so many or as a term to row some constitutional conventions. I Corinthians has the conventional epistolary opening and closing, but the body of the letter is quite different from the typical Pauline epistle. Rather than the two-fold division outlined above, I Corinthians contains a series of topics on discourses which often seem quite unrelated.

It may appear at first to the reader that Paul was following a "stream of consciousness" order, simply discussing items as they came to his mind. The reader may see the topics discussed as a hodge-podge of items. An in-depth analysis of the patterns in this discourse, however, reveals that it shows much more structure than may be apparent on an initial reading.

The historical background to I Corinthians

The apostle Paul came to the city of Corinth on his second missionary journey, probably in the spring of A.D. 50 (Barrett 1968:5). Acts 18:1-18 records how Paul stayed with Aquila and Priscilla, working with them as tentmakers during the week and preaching in the synagogue on the Sabbath days. When Silas and Timothy finally arrived from Macedonia, he devoted himself to preaching and teaching all the time. Opposition arose from the Jews and Paul moved his preaching to the house of Titius Justus, a God-fearer who lived next door to the synagogue. Crispus, the ruler of the synagogue, was converted, along with many of the Corinthians. In all, Paul stayed about a year and a half, probably until the fall of A.D. 51 (Barrett 1968:5). It was during this time that the Jews dragged Paul before the judgment seat of Galileo, the Roman proconsul. Their effort to stop his preaching by legal means failed, but it aids us in dating the event. An inscription found at Delphi places Galileo in Corinth between January 25th and August 1st in A.D. 52. It is therefore likely that he became proconsul in the spring of A.D. 51. This date may be a year too early, but the chronology is close if not exact (Conzelmann 1975:12-13).

After Paul, Aquila, and Priscilla left Corinth for Ephesus, Apollos came to Corinth (Acts 18:27-19:1). Perhaps Peter also visited the city, for we find a Cephas party mentioned in 1 Cor. 1:2. When Paul returned to Ephesus on his third missionary journey, he began correspondence with the church at Corinth that included probably four letters from him and at least one letter from them. In 1 Cor. 5:9-11 Paul refers to a previous letter he had written them (unless, of course, the word "wrote" be taken as an epistolary aorist referring to I Corinthians). Some have identified this previous letter with II Corinthians 6:14-7:1, but it is more likely that this letter has been lost (Guthrie 1970:425-426).

In reply, they sent a letter to Paul asking questions (I Cor. 7:1), perhaps carried by Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus (16:17). Several sections begin with the words "what?" or "now concerning" (7:1, 25; 8:1; 12:1, 16, 17, 12); these are usually taken as referring to the Corinthians' questions in their letter (cf. Morris 1958:115, 124, 237, 242). If this is correct, the letter read something like the following reconstruction (this was composed using I Cor. 1:2, 14; 7:1, 25; 8:1, 4; 10:23; 11:1; 12:1, 16, 17, 12; Rom. 16:23; III John 2; I Clement 1:1; Morgan-Wyne 1983:7, 10-11; Bruce 1971:102; Barrett 1968:4, and Doly 1973:2, 4-5, 30).

The church of God which is at Corinth to Paul. Rejoice.

We pray that you may be in health, even as we are. We thank God for you, remembering you in our prayers.

There have been some matters of discussion among us, and knowing your wisdom, we are writing for your decision in these matters.

Is it a good thing for a man not to touch a woman? If so, does a man do well if he should give his virgin in marriage?

Should we eat things sacrificed to idols? Some say that we all have knowledge that no idol is anything in the world and that there is no God but one. And we know that all things are lawful.

Now I remember you in everything and maintain the traditions even as you have delivered them to us. But as to spiritual gifts, is it better to speak in tongues or to prophesy in church?

How should we take up the collection for the saints in Jerusalem?

Some among us would like Apollos to return. Send him back to us soon.

This letter is sent by the hand of Stephanas and Fortunatus and Achaicus whom you know to be faithful in the Lord. They will tell you more than what we have written.


Paul's answer to them was the letter we call I Corinthians.

In the opening, Paul associates Sosthenes, a Christian brother, with himself. Some have connected him with the Sosthenes mentioned in Acts 18:17 (Barrett 1968:31, Bruce notes that he was probably "someone well known to the Corinthian church who was with Paul in Ephesus at the time of writing" (Bruce 1971:30). But Conzelmann is right in noting that "the fellow-writer is not a fellow-author" (1975:20). Paul uses the singular Greek pronoun for "I" eighty-six times in the letter (Aland, Bachmann, and Slaby 1978:).

The Structure of the Letter

The body of the letter of I Corinthians is composed of ten discourses, whose main topics are division (1-4), fornication (5-6), marriage (7), food offered to idols (8-10), head coverings (11), the Lord's Supper (11), spiritual gifts (12-14), the resurrection from the dead (15), the contribution for the saints (16), and the coming of Apollos (16). The discourses on marriage, meat offered to idols, spiritual gifts, and the contribution seem to be written in answer to the Corinthians' letter. The discourses on division, fornication, and head coverings, the Lord's Supper, and the resurrection seem to have arisen from reports brought by some members of Chloe's household (11:1) and by Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus (16:17). There are indications of oral reports also in 5:1, 11:18, and 15:12, although there is no indication of the source of this information.

The discourse on marriage actually seems to be in answer to two questions (7:1, 25). However, the responses to both are similar, and it seems best to treat this as one discourse.

The motivation for the order in which the subjects are addressed is not entirely evident. Presumably the subjects that are introduced by "what?" or "now concerning" are in the same order as in the Corinthians' letter, although even this is not certain. The sections on fornication and marriage are found together, probably because both have to do with sexual issues. In the same way, the worship concerns of head coverings, the Lord's Supper, and use of spiritual gifts are grouped together, even though the first two interrupt what would have been a continuous reply to the Corinthians' letter. Perhaps the lengthy treatment given the subject of division, the back reference to that subject in 11:18, and the primary place accorded it indicate that it was foremost in Paul's mind. In the same way, the ordering of the discourse on the resurrection as the last major discussion may indicate its importance, although it is possible that the contribution received only four verses of attention due to constraints imposed by the size of the scroll on which the letter was written (note that the merits two chapters in III Corinthians). But Paul may have seen the end of the scroll coming and decided to address the question of the resurrection before he ran out of room.

This study takes the position that only those sections which are introduced by "what?" or "now concerning" are in fact Paul's answers to the Corinthians' letter. All other sections are in response to oral reports which Paul received from various sources. Not everyone has always taken this position; for example, Hurd (1983) has argued that some of the sections which do not begin with "now concerning" are also answers to questions in the Corinthians' letter. It is beyond the scope of this article to address this question, but interested readers can consult the justification for the position this paper takes in Terry (1995:39-42).

When only those sections which are introduced by "what?" or "now concerning" are treated as replies to questions in the Corinthians' letter and the other sections are treated as responses to oral information which Paul had received, the letter divides nicely into a cyclical structure of ABA'B'AB', where A is a response to oral reports and B is a response to the Corinthians' letter. This is shown clearly in Table 1. First, two subjects are covered in response to oral reports; then there are two subjects in response to their letter. This is followed by a two-one-two-one pattern of two responses to oral reports, one to the letter, one to an oral report, and two to the letter. The motivation for this pattern is not clear, although it may provide groupings of related topics (discourses 2 and 3 on sex; 4, 5, and 6 on pagan worship forms; and 6 and 7 on the Christian assembly).

In addition, Paul's travel plans are found both between the first two discourses and the last two discourses. If the division defended below and indicated in Table 1 is correct, these travel plans are found at the beginning of the second discourse and the end of the next to last discourse, showing an even greater balance in the overall structure of the book.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Response to Oral Report</th>
<th>Response to Letter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction (1:1-9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Church Division (1:10-4:17)</td>
<td>A Division (1:10-17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Wisdom (1:18-16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. A Division (3:1-4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. C Suffering (3:15)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. D Wisdom and Division (3:25-16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. C Suffering (4:1-17)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Travel Plans (4:18-21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. A Fornication (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9. C Fornication (6:20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. A Marriage (7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. A Marriage (7:1-16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12. Circumcision &amp; Slavery (7:27)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13. A Marriage (7:25-40)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14. B Food (8:1-13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15. A id: Food (8:1-13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17. A Food (10:11-11)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>18. B Head Coverings (11:3-16)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19. A Lord's Supper (11:17-19)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20. A Spiritual Gifts (12)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21. B Love (13)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Endings of Two Discourses

In a couple of places it is questionable whether chapter beginnings actually mark the beginnings of the major embedded discourses. It is generally agreed that 11:1 is the last statement of the discussion on meat offered to idols rather than the beginning of the next discourse, and 11:21 the last statement of this discourse. In the same way, there is some difficulty in knowing whether to assign the transitional verses 4:18-21 to the first or second discourse.

It is traditional among commentators to carry the discussion of the first discourse through 4:21 and begin the new discourse on fornication with 5:1. This view is not without its problems. Some commentators who take this view note that 5:1 begins abruptly (Findlay 1979:907 and Morris 1958:86) or medias in res (Loran 1946:205) or as a "sudden bursting of the storm" (Edwards 1885:118; cf. also Robertson and Plummer 1914:95). A few note either that the new discourse begins with 4:1 (Calvin 1846:177), or that 4:21 ties the two discourses together (Alford reprinted 1893:1000). Fee (1987:194) notes that there are verbal "ties" between 4:18-20 and 5:2-6, and Hurst (1983:39) lists 4:18-21 as a transitional passage. Several ancient manuscripts marked 4:21 as beginning kaiphalon 2 (an ancient system of chapters) while manuscript Vaticanus marked the new discourse as beginning with 4:16. Various manuscripts also began paragraphs either at 4:16, 17, or 18 as well as at 4:14 and 5:1 (Nestle, Nestle, and Aland 1977:432; Nestle et al. 1977:447).

If indeed the new discourse begins at 5:1 (or even at 4:21), this would be unique among the discourses of I Corinthians, for all the other discourses (1:10; 7:1; 8:11; 11:17; 12:15; 16:1; and 16:12) begin a verse with the conjunctive particle de 'now'. In addition, they all end with verses that contain a transitional particle, either de 'but' (7:40, 11:16; 13:34; 14:40; 16:12), ???ste 'so' (11:33; 14:39), ????? 'therefore' (10:31), or ???a 'then' ... de 'for ... but' (6:20; 16:11). But neither 5:1 nor 4:21 contain inter-colon transitional conjunctions (4:21 does contain ??? 'or' and 5:1 contains ???a 'and', but both connect clauses within a colon).

For the purposes of this analysis, it is suggested that the first discourse actually ends with 4:17 and the new discourse begins with 4:18. In favor of this are the following facts: First, the verses 4:18-21 are all on a single subject—Paul's proposed visit to Corinth. This subject is picked up again in 16:5-9. It hardly seems right to begin the new discourse in the middle of this subject. This small section can fit either the preceding discourse or the following as far as content is concerned. But when put with the following discourse it provides a meaningful introduction to the stern words of chapter 5. Second, it also contains ideas elaborated on in chapter 5: those of being puffed up (vv. 18-19) and having power (vv. 19-20). These words are picked up in 5:2 and 5:4, respectively. Third, it contains the phrase "kingdom of God," a term which is picked up again in 6:9-10. Fourth, beginning the discourse on fornication with 4:18 would make this discourse begin with a verse containing de 'now' and have the discourse on division end with verses containing ????? 'therefore' (v. 16) and ???a 'because of this' (v. 17). Fifth, commentators have noted the difference in tone between 4:14, where Paul is admonishing the Corinthians as children, and 4:21, where Paul is threatening to come against the arrogate with a whip (cf. Bailey 1983, 162; and Barrett 1968, 117). And finally, verses 16 and 17 contain similar ideas to those found in other verses that end discourses. The idea of imitating Paul in verse 16 also contains ideas elaborated on in 16:13-18.

The Macrostructures of the Discourses

When one examines the arguments in summary form and the key ideas of I Corinthians, a macrostructure can be abstracted for each of the ten discourses and the conclusion in I Corinthians. They are as follows:

**Discourse 1 (1:10-4:17):**
I appeal to you to avoid division and strife due to following men (Paul, Apollos, and Cephas), for such boasting is due to the wisdom of men, but in God's wisdom they are servants of Christ.

**Discourse 2 (4:18-6:20):**
Flee fornication and lawsuits with one another, and deliver an incestuous fornicator to Satan.

**Discourse 3 (7:1-49):**
Let everyone remain in the marital status in which he was when called, but it is not sin to get married if an unmarried person cannot control his passions.

**Discourse 4 (8:1-11:1):**
Do not eat meat offered to idols in an idol's temple, for this is not a right but idolatry and can lead a weak brother into sin; but eat meat bought at the meat market or at a friend's dinner without asking any questions.

**Discourse 5 (11:2-16):**
A man ought not cover his head when he prays or prophesies, but a woman should.

**Discourse 6 (11:17-34):**
When you meet to eat the Lord's Supper, wait for one another and remember the body and blood of the Lord.

**Discourse 7 (12:1-14:40):**
Seek spiritual gifts, especially prophecy, which builds up the church, but above all, show love.

**Discourse 8 (15:1-58):**
Just as Christ was raised from the dead, so you should believe that Christians will be raised at His coming with a spiritual body.

**Discourse 9 (16:1-11):**
Every Sunday let each of you put something aside and store it up for the contribution for the saints at Jerusalem. I will come after Pentecost, and Timothy will come now.

**Discourse 10 (16:12):**
Apollos will not come now.

**Conclusion (16:13-18):**
The question may be asked as to whether the discourse macrostructures given above can be further combined into one overall macrostructure. Some of them seem to have little in common with others. Yet there are two themes which run throughout the whole book. First, every problem which Paul discusses has its roots in Greek culture. And second, almost every argument appeals to Christ in some way.

If a unifying theme is sought, it is found first in the conflict of Christianity with the cultural background of Corinth. As Conzelmann has noted, "We have here to do with people who have only recently become Christians, while the ideas they brought with them into the community" (1975:15). Most, if not all, of the problems which Paul discusses in I Corinthians can be attributed to the influence of the Corinthian cultural setting on the Corinthians there. It is generally accepted that the glorification of wisdom, the eating of meat offered to idols, and the denial of a bodily resurrection were aspects of Greek culture. In addition, ecstatic utterances may have been found in some Pythian and Dionysiac religions (Bruce 1971:21), although the "speaking in tongues" in I Corinthians should not be viewed as a part of pagan religion. But Greek religion may have had some influence on the Corinthians' high estimate of this gift. Some of the problems that Paul deals with are moral problems, such as fornication, drunkenness, the desires of greed and for revenge that accompany lawsuits. But even these problems are culturally based, for Greek society did not place a strong condemnation on them.

Perhaps the most misunderstood cultural influence in modern days is the Greek attitude toward women wearing head coverings. Regarding this, Guthrie writes, "Paul urges Christian women to respect the social customs of their time, in spite of their new-found freedom" (1970:445). But in fact, Greek women were under no necessity to wear a covering on their head in Greek society, especially when they were at worship (cf. Kittel 1865/III, 562; Conzelmann 1975:185; Terry 1995:26:31). Rather than Paul pleading for respect of social customs, in I Corinthians 11 he is arguing for the maintenance of the Christian tradition (11:2). Some women were being influenced more by what society allowed than by what Christianity taught.

The Centrality of Christ

Although the cultural influences behind the problems at Corinth stand out, the word "culture" is not found in the text. Rather the key concept in I Corinthians is the Lord Jesus Christ. The term "Christ" is found 64 times in I Corinthians. This is second in frequency in usage only to Romans (which has the word 66 times) among the New Testament books. The term "Lord" is found 66 times, and Jesus 26 times (Aland, Bachmann, and Slaby 1978:2-304).

The arguments that Paul advances in trying to solve the various problems are rooted in Christ. Paul's argument about divisions in chapter 1 begins with an appeal in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ (1:10). He implies that the real issue is not the "ideas they brought with them into the community" (1:13:15). For Paul, Christ is the crucified One, the Power of God, and the Wisdom of God (2:23:24). He is the foundation of the church (3:11). In discussing fornication, Paul notes that Christ is our Passover lamb (5:7); therefore, we should cleanse out the old leaven of sin from our lives. He argues that for a Christian to commit fornication is to join Christ to a prostitute (6:15). He refers to the command of the Lord in the instructions about marriage (11:1). He discussing food offered to idols, Paul states that Christians have one Lord, Jesus Christ. When we eat the Lord's Supper, we share in the body and blood of Christ (10:16). Paul exhorts the Christians to imitate him, as he imitates Christ (11:1). In discussing head coverings, he argues that Christ is the head of every man (11:3). In the discussion on the Lord's Supper, he recounts the words of Jesus on the night that He was betrayed (11:23-25). In the discourse on spiritual gifts, he calls Christians the body of Christ (12:27). And he grounds his discussion of the resurrection in the resurrection of Christ (15:23).

An Unified Macrostructure

With these two concepts in mind, the following tentative macrostructure could be suggested. Whether this was in fact the motivating idea which was in Paul's mind when he produced I Corinthians is highly questionable, but it can be said to fairly represent a summary of the text which he produced. It reads as follows:

14. Obey Christ rather than following social customs, such as boasting about men, committing fornication and suing one another, getting a divorce, eating meat offered to an idol, having women pray bareheaded, getting drunk, valuing ecstatic utterances, dividing and spending, and all your money on yourself.

Themes as Meta-Structures

Now the question remains: is this is a mental concept which Paul had in mind before beginning I Corinthians or not? While it does represent a good generalization that fairly summarizes the whole book, it is open to some criticisms. For one thing, this suggested macrostructure is so general that it could generate any number of given texts. For another, it introduces the terms "Christ" and "social customs" from the theme, but such terms do not appear in most of the sectional macrostructures. The term "Christ" does appear in the discourses as they are worked out by Paul, and various social customs are dealt with in I Corinthians. But such a theme seems to be a part of a recurrent theme rather than a part of a macrostructure. Finally, this suggested macrostructure would make the macrostructures of the component discourses of less importance than the theme, although an over-all macrostructure ought to be discoverable out of the macrostructures of the constituent discourses.

Now a recurrent theme in a discourse is not necessarily a part of its macrostructure. This is not to say that it is not a controlling mental concept, just that it is not necessarily a part of the central idea. Such a theme does play a part in structuring the discourse. But it is woven into the fabric of the text, appearing, disappearing, and reappearing. As such, the mental theme that embodies the text may be referred to as a "meta-structure" because it occurs throughout the text. Thus, it seems best not to take the tentative macrostructure suggested above as an actual macrostructure that existed in the mind of Paul.

I Corinthians is one of these complex discourses that requires more than a simple statement of a simple macrostructure to account for its final form. Ten macrostructures of component discourses have been isolated together with a "meta-structure" that takes the form "Obey Christ rather than following social customs." These conceptual structures are mapped onto a mixture of rhetorical patterns that include a cyclical (ABA*B'A'B") treatment of response to oral information and response to the Corinthians letter. Several of the component discourses take the form of a simple chiastic structure (ABA'). The discourse is laid out with balance in mind as regards the number of discourses per cyclical unit, forming a pattern (2:2-2:1-1-2). Balance is seen in the location of the transitional paragraphs about Paul's travel plans: between the first two discourses and also between the last two. All of these last two, of course, are meant to explain the high level organization of the complex book of I Corinthians.

Types of Grammatical and Conceptual Patterns

Not only is the high level structure of I Corinthians complex, the lower level structures are as well. Before looking at the specifics, it is necessary to review the kinds of patterns that are found in I Corinthians.

Where a paragraph structure is made up of two elements, there are two possible patterns: AA' and AB. The AA' pattern is a parallelism structure. The two elements, whether sentences or paragraphs, are either conceptually or grammatically parallel to one another or parallel in both ways. I Corinthians contains numerous examples of this pattern on a microbioparagraph level, including pairings in 6:7, 7:12-13, 16, 22, 28; 9:1ab, 1b-2a, 6, 7, 10, 18, 21, 23, 11a-45, 22, 12:15-16, 17, 26, 28:29, 13:11, 12, 14-16, 5, 23-24, 15:21-22, 55, and 16:23-24. On a slightly higher paragraph level, the paragraphic in 15:13-14 is parallel to the paragraphic in 15:16-17.

The AB pattern contains two parallel elements which are connected to one another in a similar fashion but also are quite different in form. A good example of this pattern is a question-answer paragraph, such as is found in 11:22 and 14:15. A similar structure is a question-paragraph command. Examples of this are found in 7:18, 21, 27. This structure is the functional equivalent of a conditional command. If the question is answered positively, the command applies. The example in 7:27 is a case of two question-command paragraphs with a parallel pattern, as shown in (15).

Type of Paragraph Level

As noted earlier in this study, several of the discourses show a form of ABA' chiastic pattern. But chiasticism is present, not only on the macroparagraph level, but also on the microparagraph and intermediate levels. The major studies of chiasticism in I Corinthians have been by Lund (1942; reprinted 1952) and Bailey (1983). If there is a fault in their work, it is that they tend to find chiastic throughout the book, even in locations where other rhetorical strategies seem to be used. Lund is better than Bailey about identifying alternate rhetorical schemes, but even he takes the use of chiasticism to an extreme. But there are many clear cases of chiasticism in this letter, and several of these are discussed below.

Now the simple pattern ABA' can be either a reduced cycle of chiasticism, a defective cycle, or a simple case of inclusion. The exact rhetorical scheme is impossible to tell since all three of these cases show the same pattern. In this study, however, such a pattern is analyzed as chiastic since it is so pervasive throughout I Corinthians.

Chiasticism

As noted earlier in this study, several of the discourses show a form of ABA' chiasticism. But chiasticism is present, not only on the macroparagraph level, but also on the microparagraph and intermediate levels. The major studies of chiasticism in I Corinthians have been by Lund (1942; reprinted 1952) and Bailey (1983). If there is a fault in their work, it is that they tend to find chiastic throughout the book, even in locations where other rhetorical strategies seem to be used. Lund is better than Bailey about identifying alternate rhetorical schemes, but even he takes the use of chiasticism to an extreme. But there are many clear cases of chiasticism in this letter, and several of these are discussed below.
Certainly this pattern exists, but the problem with it is that it omits the passages about the Corinthians being God's temple (3:16-17) and about the wisdom of men (3:18-20). A pattern without such breaks can be found in 3:21-4:7 as shown in (17).

(17)  A'  Boasting (3:21)
B  Paul and Apollos (3:22-23)
C  Servants of Christ (4:1-5)
B'  Paul and Apollos (4:6)
A'  Boasting (4:7)

But this pattern as well as Bailey's suggested pattern has a difficulty. They both cut across the chiastic macroparagraph structure of the first discourse as given in (18) and shown also in Table 1.

(18)  A   Division (1:10-17)
B   Wisdom (1:18-2:16)
A'  Division (3:1-4)
C   Servanthood (3:5-15)
D   Wisdom and Division (3:16-23)
C'  Servanthood (4:1-17)

This major structure also exists. Bailey's pattern shown in (16) has taken the elements of A'CD in this analysis and made them ABA'.

The problem is that his analysis here is too small. But the analysis in (17) also is legitimate, and it too cuts across the boundary lines of the analysis given in (18). This tells us that the rhetorical structure of the first discourse is quite complex and is probably composed of several patterns interwoven together (cf. Longacre 1979 on both an episodic and a chiastic structure in the Genesis flood narrative and Pike 1987 on the multi-dimensional patterns of the Sermon on the Mount). Certainly the C section of (18) in 3:5-15 on servanthood is composed of two major paragraphs, as Bailey notes, which form an AA' parallelism.

Within the first discourse another chiasm can be noted in the paragraph (3:16-17) about the Corinthians being the temple of God as shown in (19).

not do you know that temple of God you are
B  ?a'?  t'?  p??t??ta  t???  ?a????  ????e??  e??  ??y??
and the Spirit of God dwells in you?
C  e??'
??  t??  ?a'?  t???  ?e??  f?e'f'??  (3:17)
If anyone the temple of God destroys
C'  ???e??  ????t?  ??  ?a'?  will destroy this one [O] God [S]
B'  ??  ?a'?  ??  t???  ?e??  a'?  ???t?  e?st??, the for temple of God holy is
A'  ????f?'?e  e?st?e  ??y??
which are you

The A, B, and C elements are all conceptually and lexically connected.

The second discourse also shows evidence of chiasmus on a smaller scale. The passage in 6:13-14 (noted by Fee 1987:253-254) shows a complex pattern of two lexical chiasms embedded within a cyclical XXY' pattern as shown in (20), another example of multiple patterns.

(20)  X  A  ta'  ??'?? yata  (6:13)
the foods
B  t???  ?????'a?
for the stomach
B'  ?a'?  ??  ?????t
and the stomach
A'  ?????  ??'?? ??s'??
for the foods
Y  ??  de'  ?e'?  ?a'?  ta'????  ?a'?  ta??ta  ?ata???  'se?.
and God both this and these will destroy
X  A  t'  de'  s??'a  ???  t????  p??ta  a'
the but body not for the fornication
B  a'??ta'  t???  ?????', but for the Lord,
B'  ?a'?  ??  ?????
and the Lord
A'  ?????  s'?  ??s'?
for the body.
Y  ??  de'  ?e'?  ?a'?  t'?  ??  ?????  ??'e'?e?  (6:14)
the but God both the Lord raised
?a'?  ??'a  o??e?e?e?  d'a'  t????  d??f'??e  a'????.
and us will raise up through the power of him

Fee (1987:257) also notes that the next verses contain a lexical and conceptual chiasmus as shown in (21).

(21)  A  members of Christ(6:15)
B  members of a prostitute
B'  the one joined to a prostitute(6:16)
A'  the one joined to the Lord(6:17)

The third discourse begins with several examples of lexical chiasmus as noted by Lund (1942; reprinted 1992:151-152), who has noted that 7:2-5 form a chiasmus as shown in (22).

(22)  A  d'f'??  de'
because of but
B  e?'f'??
each [man]
?a' and
C


```
A' ?? ??
```

The chiasmus is conceptual, with fornication equaling a lack of self-control, having a person being the same as not defrauding and being together, and giving due equaling not having a grammatical structure of verses 2-4 is a series of parallel units: AA' BB' CC'DD', where the last three primed elements omit the predicate. Again, there exists an overlay of patterns, not it

A little farther on in the third discourse Fee (1987:299) has noted that 7:12-14 form what he calls "a perfect triple chiasm" as shown in (23).

Once again note that the lexical chiasmus is embedded within a different grammatical pattern—this time a couple of parallelisms: AB is parallel to CD and D'C' is parallel to B'A'.

The fourth discourse also contains several examples of chiasmus. Youngman (1987:189) has noted that there is a chiasitic pattern in 9:4-12 as shown in (24).

Further, 9:16 contains a lexical and structural chiasmus as shown in (25).

But the most obvious example of chiasmus in the fourth discourse is found in 9:19-22 as shown in (26). It has been noted by Lund (1942; reprinted 1992:147), Bailey (1983:167), Yo

Each of the six elements ends with a purpose clause beginning with "?? ?? 'in order to'. The chiasmus is conceptually defective in the B' element, although Bailey (1983:167) and Yo

Another example of chiasmus in the fourth discourse is noted by Youngman (1987:202) in 10:7-10 as shown in (27). This chiasm is grammatical rather than conceptual.
as it is written, Sat down the people to eat and

drink and rose up to play

B με? ??? η??? ?? ??? ???? ???? ???? η??? η?? η?? η??, (8)

let us not fornicate, just as some of them did

and fell dead one day twenty three thousand

B′ με? e??? ???? ???? ????? η??? ???? e??? η??? η??? η??? η??? η???, (9)

let us not test the Christ, just as some of them did

A′ μ??? ???? ????, η??? ???? ?? ??? ??? ?? ??? η??? ?????? ???? ?? ??? ???? ?? ???, (10)

do not grumble, just like some of them grumbled

They are not.

Both Lund (1942; reprinted 1992:184) and Bailey (1983:169) have noted that the first part of the Y′ element (14:1-5) is chiastic in structure, although they have differed over how much text it covers.

Bailey (1983:178) has pointed out that what is here called the X element (12:1-31) can be itself interpreted as a chiastic pattern.

The seventh discourse is the most chiastic of all the discourses, showing several levels of embedded chiasmus.

The B element at the center is marked by narrative texttype.

The whole sixth discourse can be divided into an ABA′ chiasmic pattern as shown in (30).

The B and B′ colons contain first person subjunctive verbs in their independent clauses, sandwiched between second person imperative verbs in the main clauses of the A and A′ colons are not.

The B and B′ colons contain first person subjunctive verbs in their independent clauses, sandwiched between second person imperative verbs in the main clauses of the A and A′ colons are not.

A fifth example of chiasmus in the fourth discourse is found in 10:16-21 as shown in (28). Both Bailey (1983:169) and Youngman (1987:208) have previously noted this example.

(28) A The cup of blessing is it not a sharing (10:16)

The bread . . . is it not a sharing (10:16)

B Are not those who eat the sacrificial shewbread (10:18)

C That food offered to idols is anything (10:19)

R′ I do not want you to be shewbread with demons (10:20)

A′ You cannot drink of the cup of the Lord (10:21)

You cannot partake of the table of the Lord

Here the correspondences are conceptual rather than grammatical. The A and A′ elements deal with the cup and the bread (or table) of the Lord's Supper. The B and B′ elements relate that eating a sacrifice makes one a sharer or partner with an altar or a demon, respectively.

A′ You cannot drink of the cup of the Lord

The fifth discourse has an example of embedded chiasmus in 11:8-12 as shown in (29), Lund (1942; reprinted 1992:148) has shown that these verses form a ABCBA′ chiasm with the A, B, B′, and A′ elements containing lexical chiasms using the words woman/man.

The whole sixth discourse can be divided into an ABA′ chiasmic pattern as shown in (30).

The B element at the center is marked by narrative texttype.

The seventh discourse is the most chiastic of all the discourses, showing several levels of embedded chiasmus. In this regard, it seems significant that this discourse is within the peak of the letter (Terry 1995:119-125).

Bailey (1983:178) has pointed out that what is here called the X element (12:1-31) can be itself interpreted as a chiastic pattern. Strictly speaking, the chiasm runs from 12:4-30 rather than 12:1-31.

In the same way the Y element (13:1-13) also contains a chiasmatic pattern, as shown in (33).

This has been noted by Lund (1942; reprinted 1992:175-176) and Osburn (1976:150-152) among others.

Both Lund (1942; reprinted 1992:184) and Bailey (1983:178) have noted that the first part of the Y′ element (chapter 14) is chiastic in structure, although they have differed over how much depth (forming merely an RSR′ chiasm) and his S element could be labeled as saying the same thing as the R and R′ elements. Bailey labels the R (14:1b-5) and R′ (14:11-12). The problem is that the point of the central S element is also that prophecy is better than tongues. It is just that in these verses Paul is arguing by analogy. The chiasm should minor variations to improve the correspondences.

R μ??? greater

?a??? speaking

S
because of

R'  

therefore

???

The T and T' elements of this chiasm contain an AAB'B' cyclical structure of question-illustration. Again there are multiple overlaid patterns.

Besides these intermediate levels of chiasmus in the seventh discourse, there are several examples of low level chiasmus in chapters twelve through fourteen also. For example, there is a lexical chiasm in 12:3 as shown in (35).

(35)  

(12:3)  

A  

B  

B'  

A'  

This has previously been noted by Lund (1942; reprinted 1992:164). In the same way, Lund (1942; reprinted 1992:165) has also noted a lexical and conceptual chiasm in 12:12, as shown in (36).

(36)  

(12:12)  

A  

B  

B'  

A'  

But perhaps the best example of embedded chiasmus is found in 13:8-13, as shown in (37). It has been noted by Lund (1942; reprinted 1992:176) and Osburn (1976:151-152).

(37)  

(14:33b)  

A  

B  

B'  

A'  

This chiasm forms the S' element of the intermediate level chiasm in (33) which is the Y element of the high level chiasm in (31). The corresponding elements are not only conceptually parallel, but to a certain extent grammatically as well.

A further example of chiasmus in the seventh discourse is found in 14:33b-36, as shown in (38).

(38)  

(14:36)  

A  

B  

B'  

A'  

This chiasm is purely conceptual. The point presented in a phrase at the beginning (the A element) is repeated at the end in the A' element with a compound

S'
Finally, the eighth discourse also contains an example of chiasmus in 15:12-13, as shown in (39).

(39) A

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>??</th>
<th>de'</th>
<th>????</th>
<th>???</th>
<th>??</th>
<th>??</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Christ | is reached | that | from | the | ???
| he is raised | if | but | ??''? ?? | ?? | ?? |
| B | p??? | ???? | ????? | ?? | ?? | ?? | ?? | ?? |
| how you say | a????? | ??'''' | ??'' | ?? | ??' | ?? | ?? | ?? |
| B' | resurrection | not | is one of the dead | do | ??'''' | ?? | ?? | ?? |
| if | but | ??'''' | ?? | ?? | ?? | ?? | ?? | ?? |
| A' | ???de' | ?? ?? | ??'' | ??'' | ?? | ?? | ?? | ?? |
| neither Christ | has been raised | ??'''' | ??'''' | ??'''' | ??'''' | ??'''' | ??'''' | ??'''' |

The ninth and tenth discourses in chapter 16 are very short and do not seem to contain examples of chiasmus. The examples listed here are not exhaustive.

Both Lund (1942; reprinted 1992) and Bailey (1983) list other examples, although the correspondences for some of them seem rather strained; only the most obvious have been listed above. But these are enough examples to show that Paul used ample use of the rhetorical device of chiasm at all levels of the text.

Constraints Imposed by Discourse Structure

The letter of 1 Corinthians is thus seen to be a highly structured piece of literature, not a hodge-podge of thought that simply follows "stream of consciousness." It shows patterning at both higher and lower levels of discourse. This structuring constrains the way in which this letter should be understood because every author, including Paul, is constrained in the way in which he or she can intelligently present his or her material by the grammar of discourse.

Among other things, an author is constrained by the idea or ideas which may be described as macrostructures (or theses) and meta-structures (or themes). A text which is continually cluttered with extraneous ideas will not be easily understood; it will lack the coherence that the audience expects. This helps to explain why some passages are misunderstood in the modern west. Where the average reader does not expect to find chiasmus in ancient documents and probably does not recognize it when it is encountered. It also helps to explain why western readers, expecting a linearly organized text, often miss the cyclic and chastic patterns of organization in 1 Corinthians, such as those shown earlier in Table 1.

Thus constrained by the grammar of Greek discourse, the apostle Paul fashioned his letter to the Corinthian church known as 1 Corinthians according to a definite pattern of structure.
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