to bind together. In modern times, especially in the West, family life has turned out to be more individualistic. It is suggested that the family life situation in antiquity was much closer to that of the traditional Indian Christian family, and was the household imagery that Paul adopts in 1 Cor. 4:14-21.

1 Cor. 4:14-21 is the rhetorical culmination of the first main section of 1 Corinthians (Mitchell 1991: 197-224; Wanamaker 2003a: 121-122) where Paul is faced with a rhetorical conundrum: how can he reassert his authority over the entire community and secure obedience from those whom he believes to be disruptive within the community and openly defiant towards him? His solution, as seen in earlier sub-rhetorical units, is to employ one of his boldest and most audacious extended metaphors, one that allows him to claim primary authority over the Corinthians, to the exclusion of all others, while justifying his demands for their obedience and his control over the community.²⁰¹ In 4:14, Paul explicitly calls the Corinthians his *τεκνία μου αγαπητά* and in 4:15, he claims to have fathered them through the gospel (*εγω υ(μα) φ ε(γε) ννησα*). However, Paul’s use of the father-children metaphor goes far beyond these assertions as he employs a variety of culturally determined aspects of father-children and father-household relationships. Thus, 1 Cor. 4:14-21, is really an elaboration of a complex metaphor (Kövecses 2002: 80-84) about the household in antiquity. This complex metaphor includes a number of submetaphors: father/holder-Paul, the apostle;

²⁰¹ Nowhere else in his authentic letters does Paul come remotely close to using the father-children metaphor in such an extended form or in such a rhetorically crucial manner. 1 Thess. 2:11 is the only other example, but there it functions in an epideictic fashion, whereas in 1 Cor. 4:14-21 it is powerfully deliberative.

children-Paul's converts in Corinth; guardians-leaders in the community; and Timothy-Corinthian Christians, in his rhetorical bid to re-establish his position as the dominant authority within the community.

In chapter 3, the ancient household provided a structuring concept and metaphorical source for Paul's target concept of the Christian community as a household and himself as *paterfamilias* of that household. At the heart of the thought of 1 Cor. 4:14-21 is the double scope metaphor (Fauconnier & Turner 2003b: 131-135), Paul as the father of the Corinthians Christians and the Corinthian Christians as his children.

As with other metaphors, in this chapter through socio-rhetorical analysis I will begin with a study of the social and cultural texture of the household imagery in antiquity. A household metaphor might have a very different significance across cultures. The analysis of the social and cultural texture of the metaphor then becomes quite an important step for understanding Paul's rhetorical usage of the household metaphors through the blending theory to interpret metaphors in 1 Cor. 4:14-21. The blending between the source domains and target domains, as noted above, will show that the interpretation of the metaphors, as we shall see, will firstly see how Paul claims his father-like authority over the Corinthian church. Secondly, how Paul attempts to subordinate other leaders to himself. Finally, how Paul like a good father disciplines the οἱ(πε)φυσιω&με&νοι/. Investigating these questions will enable us to see Paul's main intention of bringing unity in the Corinthian church in the midst of divisions caused by factionalism. In fact, it is this rhetorical attempt that makes 1 Cor. 4:14-21 ideologically pregnant.²⁰² In this sense, my work is distinguished from the work of Trevor Burke (2003) "Paul's Role as 'Father' to his Corinthian 'Children' in Socio-Historical Context (1 Corinthians 4:14-21)" in *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall*, pp. 95-113, and Williams, David J (1999) *Paul's Metaphors: Their Context and Character*, who have discussed the father-children metaphor in 4:14-21 but missed it as the implied household metaphor.

²⁰² The rhetoric reflects the fact that metaphors often function to deceive people about the nature of their relationship with those holding power, or desiring to hold power. In other words, metaphors are useful for ideological purposes (Thompson 1994: 63).

7.2. The household in antiquity

The relationship between a father and his children in antiquity is located in the context of a household, which included blood members, material goods, slaves, guests, clients, agnates, cognates, ancestors, descendants and patrimony (DeSilva 2000: 173-174; Saller 1996: 80; Osiek & Balch 1997: 41-42; Gardner 1997: 35; Corbier 1991: 129).²⁰³ A household management, according to Aristotle (*Politics* 1253b 1-14), consisted of master-slave relationships and at times freedmen, marriage partners and their progeny. The master/husband/father is metaphorically referred to as the “head” of the household to whom the other members are placed in subordination (DeSilva 2000: 173). Therefore, the household, which comprised of the biological family in antiquity, was strongly patriarchal in character.²⁰⁴ Saller (1996: 102) considers that “Roman family relationships were almost wholly asymmetrical, with power in the hands of the father, and the obligation of obedience imposed on the rest of the household and underwritten by the core family value of *pietas*.”²⁰⁵

Both the household and the city management were similar, particularly in terms of the relation of the ruler to the ruled in the city (Balch 1981: 25).²⁰⁶ Plato related the constitution of the city to the household. According to Roman imperial ideology, the empire was metaphorically viewed as a household, and in particular, the household of the emperor (DeSilva 2000: 195).²⁰⁷ This is noticeably the case of the emperor, who, as the *pater patriae*, the ‘father of the country’, was thereby implicitly associated to the household metaphor (DeSilva 2000: 195).

Burke (2003: 100-105) has identified five aspects of the father-child relationship in antiquity that are relevant to Paul’s metaphoric claim to be the father of the Corinthian Christians. These are hierarchical domination, authority, imitation, affection and education. We will explore these categories in the literature on antiquity and identify

²⁰³ For details on these lists, see Saller (1996: 80-88).

²⁰⁴ For definitional details of family, see Saller (1996: 74-80).

²⁰⁵ For details, see Saller (1996: 102-104).

²⁰⁶ Plato, in *Laws* VI 771 to VII 824C dealt with household management. Aristotle *Politics*, 1.2.1 also noted that every state was composed of households (ἐχ οἰκτω~ν) and every household has a household management (οἰκονομιαφ).

²⁰⁷ The metaphor, the empire is the emperor’s household, may refer to that which Radden (2003: 93-94) describes as a “metonymy-based metaphor.” These metaphors involve “two conceptual domains which are grounded in, or can be traced back to, one conceptual domain” (Radden 2003: 93). In this instance, both the empire and the emperor’s household derive their meaning from the emperor as ruler.

those that are relevant to the blending of the source and target domains in 1 Cor. 4:14-21. It will become evident that these categories can also be located within the metaphorical relationships between gods and people, as well as in the case of rulers and people.

7.3. Father – child relationship in the household in antiquity

7.3.1. Hierarchy

The relationship between a father and his children in the household depended upon an unambiguous hierarchical relationship in which the children were subordinate to the father. Greek society in the classical and Hellenistic periods was patriarchal (Aristotle, *Politics* 1259A-B) as was the Hellenised Roman world. For a Roman father, the culturally permitted hierarchical relation within the family gave him extreme power over his children. Since the Roman context granted significant power to the father within the household over his offspring, fathers exercised ultimate control over his children until the time of his death, or until he by his own decision released his children by giving them up for adoption to another family, or by allowing his daughters to marry into another family (Dixon 1992: 40). Burke (2003: 100) also observes this hierarchical order between a father and his children, but does not deal with the dynamics of the hierarchical father and children relationships in antiquity. Interestingly, in antiquity, a father as *paterfamilias* also had exclusive control over the property of his family. Although a father had the right to give away his property to either his children or to others (Dionysius *Roman Antiquities* 8.79.4), he normally favoured giving it to his own children (*Gai.* 2.104-8, 116-117, 123-124; *Inst.* 2.13 *pr.* I in Dixon 1992: 41). Moreover, in antiquity, fathers were granted the paternal power (*patria potestas*) and legal right to decide, from the time that his biological children were born, whether or not he would actively raise the child (Rawson 1991b: 12). Furthermore, a father's hierarchical power and dominance extended beyond his own children to his son's children (Dixon 1992: 117-118). Thus, sons and daughters were forced to co-operate with their father. Married daughters were placed under the authority of their husbands and, by extension, their fathers-in-law. Customarily, children respected this hierarchical relationship, as it was necessary for the household to operate as an economic entity (Wiedemann 1989: 30).

The hierarchical nature in the ancient world is also evident in the cases of the high god of the Greeks and the Romans, as well as the God of the Jewish people, who was named “father” and were described as fathers (Plutarch *Generation of the Soul* 1017.A; *A Pleasant Life Impossible* 1102.D; Dio, *Orationes*, 2.75, 4.22, 12.22, 12.75, 53.12; Epictetus, *Discourses* 1.3.1, 1.19.12, 3.24.3; Livy, *Livy* 1.16.3; Strabo *Geography* 4.1.7; 13.4.6). In both cases, the choice of metaphor is reasonable since the high gods were pictured as the creators of human kind similarly to the concept of human fathers as creators of their children. For example, Dio (*Orationes* 53.12) noted that Homer is said to have referred to Zeus as the “father of men and gods” based on the rule of the father over the children is that of a king.²⁰⁸ Likewise, “designations” for gods as fathers, such as “Zeus is the father” (Strabo, *Geography* 4.1.7; 13.4.6),²⁰⁹ metaphorically reflected their superior position in relation to humankind, and since the gods were seen as superior to humans, humans were to operate in subordination to them comparable to the subordination of children to their human fathers.²¹⁰

The hierarchy implied in father-child relations was metaphorically appropriated in the metaphorical epithet, *Pater Patriae* (“father of the fatherland”) which was used regularly of different leaders (Lassen 1997: 111). The term *pater* as a political designation appeared first in Cicero’s appraisal of his own consulate (Cicero *De domo sua* 94 in Weinstock 1971: 200-201).²¹¹ Nevertheless, Weinstock (1971: 201) observes a connection to the provenance of this usage much earlier pertaining to “. . . the founders, liberators and saviours . . . who were treated like fathers.” For example, a person who was saved by another person offered the saviour an oak wreath (Plutarch, *Roman Questions*, 92) and honoured him as his father (Polybius 6.39.7). Likewise, M. Minucius Rufus alluded to the dictator, Fabius, as *pater* (father) and to his soldiers as *patroni* (protectors, defenders)²¹² (*ILS* 56) since Fabius had apparently saved the army from his *magister equitum* (or co-dictator), Minucius Rufus, during the second Punic

²⁰⁸ <http://perseus.uchicago.edu/cgi-bin/ptext?doc=Perseus%3Atext%3A1999.01.0058&layout=&loc=1259b>, 18th April 2005.

²⁰⁹ Likewise, Jupiter was labelled as a father (πατήρ) (Plutarch *The Roman Questions* 274.B).

²¹⁰ For further references of titles of gods pertaining to familial hierarchical connections, see Plutarch, *Generation of the Soul* 1017.A; Dio Chrysostom, *Orationes* 12.75; Plutarch, *Sayings of Kings and Commanders* 180.D.

²¹¹ For a similar view, see Pliny 7.117 with further references in Dio *Orationes* 43.17.2.

²¹² *Patronus* is derived from the word *pater* since a father was considered a defender, protector, and patron (cf. *Ant. Rom.* IV 32.1; Polybius IX 36.5 in Nock 1972: 726).

War (217 BCE).²¹³ In the *Principate* the term *paterpatriae* became a standard metaphor for the emperor, representing the emperor not only as state-leader but also as father-figure of the Empire, a man, who in the tradition of Romulus, the first Father of Rome, would rescue the Roman population in times of war (Cicero, *The Republic* I. 64; cf. Lassen 1997: 110).²¹⁴ Thus, the family metaphors throughout all aspects of Roman society were mostly brought into play with the intention of evoking symbolic domination and authority over others through the metaphorical allusion to the hierarchical domination associated to the father of a family in antiquity.

7.3.2. Authority

In the relationship between a father and his children, the father's authority was closely associated with his position at the top of the familial hierarchy and served to ensure his authority over his offspring (Burke 2003:101; Eyben 1991: 115). In our quest further to appreciate the dynamics of the father's authority, we will consider the reason for this authority. Seneca postulated that the reason for this authority is linked to the fact that generally parents have no choice over whom they rear as biological offspring. He reasoned that since child rearing is faced with numerous/various unexpected hazards, the parents should have complete authority over their children like household magistrates who control children (Seneca, *On Benefits*, 3.11.1-2). Seneca added that the parental authority included the responsibility to discipline a child who did not seem able to be controlled by rational dialogue.²¹⁵

²¹³ For similar view, see Livy 22.29.10; 22.30.2; Plutarch, *Fabius Maximus* 13.6ff; Valerius Maximus 5.2.4; references taken from Weinstock (1971: 149-150).

²¹⁴ In addition, Romulus, the eponymous founder of Rome, was designated as founder or new founder of the city on the basis of having saved the people in the area around what subsequently became known as Rome from external threats. This led to the epithet of "father of the city", and Romulus was then honoured for his deeds with the title 'father' (Plato, *The Republic* 1.41.64). ". . . they all with one accord hailed Romulus as a god and a god's son, the King and Father of the Roman City, and with prayers besought his favour that he would graciously be pleased forever to protect his children" (Livy, *Livy* 1.16.3). Therefore, the term "father" carries the connotation of respect/honour within the honour based culture of antiquity. Others were also known as fathers for various acts of saving. Camillus, the general, for example, upon having defeated the enemies of Rome and thereafter returned victoriously to Rome, was hailed by his soldiers "as a Romulus and Father of his Country and a second Founder of the City" (Livy, *Livy* 5.49.7). Furthermore, Cicero noted that it was Marius, in the year of his consulate who deserved to be called 'pater patriae', a 'parens' of the freedom of the citizens and of the state through his victory over the enemy (Cicero, *Pro Rabirio Postumo*, 27)" in Weinstock (1971: 201-202). Also, see Cicero, *In Catilinam*, 3.2.

²¹⁵ Both Philo and Epictetus, for example, emphasised the father's absolute authority over his children. Philo maintained that parents exercise the type of authority over their offspring that a master wielded over a slave (*Spec.* 2.233). For further details on the subject of authority pertaining to fathers and their offspring see *Spec.* 2.231-232, 234, 236, 240; Epictetus *Diatr.* 2.10.7.

In antiquity, as a means of discipline, fathers frequently meted out punishment to their children for various kinds of misdeeds and mistakes without mercy or compassion (Dionysius, *Roman Antiquities* 8.79.2) such as, for instance using a whip against his children (Saller 1996: 142). Corporal punishment was also carried out by using spiked whips, clubs, racks, and hot irons.²¹⁶ Examples of misconduct include sons accepting bribes, betraying their cities, and forgetting their fathers' commands. Certain fathers were even known to have exercised their 'right of life or death' over their sons and took their lives as punishment for various crimes. For instance, when Cassius was seeking to rule as a tyrant, his father suspected his activities, made stringent investigation, and helped the senate to accuse his own son whom he had taken home and put to death (Dionysius, *Roman Antiquities* 8.79.1). Similarly, Brutus is said to have accused both his sons and is recorded as having killed them, for being offenders of the law (Dionysius, *Roman Antiquities* 8.79.2).²¹⁷ Osiek and Balch (1997: 109) relate an episode during which the father executed his son on the grounds that his son had committed adultery with his stepmother. Some fathers did not even spare their daughters from being disciplined by various forms of severe punishment. Lacey (1986: 139) illustrates this by observing that Augustus, as a *pater patriae* and *paterfamilias*, disciplined his errant daughter Julia by punishing her (Suetonius, *Augustus* 65.2). According to the *lex Iulia de adulteriis*, daughters found having committed adultery were also sentenced to death (Saller 1996: 116).²¹⁸

Likewise, Cicero, in the famous legal defence of Caelius, metaphorically applies two roles of a father to himself. In his speech, Cicero presents himself as an "iron father" in relation to Clodia, whom he vilifies as a prostitute,²¹⁹ as well as taking on the role of a "gentle father" in relation to Caelius whom he seeks to justify (*Pro Caelio* 38, 40, 44-48).

²¹⁶ For details on punishments, see Saller (1996: 134-135, 138).

²¹⁷ For further examples of sons having been executed by their fathers for various forms of disobedience see Livy 2.4; Valerius Maximus 5.8.1; Livy 7.3; Valerius Maximus 5.8.3 in Dixon (1002: 22); *Parallel Stories* 308.B-E.

²¹⁸ Stevenson (1992: 432) observes that gods as fathers of human beings were also portrayed as being violent in disciplining their human progeny. For details, see Stevenson (1992: 432).

²¹⁹ For details on the "iron" character of a father, see Cicero's comments in *The Speeches* 37.

Generally, fathers made use of the mode, severity, when instructing their offspring in the realm of moral values (Dixon 1992: 117-118).²²⁰ Fathers used violence to punish their children, since violence was a socially recognised form for disciplining, and it came to be seen as an institutionalised symbol of an unequal relationship of power. Nonetheless, punishment did not imply that the parents rejected their children, since these children were subjected to strict discipline in order to prepare themselves for “the anticipated ordeals of adult manhood” (Pilch 1993: 102-103; Lakoff 1996: 65ff). In this regard, Seneca employs an unusual metaphor to explain the father’s role in disciplining his children. He compares a father’s act of disciplining of his children to the way humans control wild beasts to overcome their obstinacy. The intention of disciplining is so that the children learn to stop doing what is wrong [*De Constantia Sapientis* (= *Dial.* 2) 12.3 in Wiedemann 1989: 27].

7.3.3. Obedience

The other side of the coin in relation to paternal authority is obedience of the children to their fathers. Interestingly, the obligation of obedience to a father was practised with a heightened sense of sincerity and devotion in that while children knew that they were forbidden to do wrong to any other person in the society, even the slightest thought of not doing anything for their father’s pleasure was considered unholy and unlawful (Plutarch *On Brotherly Love* 480A). This highlights the ideology of a patriarchal society as a whole without informing us of the actual desires and actions of children in antiquity. Saller (1996: 114) states, “[r]espect and obedience were regarded as the duty of offspring towards parents, who bestowed on their children the incomparable *beneficium* of life.”²²¹ It seems that the household system, with the dominance of the *paterfamilias*, proved so successful within Rome that it “flowed from obedience to authority, especially paternal and state authority, celebrated in the virtue of *pietas*: success, authority, and obedience went hand in hand” (Saller 1996: 106).

While fathers were responsible for the wellbeing of their children, children when they turned adults carried the duty of tending their parents especially in their old age. Children extended their obligation to ensure proper commemoration for their parents at

²²⁰ Wiedemann (1989: 143) shares a similar view.

²²¹ For some examples of the duty of respect and obedience of children to a father, see Saller (1996: 106-113).

their death.²²² In addition, as obedient offspring, they were expected to respect the good teachings of their fathers and to consider the fathers as just and honourable and consequently worthy of obedience (Plato *The Republic* 583C-D). Similarly, rulers often sought to elicit obedience from others in order to support and extend their own ideological interests. For example, Dio recorded that when Augustus was given the honorary title ‘father’ it first served to underline the fathers’ attachment to their children as well as the children’s respect for their fathers. This father-children relationship pattern even paved the way to emperors exercising power over those they governed in the same way in which fathers did over their children in a household (Dio *Orationes* 53.12).

Nevertheless, it is uncertain whether it was in fact customary for a father to expect a response of obedience from his children. In general, a father appears to have reared his children out of attachment and affection and not with the intention of receiving benefits from them (cf. Seneca, *On Benefits* 3.11.3). Plutarch, in *On Brotherly Love* 479F-480A, noted that such a motivated father-child relationship is due to nature. However, even if a son wants to give something back to his father it is still deemed as “less, because he owes to his father this very power of giving” (*On Benefits* 3.29.3). Seneca observed an example in which a patron functioned in a manner that can be compared to a parent, particularly since in this case did not appear to have been inspired by feelings of repayment (*On Benefits* 1.1.9). By Seneca’s characterisation of a benefactor, it could once again be appropriate to compare the attitude of the benefactor to that of a father who gives willingly and “never demands any return, rejoices if a return is made, in all sincerity forgets what he has bestowed, and accepts a return in the spirit of one accepting a benefit” (*On Benefits* 2.17.7). Furthermore, a father has unintentionally bestowed a number of items upon his children, which they would never be able to repay, such as life itself, position, security and sound health.²²³ A father only expects a joyful response, even where the benefit in question is the ultimate one of life (Stevenson 1992: 426).²²⁴

²²² For details, see Hierocles in Stob. *Floril.* 79.53; Philo *Decal.* 120; Homer, *Iliad*, 17.301-3, cf. 17.477-9; *Odyssey* 2.113-14, 130-1; cf. Hesiod, *Opera et Dies* 182, 85-8; Plato, *Laws* 717e-718a, Xenophon, *Memorabilia* 2.2.1-13; 4.4.19-20. References are taken from Stevenson (1992: 428). For further details and references, see Stevenson (1992: 428-429; Dixon 1992: 138).

²²³ Cf. *On Benefits* 2.30.2; 2.31.2; 3.14.3, to how a benefactor with what attitude and intention he gives gifts to others.

²²⁴ An example of such obedience is seen in the story of Fufetius who asked some youth whether they would go to battle with the Curiatii (Dionysius *Roman Antiquities* 3.16.2). The youth decided to take the advice of their father since he was alive to which act Tullus appreciated such filial devotion (Dionysius

In appreciative response to these benevolent attitudes of the father, a child reacts in treating his/her father with gratitude just as they would worship god (Seneca *On Benefits* 4.28.2). Furthermore, the child

treat(s) everything that is his own as belonging to his father, to be obedient to him in all things, never to speak ill of him to anyone else, nor to say or do anything that will harm him, to give way to him in everything and yield him precedence, helping him as far as is within his power (Epictetus *Discourses* 2.10.7).²²⁵

Thus, children acted in good faith, by being obedient to their father, where their obedience can be incorporated into their father's authority over them.

7.3.4. Affection

Burke (2003: 103) states that parental love for children was a prevalent manifestation in antiquity. However, at the very outset, we have to note that, as Malina (1993a: 130) argues, the modern western understanding of love, which is associated with affection, is significantly different to love as understood in antiquity. Therefore, Paul and his contemporaries most likely did not form an association between affection and love as understood in antiquity, where the accent was on attachment. As Malina (1993a: 127) observes, this form of attachment refers to the social bonding that connects kinship and other types of group members to each other. Aristotle noted that love is an hierarchical emotion and claims that it was usual for a parent to show affection (στειργουσι) to a child as soon as the child was born (Aristotle *Nicomachean Ethics* 8.12.2 cited by Burke 2003: 103). Attachment, however, between father and child is that bonds of attachment that require mental activity and that is why parental bonding occurs before the child and is able to bond to its parents (cf. Fitzgerald 2003: 325). Attachment is given so much importance that Plutarch observed that it is more important and a greater source of

Roman Antiquities 3.17.1-2). Likewise, the father of the youth acknowledged that their conduct was dutiful and obedient and advised them to take decisions on their own. The youth, however, felt that an act "without father's consent would term them unworthy for not honouring their father and ancestors" (Dionysius *Roman Antiquities* 3.17.4).

²²⁵ For a similar view see Plutarch *The Education of Children* 7E.

pleasure for a father to have experienced the attachment to his children than to see them gain social repute (*On Brotherly Love* 480 C).²²⁶

In general, fathers expressed their attachment to their children through gentleness (Epictetus, *Discourses* 3.17.5), care (*Discourses* 3.24.15-16) and affection (Plutarch, *Moralia: The Education of Children* 7E). Dio in his discourse on Homer recorded that Homer manifested the character of Zeus, in that his power and disposition were expressed in the metaphorical epithet, a “father of gods and of men” (*Orationes* 53.12). Although the Greek gods were often perceived as capricious, Zeus has also been viewed as a king who acted as a solicitous father, with kindness and affection, and who always led and governed his subordinates with love and protective care (*Orationes* 53.12).²²⁷ These fatherly characteristics of gentleness, kindness and caring also became evident in instances where fathers advised and counselled their children in times of difficulty. Dio stated that the very existence of a father is a force that encourages family members to have proper relationships with each other (*Orationes* 74.27). It appears that Cicero, noting the bonding characteristics of a father, realised that for the Greeks the title of a king was given to a king who takes care of his citizens and who provides better living conditions for them like a father does (*The Republic* 2.26.47-48).

7.3.5. Education

An essential characteristic of a good father was to bring up his children to become good citizens.²²⁸ Plautus understood the purpose of proper upbringing as the development of the child’s character (*Mostellaria* 118-21).²²⁹ One way to bring up children well was by providing proper education.²³⁰ Quintilian (*Institutio Oratoria* 287-8) strongly

²²⁶ For details, see Plutarch *On Brotherly Love* 480.C-D.

²²⁷ Dio Chrysostom also noted that Zeus as a Father (πατήρ) figure demonstrated solicitude and kindness to others (*Orationes*, 1.40; *Orationes* 12.75). Furthermore, Epictetus described God as a protector in the way that a father protects his own children (*Discourses* 3.24.3).

²²⁸ Burke (2003: 104-105) also observed that generally fathers in antiquity carried the responsibility to educate their children.

²²⁹ For further references on the upbringing of children see Juvenal 14; Tacitus, *Dialogues of the Orators* 28; Horace *Sermones* 1.6.71-92. References are taken from Dixon (1992: 118).

²³⁰ The very wealthy provided Greek tutors for their children. For the less wealthy, there were private schools in which Greek educated slaves would instruct students. Children learned the basic requirements of reading, writing and arithmetic. By the age of twelve or thirteen, and if the child had shown promise, he could attend the *grammaticus*, or grammar school. The standard curriculum in the liberal arts included literature, dialectics (or the art of reasoning), arithmetic, geometry, astronomy, and music. At the core of this curriculum was, of course, Greek literature. So, students were exposed to Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Hesiod’s *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, as well as Pindar’s *Odes*. The philosophies of Plato, Aristotle and Zeno of Elea, the histories of Herodotus and Thucydides and dramas of Sophocles and Aeschylus

encouraged fathers to provide the best possible education for their sons, which would allow the fathers to expect outstanding achievements from their sons. Plutarch mentions that the real character of a father is shown when he “thinks of the education of his children,” rather than “gratifying those who ask favours” (*Education of Children* 4.E).²³¹ The Roman, Aemilius, exemplified the concept of a good father, since he provided a good education for his sons by training them not only in his own native and ancestral disciplines²³² that he himself went through but also with passion for the discipline of the Greeks. Aemilius demonstrated his passion for the education of his children that he always attended his sons’ education and exercises unless an important community affair needed his presence (Plutarch *Aemilius Paulus* 6.5). Similarly, in the context of administering the universe, Heracles’ father is described as having trained Heracles by encouraging him to have good desires, providing all necessary guidance and instruction pertaining to proper relationships with his fellow human beings. This training portrayed a character of Heracles as one who did not seek power for “pleasure and personal gain” but who sought to improve the general plight of the citizens (Dio, *Orationes*, 1.64-65).²³³

7.3.6. Imitation

Education and imitation are closely related to each other in ancient thought. Castelli (1991: 82) observes that imitation functioned as the primarily means of education within and throughout antiquity. As Aristotle noted, human beings appeared to have begun their learning experiences by means of imitation (*Poetics* 1448B). Likewise, as Castelli (1991: 83) illustrates, learners were taught in antiquity largely by simply imitating their teachers (Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, 1.2.3; Isocrates *Against the Sophists* 17). Thus, the teacher had to be able to provide an authoritative example for the student to imitate (Castelli 1991: 85).

were also standard fare. Very promising students would end their education by studying Greek oratory, the best schools being found at Athens (Pogoloff 1992: 49-53).

²³¹ It has to be noted though, that this does not mean that education alone resulted in learners/ children developing into good citizens, since in many instances educated offspring failed to progress in life. For details see Plutarch *Moralia: Education of Children* 4.A-F.

²³² Those such as grammarians, philosophers, rhetoricians, sculptures and painters provided education in ancestral discipline (Plutarch *Aemilius Paulus* 6.5).

²³³ Heracles is used in the subject context of ‘kingship’. Heracles was the son of Zeus and Alcmena and the king of Argos and Greece. As king, Heracles was used as an ideal model of the cynics (Dio Chrysostom, *Orationes*, 1.58-59).

Education comprised of both formal learning and instruction in moral values required to develop into good citizens. Burke (2003: 102) notes that imitation played a crucial role in the development of children since children require a “moral exemplar” to imitate. In antiquity, children who were not given specific training by their father were thought to benefit in life through learning to imitate their father’s qualities seen through his actions. In fact, fathers expected such imitation. This is illustrated by Isocrates’ direction to Demonicus in that he was urged to follow the example of his father, Hipponicus: “I have produced a sample of the nature of Hipponicus after whom you should pattern your life as after an ensample regarding his conduct as your law, and striving to imitate and emulate your father’s virtue” (Isocrates, *Dem.* 4.11).²³⁴ Marcus Aurelius is another good example of someone who learned by imitating his father’s characteristics such as soberness in all things, steadfastness (Marcus Aurelius *To Himself* 1.16.3), modesty, manliness (*Declamations* 1.2), perseverance (Marcus Aurelius *To Himself* 1.16.2), disclaiming of public honours (Marcus Aurelius *To Himself* 1.16.1, 4, 7),²³⁵ love of work (Marcus Aurelius *To Himself* 1.16.7),²³⁶ and knowledge of when to act and when to desist from action (Marcus Aurelius *To Himself* 1.16.1).

Imitation, however, is not a neutral concept or activity. It is ideologically powerful because it embeds relations of power in favour of the one being imitated. Castelli (1991: 89) observes, “Mimesis must be understood in its larger context, as a notion that places sameness at a premium and imbues the model with a privileged and unattainable status.” Referring to an example of cosmological discourse of Plato’s *Timaeus*, 41B-C, 48, Castelli (1991: 86) notes, “mimesis is constituted through a hierarchy in which the model is imbued with perfection and wholeness, and the copy represents an attempt to reclaim that perfection.”²³⁷ In this mimetic relationship, the authority of the one being imitated is placed in the foreground while the one imitating is required to yield to that authority (Castelli 1991: 86).

²³⁴ Reference taken from Burke (2003: 102).

²³⁵ Marcus Aurelius Antoninus continued with his education to such an extent that “no one could charge him with sophistry, flippancy, or pedantry” as “he was a man mature, complete, deaf to flattery, able to preside over his own affairs and those of others” (*To Himself* 1.16.4).

²³⁶ Marcus Aurelius noted that his father always loved his work and at all times analysed the requirements of the empire and effectively managed its resources (*To Himself* 1.16.3).

²³⁷ Castelli (1991: 78-81) gives another example of the hierarchical power where “mimetic relationship in kingship is considered to be a derivative relationship.”

7.4. Father – guardian relationship in the household in antiquity

Παιδαγωγοί normally belonged to elite households in antiquity and worked under the authority of the head of the household, the father or master, and were mostly of foreign origin (Young 1987: 151). Παιδαγωγοί were either household slaves or freedmen, purchased or hired (Plutarch *Lysander* 208b, cf. 223a; Young 1987: 158). Our earlier investigation shows that, in general, fathers placed great value on the education of their children, since poor education would in most cases lead to irregular living and baser diversions and thus they employed παιδαγωγοί for their children (*Lib. Educ.*, 7 II, 4d-5b; cf. Socrates in Plat. *Clitopho* 407a); 13 (II, 9c). These παιδαγωγοί had numerous duties, such as the accompaniment of minors “for the purpose of protection, guidance, support, discipline and general supervision of behaviour, for example, to or from school, or on occasions when they themselves were absent” (Thiselton 2000: 370; Malina & Pilch 2006: 77).²³⁸ Young (1987: 150) observes that this was a constant practise that was carried out from the 5 century BCE up to the Roman imperial period. Most importantly, the παιδαγωγοί “were moral guides and were to be obeyed” (Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1119b in Young 1987: 159). Collins (1999: 193), referring to *P. Oxy.*, VI, 930, notes that by the time of the Hellenistic era, παιδαγωγοί had become revered tutors. The παιδαγωγοί were considered vital since it was thought that children were to be “as little without a teacher and pedagogue as sheep without shepherds or slaves without masters” (Philo *Legum Allegoriae* VII, 808d in Bertram 1968: 601). To illustrate their significance, Socrates lists the four best παιδαγωγοί of the day who had been chosen to tutor the prince at Persian court (*Ps.-Plat. Alc.*, I, 121e, 122a). “The wisest gives instruction in the fear of God and in kingship, the most righteous in uprightness, the most prudent in inner freedom and self-discipline, and the most manly in fearlessness” (Bertram 1968: 599). However, in spite of their numerous skills and qualities, παιδαγωγοί were paid employees, and therefore inferior to that of their masters (Bertram 1968: 620; Wolff 1996: 94). Hence, they were vulnerable to rejection by a father if they did not meet his expectations. Young (1987: 168) observes that the authority of the father in the household over the παιδαγωγοί can be portrayed such that “[t]he role of the pedagogue was [...] ambivalent; attracting ridicule and scorn on the one hand, but praise and appreciation on the other. The pedagogue’s function was [therefore] temporary.”

²³⁸ Also, see Bertram (1968: 599); Collins (1999: 193); Young (1987: 158-160).

The above discussion has demonstrated that we can highlight the source domain of the father-child submetaphor, the nature and role of the father in relation to his children in antiquity; and father-guardian submetaphor and the nature and role of the father in relation to guardians in antiquity. Familiarity with the target domain, Paul the Apostle and founder of Corinthian church and his relation with his converts is also required. I have previously discussed this in the introductory chapter, in which some of the most salient features concerning Paul as an Apostle are listed, in order to locate him as the target of various metaphors within 1 Corinthians. In what follows, these features blend with the concept of father as a source domain.

<u>Source Domain</u>	<u>Target Domain</u>
Father-children relationship in antiquity	Paul-Corinthian Christians relationship in Corinth
A father procreated his children.	Paul converted the Corinthian Christians to faith in Jesus Christ, thereby founding the church in Corinth.
A father was responsible for educating and socialising his children pertaining to the core knowledge and values of his society and culture.	Paul proclaimed the life orienting Gospel of Jesus Christ to the Corinthian Christians, after which he socialised them in the Christian way of living.
A father functioned with hierarchical power, having sole custody and control over his own children, his sons' children and all family property.	Paul claimed hierarchical power over the Corinthian Christians as his converts.
A father possessed authority over his children to discipline and punish them for their faults and misdeeds.	Paul maintained that he had the required authority over the Corinthian Christians whereby he could discipline them and correct various errors.
A father expected a willing response in obedience from his children.	Paul sought an obedient response from his converts.
A father bonded with his children.	Paul bonded with the Corinthians and regarded them with affection.

From the cultural understanding of father-guardians relationship in the structural building metaphor in antiquity, the source, father-guardians relationship in antiquity, and the target, Paul and the leaders' relationship in the Corinthian church, can be identified as follows:

Source domain	Target domain
Father-Guardians relationship in antiquity	Paul-leaders relationship in the Corinthian church
Elite fathers appointed guardians to work under their authority.	After Paul established the Corinthian church, while various other leaders were expected to continue Paul's ministry to the Corinthian Christians.
Guardians functioned as custodians and sometimes tutors of the children of their masters.	The leaders were preaching the gospel of Jesus Christ in sophistic wisdom leading to power struggles within the Corinthian elite and factionalism in the Corinthian church.

7.5. Interpretation of the father-children submetaphor (4:14-21)

In 1 Cor. 4:14-21, as mentioned earlier, Paul employs metaphors and makes metaphorical connections that are related to the household system of antiquity. The household metaphor provides Paul a means of addressing problems of authority and factionalism. The household serves as a complex metaphor from which flows several submetaphors chosen by Paul in his discourse to the Christian community. As observed in chapter 3, the household imagery seems to be what Kövecses (2002: 80-84, 116-118) called complex metaphor. The ancient household thus provides a basis for the hierarchical social relations that Paul sought to impose on "his" church in Corinth. In the case of 4:14-21, the submetaphors within the complex metaphor of the household

comprise of the father and children relationship and the subordinate role of the guardians and their dealings with the children of the household (cf. Martin 1995: 85).²³⁹

The most obvious of the submetaphors is the one that involves the metaphoric source, the father-child relation in antiquity and the target domain, Paul the apostle and his Corinthian converts. Even though Paul does not use the Greek word *πατήρ* (father) directly in respect of himself in 4:14-21, the concept is clearly and powerfully present. Three features of the argument of 4:14-15 demonstrate this. First, he says that he does not write to shame the Corinthians in terms of what he has said in 4:6-13, though this may be a conscious dissimulation on his part, but to admonish them as *τέκνα μου αγαπητά* (Wanamaker 2003a: 135; Merklein 1992: 324). The blending between the source and target indicate that the primary meaning of the *τέκνον* concept is the biological offspring of a parent. Thus, Paul blends his Corinthian converts into this concept by claiming them as his own offspring, “my beloved children.” The concept represented by *αγαπητά* implies the existence of an affective bond in Paul’s mind between his converts and himself that has its basis in a father to child type of relation with the Corinthian Christians. In 4:15c, he provides the reason why he can claim to have a father-like relation with them.

In 4:15a-b, Paul offers a second comment that points to his appropriation of the father-child concept when explaining his relationship with the Corinthians. He argues that, while they may have a number of guardians in their relationship with Christ, they cannot have many fathers, that is, they can only have Paul as their exclusive father (4:14-15) (Barnett 2003: 317). The implication is, of course, that they can only have one father, since children can only have one biological father, just as they can only have one biological mother. Young (1987: 170) adds that a father’s attachment to his children was deeper than that of the *παιδαγωγοί*, which is similar to the case of Paul and his converts as, “[h]is affinity with the Corinthians was as their progenitor into the gospel, not as a postnatal appointee.” To undergird his assertion of being their one and only father, Paul reminds the Corinthian Christians of the analogous connection that exists between his missionary activity and the act of fathering a child when he asserts, *ἐὼν Ἐριστῶ Ἰησοῦ διὰ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς ἐγεννήσα* (4:15).

²³⁹ While Paul does not take up the household metaphor directly, later writers in the Pauline tradition did so when they began to refer to the church as the household of God (see Eph. 2:19; 1 Tim. 3:15).

This is a metaphor concerned with the origins of the Corinthian Christian community: “I fathered you in Christ Jesus”. Thus Paul portrays himself as the progenitor of the Corinthians’ attachment to Christ based on the argument that both he and his converts are aware that he was the first to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ to them (Eriksson 2001: 117). Quintilian had observed this enhancement in the meaning that a metaphor creates (*Institutio Oratoria* 8.6.19). Paul maps his generative missionary work on to the biologically generative role of the father, in order to create the basis of his claim to have a father-like relation to his converts. Consequently, Paul’s converts are blended into the children source domain that results in significant implications for their relationship with Paul (Martin 1995: 103; Garland 2003: 145; Merklein 1992: 328). The nature of the father-children relationship leads to its inherent non-interchangeability, at the same time this results in the realisation that neither Paul nor the Corinthian Christians could at any future point be released from their roles within this relationship (Schrage 1991: 353-354). This is confirmed in 4:15a-b, where Paul distinguishes his role among the Corinthian community from all other leaders whom he identifies as mere guardians.

Paul’s status of progenitor of the Corinthian church allows Paul to make a number of connections in the area of his hierarchical domination, authority and disciplinary power within the Corinthian church. This is evident through the blending between the source, father-child relationship in antiquity, and the target, Paul and his converts, in the Corinthian church. By designating his converts as his “beloved children in 4:14,” Paul’s fatherly admonishing indicates his desire to bring the Corinthian Christians to proper behaviour in the context of their attitude of arrogant superiority (Collins 1999: 192; Welborn 1987: 108; Fee 1987: 184; Fitzgerald 1988: 117; Merklein 1992: 323). As in chapter 2, the Corinthian elite assumed that they had superiority over the remaining community in part by showing allegiance to and finding identity in one leader as opposed to a different leader or leaders, resulting in the creation of factions within the church. In reaction to the issues concerning authority and dissension, Paul undermines the basis of the Corinthian elite’s claim to superiority by shaming them based on their factious attitude that is apparent in 1:10-4:13 (Mitchell 1991: 214). Paul’s masterful use of rhetoric is described further in that,

[h]e does not deny that he seemed unwise and unsophisticated when he was among the Corinthians, but instead subtly attributes his retrospectively

inferior appearance to the necessity of adapting to their own level at the time. He strongly criticizes the type of wisdom they have begun to aspire toward apart from his guidance, and instead casts himself as the conduit of a genuinely spiritual wisdom to which they have yet to attain, and will not attain apart from him. One might say he utilizes ‘the verbal ploys of the sophist making the adversary’s powerful argument recoil against him’ Through this section, and 1 Corinthians as a whole, Paul demonstrates that he is far more sophisticated than some Corinthians might think as he sophistically seduces the sophists (Given 2001: 103).

As such, Paul warns us not to underestimate his capacity to say one thing, for example, “I do not wish to shame you,” and mean another, for example, “you really should be ashamed of yourselves without my having to shame you.” Welborn (1987: 108) describes this phenomenon aptly as dissimulation, which is shown by the example in which Paul declares: “I am not writing this to make you ashamed” (4:14).

Having discussed the *παιδαγωγοί* metaphor to a certain extent earlier, a closer analysis is now required. Just as Paul applies submetaphors to clarify his authority pertaining to the Corinthian Christians, he applies the *παιδαγωγοί* submetaphor in a similar fashion with regard to the other leaders in Corinth. Witherington (1995: 147) recognises that Paul identifies the other leaders and missionaries in the church at Corinth as *παιδαγωγοί* to his converts, but then fails to interpret Paul’s metaphorical language that would also suggest that the leaders and missionaries are all his subordinates or at least that they should be. Thiselton (2000: 370), who places a different emphasis on the dynamics between a father and guardians, is subject to a similar criticism. Thiselton avoids the authoritative aspect and limits the dynamics of a parent and guardian. He says that a parent corrects a child out of love but a guardian lacks this affection. Thus, Paul as an affectionate father to the Corinthian Christians corrects them whereas other leaders lack this affection. The following discussion will demonstrate that Paul’s *παιδαγωγοί* submetaphor does not merely identify all other leaders as *παιδαγωγοί* to the Corinthian Christians, but also suggests that these leaders are subordinate to Paul. This will illustrate the inadequacy of the analyses of Witherington and Thiselton.

By his choice of the *παιδαγωγοί*/ metaphor for other leaders in Corinth, Paul suggests a hierarchy in which he stands at the top. The target, the leaders, are those who came after Paul who had already preached and established the church. These leaders in all probability were the people whom Paul saw as building on his foundations in the complex building metaphor in 3:9-17. The source, *παιδαγωγοί*, are those who are employees of a father and are guardians of school going children in antiquity. The blending between the source and the target shows that the leaders who came after Paul, like *παιδαγωγοί*, & are merely guides and supervisors for immature Christians, but do not have a right to make important decisions regarding the welfare of the Corinthians (Klauck 1984: 39-40; cf. Moffatt 1938: 51). This is to say that under Paul the *παιδαγωγοί* serve as disciplinarians and guides at his pleasure, while the Corinthians as his children stand at the bottom of the household hierarchy because of their immaturity (cf. 3:1-3).²⁴⁰ Just as a father carried the hierarchical power of custody over his own children and others in his household, in like manner Paul professes that he wields a similar power by his metaphorical argument. Consequently, Paul has to maintain custody over them until they are mature enough to be released from the *παιδαγωγοί* &. This forms the basis of Paul's assertion as the head of the Corinthian Christian household, and therefore, as the only person to have the power of custody over his converts. Hence, no other leaders would be in the position of taking on Paul's headship, even though various leaders in the church have attempted to attain a level of equality with Paul, while merely having the ability to discipline or guide the Corinthian Christians. Such leaders are deemed inferior and subordinate to Paul (vs. 15) and the Corinthian elites' very claim of following superior leaders falls flat when they realise that in reality their leaders are subordinate to Paul (Fee 1987: 185-186; Horsley 1998: 72). Therefore Paul shows the Corinthians how their patronage relationship brings shame and not honour to them (cf. Thiselton 2000: 369). With this authority, Paul asks the Corinthian Christians to equip themselves to walk in Christ by imitating his ways in Christ just as children in antiquity would imitate their respective father's ways to be of right behaviour (vs.16). Thiselton (2000: 371) phrases this as "by your conduct prove your parentage".

²⁴⁰ Also, see Wanamaker (2003a: 135) for a similar view.

Holmberg (1980: 77-78, 185-186), rather highlights the attitude of affection in contrast to an authoritarian attitude in the exercising of Paul's power, since in Holmberg's view, Paul does not issue strict orders nor does he demand obedience. Rather, Paul's authority is based on an affective father-child relationship, similarly to the manner in which a father loves his offspring and takes care of them. Likewise, children, out of love, demonstrate both obedience and respect to their fathers. Holmberg (1980: 186) argues that such a relationship serves two purposes. First, it allows the Corinthian Christians to "grow and develop maturity and independence" (cf. 3:1-2). Second, it "helps to explain Paul's mildness and his unassuming conduct, which contrasts so sharply with his persona as one with charismatic authority (e.g., 2 Cor. 10:10-12; 11:20-21)" (Holmberg 1980: 186). Castelli (1991: 100) also records that a number of scholars view the father metaphor as one denoting "a sense of kindness and love." For example, Castelli says that Conzelmann (1975: 91) describes "the shift in tone in vs. 14 as reflecting a 'conciliatory fashion'" on Paul's part. Sanders (1959: 353) interprets Paul's 'fatherhood' as "paternal concern tempered by his deeper affection". De Boer (1962: 145) adds that Paul's "only intention was to do what every good father does; he was admonishing his children with love."

Holmberg's view is too simplistic to ignore Paul's authoritarian role in 2 Cor. 10-13, which certainly suggests that some in Corinth resented his heavy handed approach, presumably in 1 Corinthians, assuming that 2 Cor. 10-13 is an intervening letter between 1 Corinthians and the rest of 2 Corinthians. Holmberg's view is further undermined by 1 Cor. 4:21, where Paul threatens to whack the Corinthian Christians like a responsible father would if his children had acted in an undisciplined and rebellious manner. Scholars, such as Holmberg omit the consideration that ancient society enforced obedience on children, even adult children, in numerous ways. The relationship between a father and his children was therefore not primarily one of affection, though affection may have on occasion been present. For the most part, the relationship was a hierarchical relationship based on authority and power, which required unequivocal obedience from children. As Reese (1998: 142-143) observes, obedience was "a primary value of ancient Mediterranean culture" and obedience began in the household (cf., Eph. 6:1-3; Col. 3:20-21; 1 Tim. 3:4-5, 13). As mentioned in an earlier section, fathers were able to execute their children on the grounds of disobedience and unlawful acts. The imposition of discipline, even harsh discipline, was thought to be the only way

to secure and enforce the authority of the father when his children had been disobedient. Incidentally, this forms the underlying cultural wisdom of the story of the Prodigal Son in Luke 15:11-32. In this case, the older brother, whose views correspond to common cultural wisdom, not only completely rejects his younger brother due to his disobedience to their father and the public shame that it brought upon the family, but he also resents and challenges his father, who is prepared to and desires to restore his previously disobedient son to his household. This was deemed to be even more shameful than the younger son's original disobedience had been.²⁴¹

As noted earlier, obedience through imitation was the chief way that a father expected his children to practise in antiquity. Castelli (1991: 77) refers to Philo's discourse on the notion of imitation of God as an "analogy between the parental relationship to children and God's relationship to the world." "For parents are the servants of God for the task of begetting children, and he who dishonors the servants dishonors also the Lord" (*On the Decalogue* 119-120). The blending between the source and the target demonstrates that Paul, like a father, expects his converts, who he calls, "τε/κνα μου αγαπητα&" to respect him and to be obedient to him. As we have seen, imitation has its source in the father-child relation of antiquity, since children, especially sons, were to learn how to exist and to behave by imitation of their fathers (cf. Burke 2003: 110). Paul's exhortative command through the imperative γι/νεσθε in the sentence μιμηται/ μου γι/νεσθε in vs. 16 derives from the domain of father-child relations and blends into the target domain of Paul and his converts relations (vs. 16). Thus, the position of fatherhood creates a position of continual authority for Paul (Schrage 1991: 356). Mitchell (1991: 222) remarks that the call to imitate (1 Cor 4:16) goes back and forth throughout the epistle and, for example, at 1 Cor 4:1-13 Paul encourages the Corinthian Christians to follow his own life as a model of the countercultural life that God requires of those who belong to Jesus Christ as his servants. Imitation is not neutral, therefore imitating Paul in obedience infers acknowledging him as father to the extent of submitting to his authority. Paul's call to imitation is not a direct call to imitate

²⁴¹ For a helpful, though somewhat flawed, cultural reading of the Prodigal Son, see Malina & Rohrbaugh (2003: 288-291). Their interpretation assumes that the father had handed over all of his property to his two sons. The elder son's attitude upon the return of his younger brother renders this interpretation implausible because the father indicates continuing ownership of his property with the younger son sharing in the living generated by the father's property.

Christ but to an imitation of himself, which leads to an imitation of Christ, since he himself imitates Christ (Schrage 1991: 357). Castelli (1991: 111) notes that,

[t]he political nature of the paternal metaphor that Paul uses often in relation to mimetic language evokes authority, while the imprecise content of mimesis in 1 Cor 4:16 has a political function as well. It reinscribes the authority of the model while forcing the imitators to ‘police themselves’ because the exact nature of what they are called to do is elusive.

Any disobedience to Paul is alluded to as having the same impact as dishonouring one’s own father. Through the blend, Paul seeks to redirect the Corinthians, particularly the socially prominent members of the community, into a renewed acceptance of his authority. This, in turn, he hopes will lead to an imitation of his humility and servant orientation, thereby overcoming their arrogance, boasting, and factionalism. Thus, Paul’s desire for authority and its concomitant, power, is not self-serving but seeks the unification of the community through concord (Welborn 1997: 39-40; Mitchell 1991: 65-66; Burke 2003: 111). An excellent example of a father-son relationship can be seen in Paul’s relationship to Timothy, who is described as Paul’s beloved child who imitates Paul his father in faith (vs.16).

The $\delta\iota\alpha\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \sim\tau\omicron$ in vs. 17 connects what follows with Paul’s instruction to become imitators of him in vs. 16. Timothy, who Paul metaphorically incorporates into his household and family by describing him as $\mu\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\epsilon/\kappa\nu\omicron\nu\ \alpha\gamma\alpha\pi\eta\tau\omicron\ \therefore\ \nu\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \therefore\ \pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\ \nu\ \epsilon\theta\upsilon\ \kappa\upsilon\rho\iota/\omega\ |$, was being sent to the Corinthians to remind them of Paul’s ways in Christ.²⁴² His ways in Christ appear to refer to the moral precepts necessary for their well-being (Fee 1987: 186-187; Horsley 1998: 73; Garland 2003: 146-147).

Paul underlines Timothy’s authority as his emissary, not only by blending his relation to Timothy into the father-child source domain, but also by ascribing trustworthiness ($\pi\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\ \&\ \omega$) to him in that relationship (Barrett 1987: 116-117; Fee 1987: 188). This is intended to authorise Timothy’s role as Paul’s representative in reminding the

²⁴² Barrett (1987: 116); Collins (1999: 199); Garland (2003: 147) see $\epsilon\ \pi\epsilon\mu\psi\alpha$ as an epistolary aorist.

Corinthians of Paul's ways, especially since he might be required to challenge some of the Corinthians ways as deviations from Paul's ways. Timothy is therefore comparable to a tutor and to a proper guardian. Paul implies that Timothy could walk in Christ only because of imitating him like a father and being trustworthy for the task to which Paul assigned him. By intimating his own presence in the form of Timothy, his emissary, the blending does not simply lead to an imitation, as Witherington (1995: 147) observes, but also to the right to remind the Corinthian Christians of Paul's ways by granting significant power to Paul who controls the teaching content and process.²⁴³ This is an anti-innovation claim that agrees with Welborn's interpretation of 4:6, namely, that Paul is saying not to go beyond what they were given initially and, which had been agreed upon at their conversion (Welborn 1997: 74-75). This subtly re-enforces Paul's claim to authority over the Corinthian church, in order to bring it into line with his other churches, which presumably acknowledged Paul's authority (vs.17). The blending thus reaffirms Paul as their exclusive leader who was the first to have proclaimed the gospel in the Corinthian church and others should simply imitate his ways in Christ.

In the discussion above, it has become evident that a series of submetaphors linked to the complex household metaphor enable Paul to portray his authority as natural, similar to the natural authority a father held over his children in antiquity, since he carries the status of progenitor in the Corinthian church. This status maps on to the source domain of father in the ancient world, and allows Paul to make a number of connections to the role of father and head of the household that rhetorically transfers power associated with real fathers in the ancient world to himself, issues such as authority, hierarchical domination, and disciplinary power. Fathers possess asymmetrical power in relation to their offspring, not because this is the way the world has to be, but because of the ideological construction in which the household is a hierarchical structure based on vertical lines of authority with the father as head of the household. Paul's authority is then applied to his Corinthian converts whose experience in relation to Paul is blended into the source domain, of children in antiquity. By his rhetoric, Paul seeks to subordinate the Corinthians and their leaders to his authority. His claim to authority derives from his actual role as founding apostle and bringer of the gospel to Corinth

²⁴³ Collins (1999: 196, 198) further emphasises Paul's presence by sending Timothy to exercise a charge on his behalf. The emissary is to be treated according to the status of the one who sent the emissary and should therefore not be based on the emissary's personal qualities. For details, see pp. 196-198.

(Hester 1994: 4). This authority had been slipped away from him earlier when some of the elite in the community claimed that he was actually a second rate apostle who was not up to their intellectual level in human terms, as defined by the sophistic competition (Winter 2002: 200). Paul ideologically hoped to gain a viable basis from which to solve the problem of authority and factionalism in the Corinthian church (cf. Wanamaker 2003a: 135-136).²⁴⁴ It is in this sense that Thompson (1990: 63) states that metaphors are highly effective ideologically because Paul is able to dissimulate his role like a father to re-establish and sustain his dominance in the Corinthian church.

Having sought to re-establish his authority over the community in 4:14-17 through his extensive appropriation of the father-child household metaphor, Paul turns to another aspect of achieving his rhetorical goal. His claim to authority based on the correspondence between his role as apostolic progenitor and real fathers who procreate their own children does not mean that the Corinthians or, at least, all of the Corinthians would be prepared to accept this renewed claim. Thus Paul sends Timothy (vs. 17) as an attempt to shift from the rhetoric of power asserted through the father-children metaphor in 4:14-16, to the practice of power through a re-education project directed by Paul through Timothy (cf. Horsley 1998: 73; Garland 2003: 148). Nonetheless, Paul was confronted by a rhetorical problem: how could he impose his authority while being absent, as well as provide support for Timothy's mission. The answer will become evident in the last four verses of chapter 4.

As mentioned above, from vss.18-19 Paul threatens to challenge the power of any who refuse to accept his authority. In this complex metaphor, the household management is very much in evidence in the way that Paul structures and manages his church. First, he deals with the possibility that some may have doubted that he would return to the Corinthian Christian community, and sees them as having an over inflated view of their own self-worth (οἱ πε/φυσιω&με&νοἱ) (vs.18) (Collins 1999: 201; Thiselton 2000: 376). Second, Paul takes up the possibility that there might be some individuals who question the legitimacy of his claims to having authority over them (vs.19) (Fee 1987: 190; Fiorenza 1987: 396-397). But, when his authority is challenged, his generative role in creating the Christian community in Corinth allows for a blending with the generative

²⁴⁴ However, 2 Corinthians 10-13, while having been written after 1 Corinthians, gives a strong indication that Paul's rhetoric in 4:14-21, as well as in 1:10-4:13, did not achieve its desired effect.

role of physical fathers. Then, on the basis of this blend, he picks up aspects of the source domain that are relevant for conceptualizing his status, authority and power as an apostle called by God (1 Cor. 1:1-2). In Paul's mind, these troublemakers are from within the community and not from outside based on his reference to those who are "puffed up" against one another in 4:6 where the same verb (φυσιοῦ) is used as in 4:18 (Fee 1987: 189-190). These were those who criticised Paul for his deficiency in persuasiveness and social status (2:1-5) (Wanamaker 2003a: 136), because sophistic influences drew these people to look to Apollos as their sophistic master and, as such, they became arrogant and were especially puffed up when Paul was delaying coming to Corinth (Winter 2002: 200).

Through his authoritative role in the Corinthian church and the father-child relationship in antiquity, Paul addresses the "puffed up" (οἱ (πε)φυσιωμένοι) (vs.19), by blending them with a gentle but authoritative father as generally understood within the framework of antiquity. Similar to a father who had to sort out his troubled household in antiquity, Paul threatens to return soon and to engage in a "power contest" with his boastful attackers upon his arrival (4:19) (Plank 1987: 14). The above discussion parallels Lakoff's (1996: 70) strict father model, which corresponds to the cultural understanding of the role of father in antiquity where a father had a duty to support and protect his family.²⁴⁵ A father's duty included the moral authority to punish his disobedient children so that they develop and exhibit self-discipline (Lakoff 1996: 66-68). Therefore, it was thought that the obedience of children to their fathers paved the way to self-discipline (Lakoff 1996: 68). This concept of obedience and self-discipline is also noticeable in the Imperial period in which the emperor, as the ruler of the empire, was blended with the father as the "ruler" or head of the family and household, thereby creating the notion that the emperor ruled a household that was coterminous with the empire. Just as the *paterfamilias* had to safeguard his household, and this led to him gaining honour, the emperor, as the father of the empire, had similar responsibilities to protect the empire, which ascribed honour to him (Saller 1996: 93).

The authority to discipline the Corinthian Christians applies similarly to Paul, since 4:19-21 indicates that he is prepared to discipline them directly, and beat them into

²⁴⁵ Strict father model take note that the context of life is difficult and the world is dangerous (Lakoff 1996: 65).

subjection, if necessary, and 4:14 shows that he is prepared to shame them as well. Interestingly, Paul downplays the source of the Corinthian elite power, namely, their rhetorical eloquence, by speaking to the Corinthian church in the second person plural (ὁ(μα~φ) and of the troublemakers in the third person (ἐ)φυσιω/θησα/ν) (4:19).²⁴⁶ Through this second person and third person distinction, Paul rhetorically implies a clear differentiation between those in the community whom he classifies as his supporters, and those who oppose his authority. Paul introduces the kingdom of God into his challenge to the arrogant, in order to stress that the kingdom of God is not dependant upon the rhetorical speech that is most sought after in the worldly society, but rather of the power (Martin 1995: 48). Paul therefore states that his power is not exhibited by a form of eloquent speaking, but it comes exclusively from a divine source (vs. 20). He invokes the rule of God and the power of God to undergird his own position (vs. 20). To resist Paul and his authority is subtly equated with resistance to the βασιλει&α του~ θεου~, something that no Christian could do and remain a Christian (Wanamaker 2003a: 136).

Finally, drawing on the metaphorical blend that he has created in this passage, between his position and status as founding apostle of the church and the source domain of the father in antiquity, Paul offers two options to those who appear as arrogant towards him. Either he could treat them as an “iron” father figure or he could relate to them as a gentle and affectionate father figure. Since fathers in antiquity had the legal right to discipline and to reward his children when they were obedient, it is clear that Paul views his converts in vs. 21 in terms of the father-child metaphor. Consequently, Paul’s converts are forced to decide whether they will behave like obedient children towards him, or whether they would force him to discipline them like an iron father. Paul is aware that it was easier to act harshly through his rhetoric argumentation in the form of a letter while being physically absent, since his power and authority was dependent upon who would accept his authority and to what lengths these converts would be prepared to go in support of Paul. Thus, Paul underlines his rhetoric in 4:14-17 with a threat to impose his power on any disobedient members of the community upon his return.

²⁴⁶ Paul uses the verb “to know” in its Semitic sense, “to experience” the power of the Corinthian Christians through contrasts λογος and δυναμις as in 2:4-5; cf., the use of “word” in 1:5, 17, 18; 2:1, 4, 13 and “power” in 1:18, 24) (Collins 1999: 201). Likewise, Winter (2002: 200-01), observes that the puffed up perceived Apollos as a powerful and eloquent speaker. By supporting him, they hoped to increase and solidify their own power in the church.

Thus, by using dissimulation and fragmentation, Paul, like a father and head of a household, ideologically affirms his authority and power over his household, the Corinthian church. However, Paul does not conclude the matter here. In the same way in which he had opened the rhetorical unit of 1:10-4:21 with a call for unity within the Corinthian church (1:10), he ends with the same emphasis at 4:21.²⁴⁷ Paul therefore uses unification as an ideological mode of operation to serve the call to oneness within the church and to establish and sustain his dominate position in the Corinthian church. The very father metaphor becomes the symbolisation of unity. When Paul calls the Corinthian Christians his beloved children, this description is an example of the language of unity used to encourage the various Corinthian Christians, to view themselves as children of Paul and therefore as one household, similar to the unity existing within the hierarchically determined household in antiquity. Paul's description of beloved children also accentuates the concept of attachment, attachment to him as opposed to other leaders or missionaries. Paul is therefore advocating unity in his household, the church, which is based on cultural conceptual experiences of the structuring household metaphor. Since Paul rhetorically portrays the Corinthian Christians as his children through his extensive application of the *topoi* from the source domain of the father-child metaphor, it is reasonable for him to call for them to imitate him, especially his ways in Christ which strengthens his appeal for unity. As Castelli (1991: 103) points out, for Paul to say, “‘become imitators of me’ is a call to sameness which erases differences and at the same time reinforces the authoritative status of the model.” Furthermore, Paul's challenge to the “puffed up” suggests to them that they are to return to the fold on Paul's terms or else risk isolation from the community. Paul “not only relativises the position of the other leaders, but also asserts his own vital role to those who feel that they have no need of an apostle” (Carter 1997: 68).²⁴⁸

7.6. Conclusion

1 Corinthians 4:14-21 provides us with an extraordinary example of Paul's dependence on metaphors which are used in an appropriate and timely manner to overcome the problems of authority and factionalism within the church at Corinth. The passage itself is the culmination of his argument in 1:10-4:21. In order to address a challenging

²⁴⁷ Welborn (1987: 89) also notes Paul call to unity begins at 1:10.

²⁴⁸ For a similar view see Lassen (1991: 135).

situation in which Paul seeks to re-establish his authority over the entire community, including those who were spawning factionalism, Paul turns to an extended household metaphorical structure, in which he takes the role of the father of the household. Paul thus draws on the dominant cultural understanding of the role of a father and his relationship to his children within the social and cultural context of antiquity. This chapter has shown that the father-children metaphor enables Paul to issue powerful claims about his position vis-à-vis the Corinthians, which would have been difficult to make without the use of a metaphor. The metaphor itself is ideologically pregnant since it dissimulates Paul's real relationship with the Corinthians, a relationship that was both complex and contested. Paul presents himself as an authoritative and powerful father-like figure in relation to the Corinthian Christians, in order to address the divisions that certain Corinthian Christians had initiated within the church. He bases his assertions pertaining to hierarchical power on the fact that he is the first and senior leader of the Corinthian church. As his beloved children, Paul exhorts and educates the Corinthian Christians to imitate his ways in Christ, and thereby explains that it is of no use to imitate other leaders who carry roles of mere disciplinarians or guides of the Corinthian church. Thus, Paul, as an authoritative father, places the other leaders at a lower level and emphasises that he is their real leader, and that the Corinthian Christians need to imitate him and follow his instruction. Indirectly, Paul shames the 'puffed up' for their allegiance to other leaders. The various leaders are to be viewed as guardians in a father-guardian relationship and are thus to be viewed as being subordinate to him. Paul directly and sternly warns them that he would use the rod to correct them if needed.

Thus, rhetorically Paul seeks to force the Corinthian Christians to accept his redescription of their reality. He rhetorically seeks to motivate them to realise that they need to acknowledge him as their only true leader in Christ, and that they are to imitate him and the ways in Christ that he had already taught them. Such teaching would help them to avoid further divisions caused by the Corinthian elite in boasting of their respective apostles having eloquence and power. The father metaphor, then, as the symbol of unity paves the way for the Corinthian Christians, especially the 'puffed up', to reconstruct their reality. The symbol also works well for Paul to re-establish and sustain his domination in the Corinthian church.

CONCLUSION

Having discovered that Paul predominately uses complex metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4 as a means of responding to issues concerning lines of authority and factionalism within the Corinthian church community, we have sought to understand the motivation for the use of these various complex metaphors. We have discovered in the second chapter, that the background to Paul's rhetoric provides vital clues to enable an understanding of the text. To that end, the socio-cultural patterns of behaviour in antiquity and a rhetorical construction of 1:10-4:21 have portrayed the importance of status levels within society. Using this information we appreciate how certain church members, mainly the elite, were impressed upon by social norms to such an extent that they concentrated much energy on elevating themselves socially as was achieved in civic society in antiquity. These Corinthians seemed to be consumed with gaining and sustaining assumed levels of social prominence within the church community. They chose to identify church leaders whom they thought exhibited the highest and most impressive level of sophistic rhetoric in their preaching styles, since sophistic rhetoric was highly regarded in the ancient world. This seems to have resulted in their judgement of Paul's preaching as being less socially impressive than the preaching of others, such as Apollos, which then led to dissensions and smaller groups being formed in which each group followed a particular leader. Furthermore, the desire for status comparable to that within secular society drove those Corinthians to strive against each other in their attempt to gain the highest societal level in the eyes of the church community as a subsection of the ancient society. This need for social recognition was exacerbated by the intense rivalry amongst the groups to such an extent that jealousy amongst the groups led to demonstrations of pride concerning the various leaders based on their seemingly impressive oratory styles. Moreover, the system of patronage and honour, linked to status levels, highlighted the church members' drive to be viewed as socially prominent within the church community. These factors led to the denigration of Paul's original and legitimate position of power and authority.

Paul, consequently, had to deal with the abstract concepts of his authority and power to shape the community, which he did by means of complex household and temple metaphors, since these enable Paul to shift from known ideas and familiar concepts to unknown ideas and unfamiliar concepts. By means of these complex metaphors, Paul seeks to re-construct the church community's sense of reality, thereby offering a new set of goals. The text gives the impression that Paul's choice of metaphors resulted in an effective manner of responding to the issues within the church community. Although current scholarship has neglected to locate the need for a particular theory of interpretation whereby Paul's metaphors are to be examined and appreciated, this thesis has sought to suggest such a theory as well as demonstrating the application of this theory pertaining to a number of complex metaphors in the Pauline text. In view of discovering a workable theory of interpretation, in the first chapter, the history of metaphors is portrayed, beginning in antiquity and moving into contemporary literature. It became apparent that most writers neglected to appreciate the significance of metaphors in cognitive linguistics and thought and reason. From the 20th century onwards, records show a marked increase pertaining to research on metaphors and theories required for the interpretation of metaphors. Within this thesis, the combination of the blending theory, socio-rhetorical analysis and Thompson's mode of operation of ideology proves to be crucial for an interpretation of the various Pauline complex metaphors located in 1 Corinthians 3-4. Socio-rhetorical analysis, which deals with the social and cultural textures of texts, supports the blending theory, since it greatly assisted in the identification of categories of the source domains and target domains located within the complex metaphors, as well as having provided a useful socio-cultural context to Paul's rhetoric.

Although certain metaphors, such as the highly structured household and building metaphors, can be described as structural metaphors, the Pauline metaphors can be defined as complex metaphors. The various layers within the rhetoric show different comparisons between what is mentioned and the current situation that requires Paul's response. For example, the source domain taken from the household and building complex metaphors is blended onto the target domain, which is the relationship between Paul and his converts. In this instance, Paul creates a platform from which he can re-establish his authority over the community in order to address the factious Corinthian elite. Paul continues by alluding to himself within the role of a mother, whereby he

treats the Corinthian Christians as a mother would treat her young and immature children. The application of this rhetorical strategy results in Paul's ideological shaming of the Corinthian Christians, especially the elite, who apparently had considered themselves as highly spiritual and thus holding positions of power within the church. Paul seeks to move them toward a place of subordination, while submitting to him as their ultimate human authority. Thus, Paul urges the Corinthian elite not to follow and be impressed by a sophistic gospel which they were incapable of evaluating at their current level of spiritual immaturity. Paul implores them to return to the initial level of Paul's proclamation of the gospel at the time of their conversion.

This pattern of applying metaphors in Paul's re-assertion of his authority over the entire Corinthian church community is continued in subsequent submetaphors (3:5-9b; 3:9c-17; 4:1-13 and 4:14-21) as examined in chapters 4-7. Using the sub-metaphors, master-servants, and planter-field, and one who waters-field where these relationships pertain to the complex household in antiquity, Paul established his authority over the Christians. Moreover, by the choice of the agricultural sub-metaphors, Paul demonstrates that even Apollos is subordinate to him in functional roles. This information serves to shame the elite who thought that Apollos was the superior leader and thus socially beneficial to follow. Nevertheless, Paul claims unity in the Corinthian church by stressing that both his and Apollos are co-workers and work for the Lord.

Likewise, Paul applies the master builder-builders submetaphor (3:9c-15), by which he illustrates that the commission of God to be the one to plant and establish the Corinthian church, ratifies his authority over the church, both during his presence and absence. Paul deftly moves the various church leaders in positions of submission to his own authority. Furthermore, Paul emphasises that other leaders function according to Paul's guidance since they had not been the ones spiritually to give birth to the Corinthian church as he had done. Therefore, the other leaders are to continue along the course of spiritual guidance and instruction set out by him and subsequently to avoid the socially impressive sophistic rhetoric in order to elude divine judgement as they grow as a community, which is also the temple of God (3:16-17). Similarly, Paul subverts the secular system of evaluating and judging fellow human beings by for example the ability of generating sophistic rhetoric, in his allusion to the counter-cultural gospel.

Paul continues his intention to reform the Corinthian church by selecting the complex temple metaphor (3:16-17) which is a continuation of the building metaphor in 3:9c-15. Through this temple submetaphor, Paul hones in on the elite's egocentric attitude by elucidating that the Corinthian Christians identity is the temple of God and that God's Spirit dwells in them. Consequently, the Corinthian Christians are to live holy lives. They are to maintain holiness and thus to avoid factious behaviour, not least to avoid damage/harm by God. This warning severely cautions the trouble makers and shames them into a re-consideration of their perceived social standing within the church, thereby urging them to preserve holiness and unity since they are collectively the temple of God.

Using the master-servants and stewards submetaphor (4:1-13) Paul elevates his own level of authority over the level assumed to be held by the various other leaders. He asserts that he serves a superior master, Jesus Christ, which provides him with an inaccessible position in that he cannot be judged by fellow humans of any social status, since only his own and exclusive master, Jesus Christ, can hold him accountable. Paul thus lays claim to a superior status, based on his alleged trustworthiness in the ministry, for example in the management and supervision of the Corinthian church. Based on Paul's position of authority, the Christians are shown as having no recourse but to respect his level of authority, particularly since he had initially proclaimed the crucified Christ, which is a message of unity. Paul pleads with the elite to refrain from their jealous inter-group striving and power struggles, so that God would not judge them.

Lastly, with the father-children submetaphor (4:14-21) which can be classified as a complex metaphor and as one of the most important relationships of the household, Paul demonstrates the authenticity of his authority over the church. He shows the church community that he had become their spiritual father at the moment of their acceptance of the gospel that he had proclaimed. Therefore Paul legitimately regards the Corinthian Christians as his spiritual children, whereby he wields the hierarchical power attributed to the initial and "senior pastor" of the Corinthian church. As their authoritative spiritual father, Paul reacts to the alleged factionalism by discrediting the other leaders, and by emphasising that as their authentic and ultimate human leader, the Corinthian Christians ought to imitate him and follow his instructions. Paul addresses the dissension amongst the church community by shaming the 'puffed up' Corinthians due to their allegiance to the various other leaders. He explains that these leaders function as guardians in a

father-guardian relationship and are subordinate to him. Paul demonstrates his authority directly and sternly by warning the dissenters that he would resort to corporal punishment if necessary. Therefore, the father metaphor enables the Corinthian Christians, particularly the elite, to re-construct their reality in Paul's terms and to return to unity, while strengthening Paul's authority over the Christian community at Corinth.

In sum, Paul's use of complex metaphors enables him to address the issue of factionalism as well as providing a means to ideologically re-establish and sustain his authority and domination over the Corinthian church community. This is illustrated by Paul's ability to take a decision in 5:1ff, with respect to some of the Corinthian Christians factious behaviour in the church

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Primary Literature

- Antoninus, Marcus Aurelius (1916) *To Himself*, C. R. Haines (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Aristotle (1991) *History of Animals*, Books VII-X, D. M. Balme (tr.), Loeb Classical Library, Harvard University Press, London.
- _____. (1991) *On Rhetoric: a theory of civil discourse*, Newly translated with Introduction, Notes and Appendixes by George A. Kennedy. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- _____. (1926) *The 'Art' of Rhetoric*, John Henry Freese (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1926) *The Nicomachean Ethics*, H. Rackham (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1929) *The Physics*, Vol. I, Philip H. Wicksteed & Francis M. Cornford (trs.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1932) *The Politics*, H. Rackham (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1933) *The Generation of Animals*, A. L. Peck (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1933) *The Metaphysics*, Books I-IX, Hugh Tredennick (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1935) *The Eudemian Ethics*, H. Rackham (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1935) *The Magna Moralia*, G. Cyril Armstrong (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1936) *Minor Works: On Colours*, W. S. Hett (tr.), Loeb Classical Library, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1936) *Problems*, Vol. I, W. S. Hett (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1943) *Generation of Animals*, A. L. Peck (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.

- _____. (1945) *Parts of Animals*, A. L. Peck (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1966) *Posterior Analytics*, Hugh Tredennick (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1995 2nd ed.) *Poetics*, Stephen Halliwell (ed. & tr.), Loeb, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Cicero (1913) *De Officiis*, Walter Miller (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1928) *De re Publica*, Clinton Walker Keyes (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1939) *Brutus*, G. L. Hendrickson (tr.), Loeb, Cambridge: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1942) *De Oratore*, Books I & II, E. W. Sutton and H. Rackham (trs.), Loeb, Cambridge: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1942) *De Oratore*, Book III, together with *De Fato*, *Paradoxa Steicorum*, and *De Partitione Oratoria*, H. Rackham (tr.), Loeb, Cambridge: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1954, 1989 reprint) *Rhetorica Ad Herennium*, Harry Caplan (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1958) *The Speeches*, R. Gardner (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Demetrius (1995) *On Style*, Doreen C. Innes (ed. & tr.), Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Demosthenes (1926) *De Corona*, C. A. Vince & J. H. Vince (trs.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1935) *Against Androtion*, J. H. Vince (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1935) *Against Timocrates*, J. H. Vince (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1936) *Against Zenothemis*, A. T. Murray (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1939) *Against Polycles*, A. T. Murray (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1939) *Private Orations: Against Neaera*, Vol. III, A. T. Murray (tr.), Loeb Classical Library, London: William Heinemann.
- Dio Cassius Cocceianus (1914) *Roman History*, Vol. II, Earnest Cary (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1916) *Roman History*, Vol. IV, Earnest Cary (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1917) *Roman History*, Vol. V, Earnest Cary (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.

- _____. (1917) *Roman History*, Vol. VI, Earnest Cary (tr), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1924) *Roman History*, Vol. VII, Earnest Cary (tr), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Dio Chrysostom (1932) *Orationes*, Vol. I, J. W. Cohoon (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1939) *Orationes*, Vol. II, J. W. Cohoon (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1940) *Discourses*, Vol. III, J. W. Cohoon & H. Lamar Crosby (trs.), London: William Heinemann, Loeb.
- _____. (1951) *Orationes*, Vol. V, H. Lamar Crosby (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1956) *Orationes*, Vol. IV, H. Lamar Crosby (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1939) *The Roman Antiquities*, Vol. II, Earnest Cary (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1940) *The Roman Antiquities*, Vol. III, Earnest Cary (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1943) *The Roman Antiquities*, Vol. IV, Earnest Cary (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1945) *The Roman Antiquities*, Vol. V, Earnest Cary (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1947) *The Roman Antiquities*, Vol. VI, Earnest Carey (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1950) *The Roman Antiquities*, Vol. VII, Earnest Cary (tr.), Loeb Classical Library, London: William Heinemann.
- Epictetus (1926) *The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual, and Fragments*, Vol. I, W. A. Oldfather (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1928) *The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual, and Fragments*, Vol. I, W. A. Oldfather (tr), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1928) *The Discourses as Reported by Arrian, The Manual, and Fragments*, Vol. II, W. A. Oldfather (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Euripides (1935) *Ion*, Vol. IV, Arthur S. Way (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1995) *Hecuba*, David Kovacs (tr.), Loeb, London: Harvard University Press.

- _____. (1995) *Hippolytus*, David Kovacs (tr.), Loeb, London: Harvard University Press.
- Herodotus (1924) *Herodotus*, Vol. IV, A. D. Godley (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Isocrates (1929) *Antidosis*, Vol. II, George Norlin (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1990), *Panegyrius and to Nicholas*, S. Usher (ed. & tr.), Warminster: Aris & Phillips.
- Josephus (1934) *Jewish Antiquities*, Vol. V, H. St. J. Thackeray & R. Marcus (trs.), Loeb Classical Library, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1937) *Jewish Antiquities*, Vol. VI, R. Marcus (tr.), Loeb Classical Library, London: William Heinemann.
- Livy Titus Livius (1919) *Livy*, Vol. I, B. O. Foster (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1924) *Livy*, Vol. III, B. O. Foster (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1926) *Livy*, Vol. IV, B. O. Foster (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Philo Judeaus (1929) *The Sacrifices of Abel and Cain*, Vol. II, F. H. Colson & G. H. Whitaker (trs.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1930) *Philo*, Vol. III, F. H. Colson & G. H. Whitaker (trs.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1932) *Philo*, Vol. IV, F. H. Colson & G. H. Whitaker (trs.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1934) *On the Change of Names*, Vol. V, F. H. Colson & G. H. Whitaker (trs.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1935) *On Abraham*, Vol. VI, F. H. Colson (tr.), Loeb Classical Library, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1939) *On Rewards and Punishments*, Vol. VIII, F. H. Colson (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1941) *Philo*, Vol. IX, F. H. Colson (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Plato (1913) *Phaedrus*, W. R. M. Lamb (tr.), Loeb Classical Library, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1925) *Gorgias*, W. R. M. Lamb (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1925) *Politics*, Vol. III, Harold N. Fowler (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1926) *Laws*, Vol. I, R. G. Bury (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.

- _____. (1926) *Laws*, Vol. II, R. G. Bury (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1927) *Alcibiades I*, Vol. VIII, W. R. M. Lamb (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1930) *The Republic*, Vol. I, Paul Shorey (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1935) *The Republic*, Vol. II, Paul Shorey (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Plutarch, Mestrius (1914) *Plutarch's Lives: Lycurgus*, Vol. I, Bernadotte Perrin (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1914) *Plutarch's Lives: Lucullus*, Vol. II, Bernadotte Perrin (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1914) *Plutarch's Lives: Camillus*, Vol. II, Bernadotte Perrin (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1916) *Plutarch's Lives*, Vol. III, Bernadotte Perrin (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1916) *Plutarch's Lives: Sulla*, Vol. IV, Bernadotte Perrin (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1917) *Plutarch Lives: Marcellus*, Vol. V, Bernadotte Perrin (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1918) *Plutarch Lives*, Vol. VI, Bernadotte Perrin (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1919) *Plutarch's Lives: Demosthenes and Cicero, Alexander and Caesar*, Vol. VII, Bernadotte Perrin (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1920) *Plutarch Lives*, Vol. IX, Bernadotte Perrin (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1927) *Moralia*, Vol. I, Frank Cole Babbitt (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1928) *Moralia*, Vol. II, Frank Cole Babbitt (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1931) *Moralia*, Vol. III, Frank Cole Babbitt (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1936) *Moralia*, Vol. IV, Frank Cole Babbitt (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.

- _____. (1936) *Moralia: Old Men in Public Affairs*, Vol. IX, E. L. Minar, et al (trs.), Loeb Classical Library, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1936) *Moralia*, Vol. X, Harold North Fowler (tr.), Loeb, Cambridge: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1936) *Moralia: The Fortune of the Romans*, Vol. IV, Frank Cole Babbitt (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1939) *Moralia*, Vol. VI, William C. Helmbold (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1957) *Moralia*, Vol. XII, Harold Cherniss (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1959) *Moralia: On Compliancy*, Vol. VII, Phillip H. De Lacy & Benedict Einarson (trs.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1959) *Moralia: On Love of Wealth*, Vol. VII, Phillip H. De Lacy & Benedict Einarson (trs.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1976) *Moralia*, Vol. XIII, Harold Cherniss (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1976) *Moralia*, Vol. XIV, Benedict Einarson & Phillip H. De Lacy (trs.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Polybius (1922) *The Histories*, Vol. I, W. R. Paton (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1922) *The Histories*, Vol. II, W. R. Paton (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1923) *The Histories*, Vol. III, W. R. Paton (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1925) *The Histories*, Vol. IV, W. R. Paton (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Quintilian Marcus Fabius (1921) *The Institutio Oratoria*, Vol. I, H. E. Butler (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1922) *Institutio Oratoria*, Vol. III, H.E. Butler (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1922) *Institutio Oratoria*, Vol. IV, H. E. Butler (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1922) *Institutio Oratoria*, Vol. V, H.E. Butler (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.

- Seneca (1935) *Moral Essays*, Vol. III, John W. Basore (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Sophocles (1994) *Oedipus at Colonus*, Hugh Lloyd-Jones (tr.), Loeb, Cambridge & London: Harvard University Press.
- Strabo (1923) *The Geography of Strabo*, Vol. II, Horace Leonard Jones (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1927) *The Geography of Strabo*, Vol. IV, Horace Leonard Jones (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Suetonius (1924) *The Deified Augustus*, Vol. I, J. C. Rolfe (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Thucydides (1920) *Thucydides*, Vol. II, Charles Forster Smith (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1921) *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Vol. III, Charles Forster Smith (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1923) *History of the Peloponnesian War*, Vol. IV, Charles Forster Smith (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- Xenophon (1914) *Cyropaedia*, Vol. II, Walter Miller (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1921) *Anabasis*, Vol. I, Carleton L. Brownson (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1922) *Anabasis*, Vol. II, Carleton L. Brownson (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.
- _____. (1923) *Memorabilia and Oeconomicus*, E. C. Marchant (tr.), Loeb, London: William Heinemann.

Secondary Literature

- Amador, J. D. H. (2000) *Rediscovering and Re-inventing Rhetoric*, <http://home.earthlink.net/~thevoidboy/Reinvent.htm> (5 November 2000).
- Ascough, Richard S & Cotton, Charles A (2006) *Passionate Visionary: Leadership Lessons from the Apostle Paul*, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Aune, David E. (2003a) "Ethos" in David E. Aune (ed) *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, pp.169-173.

- _____. (2003b) "Pathos" in David E. Aune (ed) *The Westminster Dictionary of New Testament and Early Christian Literature and Rhetoric*, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox, pp. 339-342.
- Balch, David L. (2003) "Paul, Families, and Households" in J. Paul Sampley (ed.) *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, pp. 258-292.
- Balch, David L. (1981) *Let Wives Be Submissive: The Domestic Code in 1 Peter*, Chico, CA : Scholars Press.
- Barcelona, Antonio (2003) "Introduction: The Cognitive Theory of Metaphor and Metonymy" in Antonio Barcelona (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*, Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 1-28.
- Barclay, John M. G. (1992) "Thessalonica and Corinth: Social Contrasts in Pauline Christianity", *JSNT* 47, pp. 49-74.
- Barnett, Paul (2003) "Paul, Apologist of the Corinthians" in Trevor J. Burke & J. Keith Elliott (eds.) *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 313-326.
- Barrett, C. K. (1968, reprint 1987) *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Barton, S. (1982) "Paul and the Cross: a Sociological Approach", *Theology* 85, pp. 13-19.
- Bauer, Walter., Arndt, William F., Gingrich F. Wilbur and Danker Frederick W (1979) *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 2nd revised ed., Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Baur, F. C. (1831) "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz des petrinischen and paulinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche," *Tübinger Zeitschrift* 4, 61-206.
- Beardsley, Monroe C (1972) "The Metaphorical Twist" in Warren Shibles, *Essays on Metaphor*, Whitewater, Wisconsin: The Language Press.
- Bertram, G (1968) "παῖδα γωγο/φ," in Kittel, Gerhard & G. Friedrich (eds.), G. W. Bromiley (tr. & ed.), *TDNT* 5, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, pp. 596-625.
- Black, C. Clifton (1996) "Christ Crucified in Paul and in Mark: Reflections on an Intracanonial Conversation" in Eugene H. Lovering & Jerry L. Sumney (eds.) *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish*, Nashville, Tennessee: Abington, pp.184-206.

- Black, Max (1962) *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*, Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- _____. (1976 reprint) *Models and Metaphors: Studies in Language and Philosophy*, Ithaca & London: Cornell University Press.
- _____. (1993), 2nd ed., “More About Metaphor” in Andrew Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 19-41.
- Blass, F. & Debrunner, A. (1971) *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, tr. and rev. by Robert W. Funk, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Bradley, K. R. (1991) “Remarriage and the Structure of the Upper-Class Roman Family” in Rawson, Beryl (ed.) *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, Humanities Research Centre; Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 79-98.
- Brant, Jo-Ann A. (1993) “The Place of *mimēsis* in Paul’s Thought”, *SR* 22, pp. 285-300.
- “Breastfeeding and Maternal and Infant Health Outcomes in Developed Countries.” (April 2007) <http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/tp/brfouttp.htm>.
- Braxton, Brad Ronnell (2000) *The Tyranny of Resolution: 1 Corinthians 7:17-24*, SBLDS 181, Atlanta: SBL.
- Bremmer, Jan N (1994) *Greek Religion, Greece & Rome: New Surveys in the Classics* No. 24, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buck, C. D. (1955) *Greek Dialects*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burford, Alison (1972) *Craftsmen in Greek and Roman Society*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- Burke, Trevor (2003) “Paul’s Role as ‘Father’ to his Corinthian ‘Children’ in Socio-Historical Context (1 Corinthians 4:14-21)” in *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall*, Trevor J. Burke & J. Keith Elliott (eds.), Leiden: Brill, pp. 95-113.
- Byrne, Brendan (1987) “Ministry and Maturity in 1 Corinthians 3”, *ABR*, Vol. 35, pp. 83-87.
- Carter, Timothy L (1997) “‘Big Men’ in Corinth”, *JSNT* 66, 45-71.
- Cary, M. J & Haarhoff, T. J (1940) *Life and Thought in the Greek and Roman World*, London: Methuen.
- Carson, Donald A (1993) *The Cross and Christian Ministry: An Exposition of Passages from 1 Corinthians*, Grand Rapids: Inter-Varsity Press.

- Castelli, Elizabeth A. (1991) *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power*, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster/John Knox Press.
- Chester, Stephen J. (2003) *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church*, London & New York: T & T Clark.
- Chow, John K. (1992) *Patronage and Power: A Study of Social Networks in Corinth*, JSNT Supplementary Series 75, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Clarke, Andrew. D. (1993) *Secular and Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-historical and Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1–6*. AGJU 18. Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Collins, Raymond F. (1999) *First Corinthians*, Sacra Pagina Series 7, Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press.
- Conzelmann, Hans (1975) *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, James W. Leitch (tr.), George W. MacRae (ed.), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress.
- Corbier, Mireille (1991) "Constructing Kinship in Rome: Marriage and Divorce, Filiation and Adoption", in David I. Kertzer & Richard P. Saller (eds.) *The Family in Italy: From Antiquity to the Present*, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, pp. 127-144.
- Crocker, Cornelia Cyss (2004) *Reading 1 Corinthians in the Twenty-First Century*, London: T & T Clark.
- Crocker, J. Christopher (1977) "The Social Functions of Rhetorical Forms" in J. David Sapir and J. Christopher Crocker (eds.) *The Social Use of Metaphor: Essays on the Anthropology of Rhetoric*, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Danesi, Marcel (2004) *Poetic Logic: The Role of Metaphor in Thought, Language, and Culture*, Madison, Wisconsin: Atwood Publishing.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. (1997) "Paul as Master-builder", *EQ*, 69:2, pp. 129-137.
- DeSilva, David A. (2000) *Honor, Patronage, Kinship and Purity: Unlocking New Testament Culture*, Downers Grove, Illinois: InterVarsity.
- Dixon, Suzanne (1992) *The Roman Family*, Baltimore and London: John Hopkins University Press.
- Driven, René (1985) "Metaphor as a Basic Means for Extending the Lexicon" in René Driven and Wolf Paprotté (eds.) *The Ubiquity of Metaphor: Metaphor in Language and Thought*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins, pp. 85-119.

- Eriksson, Anders (2001) "Fear of Eternal Damnation: Pathos Appeal in 1 Corinthians 15 & 16," in Thomas H. Olbricht & Jerry L. Sumney (eds.) *Paul and Pathos*, Atlanta, Georgia: SBL, pp. 115-126.
- Eyben, Emiel (1991) "Fathers and Sons" in Beryl Rawson (ed.) *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, Humanities Research Centre, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 114-143.
- Fauconnier, Giles & Turner, Mark (2003a) *Metaphor, Metonymy, and Binding*, in Antonia Barcelona (ed.), "Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective", Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 133-145.
- Fauconnier, Giles & Turner, Mark (2003b) *The Way We Think: Conceptual Blending and the Mind's Hidden Complexities*, New York: Basic Books.
- Fee, Gordon D. (1987) *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Fernandez, James W. (1977) "The Performance of Ritual Metaphors" in J. David Sapir and J. Christopher Crocker (eds.) *The Social Use of Metaphor: Essays on the Anthropology of Rhetoric*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 100-131.
- Feyaerts, Kurt (2003) "Refining the Inheritance Hypothesis: Interaction between metaphoric and metonymic hierarchies" in Antonio Barcelona (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*, Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 59-78.
- Fiore, Benjamin S. J. (1985) "'Covert Allusion' in 1 Corinthians 1-4", *CBQ* 47, pp. 85-102.
- _____. (2003) "Paul, Exemplification, and Imitation" in J. Paul Sampley (ed.) *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, pp. 228-257.
- Fiorenza, Elisabeth Schüssler (1987), "Rhetorical Situation and Historical Reconstruction in 1 Corinthians", *NTS* 33, pp. 386-403.
- Fishburne, C. W. (1970) "1 Cor. 3:10-15 and the Testament of Abraham", *NTS* 17, pp. 109-115.
- Fitzgerald, John T. (1988) *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence*, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.

- _____. (2003) "Paul and Friendship," in J. Paul Sampley (ed.) *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, pp. 319-343.
- Forbes, Hamish & Foxhall, Lin (1995) "Ethnoarchaeology and Storage in the Ancient Mediterranean: Beyond Risk and Survival," in John Wilkins, David Harvey & Mike Dobson (eds.), *Food in Antiquity*, Exeter: University of Exeter, pp. 69-86.
- Forbes, Christopher (2003) "Paul and Rhetorical Comparison," in J. Paul Sampley (ed.) *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, pp. 134-171.
- Ford, J. M. (1973/74) "You Are God's 'Sukkah' (1 Cor. 3:10-17)", *NTS* 21, pp.139-142.
- Furnish, V P (1990) "Belonging to Christ: A Paradigm for Ethics in First Corinthians", *Int.* 44, pp. 145-157.
- Gardner, Jane F. & Wiedemann, Thomas (1991) *The Roman Household: A Sourcebook*, London: Routledge.
- Gardner, Jane F. (1997) "Legal Stumbling-Blocks for Lower-Class Families in Rome" in Beryl Rawson & Paul Weaver (eds.) *The Roman Family in Italy: Status, Sentiment, Space*, Humanities Research Centre, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 35-54.
- Gardner, P. D. (1994) *The Gifts of God and the Authentication of a Christian: An Exegetical Study of 1 Cor. 8-11:1*, New York: University Press of America.
- Garland, David E. (2003) *1 Corinthians*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Baker Academic.
- Garnsey, Peter & Saller, Richard (1987) *The Roman Empire: Economy, Society and Culture*, London: Duckworth.
- Garnsey, Peter (1991) "Child Rearing in Ancient Italy" in David I. Kertzer & Richard P. Saller (eds.) *The Family in Italy: From Antiquity to the Present*, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press, pp. 48-65.
- Garnsey, Peter (1999) *Food and Society in Classical Antiquity*, Cambridge: Cambridge.
- Gartner, B. (1965) *The Temple and the Community in Qumran and the New Testament*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts (1996) "Mother's Milk and Ministry in 1 Corinthians 3" in Eugene H. Lovering, Jr. & Jerry L. Sumney (eds.), *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish*, Nashville, Tennessee: Abington Press, pp. 101-113.

- _____. (2004) "Our Mother St. Paul: Towards the Recovery of a Neglected Theme," in Amy-Jill Levine & Marianne Blickenstaff (eds.) *A Feminist Companion to Paul*, London & New York: T & T Clark.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. & Gerrig, Richard J. (1989) "How Context Makes Metaphor Comprehension Seem 'Special'", *Metaphor and Symbolic Activity* 4, pp. 145-158.
- Gibbs, Raymond W. (1994) *The Poetics of Mind: Figurative Thought, Language, and Understanding*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Given, Mark D. (2001) *Paul's True Rhetoric: Ambiguity, Cunning, and Deception in Greece and Rome*, Emory Studies in Early Christianity, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press.
- Glucksberg, Sam and Keysar, Boaz (1993) 2nd ed., "How Metaphors Work" in Andrew Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 401-424.
- Goatly, Andrew (1997) *The Language of Metaphors*, London: Routledge.
- Hainz, Josef (1972) *Ekklesia*, Münchener Universitäts-Schriften: Katholisch-Theologische Fakultät. Regensburg: Verlag Friedrich Pustet.
- Hallett, Judith P. (1984) *Fathers and Daughters in Roman Society: Women and the Elite Family*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Hawkes, Terence (1972) *Metaphor*, London: Methuen & Co Ltd.
- Hester, James (1994) "Re-discovering and Re-inventing Rhetoric", *Scriptura* 50, pp.1-22.
- Hollander, H. W. (1994) "The Testing by fire of the Builder's works: 1 Cor. 3:10-15", *NTS* 40, pp. 89-104.
- Holmberg, Bengt (1980) *Paul and Power: The Structure of Authority in the Primitive Church as Reflected in the Pauline Epistles*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress.
- Horrell, David G. (1996) *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*, Edinburgh: T & T Clark.
- Horsley, Richard A. (1998) *1 Corinthians*, Nashville, Tennessee: Abington Press.
- Hunt, Allen R. (1996) *The Inspired Body: Paul, the Corinthians, and Divine Inspiration*, Macon, Georgia: Mercer University Press.
- Hurd, John Coolidge (1965) *The Origins of 1 Corinthians*, London: SPCK.

- Hyldahl, Niels (1991) "The Corinthian 'Parties' and the Corinthian Crisis", *Studia Theologica* 45, pp. 19-32.
- Ibáñez, Francisco José Ruiz de Mendoza (2003) "The Role of Mappings and Domains in Understanding Metonymy," in Antonia Barcelona (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*, Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 109-132.
- Isager, Signe & Skydsgaard, Jens Erik (1992) *Ancient Greek Agriculture: An Introduction*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Käsemann, Ernst (1966) *New Testament Questions of Today*, London: SCM.
- Keck, Leander E. (1996) "The Accountable Self" in Eugene H. Lovering & Jerry L. Sumney (eds.) *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish*, Nashville, Tennessee: Abington, pp. 1-13.
- Kennedy, George A. (1991) "Supplementary Essays." in *Aristotle On Rhetoric: a theory of civil discourse*. Newly translated with Introduction, Notes and Appendixes by George A. Kennedy. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 299-312.
- _____. (1994) *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*, Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Kent, John H. (1966) *Corinth – The Inscriptions, 1926-1950: Results VIII*, Part III, Princeton, New Jersey: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Ker, Donald P. (2000) "Paul and Apollos – Colleagues or Rivals", *JSNT* 77, pp. 75-97.
- Kitzberger, Ingrid (1986) *Bau der Gemeinde: Das paulinische Wortfeld*, Forschung zur Bibel, Würzburg: Echter.
- Klauck, Hans-Josef (1984) *1. Korintherbrief*, Die Neue Echter Bibel, Würzburg: Echter.
- König, Alice (2006) "Technical Writing," in Edward Bispham, Thomas Harrison & Brian A. Sparkes (eds.) in *The Edinburgh Companion to Ancient Greece and Rome*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University, pp. 439-444.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2000) "The Scope of Metaphor" in Antonio Barcelona (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective*, Berlin: De Gruyter, pp. 79-92.
- Kövecses, Zoltán (2002) *Metaphor: Practical Introduction*, Oxford: Oxford.
- Lacey, W. K. (1968) *The Family in Classical Greece*, London: Thames and Hudson.
- _____. (1986) "Patria Potestas," in Beryl Rawson (ed.) *The Family in Ancient Rome: New Perspectives*, Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.

- Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark (1980, 2003) *Metaphors We Live By*, Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press.
- Lakoff, George (1993) 2nd ed., "The Contemporary Theory of Metaphor" in Andrew Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- _____. (1996) *Moral Politics: What Conservatives Know That Liberals Don't*, Chicago, Illinois: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lampe, Peter (1990) "Theological Wisdom and the 'Word About the Cross': The Rhetorical Scheme in 1 Corinthians 1-4", *Int* 44, pp. 117-131.
- _____. (2003) "Paul, Patrons, and Clients," in J. Paul Sampley (ed.) *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, pp. 488-523.
- Lanci, John R (1997) *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*, New York: Peter Lang.
- Lassen, Eva M (1991) "The Use of the Father Image in Imperial Propaganda and 1 Corinthians 4: 14-21", *TynBul* 42, 127-136.
- _____. (1997) "The Roman Family: Ideal and Metaphor" in Halvor Moxnes (ed.) *Constructing Early Christian Families*, New York: Routledge, pp. 103-120.
- Liddell, Henry George and Scott, Robert (1968) *A Greek-English Lexicon: with a Supplement*. Revised and augmented by Henry Stuart Jones. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Litfin, Daune (1994) *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Greco-Roman rhetoric*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lüdemann, Gerd (1989) *Opposition to Paul in Jewish Christianity*, M. Eugene Boring (tr.), Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress.
- Lütgert, Wilhelm (1908) *Freiheitspredigt und Schwärmgeister in Korinth: Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik der Christuspartie*, Gütersloh: Bertelsmann.
- Mack, Burton L (1990) *Rhetoric and the New Testament*, Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Malina, Bruce J & Neyrey, Jerome H (1996) *Portraits of Paul: An Archaeology of Ancient Personality*, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox.
- Malina, Bruce J & Pilch, John J (2006) *Social Science Commentary on the Letters of Paul*, Minneapolis: Fortress Press.
- Malina, Bruce J. & Rohrbaugh, Richard L. (2003) 2nd ed., *Social-Science Commentary on the Synoptic Gospels*, Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress.

- Malina, Bruce J. (1993a) "Love" in John J. Pilch & Bruce J. Malina (eds.) *Biblical Social Values and their Meaning: A Handbook*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, pp. 127-130.
- _____. (1996) *Portraits of Paul: An Archaeology of Ancient Personality*, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster.
- _____. (1993b) "Grace/Favor" in John J. Pilch and Bruce J. Malina (eds.) *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning: A Handbook*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, pp. 83-86.
- Marshall, Peter (1987) *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians*, Tübingen: Mohr.
- Martin, Dale B (1990) *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- _____. (1995) *The Corinthian Body*, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- McFague, Sallie (1982, reprint 1985) *Metaphorical Theology: Models of God in Religious Language*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress Press.
- McKelvey, R. J. (1969) *The New Temple: The Church in the New Testament*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Meeks, Wayne A. (1983) *First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*, New Haven, Connecticut: Yale University Press.
- Merk, Otto (1968) *Handeln Aus Glauben: Die Motivierungen der Paulinischen Ethik*, Marburg: N.G. Elwert Verlag.
- Merklein, Helmut (1992) *Der erste Brief an die Korinther: Kapitel 1-4*, Ökumenischer Taschenbuchkommentar zum Neuen Testament, Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus and Mohn & Würzburg: Echter.
- Michel, O. (1968) "οἰκοδομεῖω", in Kittel, Gerhard & G. Friedrich (eds.), G. W. Bromiley (tr. & ed.), *TDNT* 5, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, pp. 136-144.
- Mikalson, Jon D. (1987) *Athenian Popular Religion*, Chapel Hill, North Carolina: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. (1991) *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster & John Knox Press.
- _____. (2003) "Why Family Matters for Early Christian Literature," in David L. Balch & Carolyn Osiek (eds.) *Early Christian Families in Context: An Interdisciplinary Dialogue*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, pp. 345-358.

- Moffatt, James (1938) *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, New York & London: Harper and Brothers.
- Morris, Leon (1958) *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, Tyndale New Testament Commentaries, Grand Rapids: Eerdmans.
- Moulton, James H, Howard, and Turner (1929) *The Vocabulary of the Greek New Testament Illustrated from Papyri and Other Nonliterary Sources*, London: Hodder & Stoughton.
- Muller, Hans-Friedrich (2002) *Roman Religion in Valerius Maximus*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Munck, Johannes (1959) *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*, Frank Clark (tr.), Richmond, Virginia: John Knox.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome (1983) *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*, Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier.
- _____. (1996) *Paul: A Critical Life*, Oxford: Clarendon.
- Newmark, Peter "The Translation of Metaphor" in René Driven and Wolf Paprotté (eds.) (1985) *The Ubiquity of Metaphor: Metaphor in Language and Thought*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins, pp. 295-326.
- Neyrey, Jerome H. (1990) *Paul, in Other Words: A Cultural Reading of His Letters*, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster & John Knox.
- _____. (1993a) "Deception" in John J. Pilch and Bruce J. Malina (eds.) *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning: A Handbook*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, pp. 38-42.
- _____. (1993b) "Group Orientation" in John J. Pilch and Bruce J. Malina (eds.) *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning: A Handbook*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, pp. 88-91.
- _____. (1993c) "Wholeness," in John J. Pilch and Bruce J. Malina (eds.) *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning: A Handbook*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, pp. 180-184.
- Nock, Arthur Darby (1972) "Soter and Euergetes" in *Essays on Religion and the Ancient World*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- North, John A. (2000) *Roman Religion, Greece & Rome: New Surveys in the Classics* 30, Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Nöth, Winfried (1985) "Semiotic Aspects of Metaphor" in René Driven and Wolf Paprotté (eds.), *The Ubiquity of Metaphor: Metaphor in Language and Thought*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins, pp.1-16.
- Olbricht, Thomas H. (2001) "*Pathos* as Proof in Greco-Roman Rhetoric" in Thomas H. Olbricht & Jerry L. Sumney (eds.), *Paul and Pathos*, Atlanta, Georgia: SBL, pp. 7-22.
- Ortony, Andrew; Reynolds, Ralph E. & Arter, Judith A (1978) "Metaphor: Theoretical and Empirical Research", *Psychological Bulletin* 85, pp. 919-943.
- Osiek, Carolyn & Balch, David L. (1997) *Families in the New Testament World: Household and House Churches*, Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster & John Knox.
- Paivio, Allan and Walsh, Mary (1993) 2nd ed., "Psychological Processes in Metaphor Comprehension and Memory," in Andrew Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 307-328.
- Parker, Robert (1983) *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in early Greek Religion*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Perelman, C. & Olbrechts-Tyteca, L. (1969) *The New Rhetoric: A Treatise on Argumentation*, John Wilkinson and Purcell Weaver (trs.), Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Pfammatter, Josef (1960) *Die Kirche Als Bau: Eine Exegetisch-theologische Studie zur Ekklesiologie der Paulusbriefe*, Series Facultatis Theologicae 110. Roma: Libreria Editrice Dell'Universita Gregoriana.
- Pickett, Raymond (1997) *The Cross in Corinth: The Social Significance of the Death of Jesus*, JSNTS 143, Sheffield: Sheffield.
- Pilch, John J. (1993), "'Beat His Ribs While He Is Young' (Sir. 30.12): A Window on the Mediterranean World", *BTB* 23, pp. 101-113.
- Plank, Karl A. (1987) *Paul and the Irony of Affliction*, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Plevnik, Joseph (1993) "Honor/Shame" in John J. Pilch and Bruce J. Malina (eds.) *Biblical Social Values and Their Meaning: A Handbook*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, pp. 95-104.
- Pobjoy, Mark (2006) "The Roman Republic," in Edward Bispham, Thomas Harrison & Brian A. Sparkes (eds.) in *The Edinburgh Companion to Ancient Greece and Rome*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University, pp. 102-107.

- Pogoloff, S. M. (1992) *Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians*, SBLDS 134, Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Price, Simon (1999) *Religions of the Ancient Greeks*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Purcell, Nicholas (2006) "Landscape," in Edward Bispham, Thomas Harrison & Brian A. Sparkes (eds.) in *The Edinburgh Companion to Ancient Greece and Rome*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University, pp. 123-134.
- "Questions and answers about breastfeeding" (May 2005)
<http://www.4woman.gov/breastfeeding/index.cfm?page=QandA>.
- Radden, Günter (2003) "How metonymic are metaphors?" in Antonio Barcelona (ed.), *Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: a Cognitive Perspective*, Berlin & New York: De Gruyter, pp. 93-108.
- Ramsaran, Rollin A. (1996) *Liberating Words: Paul's Use of Rhetorical Maxims in 1 Corinthians 1-10*, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press.
- _____. (2003) "Paul and Maxims" in J. Paul Sampley (ed.) *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, pp. 429-456.
- Ramsey, Ian T. (1972) "Models and Mystery" in Warren Shibles, *Essays on Metaphor*, Whitewater, Wisconsin: The Language Press.
- Rawson, Beryl (1991) *Adult-Child Relationship in Roman Society*, in Beryl Rawson (ed.) *Marriage, Divorce, and Children in Ancient Rome*, Humanities Research Centre; Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 7-30.
- Reddy, Michael J. (1993) 2nd ed., "The Conduit Metaphor: A Case of Frame Conflict in Our Language about Language" in Andrew Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 164-201.
- Reese, James M. (1993, 1998 reprint) "Obedience" in John J. Pilch & Bruce J. Malina (eds.) *Biblical Social Values and their Meaning: a Handbook*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson, pp. 142-143.
- Rengstorff (1972) "ὕ(πηρετηφ," Kittel, Gerhard & G. Friedrich (eds.), G. W. Bromiley (tr & ed), *TDNT*, Vol. 8, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans, pp. 530-544.
- Reumann, J. (1958) "Stewards of God – Pre-Christian Religious Application of *OIKONOMOS* in Greek", *JBL* 77, pp. 339-349.
- _____. (1966-67) "Οἰκονομι/α - Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan Heilsgeschichte", *NTS* 13, pp.147-67.
- Rhyne, C. Thomas (1990) "1 Corinthians 3:1-9", *Interpretation*, Vol. 44, pp. 174-179.

- Richards, I. A. (1936) *The Philosophy of Rhetoric*, Oxford: OUP.
- Ricoeur, Paul (1975), "The Metaphorical Process," *Semeia* 4, pp.75-106.
- Ridderbos, Herman (1977) *Paul: An Outline of His Theology*, J. R. De Witt (tr.), London: SPCK.
- Robbins, Vernon K. (1994) "Socio-Rhetorical Criticism: Mary, Elizabeth and the Magnificent as a Test Case", in Edgar V. McKnight and Elizabeth S. Malbon, *The New Literary Criticism and the New Testament*, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, pp. 164-209.
- _____. (1996a) *Exploring the Texture of Texts: A Guide to Socio-Rhetorical Interpretation*, Valley Forge, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press.
- _____. (1996b) *The Tapestry of Early Christian Discourse*, London & New York: Routledge.
- Roon, R V (1974) "The Relation Between Christ and the Wisdom of God According to Paul," *NovT* 16, pp. 207-239.
- Saller, Richard P. (1994, reprint 1996) *Patriarchy, Property and Death in the Roman Family*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Saller, Richard P. (1982) *Personal Patronage under the Early Empire*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Salmon, E. T. (1969) *Roman Colonization under the Republic*, London: Thames & Hudson.
- Sampley, J. Paul (1996) "Reasoning From the Horizons of Paul's Thought World: A Comparison of Galatians and Philippians" in Eugene H. Lovering & Jerry L. Sumney (eds.) *Theology and Ethics in Paul and His Interpreters: Essays in Honor of Victor Paul Furnish*, Nashville, Tennessee: Abington, pp.114-131.
- _____. (2003a) (ed.) *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press.
- _____. (2003b) "Paul and Frank Speech" in J. Paul Sampley (ed.) *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, pp. 293-318.
- Sapir, David J. (1977) "The Anatomy of Metaphor" in J. David Sapir and J. Christopher Crocker (eds.) *The Social Use of Metaphor: Essays on the Anthropology of Rhetoric*, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press, pp. 3-32.

- Schmithals, Walter (1971) *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians*, ET, John E. Steely, Nashville, Tennessee & New York: Abington Press.
- Schneider, Norbert (1970) *Die Rhetorische Eigenart der Paulinischen Antithese*, Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Schön, Donald A. (1993) 2nd ed., "Generative Metaphor: A Perspective on Problem-Setting in Social Policy" in Andrew Ortony (ed.) *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 137-163.
- Schrage, Wolfgang (1991) *Der erste Brief an die Korinther (1 Kor 1,1-6,11)*, Evangelisch-katholischer Kommentar zum Neuen Testament VII/1, Neukirchen-Vluyn: Benziger & Neukirchener Verlag.
- Searle, John R. (1993) 2nd ed., "Metaphor" in Andrew Ortony (ed.), *Metaphor and Thought*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 83-111.
- Shanor, J (1988), "Paul as Master Builder. Construction Terms in First Corinthians", *NTS* 34, pp. 461-71.
- Shelton, Jo-Ann (1988) *As The Romans Did: A Source Book in Roman Social History*, New York: Oxford.
- Smit, Joop F. M. (2002) "'What is Apollos? What is Paul?' In Search for the Coherence of First Corinthians 1:10-4:21", *NovT* 44, pp. 231-251.
- Soskice, Janet Martin (1985, reprint 1987) *Metaphor and Religious Language*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Spicq, Ceslas (1994) *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*, Vol. I, James D. Ernest (tr.), Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Strüder, Christof W. (2003) "Preferences Not Parties: The Background of 1 Cor 1,12", *Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses* 79, pp. 431-455.
- Stamps, D. L. (1995) "Rhetorical Criticism of the News Testament: Ancient and Modern Evaluations of Argumentation" in Stanley E. Porter and David Tombs. *Approaches to New Testament Study*, JSNTS 120, Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, pp. 129-169.
- Sterling, Gregory E. (1995) "'Wisdom Among the Perfect: Creation Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism and Corinthian Christianity", *NovT*, 37, pp. 355-384.
- Stevenson, T. R. (1992) "The Ideal Benefactor and the Father Analogy in Greek and Roman Thought", *Classical Quarterly* 42, pp. 421-436.

- Stuhlmacher, P. (1987) "The Hermeneutical significance of 1 Cor. 2:6-16," in P. Stuhlmacher (ed.) *Tradition and Interpretation in the New Testament*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Theissen, Gerd (1982) *The Social Settings of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*, John H. Schütz (tr.), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress.
- _____. (1987) *Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology*, John P. Calvin (tr.), Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: Fortress.
- Thiselton, Anthony C. (2000) *The First Epistle to the Corinthians: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Thompson, John B. (1984) *Studies in the Theory of Ideology*, Cambridge: Polity.
- _____. (1990) *Ideology and Modern Culture: Critical Social Theory in the Era of Mass Communication*, Oxford: Polity Press.
- _____. (1994) "Communication and Power: A response to some Criticisms", *S. Afr. J. Philos.* 13, pp. 133-140.
- Traugott, Elizabeth Closs (1985) "'Conventional' and 'Dead' Metaphors Revisited" in René Driven and Wolf Paprotté (eds.) *The Ubiquity of Metaphor: Metaphor in Language and Thought*, Amsterdam & Philadelphia, Pennsylvania: John Benjamins, pp. 17-56.
- Turner, Mark & Fauconnier, Gilles (2003) *Metaphor, Metonymy, and Binding*, in Antonia Barcelona (ed.), "Metaphor and Metonymy at the Crossroads: A Cognitive Perspective", Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 133-145.
- Tyler, Ronald L. (1998) "First Corinthians 4:6 and Hellenistic Pedagogy", *CBQ* 60, pp. 97-103.
- Vanhoozer, Kevin J. (1990) *Biblical Narrative in the Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur: A Study in Hermeneutics and Theology*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vickers, Brian (1988) *In Defence of Rhetoric*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Wagner, Ross J. (1998) "'Not Beyond The Things Which Are Written': A Call to Boast Only in The Lord (1 Cor. 4:6)", *NTS* 44, pp. 279-287.
- Wanamaker, Charles A (2003a) "A Rhetoric of Power: Ideology and 1 Corinthians 1-4" in Trevor J. Burke & J. Keith Elliot (eds.) *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict, Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall*, Leiden: Brill, pp.115-137.

- _____. (2003b) “‘By the Power of God’: Rhetoric and Ideology in 2 Corinthians 10-13”, David B. Gowler & et al (eds.) *Fabrics of Discourse: Essays in Honor of Vernon K. Robbins*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, pp. 194-221.
- _____. (2006) “The Power of the Absent Father: A Socio-Rhetorical Analysis of 1 Corinthians 4:14-5:13,” in Cillers Breytenhach, Johan C. Thom & Jeremy Punt (eds.) *The New Testament Interpreted: Essays in Honour of Bernard C. Lategan*, Leiden: Brill, pp. 339-364.
- Watson, Duane (2003) “Paul and Boasting” in J. Paul Sampley (ed.) *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, pp. 77-100.
- Way, Eileen Cornell (1991), *Knowledge Representation and Metaphor*, London: Kluwer.
- Weinstock, Stefan (1971) *Divus Julius*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Welborn, L. L. (1987a) “On the Discord in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Ancient Politics”, *JBL* 106, pp. 85-111.
- _____. (1987b) “A Conciliatory Principle in 1 Cor. 4:6”, *NovT* 29, pp. 320-346.
- _____. (1997) *Politics and Rhetoric in the Corinthian Epistles*, Macon, Georgia: Mercer.
- _____. (2005) *Paul, the Fool of Christ: a Study of 1 Corinthians 1-4 in the Comic-Philosophic Tradition*, JSNT Supplement Series 293, London: T & T Clark.
- Wheelwright, Philip (1962) *Metaphor and Reality*, Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- White, L. Michael (2003) “Paul and *Pater Familias*” in J. Paul Sampley (ed.) *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania: Trinity Press, pp. 457-487.
- Wiedemann, Thomas (1989) *Adults and Children in the Roman Empire*, New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- Wilckens, Ulrich (1959) *Weisheit und Torheit: Eine exegetisch-religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchung zu 1. Kor. 1 und 2*, Beiträge zur Historischen Theologie 26, Ed. Ebeling, G. Tübingen: J.C.B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck).
- Wilkins, John (1995) “Introduction,” in John Wilkins, David Harvey & Mike Dobson (eds.), *Food in Antiquity*, Exeter: University of Exeter, pp. 7-11.
- Williams, David J. (1999) *Paul’s Metaphors: Their Context and Character*, Peabody, Massachusetts: Hendrickson.
- Willis, W. (1989) “The Mind of Christ in 1 Cor. 2:16”, *Bib* 70, pp. 110-122.

- Winter, Bruce (1994) *Seek the Welfare of the City: Christians as Benefactors and Citizens*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2001) *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- _____. (2002) 2nd ed., *Philo and Paul Among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Wire, Antoinette Clark (1990) *The Corinthian Women Prophets: A Reconstruction through Paul's Rhetoric*, Minneapolis, Minnesota: Fortress.
- Witherington, Ben (1995) *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*, Grand Rapids, Michigan: Eerdmans.
- Wolff, Christian (1996) *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*, Theologischer Handkommentar zum Neuen Testament 7, Leipzig: Evangelische Verlagsanstalt.
- Wuellner, Wilhelm (1979) "Greek Rhetoric and Pauline Argumentation" in W. R. Schoedel & R. L. Wilken (eds.) *Early Christian Literature and the Classical Intellectual Tradition: In Honorum R. M. Grant*, Théologie Historique 54, Paris: Beauchesne, pp. 178-188.
- Young, Norman H. (1987) "Paidagogos: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor", *NovT* 29, pp. 150-176.
- Zaidman, Louise B. & Pantel, Pauline S. (1994) *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*, Paul Cartledge (tr.), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.