

## **Distribution Agreement**

In presenting this thesis or dissertation as a partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree from Emory University, I hereby grant to Emory University and its agents the non-exclusive license to archive, make accessible, and display my thesis or dissertation in whole or in part in all forms of media, now or hereafter known, including display on the world wide web. I understand that I may select some access restrictions as part of the online submission of this thesis or dissertation. I retain all ownership rights to the copyright of the thesis or dissertation. I also retain the right to use in future works (such as articles or books) all or part of this thesis or dissertation.

Signature:

---

Devin L. White

---

Date

Teacher of the Nations: Ancient Educational Traditions and Paul's Argument in 1  
Corinthians 1-4

By

Devin L. White  
Doctor of Philosophy

Graduate Division of Religion  
New Testament Studies

---

Carl R. Holladay  
Advisor

---

Anthony A. Briggman  
Committee Member

---

Luke Timothy Johnson  
Committee Member

---

Steven J. Kraftchick  
Committee Member

Accepted:

---

Lisa A. Tedesco, Ph.D.  
Dean of the James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies

---

Date

Teacher of the Nations: Ancient Educational Traditions and Paul's Argument in 1  
Corinthians 1-4

By

Devin L. White  
M.T.S., Candler School of Theology, 2010  
B.A, Grand Valley State University, 2008

Advisor: Carl. R. Holladay, Ph.D.

An abstract of  
A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the  
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in Religion  
2016

## Abstract

### Teacher of the Nations: Ancient Educational Traditions and Paul's Argument in 1 Corinthians 1-4

By Devin L. White

This study suggests that ancient Greek, Roman, and Jewish educational institutions provide insight into the nature of Paul's argument in 1 Cor 1-4. Previous scholarship has largely interpreted 1 Cor 1-4 either as Paul's apology for his apostolic ministry or as Paul's critique of the Corinthians' factionalism. This dissertation attempts to clarify Paul's line of reasoning by demonstrating that 1 Cor 1-4 adapts features of ancient educational discourse in order to portray the Corinthian community as a school. Ancient schools provide Paul with an established script of behavioral norms from which he draws in order both to defend himself against the Corinthians' criticisms (explaining that he has acted as a good teacher) and to rebuke the Corinthians for their poor behavior (depicting them as immature students).

Chapter 1 provides an introduction to the dissertation by demonstrating the frequency with which ancient readers of Paul's letters referred to him as a teacher, by introducing the argument of the dissertation, and by explaining the dissertation's exegetical and reception-historical methodology. Chapter 2 contains a survey of modern scholarship germane to the topics of Paul, the Corinthian community, and ancient educational traditions. Chapter 3 provides an introductory overview to the Greek, Roman, and Jewish educational institutions most relevant to the interpretation of 1 Corinthians, especially the preliminary levels of Greek and Roman education and the Jewish wisdom tradition. Subsequently, chapters 4 and 5 identify eighteen instances in 1 Cor 1-4 in which Paul employs common educational tropes. Chapter 6 provides a thorough rereading of 1 Cor 1-4 in its entirety, giving special attention to the ways that the educational tropes surveyed in chapters 4 and 5 inform our interpretation of the opening movement of 1 Corinthians. Finally, chapter 7 summarizes the dissertation's contributions and suggests avenues for further scholarly inquiry.

Teacher of the Nations: Ancient Educational Traditions and Paul's Argument in 1  
Corinthians 1-4

By

Devin L. White  
M.T.S., Candler School of Theology, 2010  
B.A, Grand Valley State University, 2008

Advisor: Carl. R. Holladay, Ph.D.

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of the  
James T. Laney School of Graduate Studies of Emory University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of  
Doctor of Philosophy  
in Religion  
2016

MAGISTRO MEO PRIMO ET OPTIMO  
PATRI MEO  
HIC LIBER DEDICATUR

## Table of Contents

<b>1. Introduction: Early Christian Reception of Paul and the Interpretation of 1 Cor 1-4</b> .....	<b>1</b>
I. Teacher of the Nations? .....	1
II. Argument .....	6
III. Methodology: Exegesis and Reception .....	7
IV. Chapter Summaries .....	10
<b>2. Previous Scholarship on Paul, the Corinthians, and Ancient Education</b> .....	<b>14</b>
I. The Contents of Paul's Teaching .....	15
A. C.H. Dodd and Benjamin Edsall .....	15
B. The Relevance of Preaching, Teaching and Instruction for 1 Cor 1-4 .....	18
II. Paul and Greco-Roman Education .....	19
A. E.A Judge .....	19
B. Robert S. Dutch .....	24
C. Karl Olav Sandnes .....	28
D. Claire E. Smith .....	30
E. Abraham J. Malherbe .....	31
F. Clarence Glad .....	34
G. Thomas Schmeller .....	35
H. Johannes Munck and Bruce Winter .....	38
I. Timothy A. Brookins .....	39
J. Adam White .....	42
K. Conclusion: Greco-Roman Education and 1 Cor 1-4 .....	46
III. Paul and Jewish Education .....	48
A. Hans Conzelmann .....	48
B. Kathy Ehrensperger .....	50
C. Conclusion: Jewish Education and 1 Cor 1-4 .....	52
IV. Chapter Conclusion .....	52
<b>3. Greek, Roman, and Jewish Educational Institutions: An Overview</b> .....	<b>54</b>
I. Greco-Roman Education .....	54
A. Unity and Diversity in Greco-Roman Education .....	54
B. Progress in Greco-Roman Education .....	57
C. Ancient Literary Sources for Greco-Roman Education .....	60
II. Second-Temple Jewish Education .....	73
A. Interpreting the Evidence .....	73
B. Ancient Literary Sources for Second-Temple Jewish Education .....	77
III. Conclusion .....	94

<b>4. Ancient Education in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21</b> .....	<b>95</b>
I. The Evidence: Educational Language and Imagery .....	96
II. Educational Motifs in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21 .....	99
A. Milk and Solid Food (3:1-4) .....	99
B. Sowers, Waterers, Fields, and Seed (3:5-9) .....	105
C. Building God’s Temple (3:9b-17).....	110
D. Stewards of God’s Mysteries (4:1-2).....	114
E. Not beyond what is Written (4:6).....	125
F. Pedagogues (4:14-15).....	131
G. Parent Teachers (4:14-15, cont’d).....	134
H. Mimesis (4:16).....	139
I. Teaching in All the Churches (4:17) .....	144
J. Memory (4:17, cont’d) .....	146
K. The Rod (4:21).....	148
III. Conclusion: The Significance of the Educational Motifs.....	153
<b>5. Ancient Education in 1 Cor 1:10-2:16</b> .....	<b>156</b>
I. Educational Motifs in 1 Cor 1:10-2:16.....	156
A. Factions as Competing Schools (1:10-13) .....	156
B. The Cross and Wisdom as Elements of a Curriculum (1:18-25; 2:6-16).....	162
C. Sage, Scribe, and Sophist (1:20) .....	166
D. The Nature of the Students: Wisdom for the Elect (1:26-31) .....	170
E. The Good Teacher Speaks Well (2:1-5).....	175
F. The Teacher as Mediator of Revealed Wisdom (2:10b-13) .....	178
G. Adapting Instruction for the Student (2:13-16).....	181
II. Conclusion: The Community as School in 1:18-2:16.....	186
<b>6. Good Teachers, Bad Students, and the Argument of 1 Cor 1:10-4:21</b> .....	<b>188</b>
I. Censure and Apology: The Argumentative Aims of 1 Cor 1-4.....	188
II. Exegesis of 1 Cor 1:10-4:21 .....	190
A. The Community unlike the Schools (1:10-17).....	190
B. The Precept of the Cross (1:18-25) .....	195
C. Called to Receive Wisdom (1:26-31).....	203
D. A Style Suited to the Cross (2:1-5) .....	207
E. Higher Wisdom and its Pneumatic Teachers (2:6-16) .....	212
F. Teaching Recalcitrant Students (3:1-4) .....	232
G. The Teachers and their Client (3:5-9).....	235
H. Evaluating the Hired Teachers (3:10-17).....	239
I. All Things are Yours, and You are God’s (3:18-23).....	243
J. Judging the Stewards (4:1-5).....	247



K. Imitate the Teachers who Embody their Teaching (4:6-13) .....	251
L. Imitate the Coming Teacher (4:14-21) .....	258
III. Conclusion .....	263
<b>7. Conclusion: Contributions and Directions for Future Research .....</b>	<b>264</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>272</b>

## Chapter 1:

### Introduction: Early Christian Reception of Paul and the Interpretation of 1 Cor 1-4

#### I. Teacher of the Nations?

Roughly 35 years after Paul wrote 1 Corinthians, Clement of Rome sent his own letter to the still-fractious Corinthians (c. 90 CE). In this letter, he reminded his audience of the example of the apostle who founded their community. Paul, he wrote, “taught righteousness throughout the whole world” (δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον), by making himself an “example” (ὑπογραμμός) for his audience to imitate (1 Clem 5:5-7). To contemporary readers, Clement’s description of Paul as a moral exemplar appears reminiscent of the instances in Paul’s corpus in which he exhorts his audience to imitate him (e.g., 1 Cor 4:16, 11:1). But a ὑπογραμμός was not just any example. More specifically, it was a writing exercise commonly practiced by pupils in the early stages of their education. As the literate members of Clement’s audience would have known from painful experience, teachers would inscribe practice sentences on wax tablets or papyrus, and their students, in the midst of a years-long quest to improve their penmanship, would copy them repeatedly.<sup>1</sup> When Clement likens Paul to the ὑπογραμμός, then, he presents him not as a generic example but as an example whose proper social location was the classroom. Like Paul’s modern biographers, Clement and other early Christians thought of Paul as a great apostle, perhaps the greatest apostle.<sup>2</sup> Clement’s missive indicates that there was another trajectory in the early Christian reception of Paul’s apostolic legacy,

---

<sup>1</sup> See Werner Jaeger, *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965), 24-25, who concludes that 1 Clement uses concepts and terminology derived from Greek παιδεία in order to present itself as a piece of Christian education. On the ὑπογραμμός, see Raffaella Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996), 121-29.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Benjamin White, *Remembering Paul: Ancient and Modern Contests over the Image of the Apostle* (New York: Oxford, 2014), 7-9, summarizing early Christian depictions of Paul as an apostle.

one which valorized Paul as a teacher and associated him with the life and practice of ancient schools.

Clement's association of Paul with ancient education was hardly unique among second century Christian texts. The Acts of Paul and Thecla makes it clear that it is Paul's teaching which Thecla's contemporaries find unacceptable,<sup>3</sup> and the Epistula Apostolorum recounts a prophecy of the resurrected Jesus—essentially a rewriting of Acts 9:10-16—informing the other disciples about Paul's impending apostolic call and his mission to preach the gospel and teach the nations.<sup>4</sup> Other early descriptions of Paul veered away from narrative toward the encomiastic. Polycarp summarized Paul's work in glowing terms:

For neither I nor anyone like me can keep pace with the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul. When he was with you in the presence of the people of that time, he accurately and reliably taught the word concerning the truth (ἐδίδαξεν ἀκριβῶς καὶ βεβαίως τὸν περὶ ἀληθείας λόγον). And when he was absent he wrote you letters; if you study them carefully, you will be able to build yourselves up in all the faith that has been given to you.<sup>5</sup>

For Polycarp, Paul's greatness lay primarily in his teaching. Moreover, when he exhorts his audience to study Paul's writings, Polycarp himself sounds like a schoolmaster urging his pupils to find in Homer the examples of virtuous living that, if imitated, would lead to success and power in the ancient world. Polycarp's Paul was nothing less than the teacher, the author, and the contents of a new Christian curriculum.

---

<sup>3</sup> Cf., e.g., AcPITh, 16-17, in which Paul is taken to court over his teaching, Ὁ δὲ ἡγεμὼν ἔστησεν τὴν διάνοιαν αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸν Παῦλον λέγων αὐτῷ Τίς εἶ, καὶ τί διδάσκεις; To this Paul replies, εἰ οὖν ἐγὼ τὰ ὑπὸ θεοῦ μοι ἀποκεκαλυμμένα διδάσκω, τί ἀδικῶ, ἀνθύπατε; The Greek text is that of R.A. Lipsius, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha: Acta Petri, Acta Pauli, Acta Petri et Pauli, Acta Pauli et Theclae, Acta Thaddaei* (Hildesheim: Olms, 1972).

<sup>4</sup> Ep. Apos. 31.

<sup>5</sup> Pol. *Phil* 3:2 (trans. Holmes).

This trend in the Christian reception of Paul continued unabated into the third and fourth centuries.<sup>6</sup> For Tertullian, Paul was “teacher” (*magister*),<sup>7</sup> or “teacher of the nations” (*doctor nationum*).<sup>8</sup> Athanasius remembers him as “Paul, our teacher.”<sup>9</sup> Jerome, in his translation of Origen’s homilies on Ezekiel, alludes to (and agrees with) Didymus the Blind’s assertion that Origen was the second-greatest teacher of the church “after the Apostle.”<sup>10</sup> Ambrose reflects on Paul as a student would his grammarian, asking “What better expounder of the scriptures do we indeed look for than that teacher of the gentiles, that chosen vessel?”<sup>11</sup> Paul was Chrysostom’s favorite apostle, and “teacher of the world” (διδάσκαλος τῆς οἰκουμένης) was Chrysostom’s favorite epithet for Paul.<sup>12</sup> Epiphanius calls Paul Jesus’s student (μαθητής) and claims that Christ himself appointed Paul to be a teacher of the nations (ὁ διδάσκαλος κατασταθεὶς τῶν ἐθνῶν ὑπὸ Χριστοῦ Παῦλος).<sup>13</sup> Examples from the rest of late antiquity abound.<sup>14</sup> As with all such examples

---

<sup>6</sup> The third century saw a significant uptick in early Christian concern with the problems and opportunities posed by traditional Greco-Roman education. See Karl Olav Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer: School, Pagan Poets, and Early Christianity*, LNTS 400 (London: T&T Clark, 2009), 247.

<sup>7</sup> Tertullian, *Carn. Chr.* 22.3; *Marc.* 4.2.4; *Pud.* 15.11.

<sup>8</sup> Tertullian, *Res.* 23.8; *Pud.* 14.27. On Tertullian’s reception of the figure of Paul, see esp. Robert Sider, “Literary Artifice and the Figure of Paul in Tertullian,” in *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*, ed. William Babcock (Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990), 99-120.

<sup>9</sup> Ὁ ἡμέτερος διδάσκαλος Παῦλος (PG 26:1297).

<sup>10</sup> Origen, *Hom. Ezech.* Pr. 1 (ed. Scheck).

<sup>11</sup> Ambrose, *Fid.* 1.16.105 (NPNF<sup>2</sup> 10:218).

<sup>12</sup> Cf., e.g. *Hom. Gen.* 25.2; 29.2; *Hom. Rom.* 30.3; *Hom. Col.* 10.3. For a discussion of Chrysostom’s use of teaching titles to describe Paul, as well as many more references, see Margaret M. Mitchell, *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002), 75-77.

<sup>13</sup> *Pan.* 2.160.

<sup>14</sup> The Apostolic Constitutions, in a list of the apostles, calls Paul “teacher of the nations” (ὁ τῶν ἐθνῶν διδάσκαλος) (Apos. Con. 6.14.). At the council of Chalcedon, Paul was again remembered as “the great teacher of the world” (ὁ μέγας δὲ τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος) (Schwartz, *ACO*, II.i.ii.49.25); Abba John

of cultural memory, one can reasonably ask which Christian traditions inspired so many authors to describe Paul as διδάσκαλος or *magister*.<sup>15</sup>

The simplest answer is that the earliest Christians were describing Paul as a teacher even before Clement of Rome. When Luke describes the Pauline mission in Acts, he commonly uses vocabulary drawn from the semantic range of teaching and learning.<sup>16</sup> In Antioch Paul and Barnabas “taught and proclaimed the word of God” (Acts 15:35); Paul stayed in Corinth for “a year and six months, teaching the word of God among them” (18:11). It is no surprise that in Ephesus Paul moves his students (τοὺς μαθητάς) from the synagogue to “the school of Tyrannus” (τῆ σχολῆ Τυράννου) (19:9). For Luke, Paul’s teaching was sufficiently similar to the “secular” education available in an urban center like Ephesus to warrant the occupation of an established school.<sup>17</sup>

The disputed Pauline epistles also portray Paul as a teacher. Colossians 1:28 recounts how Paul went about “warning everyone and teaching everyone in all wisdom (διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ), so that we may present everyone mature (τέλειον) in Christ.”<sup>18</sup> Both 1 and 2 Timothy begin with claims that Paul was an “apostle

---

the Persian, in a description of the ideal monk, argued that he should be “a teacher like Paul” (διδάσκαλος ὡς ὁ Παῦλος) (Aprophthegmata Patrum [PG 65:239-240]).

<sup>15</sup>Similarly, Jens Schröter argues that “Every approach to the historical Jesus behind the Gospels has to explain how these writings could have come into being as the earliest descriptions of this person.” (“The Historical Jesus and the Sayings Tradition: Comments on Current Research,” *Neotestamentica* 30 [1996]: 153).

<sup>16</sup> Assuming that Acts was composed between 80-90 CE. For alternative dating, see esp. Richard I. Pervo, *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apostles* (Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2006).

<sup>17</sup> “The focus of religious life,” writes Pervo, “has shifted from temple to house to ‘facility’ or ‘school.’ The term σχολή means ‘leisure,’ which, as Sir 38:24 points out, is the basis of learning” (Richard I. Pervo, *Acts: A Commentary*, Hermeneia [Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008] 471.). See too Daniel Marguerat, *Paul in Acts and Paul in His Letters*, WUNT 310 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013), 41-42.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Eph 4:20-22.

of Christ Jesus” (1 Tim 1:1; 2 Tim 1:1), but each also claims that Paul “was appointed a herald and an apostle ... a teacher of the Gentiles (διδάσκαλος ἔθνῶν) in faith and truth” (1 Tim 2:7) or that he “was appointed a herald and an apostle and a teacher (διδάσκαλος)” (2 Tim 1:11). Commentators tend to be skeptical about the historical accuracy of these descriptions.<sup>19</sup> Modern wariness aside, the author of 1 Timothy is keen to keep Christian teaching (ἡ διδασκαλία) in good repute (6:1; cf. Titus 2:10). Timothy is unlike the teachers whom Paul opposes in 1-2 Timothy—those “who are always being instructed and can never arrive at a knowledge of the truth” (2 Tim 3:7). Unlike false teachers, Timothy has received Paul’s teaching (σὺ δὲ παρηκολούθησάς μου τῆ διδασκαλία [2 Tim 3:10; cf. 3:14]). Moreover, Paul enjoins Timothy to

continue in what you have learned and firmly believed (ἐν οἷς ἔμαθεσ καὶ ἐπιστώθης), knowing from whom you learned it, and how from childhood you have known the sacred writings that are able to instruct you for salvation through faith in Christ Jesus. All scripture is inspired by God and is useful for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for training in righteousness (πρὸς διδασκαλίαν, πρὸς ἐλεγμὸν, πρὸς ἐπανόρθωσιν, πρὸς παιδείαν τὴν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ), so that everyone who belongs to God may be proficient, equipped for every good work. (2 Tim 3:14-17)

Paul here places Christian teaching, some of which he provided to Timothy himself, alongside education in Jewish texts, the curricular bedrock of Second Temple Jewish education.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> “While it is true,” writes Marshall, “that διδάσκαλος, ‘teacher,’ as a designation of a Christian worker is used exclusively of Paul in the PE ... it is doubtful that the author/church views him as such.... Rather, he is Timothy’s teacher and the source of the material to be used against the opponents” (I. Howard Marshall, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*, ICC [Edinburgh; T&T Clark, 1999], 435). Martin Dibelius and Hans Conzelmann discuss 1 Tim 2:7’s use of κήρυξ but ignore the appellation διδάσκαλος (*The Pastoral Epistles*, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972], 43-44).

<sup>20</sup> For variations on the hypothesis that the Jewish canon emerged in the Second Temple period as a curriculum, see André Lemaire, *Les écoles et la formation de la Bible dans l’ancien Israël*, OBO 39 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981); Philip R. Davies, *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of*

Even this brief survey demonstrates that one common “image” (*Bild*) structuring early Christian memory of Paul was the notion that, in addition to being an apostle or evangelist, he was earliest Christianity’s teacher.<sup>21</sup> This appellation, so commonly applied to Paul by his ancient readers, ought to lead modern interpreters to ask themselves a straightforward question: Did epithets like “teacher of the nations,” or “herald, apostle, and teacher,” simply strike later readers of 1-2 Timothy as catchy biblical sobriquets, or might it be helpful to bear the title διδάσκαλος in mind when interpreting the undisputed Pauline epistles?

## II. Argument

Early Christians like Clement who remembered Paul as a teacher have observed a feature of Paul’s letters that contemporary scholars are currently rediscovering: the presence of educational language, imagery, and logic in his corpus.<sup>22</sup> Though references to ancient education, overt and subtle, dot Paul’s surviving letters, awareness of educational discourse is particularly vital for answering two very old and interrelated

---

*the Hebrew Scriptures* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998); David M. Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature* (New York: Oxford, 2005).

<sup>21</sup> Following the reassessment of the reception of Paul and his letters (begun in earnest in the late 1970s), studies of the reception of Paul in the early church have helpfully focused on “images” of the apostle in Christian memory. The use of “images” is particularly associated with the work of Andreas Lindemann, *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: Das Bild des Apostels und die Rezeption der paulinische Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis Marcion*, BHT 58 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1979); idem, *Paulus, Apostel und Lehrer der Kirche: Studien zu Paulus und zum frühen Paulusverständnis* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999). See too Martinus C. de Boer, “Images of Paul in the Post Apostolic Period,” *CBQ* 42 (1980): 359-80. Other important works on the reception of Paul include David Rensberger, *As the Apostle Teaches: The Development and Use of Paul’s Letters in Second-Century Christianity* (PhD diss., Yale University, 1981); David Rylardsaam, “Interpretations of Paul in the Early Church,” in *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification*, ed. David Aune (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2006), 148-187; Michael Bird and Joseph Dodson, eds., *Paul and the Second Century*, LNTS 412 (London: T&T Clark, 2011); White, *Remembering Paul*.

<sup>22</sup> Interest in Greek and Roman educational systems as they relate to the NT is increasing. See, e.g., Udo Schnelle, “Das frühe Christentum und die Bildung,” *NTS* 61 (2015): 113-43; Andrew W. Pitts and Matthew Ryan Hauge, eds., *Ancient Education and Early Christianity* (New York: T&T Clark, forthcoming).

questions about 1 Cor 1-4: (1) what is Paul arguing and (2) how is he arguing it? This study suggests that Paul, in 1 Cor 1-4, creatively adapts ancient Greek, Roman, and Second Temple Jewish educational practices and institutional features in order to portray the Corinthian community as an ancient school. As a familiar institution, the school provided Paul with an established script of behavioral norms from which he drew in order to defend himself (explaining that he has acted as a good teacher) and rebuke the Corinthians (depicting them as immature and unruly students). In fact, Paul used this scholastic model to cast the Corinthians' factionalism as a symptom of an inherently academic disease. They have failed to learn rightly Paul's most basic message, the λόγος of the cross.

### III. Methodology: Exegesis and Reception

In order to demonstrate this thesis, the following pages provide an exegetical study of 1 Cor 1-4, with special attention given to Paul's reception of Greco-Roman and Jewish educational traditions. As an exegetical study, this dissertation focuses on the text of 1 Corinthians, leaving important but ancillary issues such as historical causes of the Corinthian crises to the side. Close attention to the text is called for because, to date, only a few of the correspondences between 1 Corinthians and ancient educational traditions have been identified. Like Clement's telling suggestion that Paul made himself a ὑπογραμμός, many of Paul's nods to ancient education rely not on teaching and learning vocabulary obvious to contemporary readers (διδάσκειν, παιδεία, etc.), but rather on imagery and commonplaces that come into focus when we familiarize ourselves with



Greek, Roman, and Jewish education.<sup>23</sup> Moreover, several previously identified educational motifs have been misinterpreted and require a fresh reading.

In addition to being a work of exegesis, the following study is devoted to analyzing Paul's reception of what were by his time established educational traditions and institutions.<sup>24</sup> To paraphrase Frances Young, the terms "reception" and "appropriation" refer to processes by which interpreters make texts and traditions their own.<sup>25</sup> Though much reception history focuses on the reception of antiquity in modern or contemporary contexts,<sup>26</sup> this study explores the phenomenon of reception within antiquity.<sup>27</sup> Biblical scholarship, fascinated since its inception by the relationship between primitive Christianity and its Greek, Roman, and Jewish forebears, has developed several effective ways of describing the relationship between New Testament texts, authors, and other elements of ancient history. These include appeals to the importance of a text's historical context(s), or, as in the case of the History of Religions School, tracing the

---

<sup>23</sup> On comparison in biblical studies in general and on *topoi* in particular, see L. Michael White and John T. Fitzgerald, "Quod est comparandum: The Problem of Parallels," in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*, ed. John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White, NovTSup 110 (Brill: Leiden, 2003), 13-39.

<sup>24</sup> This study is not the only work of New Testament scholarship to investigate early Christian interaction with Greek, Roman, and Jewish texts and traditions under the guise of reception studies. For a recent notable example, see Courtney J.P. Friesen, *Reading Dionysus: Euripides' Bacchae and the Cultural Contestations of Greeks, Jews, Romans, and Christians*, STAC 95 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015).

<sup>25</sup> See Frances M. Young, *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997), 9.

<sup>26</sup> Within biblical studies, reception-historical studies have typically focused on the reception of biblical texts and concepts in later time periods. Some noteworthy examples include Peter Gorday, *Principles of Patristic Exegesis: Romans 9-11 in Origen, John Chrysostom and Augustine* (New York: Mellen, 1983); Candida R. Moss, *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010); Michael Lieb et al., eds., *The Oxford Handbook of the Reception History of the Bible* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011); Jennifer R. Strawbridge, *The Pauline Effect: The Use of the Pauline Epistles by Early Christian Writers* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015).

<sup>27</sup> See, e.g., Lorna Hardwick, *Reception Studies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003), 12-31.

influence of one historical phenomenon upon another. By focusing on Paul's reception of earlier educational traditions, I hope to avoid one common problem affecting many studies on Paul's historical contexts or historical influences: the positivistic historicist assumption that context or the influence of prior tradition determines the meaning of Pauline text.<sup>28</sup> By focusing on Paul's reception of other texts and traditions, I want to keep the accent upon Paul as an individual who actively reshaped the textual and cultural resources around him.<sup>29</sup> When Paul employs language and imagery similar to that of Quintilian or Ben Sira, he is not necessarily engaged in the same type of project as these educators but is rather adapting the educational traditions to which they bear witness in order to address the particularities of his relationship with the Corinthian community. His immediate concerns shape his figuration of dominant educational traditions.<sup>30</sup> Paul both

---

<sup>28</sup> As at least one recent dissertation argues, because Paul uses educational metaphors similar to those found in Quintilian to describe the act of teaching, the historical Paul must be appropriating the role of the teacher: Either he acted as a teacher when founding his communities his self-presentation as teacher is a capitulation to the expectations of the members of those communities (Adam White, *Where is The Wise Man? Graeco-Roman Education as a Background to the Divisions in 1 Corinthians 1-4* [PhD diss., Macquarie University, 2013]). White may or may not be correct. Studies emphasizing historical context tend to see context as a force determining historical meaning. In contrast, studies emphasizing reception see meaning as "realized at the point of reception" (See Charles Martindale, *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception* [Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993], 3). Meanings depend at least partially upon the activity and interpretive horizons of the receiver. My focus on Paul's reception of earlier educational theory and practice in his writing practices does not preclude the possibility that the historical Paul adopted a scholastic ethos when forming his communities. A letter like 1 Corinthians would be nonsensical to its actual recipients if it lacked strong correspondences between their personal experience with Paul and his description of himself and the community in the epistle. Nevertheless, this study focuses on the effects of educational traditions within the text of 1 Corinthians itself, not on the broader function of education on the historical development and function of the Corinthian community.

<sup>29</sup> Martindale writes: "it is worth remembering that reception was chosen, in the place of words like 'tradition' or 'heritage,' precisely to stress the *active* role played by the receivers" ("Thinking Through Reception," in *Classics and the Uses of Reception*, ed. Charles Martindale and Richard F. Thomas [Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006], 11. *Emphasis original*). For a recent example in Pauline studies that describes Paul's adoption and adaptation of earlier traditions (i.e., Hellenistic kingship traditions), see Joshua W. Jipp, *Christ is King: Paul's Royal Ideology* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015), 9. Jipp does not explicitly draw from reception theory, but he is quite clear that Paul is manipulating preformed traditions for his own ends.

<sup>30</sup> Hardwick, *Reception Studies*, 32-50.

appropriates and transforms the educational institutions of the Greeks, Romans, and Jews who surround him.<sup>31</sup> In fact, Paul’s reception of Greek, Roman, and Jewish educational traditions could be described as a “hybrid intervention,” that is, “a fusion of material from classical and other cultures” characterized by “reworking the source to create a political, social or aesthetic critique of the receiving society.”<sup>32</sup> Instead of identifying educational language in the Corinthian correspondence and then arguing from this data that the Corinthian community must have functioned as a scholastic community, we ought to consider exactly how Paul employs these educational traditions for his own argumentative ends.

#### IV. Chapter Summaries

This study proceeds in three major sections: 1) an introductory section summarizing both previous scholarship on Paul’s engagement with ancient education and introducing the features of the Greek, Roman, and Jewish educational systems most relevant for the present study; 2) a section demonstrating the pervasive presence of educational motifs, language, and logic in 1 Cor 1-4; and, finally, 3) a section explaining Paul’s creative reception of these traditions in 1 Cor 1-4 and their implications for future study of 1 Corinthians and Paul.

Because this dissertation is by no means the first study to suggest that Paul had some affinity with ancient education, the second chapter will survey modern scholarship germane to the study of Paul, ancient education, and 1 Corinthians. From this survey, it

---

<sup>31</sup> Hardwick, *Reception Studies*, 12.

<sup>32</sup> Hardwick, *Reception Studies*, 9.

will become clear that while interest in educational themes in 1 Cor 1-4 is increasing, most studies which have noted the presence of educational motifs and concepts have attempted to reconstruct what Ricoeur called “the world behind the text” in their light. Thus, the present study aims to complement this trend by offering a statement regarding Paul’s use of educational images and logic within the argument of 1 Cor 1-4.

Subsequently, chapter 3 will introduce the reader to Greek, Roman, and Jewish education in the late Hellenistic period and early Roman Empire. Any attempt to correlate Paul with ancient education cannot assume tacitly that he is familiar only with one or another of these educational traditions, but a thorough survey of all of ancient education and Paul’s interactions with it would require a multi-volume project. Consequently, chapter 3 will summarize the ancient educational traditions that I have judged most relevant to the interpretation of 1 Cor 1-4. Unlike the majority of studies which have emphasized philosophical or rhetorical training as the natural background for 1 Cor 1-4, I suggest that Paul’s educational discourse bears the greatest affinity with the earliest stages of Greek and Roman education, what we today would call primary education. Of course, I will also draw from discussions of philosophical and rhetorical education when appropriate, but one of this study’s distinctive features is its heavy emphasis on primary education, the most easily overlooked stage of the ancient curriculum. Additionally, I also argue that Second Temple Jewish educational theory and practice is relevant to the interpretation of 1 Cor 1-4. To that end, chapter 3 gives special attention to the educational traditions preserved in the wisdom literature of the late Hellenistic period and in the Philonic corpus.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> One cannot simply separate Greek and Jewish education in Second Temple Judaism. Both the wisdom tradition and Philo were decisively influenced by Hellenistic education. On Second Temple Jewish

Chapters 4, 5, and 6 comprise the heart of the argument. Over the course of these three chapters I analyze 1 Corinthians 1-4 twice. In chapters 4 and 5 my goal is simply to demonstrate the consistent presence of Greek, Roman, and Jewish educational motifs running throughout 1 Cor 1-4. However, the arrangement of chapters 4 and 5 warrants some further explanation. Chapters 4 and 5 do not analyze 1 Cor 1:10-4:21 sequentially. Chapter 4 begins in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21, the *locus classicus* for educational discourse in 1 Corinthians. By beginning in 1 Cor 3:1, I am not suggesting that ancient readers would have read Paul's epistle out of order but am acquiescing to the nature of the material: 1 Corinthians 3:1-4:21 contains the highest concentration of explicitly educational motifs in the entire epistle and, properly read, provides a hermeneutical vantage point for the analysis contained in this study's subsequent chapters. Indeed, after analyzing 1 Cor 3:1-4:21, chapter 5 will identify less obvious but equally significant educational language and concepts in 1 Cor 1:10-2:16. In addition to identifying allusions to ancient education, chapters 4 and 5 suggest that when the educational motifs and concepts identified in 1 Cor 1-4 are read collectively, it becomes clear that Paul described himself as a teacher, the Corinthians as his students, and his earliest message as a curriculum: that is, as the three most basic components of a school.

Since chapters 4 and 5 focus on identifying Paul's educational motifs without pausing to explain Paul's deployment of them in his broader argument, chapter 6 provides a reading of all of 1 Cor 1:10-4:21, giving special attention to the ways Paul adapted antecedent educational traditions for his own argumentative ends. In this chapter,

---

interaction with Greek education, see chapter 3, section II.B. Nevertheless, both Philo and the wisdom tradition describe distinctively Jewish educational philosophies which warrant treating them separately from Greek and Roman sources. These varied Greek, Roman, and Jewish perspectives on ancient education provide the clearest available picture of the educational ecosystem in which Paul lived and worked.

I contend that while Paul foregrounds the factionalism of the Corinthians as cause for concern (1:10), in fact, he interprets their factionalism as a symptom of the Corinthians' failure to learn the most basic Christian message, the λόγος of the cross (1:18).

Throughout 1:10-4:21, Paul draws on the logic of ancient teaching and learning to describe himself as a good teacher, whose behavior is consistent with the principles he teaches, and the Corinthians as poor students, whose bad behavior demonstrates that they have failed to learn their basic lessons. That is, while chapters 4 and 5 made it clear that Paul characterizes the community as a school, in chapter 6 I suggest that Paul relies on this scholastic model in order to both defend his apostolic authority (presenting himself as a good teacher) and to censure the Corinthians (depicting them as poor students).

In conclusion, chapter 7 will take stock of the data outlined in chapters 2-6. After summarizing the most salient points from the previous chapters, chapter 7 will explore the value of this interpretation of 1 Cor 1-4 for future research. This summary will discuss the implications of this reading of 1 Cor 1-4 findings for the interpretation of 1 Corinthians as a whole, as well as for the interpretation of the broader phenomena of Paul and Pauline Christianity.

## Chapter 2:

### Previous Scholarship on Paul, the Corinthians, and Ancient Education

Modern New Testament scholarship has been guided by a number of ready-made critical questions, especially the problem of Paul's own educational background.<sup>1</sup> These studies have, each in their own way, sought to uncover Paul's historical context, or features of his social world. For the purposes of the present study, there are three research trends of particular value: studies focused on the propositional contents of early Christian teaching, studies correlating Paul and the Corinthians with Greek and Roman education, and studies correlating Paul with Jewish education. As will become clear, those scholars who have treated the ancient educational evidence with the greatest sensitivity have attempted to reconstruct the social situation of historical Corinthian community. But as Elizabeth Clark has convincingly argued, "Christian writings from late antiquity should be read first and foremost as literary productions before they are read as sources of social data."<sup>2</sup> Hence, this chapter has two goals: first, to provide an overview of the most relevant scholarship on ancient education and 1 Corinthians; second, to suggest that socio-historical studies of the role of education in the Corinthian

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition to the studies discussed here, it might also prove beneficial to survey scholarship devoted to Paul's own educational background. The geographical location, contents, and extent of his education will doubtless remain a matter of considerable debate. See, esp., A.D. Nock, *St. Paul* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1963), 21-34; W.C. van Unnik, *Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009); Norbert Hagede, *Saint Paul et la culture grecque* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1966), 55-58, 62-66; Martin Hengel, *The Pre-Christian Paul* (London: SCM, 1991), esp. 1-62; Ronald Hock, "Paul and Greco-Roman Education," in *Paul in the Greco-Roman World: A Handbook*, ed. J. Paul Sampley (Harrisburg, PA: Trinity International Press, 2003), 189-227; Tor Vegge, *Paulus und das antike Schulwesen: Schule und Bildung des Paulus*, BZNW 134 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2006); Ryan Shellenberger, *Rethinking Paul's Rhetorical Education: Comparative Rhetoric and 2 Corinthians 10-13*, ECL 10 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013).

<sup>2</sup> Elizabeth A. Clark, *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004), 159.

community ought to be complemented by an exegetical study which explains the role of ancient education in Paul's argument in 1 Cor 1-4.

## I. The Contents of Paul's Teaching

### A. C.H. Dodd and Benjamin Edsall

Today it is common to read 1 Corinthians in light of careful historical reconstructions of Greco-Roman education. However, some of the most influential discussions of Paul's "teaching" in 1 Corinthians gave little attention to historical parallels. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century, some scholars were engaged in an attempt to recover the contents of the early Christian catechism.<sup>3</sup> The form critics among them distinguished between early Christian preaching and early Christian teaching as two distinct literary forms, each with its own purpose in the life of early Christian communities.<sup>4</sup> Among these form critics, C.H. Dodd produced the sharpest and most influential statement concerning the distinction between early Christian preaching and early Christian teaching.<sup>5</sup> Dodd began his study in 1 Cor 1:21:

'It pleased God,' says Paul, 'by the foolishness of the Preaching to save them that believe.' The word here translated 'preaching,' *kerygma*, signifies not the action of the preacher, but that which he preaches, his 'message,' as we sometimes say. The New Testament writers draw a clear distinction between preaching and teaching.... Teaching (*didaskain*) is in a large majority of cases

---

<sup>3</sup> For a thorough survey of modern scholarship, see Benjamin Edsall, "Kerygma, Catechesis, and Other Things We Used to Find: Twentieth-Century Research on Early Christian Teaching since Alfred Seeberg (1903)," *CBR* 10 (2012): 410-41. Of the works discussed by Edsall, see esp. Alfred Seeberg, *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1903); idem, *Die Didache des Judentums und der Urchristenheit* (Leipzig: Deichert, 1908); Martin Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, trans. Bertram Lee Woolf (New York: Scribner's Sons, 1956).

<sup>4</sup> Dibelius, *From Tradition to Gospel*, 17, lists a number of distinctive literary forms.

<sup>5</sup> C.H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments: Three Lectures* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936).



ethical instruction. Occasionally it seems to include what we should call apologetic.... Sometimes, especially in the Johannine letters, it includes the exposition of theological doctrine. Preaching, on the other hand, is the public proclamation of Christianity to the non-Christian world. The verb *keryssein* properly means ‘to proclaim.’<sup>6</sup>

Since the publication of Dodd’s lectures in 1936, the guild has exhibited consistent interest in Paul’s preaching,<sup>7</sup> giving only minimal and sporadic attention to Paul’s teaching.<sup>8</sup> Seeberg’s quest for early Christian catechesis fell by the wayside, its neglect a result of the form-critical impulse to work back to the earliest and most foundational of early Christian traditions. If preaching was primary and teaching secondary then of course Pauline preaching is of the greatest interest. Some studies have investigated Paul’s “moral teaching” or the “moral formation” he practiced in his communities,<sup>9</sup> but these

---

<sup>6</sup> Dodd, *Apostolic Preaching*, 7-8.

<sup>7</sup> Among the various approaches to Pauline preaching found in modern scholarship, see, e.g., Rudolf Bultmann, *Der Stil der paulinischen Predigt und die kynisch-stoische Diatribe*, FRLANT 13 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910); Johannes Munck, “1 Thess 1:9-10 and the Missionary Preaching of Paul,” *NTS* 9 (1962-63): 95-110; Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul on Preaching* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964); Paul Bormann, *Die Heilswirksamkeit der Verkündigung nach dem Apostel Paulus: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Verkündigung* (Paderborn: Bonifacius Druckerei, 1965); J.C. Hurd, “Paul’s First Preaching in Corinth,” in *The Origin of 1 Corinthians* (New York: Seabury, 1965), 273-88; Dieter Georgi, “Forms of Religious Propaganda,” in *Jesus in His Time*, ed. H. J. Schultz (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971), 124-131; Claus Bussman, *Themen der paulinischen Missionspredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionsliteratur* (Bern: Lang, 1975); Dieter Kemmler, *Faith and Human Reason: A Study of Paul’s Method of Preaching as Illustrated by 1 Thessalonians 1-2 and Acts 17:2-4*, *NovTSup* 40 (Leiden: Brill, 1975); Ronald F. Hock, “The Workshop as a Social Setting for Paul’s Missionary Preaching,” *CBQ* 41 (1979): 438-50; John William Beauden, *Paul’s Theology of Preaching* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1988); Abraham J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987), 5-33; Duane Litfin, *St. Paul’s Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Greco-Roman Rhetoric*, *SNTSMS* 79 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994); James W. Thompson, *Preaching Like Paul: Homiletical Wisdom for Today* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001).

<sup>8</sup> As in the basically hagiographical work of Roy B. Zuck, *Teaching as Paul Taught* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998), which argues not only that Paul was a teacher, but a master teacher. See esp. pp. 60-109. Similarly, Kent Johnson, *Paul the Teacher: A Resource for Teachers in the Church* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986).

<sup>9</sup> See, e.g., Victor Furnish, *The Moral Teaching of Paul: Selected Issues*, 3rd ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 2009); James W. Thompson, *Moral Formation According to Paul: The Context and Coherence of Pauline Ethics* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011).

investigations have been relatively limited in scope, focused, for example, on the paraenetic function of virtue and vice lists, or the ethical commands in his letters.<sup>10</sup>

The search for the catechism, however, is reasserting itself. In his recent dissertation, Benjamin Edsall pays greater attention to Paul's teaching than did any of Dodd's followers.<sup>11</sup> Rather than distinguishing between preaching and teaching, Edsall suggests that we ought to employ the term "instruction" as a heuristic category to describe the knowledge imparted in the course of early-Christian communication.<sup>12</sup> "Instruction" seems a suitably neutral term to cover the range of communicative techniques early Christians might have employed.

The bulk of Edsall's study aims to identify the content of Paul's Christian instruction via an analysis of 1 Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, and Romans. Edsall argues that one can identify early Christian instruction in Paul's letters by watching out for indicators that Paul is appealing to knowledge that his audiences should already possess.

These indicators take three forms:

The first comprises (1) *explicit reminders about Paul's teaching* seen in such places as 1 Thess 4:1, Gal 5:21, or 1 Cor 2:1-4. The second type of appeal comprises (2) *direct appeals to knowledge* (you know, do you not know, etc.).... These do not necessarily involve a clear link between the stated knowledge and Paul's teaching ... but merely that the knowledge was familiar.

---

<sup>10</sup> E.g., Wolfgang Schrager, *Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese: Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Ethik* (Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1961); Eberhard Kamlah, *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*, WUNT 7 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964).

<sup>11</sup> Benjamin Edsall, *Paul's Witness to Formative Early Christian Instruction*, WUNT 2/365 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014). Additionally, note Edsall's lengthy review article of the history of the form-critical distinction between preaching and teaching, "Kerygma, Catechesis, and Other Things We Used to Find," 410-41. For an earlier survey of the content of Paul's teaching, see C.A. Anderson Scott, *Saint Paul: The Man and the Teacher* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936; repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013).

<sup>12</sup> Edsall, *Paul's Witness to Formative Early Christian Instruction*, 4.

The third type is an (3) *implicit appeal to knowledge*, found in concepts and statements that are fundamental to Paul's argument but not explicated by him in the letter.<sup>13</sup>

As one might expect, explicit reminders of Paul's teaching provide the most assured results. With regard to 1 Corinthians, Edsall concludes that most of the direct references to Christian instruction in 1 Corinthians are clustered in three portions of the letter: 1 Cor 1-4, 11, and 15.<sup>14</sup> These are the sections that contain Paul's "word of the cross," his appeals to faith, teaching about baptism, the Spirit, the Lord's Supper, and his ethical teachings (i.e., his "ways" [4:17]).<sup>15</sup>

#### B. The Relevance of Preaching, Teaching, and Instruction for 1 Cor 1-4

Edsall doubtless chose to focus on "instruction" rather than "preaching and teaching" because Dodd's antithesis between "preaching" and "teaching" has drawn increasingly heavy fire, most notably from James McDonald and J.D.G. Dunn.<sup>16</sup> The latter, for example, worried about speaking of a single unified *kerygma*, as if there were no variation between the *kerygmata* of Jesus and Paul.<sup>17</sup> Stanley Stowers has also seriously questioned the integrity of the traditional distinction between preaching and teaching. "Paul's admittedly diatribe-like style," he argues, "does not provide us with a reason for supposing that he was a Cynic-like street preacher. If anything, the style

---

<sup>13</sup> Edsall, *Paul's Witness to Formative Early Christian Instruction*, 30. Emphasis original.

<sup>14</sup> Edsall, *Paul's Witness to Formative Early Christian Instruction*, 74-87.

<sup>15</sup> Summarized in Edsall, *Paul's Witness to Formative Early Christian Instruction*, 88.

<sup>16</sup> See esp. J.D.G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, 3rd ed. (London: SCM, 2006); James I. H. McDonald, *Kerygma and Didache: The Articulation and Structure of the Earliest Christian Message*, SNTSMS 37 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980).

<sup>17</sup> Dunn, *Unity and Diversity*, 12-33.

suggests an audience of disciples, taught privately, and not occasional audiences of ‘those who happened to be present.’”<sup>18</sup> On Stowers’s socio-historical reading, Paul’s preaching—rather than being intellectually antecedent to ethical teaching—itself conformed to an educational model. Such difficulties notwithstanding, the distinction between preaching and teaching remains a part of the New Testament guild’s collective unconscious.

Dodd, Edsall, and all who have worked to compile the contents of early Christian teaching or instruction have made a vital scholarly contribution. The present study too will at times focus on the contents of Paul’s teaching. Nevertheless, criticisms like those of Dunn and Stowers demonstrate the limited utility of a focus on the contents of early Christian teaching for a historically oriented study of educational motifs in 1 Cor 1-4. Stowers in particular reveals one limitation of the form-critical approach to teaching: its focus on propositional content to the exclusion of other institutional components of ancient education, such as didactic method, the identity of one’s students, policies for remuneration, etc. No classicist asked to discuss the topic of teaching in Roman Empire would focus exclusively on curricular content, and neither will the following chapters.

## II. Paul and Greco-Roman Education

### A. E.A. Judge

Whereas the form-critical approach to Pauline teaching failed to read Pauline teaching (or instruction) against the examples of education found in Greco-Roman antiquity, no scholar has done more than E.A. Judge, an early exponent of social history,

---

<sup>18</sup> Stanley Stowers, “Social Status, Public Speaking and Private Teaching: The Circumstances of Paul’s Preaching Activity,” *NovT* 36 (1984): 63.

to compare Paul to all stages of Greek and Roman education. His most important contributions to the topic come in three major essays, titled “The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community,”<sup>19</sup> “The Conflict of Educational Aims in the New Testament,”<sup>20</sup> and “The Reaction against Classical Education in the New Testament.”<sup>21</sup> Several of the most important works on early Christianity and Greco-Roman education published since Judge have been attempts to test the theses advanced in these essays.<sup>22</sup>

In “The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community,” Judge outlines three basic functions of early Christian groups. The first is cultic or ritual (i.e., Christians joined together to engage in religious activities, to which the elements of liturgies in the New Testament documents attest). The second function was as “agencies of social welfare.” That is, they operated not only for their spiritual concerns but also sought, to contribute positively to their communities.<sup>23</sup> Judge notes that while these first two functions of

---

<sup>19</sup> E.A. Judge, “The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community,” in idem, *The First Christians in the Roman World: Augustan and New Testament Essays*, WUNT 229 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008), 526-52.

<sup>20</sup> E.A. Judge, “The Conflict of Educational Aims in the New Testament,” in idem, *The First Christians in the Roman World*, 693-708.

<sup>21</sup> E.A. Judge, “The Reaction against Classical Education in the New Testament,” in idem, *The First Christians in the Roman World*, 709-716.

<sup>22</sup> In addition to the works discussed below, see, e.g., Ross Saunders, “Attalus, Paul, and *Paideia*: The Contribution of I. Eph. 202 to Pauline Studies,” in *Ancient History in a Modern University: Proceedings of a Conference held at Macquarie University, 8-13 July 1993 to mark twenty-five years of the teaching of Ancient History at Macquarie University and the retirement from the Chair of Professor Edwin Judge*, ed. T.W. Hillard et al., 2 vols. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998), 175-83. Saunders argues that I. Eph. 202—an inscription memorializing a teacher—may have influenced Paul to describe his work as an exercise in a Christian education. This influence, he argues, is evident in the shared vocabulary of the inscription and the Pauline corpus.

<sup>23</sup> Additionally, note Bruce Winter, *Seek the Welfare of the City: Early Christians as Benefactors and Citizens* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994).

Christian communities are generally recognized, the earliest Christian churches served a third, understudied function, namely, as scholastic communities.<sup>24</sup>

According to Judge, the best way to describe Paul's scholastic role in the early Christian communities was with a title applied to many ancient educators: sophist.<sup>25</sup> This is, Judge admits, a controversial categorization but he concludes that this is how Paul's contemporaries would have perceived him. "At their best," Judge writes, the sophists "were intellectual leaders of great eminence, not only in preserving the classical heritage but in guiding public policy and private morality in their own day."<sup>26</sup> For Judge, this definition of the sophist includes not only recognized champions of the Second Sophistic—Aelius Aristides and Dio Chrysostom, for example—but also figures more commonly thought of as philosophers, such as Epictetus, the cynics, and Apollonius of Tyana. As Judge writes,

the attempt to place St. Paul in this professional class [i.e., among the sophists] itself discloses important ways in which he was different from every other member of it known to us. What other touring preacher established a set of corporate societies independent of himself and yet linked to him by a constant traffic of delegations? On the other hand the object of the missions underlines again the intellectual character of Paul's activity. He is always anxious about the transmission of the *logos* and the acquisition of true *gnosis*. The mystery that he propagates is by that very fact a revealed secret, to be publicly inculcated by every means. The Christian faith, therefore, as Paul expounds it, belongs with the doctrines of the philosophical schools rather than with the esoteric rituals of the mystery religions.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> Judge, "The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community," 531.

<sup>25</sup> Judge, "The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community," 539.

<sup>26</sup> Judge, "The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community," 540.

<sup>27</sup> Judge, "The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community," 551.

Judge's understanding of "scholastic community" seems to mean that Paul and his communities were concerned with the intellectual significance of the Christian message, not merely with its ritual enactment or significance for producing and maintaining social order; it resembles a school of philosophy.

Given the trend in "The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community," it would be reasonable to expect that Judge's subsequent work would continue to emphasize the similarities between Pauline communities and ancient schools, philosophical or otherwise. Instead, Judge argues that earliest churches, as a consequence of the bifurcation between Judaism and Hellenism, were diametrically opposed to the practice of Greek and Roman education in all its forms.<sup>28</sup> Greek and Roman education, from earliest childhood education to mature philosophical speculation or rhetorical disputation, sought to establish the status and supremacy of the individual educated person; Paul, on the other hand, was concerned only to establish the glory of God.<sup>29</sup> This is not to say that Christian leaders like Paul did not concern themselves with the formation of Christian individuals, only that their efforts so to form individuals were, because of their radically different goals, not proper examples of Greek or Roman education.<sup>30</sup> In Judge's own words: "what the New Testament churches were doing could in some respects very

---

<sup>28</sup> E.A. Judge, "The Conflict of Educational Aims in the New Testament," 693-95; "The Reaction against Classical Education in the New Testament," 709-16. Judge's Harnackian description of Judaism and Hellenism is no longer tenable since the publication of Martin Hengel's seminal *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*, 2 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974). See also Adam H. Becker and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds., *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, TSAJ 95 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003).

<sup>29</sup> E.A. Judge, "The Conflict of Educational Aims in the New Testament," 700-701.

<sup>30</sup> Judge writes: "The Apostles were not concerned with systems of education as such. But they were dedicated to the preparation of man for his proper end, as they saw it. This threw them into conflict with the principles of the established educational systems, at least insofar as their final goals were concerned" ("The Conflict of Educational Aims in the New Testament," 703).

readily have been described in educational terms. There is a considerable amount of teaching going on and great emphasis is placed on growth in understanding. But when analogies are sought for this ... they are not drawn from education.”<sup>31</sup>

Judge both associates Pauline Christianity with and distances it from the educational structures of Greek and Roman antiquity. Paul’s churches are scholastic in that they rely on Paul’s quasi-philosophical presentation of the gospel. Yet according to Judge, when one compares early Christianity and the actual educational practices of the Greek and Roman world, their different goals and the lack of shared analogies for describing intellectual growth demonstrate that Christian scholasticism and Greco-Roman education are two radically different games.

Though Judge was quite concerned to treat Christian education as *sui generis* among the ancient schools, his work remains the first serious twentieth-century attempt to juxtapose Paul (and the other NT writers) with Greek and Roman schooling. Ultimately, his scholarship blazed two trails in the study of Paul and ancient education. The first studied Paul against the lower, or primary levels of ancient education, while the second championed the study of Paul and his communities against the backdrop of higher education, namely rhetoric and philosophy. As will quickly become clear, subsequent scholarship has largely chosen to follow one or the other, with rhetorical and philosophical education attracting the lion’s share of attention. We will first discuss studies correlating Paul with preliminary forms of Greek and Roman education before discussing the (many more) studies which have studied Paul against higher education.

---

<sup>31</sup> Judge, “The Reaction against Classical Education in the New Testament,” 712.



### B. Robert S. Dutch

Robert Dutch's *The Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians* represents a pivotal moment in Corinthian scholarship.<sup>32</sup> Many have suggested that Greek and Roman rhetorical or philosophical education were a precipitating cause for the tensions in the Corinthian community, but Dutch argues that Greco-Roman education other than rhetoric or philosophy might shed light on 1 Corinthians. A revision of his 1998 University of Bristol Ph.D. dissertation, Dutch's book has a clear thesis: The social elites of the Corinthian community are Paul's true opponents in Corinth, and the worldview inculcated by their education in the Greek gymnasium led them to oppose Paul. "They cannot," writes Dutch, "transfer the cultural values of *paideia* learnt in the gymnasium with its intellectual and physical conflict, set within its religious tradition, to the new faith."<sup>33</sup> Consequently, *The Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians* supports Judge's conclusion that Greek and Roman education and early Christianity were incompatible, and that the New Testament bears witness to that tension.

Unlike Judge, however, Dutch builds his argument upon the similarities between Paul's language in 1 Corinthians and ancient literary descriptions of education.<sup>34</sup> Dutch produces a catalogue of eight texts—six of which lie in 1 Cor 1-4—which he considers linguistically or conceptually parallel to other sources for ancient education. In order of treatment, they are: Paul's claim to be the Corinthians' father (4:14-21); Paul's image of the boxer (9:24-27); nursing and nature language (3:1-4); agricultural imagery (3:5-9);

---

<sup>32</sup> Robert S. Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians: Education and Community Conflict in Graeco-Roman Context*, JSNTSup 271 (London: T&T Clark, 2005).

<sup>33</sup> Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 302.

<sup>34</sup> For example, he is conversant with the most important secondary literature on ancient education. See Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 58-64, 86-90.

Paul's reference to "the rod" (4:21); the term γραμματεύς, which Dutch reads as the title of an official of the gymnasium (1:20); the unusual phrase τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται as a reference to early literate education (4:6); and reference to circumcision and epispasm (7:18). These parallels provide the strongest potential support for Dutch's argument that Paul's opponents were educated in a gymnasium.

Dutch's interpretation of these parallels does not adequately support his thesis. He fails to demonstrate an essential connection between these apparent educational motifs and the Corinthian gymnasium. While he does cite good evidence for the variety of educational activities found in Hellenistic gymnasia,<sup>35</sup> and while there is some evidence that a gymnasium may have existed in Corinth in the latter half of the first century CE,<sup>36</sup> this does not in itself prove that the gymnasium was the social setting for elite Corinthian education. To make his case, Dutch would have needed to establish either that the gymnasium was the only setting in which a Corinthian might have been educated (an impossible task), or, more feasibly, that Paul's own language in 1 Corinthians correlates with the some aspect of gymnastic life.

---

<sup>35</sup> Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 106-109.

<sup>36</sup> The evidence for a Corinthian gymnasium at the time 1 Corinthians was composed is ambiguous. One unpublished inscription that may date to 55 CE contains a list naming athletic officials and athletic victors (see Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 133). For a judicious discussion of the evidence, see Timothy A. Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom, Stoic Philosophy, and the Ancient Economy*, SNTSMS 159 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 136-47. Brookins concludes: "In sum, while it is possible that the Corinthian gymnasium ... had not been constructed by the time of the Corinthian correspondence ... neither can its existence at that time be ruled out" (*Corinthian Wisdom*, 140). Dutch's study, which assumes the presence of a gymnasium, should be contrasted with Jerome Murphy-O'Connor, *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*, 3rd ed. (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2002), 35, who argues that the gymnasium had not been constructed by Paul's time. Even if there was no Corinthian gymnasium in the mid-50s CE, Dutch argues that the Corinthians may have received their gymnastic educations in other cities before relocating to Corinth, or that parents may have paid fees to send their sons to study in gymnasia in other cities (Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 95, 138-47).

Yet when we consider the list of educational *topoi* Dutch cites as evidence for Paul's critique of gymnastic mores, only three of them seem to refer to the gymnasium—Paul's use of the term γραμματεὺς in 1:20, the reference to epispasm in 7:18, and the athletic imagery in 9:24-27. Dutch's interpretations of these texts are tendentious, and first two of these *topoi* are easily dismissed. The notion that Paul's use of the term γραμματεὺς in 1 Cor 1:20 refers to a secretary affiliated with ephebic education is uncertain, at best.<sup>37</sup> While the term γραμματεὺς could describe such a secretary, Dutch ignores the way that 1 Cor 1:22-24 contrasts Jewish and Greek responses to the “word of the cross.” It is more likely that γραμματεὺς here refers to a Jewish scribe, a Jewish wise-man and counterpart of the philosophers and sophists.<sup>38</sup> Similarly, Dutch is correct that epispasm, the surgical procedure reversing male circumcision, is a phenomenon attested during Jewish enrollment in the Hellenistic gymnasia.<sup>39</sup> However, it was also a potential problem for Jews who would not have undertaken an ephebic education but who would have attended public baths (doubtless a significantly larger number, given the elite nature of the ephebate).<sup>40</sup>

The final case—the athletic imagery in 9:24-27—is the most potentially persuasive but it too falls short.<sup>41</sup> Even if we assumed for the sake of argument that this

---

<sup>37</sup> Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 284-87.

<sup>38</sup> See Chapter 5, section I.C.

<sup>39</sup> Cf. 1 Macc 1:14-15.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Martial, 7.82: “So large a sheath covers Menophilus’ penis that it would be enough by itself for all our comic actors. I had supposed (we often bathe together [*saepe lavamur*]) that he was anxious to spare his voice, Flaccus. But while he was in a game in the middle of the sportsground with everybody watching, the sheath slipped off the poor soul; he was circumcised” (LCL, Shackleton Bailey).

<sup>41</sup> Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 219-48.

athletic imagery was overtly educational imagery and not, e.g., derived from the Isthmian games, it does not automatically follow that its proper source domain was gymnastic education. In fact, athletic training provided a common metaphor for the decidedly non-athletic process of studying under a grammarian. “The school of literature is ‘the gymnasium of wisdom, where is shown the path to the blessed life.’ The literary education is ‘the gymnastic of the soul’; the literary culture, a matter of training (ἄσκησις), achieved through ‘the sweat of the Muses.’”<sup>42</sup> It is with this common metaphor in mind that Raffaella Cribiore titled her monograph on Hellenistic education *Gymnastics of the Mind*. When Paul uses the image of the boxer, then, he may be alluding not to gymnastic education but to its less physical analogue, literate education, which may or may not have taken place within Hellenistic gymnasias.<sup>43</sup>

These concerns regarding Dutch’s thesis notwithstanding, some have accepted his conclusion that his elite Corinthian opponents received a gymnastic education.<sup>44</sup> For those readers, we should note that even if Dutch’s exegesis of 1:20, 7:19, and 9:24-27 were proved correct, the argument would still be problematic. As Edward Adams pointed out in his incisive review, Dutch pays insufficient attention to the exegetical context of the educational imagery he identifies in 1 Corinthians.<sup>45</sup> As a result, Dutch does not

---

<sup>42</sup> Robert Kaster, *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), 16-17.

<sup>43</sup> These shortcomings notwithstanding, Dutch does provide a useful introduction to the institution of the Greek gymnasium which should be referenced by anyone interested in the gymnasium in the Greek East under Roman rule. See Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 95-167.

<sup>44</sup> James R. Harrison, “Paul and the Gymnasiarchs: Two Approaches to Pastoral Formation in Antiquity,” in *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*, ed. Stanley E. Porter, PAST 5 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 141-78; James R. Harrison, “Paul and the Ancient Gymnasium,” in *Learning and Teaching Theology: Some Ways Ahead*, ed. Les Ball and James R. Harrison (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2015), 33-48.

<sup>45</sup> Edward Adams, review of *Paul and the Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians*, by Robert S. Dutch, *JSNT* 29 (2006): 240-41.

comment on the fact that when Paul uses educational metaphors and *topoi*, he seems to employ them favorably. When Paul calls himself a father, wonders aloud whether he should engage in corporal punishment, or compares himself to a boxer, he does not seem to be critiquing the ethos of the gymnasium. On the contrary, he deploys educational imagery positively, using it to describe his own behavior and not the supposedly aberrant culture of Corinthian elites.<sup>46</sup> This limitation notwithstanding, Dutch's study provides a starting place for all who argue that Greco-Roman education other than rhetoric or philosophy might shed light on the Corinthian situation.

### C. Karl Olav Sandnes

Karl Sandnes has provided a systematic overview of Christian responses to Greco-Roman education from the first- through fifth-centuries CE.<sup>47</sup> Although the majority of the study is devoted to early Christian literate education after the New Testament, Sandnes allocates the final chapter to a consideration of attitudes toward Greek encyclical education in the New Testament. His basic goal in this chapter is to reevaluate Judge's claim that the New Testament reacts against classical education and, consequently, that any educational motifs found therein must be read metaphorically (since the topic of education is not being dealt with in itself). Sandnes ultimately finds Judge's position satisfactory.<sup>48</sup>

---

<sup>46</sup> Dutch also devotes relatively limited space to the arguments of Justin Meggitt that Corinthian culture was in fact not so stratified as Theissen et al. have concluded (Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 42-44). See Justin Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty, and Survival* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998).

<sup>47</sup> Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer*.

<sup>48</sup> Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer*, 271.

Sandnes's study is a valuable contribution to scholarship on early Christianity's engagement with classical education. However, his discussion of the New Testament's engagement with Greco-Roman education is limited by his methodology. Essentially a piece of *Wirkungsgeschichte* in reverse, Sandnes allows his survey of early Christian reactions to encyclical education from the second century onward to determine the topics he examines in the New Testament. For example, numerous patristic authors consider traditional Greco-Roman propaedeutic to the formation of Christian virtue,<sup>49</sup> so Sandnes's discussion of the New Testament's engagement with Greco-Roman education looks hard for examples of educational logic which emphasizes progress toward virtue.<sup>50</sup> The results are largely negative. The New Testament does not discuss classical education in the same fashion as, e.g., Clement of Alexandria, the Cappadocians, or Augustine did.<sup>51</sup>

Sandnes nevertheless offers some telling suggestions regarding Paul's relationship with Greek and Roman education. "Encyclical studies," he writes, "never come to the surface in Paul's extant letters. The terminology of education is, however, well attested, but used for other matters."<sup>52</sup> While it may be impossible to determine exactly how Paul would have counseled a father seeking a Greek education for his son, it is evident that Paul was familiar with the language other authors used to describe early education. Second, it is notable that Sandnes has identified a stage of education other than philosophy or rhetoric as the realm of Greco-Roman education with which Paul's letters

---

<sup>49</sup> Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer*, 124-59.

<sup>50</sup> Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer*, 255-69.

<sup>51</sup> Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer*, 8-9.

<sup>52</sup> Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer*, 269.

bear the most linguistic affinity. His study reaffirms Dutch's impulse to correlate Paul's language in 1 Corinthians with the educational mores of an institutional setting like the gymnasium. Finally, Sandnes notes that even while Paul does not directly comment on encyclical education, he employs terminology and concepts derived from Greek education positively to structure his arguments, e.g., using παιδεία language to explain moral progress.<sup>53</sup> Thus, Sandnes, unlike Dutch, indicates that when we can identify educational motifs in Paul's corpus, they may tell us more about Paul himself than they do about Paul's opponents.

#### D. Claire S. Smith

Claire Smith has provided yet another reappraisal of Judge's "scholastic communities" thesis.<sup>54</sup> Her investigation argues—via a lexical-semantic analysis of the vocabulary of teaching and learning in 1 Corinthians and the Pastoral epistles—that Pauline communities were "learning communities." While Smith's study provides a useful resource for those seeking lexical parallels of key words in 1 Corinthians and the Pastoral epistles, its utility for the present project is limited by its methodology and some of its working assumptions. First, not everyone will accept Smith's presupposition that Paul himself authored the Pastoral Epistles.<sup>55</sup> Second, Smith adopts a cognitive-linguistic approach to the question, constructing a broad definition of "teaching" based on modern English dictionaries and then seeking to identify all the terms in 1 Corinthians and the

---

<sup>53</sup> Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer*, 257.

<sup>54</sup> Claire S. Smith, *Pauline Communities as "Scholastic Communities:" A Study of the Vocabulary of "Teaching" in 1 Corinthians, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*, WUNT 2/335 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 1-13.

<sup>55</sup> Smith, *Pauline Communities*, 15-30.

Pastorals that fall within the domain covered by her definition of teaching.<sup>56</sup> Her reliance on this semantic domain allows her to investigate teaching and learning vocabulary (such as διδασκαλία and cognates), but she also investigates more marginal (and very common) lexemes like βούλομαι and θέλω. As such, the study provides little access to the structure and function of Pauline communities themselves. In fact, her most notable conclusion is that we should emend Judge’s appellation for Pauline communities, calling them “learning communities” rather than “scholastic communities.”<sup>57</sup>

Perhaps if Smith had given more attention to Greek or Roman discussions of education and integrated this into her cognitive-linguistic methodology—e.g., using the ancient authors and not modern dictionaries to form her definition of education—she would have been able to argue not just that learning took place in Paul’s communities, but that they resembled ancient schools. This would certainly have enabled her more thoroughly to evaluate Judge’s original hypothesis. Despite these qualifications, Smith does demonstrate that the vocabulary of teaching and learning is intrinsic to the language of 1 Corinthians and the Pastorals, and this conclusion ought to lead us to investigate, wherever possible, the teaching and learning practices to which those texts refer.

#### E. Abraham J. Malherbe

We turn now to examine the second scholarly trajectory begun by E.A. Judge. As we have seen, a few scholars have compared Paul and the New Testament to lower levels of Greek and Roman education (or, in Smith’s case, simply to “education” sans

---

<sup>56</sup> Smith, *Pauline Communities*, 41-51.

<sup>57</sup> Smith, *Pauline Communities*, 390.



substantive discussion of the historical *realia* of ancient education). Other scholars, however, have scoured the corpora of the Hellenistic philosophical schools in search of analogues for Paul's pastoral practice and the function of his communities. After Judge, the major proponent of this approach to Paul and his communities is Abraham Malherbe.

Malherbe's essay "Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament" set the agenda for much of his scholarly work on Paul.<sup>58</sup> First submitted for publication in 1972, his study languished with the publisher for two decades, finally appearing in 1992. In the interim, pre-publication copies circulated throughout the New Testament guild, encouraging renewed awareness of Hellenistic Philosophy. The paper sparked special interest among Malherbe's students at Yale, many of whose dissertations were cited in the final published edition. One particularly significant contribution of "Hellenistic Moralists" was a section dedicated to psychagogy,<sup>59</sup> which Malherbe summarized as the system "ancient philosophers devoted to their followers' intellectual, spiritual, and moral growth."<sup>60</sup> Much of this section of "Hellenistic Moralists" centered on parallels between Paul's pastoral practice and the psychagogic practice of Epicurus, Zeno, Musonius Rufus, Epictetus, and Seneca.<sup>61</sup> Malherbe concluded: "The initial attempts that have been made to bring the psychagogic tradition to bear on NT practice justify the expectation that this

---

<sup>58</sup> "Abraham J. Malherbe, "Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament," in idem, *Light from the Gentiles: Hellenistic Philosophy and Early Christianity*, ed. Carl Holladay et al., 2 vols., NovTSup 150 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 2:675-749.

<sup>59</sup> Malherbe, "Hellenistic Moralists," 713-17.

<sup>60</sup> Malherbe, "Hellenistic Moralists," 713.

<sup>61</sup> Malherbe, "Hellenistic Moralists," 716.

literature may throw in in much sharper relief the NT writers' concern with pastoral practice."<sup>62</sup>

Malherbe made good on this suggestion, comparing psychagogy and Pauline Christianity in several essays. After arguing that the philosophical tradition provides significant comparative material for the study of Paul's model of pastoral care,<sup>63</sup> Malherbe began to investigate Paul's methods for founding and nurturing of the Christian community in Thessalonica. The preaching, community organizing, and psychagogic practices of Hellenistic philosophical schools loom large in his work.<sup>64</sup> Malherbe notes that not only were a philosophical community's leaders responsible for the psychagogic nurture of the other members of the community, but that even the rank and file of the community were to participate in each other's nurture (cf. 1 Thess 5:11).<sup>65</sup> Malherbe's arguments have been highly influential, informing the later studies of F. Gerald Downing and Clarence Glad.<sup>66</sup>

For those concerned with early Christian pastoral practice, Malherbe's work is invaluable. However, Malherbe notes that the term "pastoral care" was not used by the philosophers themselves to describe their philosophical instruction in the way that it was in Eph 4:11. In fact, one could argue that Hellenistic philosophers would themselves have correlated psychagogy with higher education, the culmination of the *παιδεία* which the

---

<sup>62</sup> Malherbe, "Hellenistic Moralists," 717.

<sup>63</sup> Abraham J. Malherbe, "Gentle as a Nurse: The Cynic Background to 1 Thessalonians 2," in idem, *Light from the Gentiles*, 1:53-67.

<sup>64</sup> Abraham J. Malherbe, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), esp. 79-94.

<sup>65</sup> Malherbe, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*, 88.

<sup>66</sup> F. Gerald Downing, *Cynics, Paul, and the Pauline Churches: Cynics and Christian Origins II* (New York: Routledge, 1998), esp. 174-203. On Clarence Glad's *Paul and Philodemus*, see below.

pupil had begun to pursue in childhood. While Malherbe does, on occasion, employ terminology that would locate psychagogy within the ambit of ancient education (e.g., referring to a hypothetical psychagogue as “teacher”),<sup>67</sup> he tends, as he himself admits, to focus on pastoral care despite the fact that Paul, like the philosophers, “does not describe the enterprise in that manner.”<sup>68</sup> This is not to imply that Paul has nothing to teach contemporary Christians about pastoral care, only that, from a purely historical perspective, psychagogy was an organism belonging to an ancient educational system, and the term “pastoral care” should not blind us to this fact.

#### F. Clarence Glad

Clarence Glad’s *Paul and Philodemus* remains the most serious study of Pauline psychagogy published after Malherbe’s *Paul and the Thessalonians*.<sup>69</sup> Glad focuses on the theme of Paul’s adaptability in 1 Cor 9:19-23, arguing that this passage shows Paul’s participation in “a tradition in Greco-Roman society which underscores, in the light of human diversity, the importance of adaptability in conduct and speech in the unreserved association with all and in the psychagogic adaptation to different human dispositions.”<sup>70</sup> When discussing Paul’s psychagogic method, Glad, like Malherbe before him, emphasizes the communal context of Paul’s spiritual guidance. This emphasis on the

---

<sup>67</sup> Malherbe, “Hellenistic Moralists,” 715. See his overview of ancient education in, “The Cultural Context of the New Testament,” in *Light from the Gentiles*, 1:759-60.

<sup>68</sup> Malherbe, *Paul and the Thessalonians*, 1.

<sup>69</sup> Clarence Glad, *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy*, NovTSup 81 (Leiden: Brill, 1995).

<sup>70</sup> Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 1.

community as the context for growth, he argues, most closely resembles the communal psychagogy of the Epicureans.<sup>71</sup>

One of the most important elements of Glad's work is his recognition that psychagogy is a didactic technique. "On the highest level of generalization," he writes, "psychagogy is ... a pedagogical activity where the formation of a certain *paideia* is in view."<sup>72</sup> Regrettably, Glad does not develop this insight, though it would have strengthened his thesis to discuss the relationship of philosophical education to the rest of Greco-Roman education. The result is that while Glad shows that Paul adapted his presentation to his audience's capacity, his conclusion raises as many questions as it answers. Was adaptability, for example, proper only to philosophical education, or was it a feature of lower levels of education as well? The answer, as we shall see, is that adaptability was a common didactic technique at every educational level.<sup>73</sup> Primary teachers and grammarians, no less than the Epicurean philosopher, were encouraged to adapt their lessons to their students' capacities.

### G. Thomas Schmeller

If Paul engaged in psychagogy, as Malherbe and Glad claimed, this suggested some degree of affinity between Paul and Hellenistic philosophical schools. The question, then, becomes how strong this affinity actually was. Were Pauline communities popular philosophical schools or did they simply employ a didactic technique common to

---

<sup>71</sup> Since the publication of *Paul and Philodemus*, others have suggested that the Epicureans were the philosophical school with the highest degree of affinity with early Christian communities. See, e.g., Graham Tomlin, "Christians and Epicureans in 1 Corinthians," *JSNT* 68 (1997): 51-72.

<sup>72</sup> Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 58.

<sup>73</sup> See the discussion of adaptability in chapter 5, section I.G.

philosophical education? In response, Thomas Schmeller provides an exegetically savvy study of the similarities and differences between early Christian communities and philosophical schools.<sup>74</sup>

Schmeller, like Judge, notes that Paul's preaching required an intellectual and rational commitment that paralleled the philosophical schools.<sup>75</sup> Can, then, the philosophical schools provide a model for interpreting Paul's language in 1 Corinthians and 1 Thessalonians? In reply, Schmeller produced a close reading of possible parallels to educational terminology in 1 Cor 1-2, 4.<sup>76</sup> For Schmeller, this educational terminology reflects not Paul's apostolic practice, but rather the social fragmentation of the Corinthian community: The Corinthian factions were discrete groups that resembled schools. Schmeller argues that Paul critiques the Corinthians' scholastic fragmentation by employing a father-child metaphor in 1 Cor 4:16.<sup>77</sup> "The transfer of the school-image," Schmeller writes, "to a family-image (favored by Paul) is an efficacious means to overcome the divisions in the community."<sup>78</sup> On Schmeller's reading, in 1 Cor 1-4 any affinity between Paul's language and the educational theory of the philosophical schools can be best explained as Paul stating his opposition to the Corinthian community's school-like groups.

However, Schmeller's study of 1 Thess 2 nuances this conclusion. He concludes:

---

<sup>74</sup> Thomas Schmeller, *Schulen im neuen Testament? Zur Stellung des Urchristentums in der Bildungswelt seiner Zeit*, HbibS 30 (Freiburg: Herder, 2001), esp. 15-27, 93-179.

<sup>75</sup> Schmeller, *Schulen im neuen Testament*, 102-3.

<sup>76</sup> Schmeller, *Schulen im neuen Testament*, 103-38.

<sup>77</sup> "Er einerseits das Lehrer-Schüler-Verhältnis aufgreift, es andererseits aber neu qualifiziert als ein Vater-Kind-Verhältnis" (Schmeller, *Schulen im Neuen Testament*, 138).

<sup>78</sup> Schmeller, *Schulen im Neuen Testament*, 138. My translation.

Overall, it emerges from 1 Thess 2:1-12 ... that Paul ... presents himself at many points as a philosophical teacher. The parallels reflect less the content, basis, and objective of his instruction so much as his relationship to his communities and to other teachers. Although there are also obvious differences here, the concurrences are so substantial that a conscious adoption of this role by Paul is not to be doubted. This is, therefore, an important conclusion, since Paul here—unlike in 1 Cor—apparently was not pushed into this role by the communities. This is not to say unconditionally, however, that he chose it because it matched his self-understanding (*Selbstverständnis*). It remains possible that he simply provided ... such a self-presentation due to the conditions of the ... missionary situation.<sup>79</sup>

Schmeller ultimately concludes that Paul does present himself as a philosophical teacher in 1 Thess, but only occasionally, and not necessarily because he thought of himself as a philosopher.<sup>80</sup>

At the time of its writing and publication, it was appropriate to limit the scope of the educational comparative material of *Schulen im neuen Testament* to philosophical schools. As interest in the earlier stages of Greek and Roman education increases, one wonders what Schmeller might have concluded had he examined educational institutions besides philosophical schools. If Paul's resemblance to the philosophical teacher in 1 Thessalonians was not based on the similar contents of their curricula, but rather on the dynamics of the teacher/student relationship, it is fair to question whether Paul presents himself specifically as a philosophical teacher and not as some other form of teacher.

---

<sup>79</sup> Schmeller, *Schulen im neuen Testament*, 145. My translation.

<sup>80</sup> For a similar conclusion to Schmeller's treatment of Paul's resemblance to a philosophical teacher, see Christine Gerber, *Paulus und seine 'Kinder': Studien zur Beziehungsmetaphorik der paulinischen Briefe*, BZNW 136 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 29-32.

## H. Johannes Munck and Bruce Winter

Philosophical education, however, was not the only—or even the predominant—form of higher education in antiquity. To the chagrin of Platonists everywhere, the sophists were the real power in ancient higher education.<sup>81</sup> Johannes Munck and Bruce Winter each argued that rhetorical education and culture may have influenced the Corinthians' expectations for roles which the apostles played in the community. Munck first argued that the problem in Corinth was that the community, as a result of its Hellenistic tendencies, had made the mistake of interpreting Christianity as a form of Greek wisdom, and thus had understood the apostles as Greek teachers, like sophists.<sup>82</sup> Munck's suggestion was ahead of its time, one of the first serious challenges to the Tübingen school's interpretation of the Corinthian factions as the results of competing Christian missions in Corinth.<sup>83</sup>

Winter sharpened Munck's hypothesis. Paul, he argues, wrote 1 Corinthians for converts who had "formulated a sophistic conception of 'discipleship,' which in turn exposed the churches to the inevitable problems of dissension and jealousy associated with that secular movement."<sup>84</sup> Winter is only one of many who have argued that the

---

<sup>81</sup> See E.L. Bowie, "The Importance of the Sophists," *YCS* 27 (1982): 29-52; Henri Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*, trans. George Lamb (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956), 46-60.

<sup>82</sup> Johannes Munck, "The Church without Factions," in Johannes Munck, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (London: SCM, 1959), 152-54.

<sup>83</sup> F.C. Baur, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz der petrinischen und paulinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom." *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 4 (1831): 61-206. See too Baur's restatement of this thesis in Ferdinand Christian Baur, *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*, 2 vols. in 1 (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003), 268-320. For a modern rehabilitation of Baur's thesis, see Michael Goulder, *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth* (Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001), esp. 1-16.

<sup>84</sup> Bruce W. Winter, *Philo and Paul among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement*, 2nd ed. (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003), 141; See Bruce W. Winter, "The

Corinthian community's divisive "wisdom" was sophistic rhetoric,<sup>85</sup> but his work is so persuasively written that it has provided a starting place for a great deal of subsequent scholarship.<sup>86</sup> In *After Paul Left Corinth*, Winter notes what students of ancient education have long known: Sophists were not merely orators in comparison to whom Paul's oratory appeared provincial. Rather, they were educators in their own right, who competed amongst themselves to attract the best students.<sup>87</sup> If the Corinthians thought of their apostles using a sophistic schema, it is only natural that they should assume that Paul and Apollos were competitors.

### I. Timothy A. Brookins

As the most widely accepted interpretation of the Corinthian community's wisdom, the rhetorical hypothesis currently occupies the place once held by the gnostic hypothesis.<sup>88</sup> But in his recent dissertation, Timothy Brookins has seriously challenged the rhetorical hypothesis, suggesting that the allegedly rhetorical terminology in 1

---

'Underlays' of Conflict and Compromise in 1 Corinthians," in *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict*, ed. Trevor Burke and James Elliott, NovTSup 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 142.

<sup>85</sup> See esp. Stephen Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians*, SBLDS 134; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992); Michael Bullmore, *St. Paul's Theology of Rhetorical Style: An Examination of 1 Corinthians 2:1-5 in Light of First-Century Greco-Roman Rhetorical Culture* (San Francisco: International Scholars Publications, 1995); Wenhua Shi, *Paul's Message of the Cross as Body Language*, WUNT 2/254 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008).

<sup>86</sup> See esp. Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*; Corin Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul's Stance toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric: An Exegetical and Socio-Historical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-4*, LNTS 402 (New York: T&T Clark, 2009).

<sup>87</sup> Bruce Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), esp. 31-40.

<sup>88</sup> See, e.g. Wilhelm Lütgert, *Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth: Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik der Christuspartei*, BFCT 12.3 (Gutersloh: Bertelsmann, 1908); Ulrich Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1959); Walther Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians*, 3rd ed. (Nashville: Abingdon, 1971).



Corinthians (especially in 2:1-5) is better read as references to philosophical discourse. Brookins consistently and persuasively demonstrates that the key λογ- and σοφ- stem lexemes, which have traditionally provided the strongest evidence for Winter et al., should in fact be read as references to philosophical discourse.<sup>89</sup>

The question, then, becomes why Paul would bother to critique Greco-Roman philosophy. Brookins suggests that Paul's opponents in 1 Corinthians received a Stoic education, and that it was this education that led the Corinthians away from Paul.<sup>90</sup> Turning to analysis of literary and inscriptional evidence, especially Hellenistic philosophical texts, Brookins has demonstrated that for each identifiable Corinthian slogan or ethical issue addressed in 1 Corinthians, there is a readily identifiable Stoic analogue. As an example, consider Brookins's survey of the language used to describe the Stoic sage. Its similarities with 1 Corinthians are obvious:

'only the wise man is rich (πλούσιος)', 'only the wise man is king (βασιλεύς)' (cf. *SVF* 3.655). It has long been recognized that the language of 1 Cor. 4:8 finds its closest parallel in the paradoxes ('Already you have become rich [ἐπλουτήσατε]! Quite apart from us you have become kings! [ἐβασιλεύσατε]'). Verse 10 continues the Corinthians' language—or, at least, Paul continues the language of the paradoxes to characterize them: 'you are ... prudent (φρόνιμοι; *SVF* 3.655) ... strong (ισχυροί; *SVF* 1.216; cf. 3.567) ... held in honour (ἐνδοξοί; *SVF* 3.603)'. We find still further predicates of the paradoxes in 1:26 (δυνατοί, *SVF* 3.364; εὐγενεῖς, *SVF* 3.594), 2:6 (τελείοις, *SVF* 1.566; ἀρχόντων, *SVF* 3.364), 3:21, 22 (πάντα ὑμῶν ἐστίν, *SVF* 3.590), and 9:19 (ἐλεύθερος; *SVF* 3.599).<sup>91</sup>

<sup>89</sup> Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom*, esp. 8-58.

<sup>90</sup> Timothy A. Brookins, "The Wise Corinthians: Their Stoic Education and Outlook," *JTS* 62 (2011): 51-76.

<sup>91</sup> Brookins, "The Wise Corinthians," 60.

To Brookins, these parallels suggest that Paul's Corinthian opponents have received some form of Stoic education and that this education is influencing their behavior in the community.<sup>92</sup> Brookins, then, resembles Schmeller by suggesting that the Corinthians' philosophical proclivities may explain their opposition to Paul.

Brookins's argument is significant for two reasons. First and foremost, he has provided the most convincing thesis to date concerning the Corinthians' wisdom (if said wisdom can, in fact, be reduced to a single feature of Greco-Roman culture). Not only does he demonstrate that Paul intentionally distances himself from the language of philosophical argumentation, but Brookins can also correlate the Corinthians' slogans and behavior with Stoic analogues. Secondly, following Dutch, Brookins inquires into exactly how the Corinthians would have learned enough about Stoicism to permit, for example, the sharing of wives (1 Cor 5:1).<sup>93</sup> The Corinthian malefactors, he suggests, are social elites who have been exposed to Stoic philosophy via the upper levels of ancient education.<sup>94</sup>

Brookins's thesis is convincing but it must be nuanced in light of one important fact: The Stoics taught their students rhetoric. Zeno and Chrysippus even wrote handbooks on the subject.<sup>95</sup> As Catherine Atherton has argued, "In a number of ways Stoic rhetorical teaching was ... barely distinguishable from its professional

---

<sup>92</sup> Brookins, "The Wise Corinthians," 73-74.

<sup>93</sup> Brookins, "The Wise Corinthians," 64-65.

<sup>94</sup> Brookins, "The Wise Corinthians," 58; Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom*, esp. 132-47.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Cicero, who critiques Stoic handbooks in *Fin.* 4.7. Cf. Diogenes Laertius, 7.42. For an overview of these and other primary sources on Stoic rhetoric, see Yosef Z. Liebersohn, *The Dispute concerning Rhetoric in Hellenistic Thought* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 32-35.

counterparts.”<sup>96</sup> Though the Stoic rhetorical handbooks are regrettably lost, it is still possible to reconstruct Stoic rhetorical doctrine from fragmentary sources and surviving descriptions of practitioners of Stoic rhetoric. After a survey of the evidence, Atherton argues that “in both theory and practice there was, strictly, no difference in style whatsoever between the discourse of the Stoic dialectician and that of the Stoic orator.”<sup>97</sup> Thus, if Paul in 1 Corinthians distances himself from Stoic wisdom, he may not only be distancing himself from the content of that wisdom but also the rhetorical style appropriate for the expression of that wisdom, both of which were learned under the tutelage of a Stoic sage. If the Corinthians expected their teachers to live up to the model of a Stoic sage, Paul intentionally disavowed both the content of their wisdom and rhetorical styles calibrated for such wisdom’s expression.

#### J. Adam White<sup>98</sup>

Adam White has analyzed 1 Cor 1-4 in light of his reconstruction of Greco-Roman παιδεία.<sup>99</sup> Though παιδεία is a very general term, White defines it as “the process of moulding a young child into an elite, cultured citizen.”<sup>100</sup> The Corinthians’ factionalism, he argues, was the direct result of the educational expectations of the

---

<sup>96</sup> Catherine Atherton, “Hand over Fist: The Failure of Stoic Rhetoric,” *CQ* 38 (1988): 393.

<sup>97</sup> See Atherton, “Hand over Fist,” 398.

<sup>98</sup> I only became aware of Adam White’s dissertation in Oct. 2014, when my own study was roughly half-completed. I want to thank Wayne Coppins for bringing White’s work to my attention. Rather than wait for the publication of White’s monograph, I have opted to discuss his pre-publication dissertation here. For the published version, see Adam White, *Where is the Wise Man? Graeco-Roman Education as a Background to the Divisions in 1 Corinthians 1-4*, LNTS 536 (London: T&T Clark, 2015),

<sup>99</sup> Adam White, *Where is The Wise Man?*

<sup>100</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 8.

cultivated, socially elite members of the Apollos faction, or, as he puts it, the “partisan evaluation of Paul by the educated elite of the Apollos faction, according to the values found in the schools of oratory and philosophy, or more generally, Graeco-Roman παιδεία.”<sup>101</sup> Such παιδεία, he contends, is a characteristic of those who live the virtuous life and the enhancement of human nature that renders individuals suited to positions of civic authority.<sup>102</sup>

White’s understanding of παιδεία has one great virtue: It avoids any false antithesis between rhetoric and philosophy.<sup>103</sup> Hence, he can profitably make use of secondary scholarship relevant to both the Corinthians’ Stoic bent<sup>104</sup> as well as their likely appreciation for rhetoric.<sup>105</sup> Each belongs under the rubric of παιδεία. Yet it should be noted that White’s definition of παιδεία largely emphasizes tertiary rhetorical and philosophical education. “By taking this more general approach to 1 Corinthians 1–4,” he states, “I hope I have been able to demonstrate that it was values drawn from the more generic category of ‘higher education’ that are causing the conflict in the Christian community.”<sup>106</sup>

Given that he can draw on the best of both Winter and Brookins, it is not surprising that White’s argument is largely successful. It does seem likely that Paul’s

---

<sup>101</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 3, 205.

<sup>102</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 35-44.

<sup>103</sup> Surviving records of the Hellenistic world contain a steady stream of philosophical critiques of rhetoric, but not all philosophers rejected rhetoric outright. The Stoics thought of rhetoric as a virtue. See Liebersohn, *The Dispute Concerning Rhetoric*; White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, esp. 143-51.

<sup>104</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 93-115.

<sup>105</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 116-41.

<sup>106</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 250.

gospel clashed with the educational expectations of any elite members of the Corinthian community who had studied philosophy and/or rhetoric. As should by now be clear, White is not the first to contend that it was the elite Corinthians' educational expectations led them to split into factions. Yet in making this argument he avoids the pitfalls of several of his predecessors. Though he does discuss the gymnasium, he makes no attempt to argue that the gymnasium was the primary social location for the Corinthian elites' education,<sup>107</sup> all the while retaining and extending Dutch's emphasis on the elite status conferred by παιδεία.<sup>108</sup>

White's study contains one leitmotif that is of particular relevance for the present argument. White contends that when Paul uses educational metaphors in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21, he does so in order to present himself and Apollos as teachers. White's list of metaphors is the superior to that of Dutch. In the following order, he discusses: Paul as nursing mother (1 Cor 3:2),<sup>109</sup> Paul and Apollos as farmers (1 Cor 3:5-9),<sup>110</sup> Paul as master-builder (1 Cor 3:10-13),<sup>111</sup> Paul as steward (1 Cor 4:1-7),<sup>112</sup> Paul as father and Apollos as pedagogue (1 Cor 4:14-17),<sup>113</sup> and, lastly, the rod of discipline (1 Cor 4:19-21).<sup>114</sup> Like Dutch, he accepts the hotly debated conclusion that the phrase τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται in

---

<sup>107</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 44.

<sup>108</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 71-84.

<sup>109</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 184-86.

<sup>110</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 195-97.

<sup>111</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 197-98.

<sup>112</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 205-212.

<sup>113</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 230-37.

<sup>114</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 237-41.

1 Cor 4:6 refers not to scripture but to the early stages of a literate education.<sup>115</sup> White's suggestion that the metaphor of stewardship is an educational metaphor is particularly welcome, though, as we shall see in chapter 4, his interpretation is ultimately unsuccessful. Nevertheless, White is on the right track. One basic function of the metaphors in 1 Cor 3-4 is to present Paul and Apollos as teachers.

And yet White's argument could be strengthened. First, it is by no means certain that Paul is primarily concerned with correcting the leaders of the Apollos faction. Rather, as Margaret Mitchell argues, Paul could well be critiquing factionalism itself, not members of an individual faction.<sup>116</sup> Or, following Brookins, it may even be that the primary problem in Corinth is not factionalism but disputes over the nature of wisdom.<sup>117</sup> Paul does undoubtedly seek to establish his own unique relationship with the Corinthian community—only he is its father and founder<sup>118</sup>—but this does not require that he lower the Corinthians' estimation of Apollos.<sup>119</sup> Indeed, as White acknowledges, Paul often associates himself unreservedly with Apollos (cf., e.g., 1 Cor 3:6-7).<sup>120</sup>

Secondly, though generally well researched, *Where is the Wise Man?* contains several gaps in its use of both primary and secondary resources. White's survey of the secondary literature discusses F. Gerald Downing but largely ignores Malherbe, on whom

---

<sup>115</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 214-16.

<sup>116</sup> "Paul's rhetorical strategy is to combat the phenomenon of factionalism itself, not each individual faction directly" (Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 67-68). Similarly Munck, "The Church without Factions," 150.

<sup>117</sup> Brookins, "The Wise Corinthians," 57.

<sup>118</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 245.

<sup>119</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 245-47.

<sup>120</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 244.

Downing is heavily reliant.<sup>121</sup> Likewise, in his survey of ancient primary sources for the study of παιδεία, White discusses Plato, Aristotle, Quintilian, and Ps.-Plutarch, but glosses over Philo, whose *Congr.* not only contains one of the most valuable discussions of παιδεία yet extant, but also provides a unique Hellenistic-Jewish analogue for Paul himself.<sup>122</sup>

Moreover, although he correctly identified six educational metaphors in 1 Corinthians 3-4, these chapters contain more educational motifs than these metaphors alone.<sup>123</sup> He focuses on παιδεία as the desired outcome of tertiary education, although many of his sources are discussing primary education. While he focuses on Greco-Roman education exclusively, I argue that Paul also draws from Jewish educational traditions. More attention to these educational traditions would have led him to identify more references to ancient education in 1 Cor 1-4. Nevertheless, his study is an important advancement beyond Dutch's work.

#### K. Conclusion: Greco-Roman Education and 1 Cor 1-4

When Judge first described the early Christians as a scholastic community and Paul as a sophist, he took a first step toward a historically grounded interpretation of early Christian teaching, giving needed attention to the educational institutions of the ancient Mediterranean. Judge's reconstruction of Paul's character is problematic, not only because of his idiosyncratic definition of "the sophist" but also because his description of

---

<sup>121</sup> See White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 22, where he briefly mentions Malherbe.

<sup>122</sup> See White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 61, 63, for limited references to Philo.

<sup>123</sup> See chapter 4, below.

Paul as sophist relies more heavily on the portrayal of Paul in Acts than it does on Paul's undisputed letters.<sup>124</sup> Nevertheless, his argument was forward thinking, anticipating the work of Malherbe et al., who associated Paul with philosophical education.

But as the above survey has demonstrated, scholarship after Judge has displayed a marked preference for comparing Paul to rhetorical and philosophical education rather than the introductory levels of ancient education. This is even the case in a study such as White's, which draws heavily on ancient literary descriptions of the earliest stages of Greco-Roman education such as books 1 and 2 of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*. When scholars have discussed lower levels of education, they, like Judge, have tended to be vague and imprecise. "Gymnastic" education refers to a social setting, not to the rigid curricular progression which characterized all Greco-Roman ancient education regardless of social setting. This tendency to focus only on higher education should be balanced with a renewed attention to the dynamics of lower levels of Greco-Roman scholastic life. In antiquity there were few who received a higher education without first mastering the basics of literacy, numeracy, and study of the poets.<sup>125</sup> Surely the authors of the New Testament had some access to these preliminary educational stages.<sup>126</sup> To focus on tertiary education without consideration of the broader scope of ancient educational practices risks not only overlooking potentially illuminating comparanda, it also risks misrepresenting the place of philosophical and rhetorical education in the ancient educational system.

---

<sup>124</sup> Judge, "The Early Christians as a Scholastic Community," 541-49.

<sup>125</sup> Though consider, e.g., the story of Justin Martyr's education and conversion in *Dial.*, 2-3.

<sup>126</sup> Schnelle, "Das frühe Christentum und die Bildung," 120-26.



### III. Paul and Jewish Education

#### A. Hans Conzelmann

Finally, one important trend in comparing Paul and ancient education has emerged from the debates surrounding the so-called “Pauline School.”<sup>127</sup> In a groundbreaking essay on Paul and the wisdom tradition, Hans Conzelmann argued that Paul’s creative reevaluation of Jewish traditions has an unmistakably scholastic character, and that in reading 1 Corinthians one could identify “im Hintergrund ein von Paulus bewusst organisierter Schulbetrieb, eine ‘Schule des Paulus,’ ... wo man ‘Weisheit’ methodisch betreibt bzw. Theologie als Weisheitsschulung treibt.”<sup>128</sup> Paul, Conzelmann contends, was obviously the recipient of a Hellenistic-Jewish theological education, an education which presumably informs his own didactic work.<sup>129</sup> Conzelmann devotes much of the essay to discussion of 1 Cor 1:18-2:5 and 2:6-16.<sup>130</sup> He argues, for example, that Paul’s argument in 1 Cor 1:18-2:5, stands within the tradition of Jewish Wisdom

---

<sup>127</sup> The literature on the so-called “Pauline school” is voluminous and not entirely relevant to the current discussion. While it does demonstrate a consistent trend in Pauline studies to associate Paul and the early Christians with educational endeavors—especially philosophical schools—studies of the Pauline school have generally been more interested in explaining the relationship between Paul’s undisputed letters and the deutero-Pauline corpus. In addition to the work of Conzelmann and Schmeller, see Peter Müller, *Anfänge der Paulusschule: Dargestellt am zweiten Thessalonicherbrief und am Kollaserbrief*, ATANT 74 (Zurich: Theologische Verlag, 1988); Loveday Alexander, “Paul and the Hellenistic Schools: The Evidence of Galen,” in *Paul in his Hellenistic Context*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 60-83; Loveday Alexander, “IPSE DIXIT: Citation of Authority in Paul and in the Jewish and Hellenistic Schools,” in *Paul Beyond the Judaism-Hellenism Divide*, ed. Troels Engberg-Pedersen (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001), 103-27; Angela Standhartinger, “Colossians and the Pauline School,” *NTS* 50 (2004): 572-93; Helmut Merkel, “Der Lehrer Paulus und seine Schüler: Forschungsgeschichtliche Schlaglichter,” in *Religiöses Lernen in der Biblischen, Frühjüdischen, und Frühchristlichen Überlieferung*, ed. Beate Ego and Helmut Merkel, WUNT 180 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 235-52; Vegge, *Paulus und das antike Schulwesen*, 487-99.

<sup>128</sup> Hans Conzelmann, “Paulus und die Weisheit,” *NTS* 12 (1966): 233.

<sup>129</sup> “Aber dass Paulus ein geschulter jüdischer Theologe war, wird nicht bezweifelt” (Hans Conzelmann, “Die Schule des Paulus,” in *Theologia Crucis-Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Carl Andresen and Günter Klein [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979], 85).

<sup>130</sup> Conzelmann, “Paulus und die Weisheit,” 236-40.

speculation which emphasized wisdom's withdrawal into heaven ("der *entschwundenen* Weisheit, die einst in der Welt erschien, sich anbot, abgewiesen wurde, sich in den Himmel zurückzog"), which is now available only to the elect ("für den Kreise der Erwhälten").<sup>131</sup> This, he argues, is the background to Paul's conception of the wisdom of the cross (1 Cor 1:18-25).

Though many have discussed Paul's relationship with the wisdom tradition, only a few after Conzelmann have devoted significant energy to describing Paul as a teacher of a Christian wisdom school. Joachim Theis, in a substantial but largely unknown dissertation, developed Conzelmann's argument at length, arguing that Paul's understanding of his ministry, as reflected in 1 Corinthians, was that of the Jewish teacher of wisdom.<sup>132</sup> Likewise, Tor Vegge concludes his study of Paul's educational background with an appendix promising a future book dedicated to Paul's own teaching.<sup>133</sup> Though he does not cite Theis, he too suggests that "In 1Kor 1-3 präsentiert sich Paulus als Weisheitslehrer."<sup>134</sup>

Given the concentration of sapiential themes and terminology in 1 Corinthians, Conzelmann and those who have followed him have made an argument that deserves greater attention. Some scholars have read the sapiential language as a wink at the Hellenistic-Jewish tastes of Paul's Corinthian opponents,<sup>135</sup> but such readings make the

---

<sup>131</sup> Conzelmann, "Paulus und die Weisheit," 236. Emphasis original.

<sup>132</sup> Joachim Theis, *Paulus als Weisheitslehrer: Der Gekreuzigte und die Weisheit Gottes in 1 Kor 1-4* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1991), esp. 504-17.

<sup>133</sup> Vegge, *Paulus und das antike Schulwesen*, 501 n. 1.

<sup>134</sup> Vegge, *Paulus und das antike Schulwesen*, 508.

<sup>135</sup> E.g., Richard A. Horsley, "Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8:1-6," *NTS* 27 (1980): 32-51.

same error we observed in Dutch's interpretation of the Greco-Roman educational motifs: They rush to mirror-reading without considering the ways in which Paul uses the language to characterize himself and the other apostles. Nevertheless, in at least one way, Conzelmann's thesis must be nuanced. As Dutch, Brookins, and White have demonstrated, there are numerous Greco-Roman educational motifs that occur in the same passage (1 Cor 1-4) which Conzelmann et al. have argued is dominated by the Jewish wisdom tradition. If Conzelmann, Theis, and Vegge are correct that Paul uses the language of the wisdom tradition to present himself as a teacher, we must ask in what ways the language from the wisdom tradition interacts with educational motifs with distinctively Greco-Roman parallels.

### B. Kathy Ehrensperger

As a supplement to Conzelmann, Kathy Ehrensperger has argued that there are Jewish educational motifs in Paul's corpus besides sapiential language. Her argument focuses especially on paternal metaphors in Paul. Contrary to several interpretations of Paul's fatherhood which emphasize the total domineering power of the *pater familias* over his children, Ehrensperger suggests that "The fact that he does not frequently use this terminology indicates, in my view, that something different from a claim of power in the vein of the *pater familias* is going on in Paul's use of father/mother imagery."<sup>136</sup> She in turn suggests that it should be interpreted as an expression of "the discourse of learning and teaching in Jewish tradition and society."<sup>137</sup> The strongest portion of Ehrensperger's

---

<sup>136</sup> Kathy Ehrensperger, *Paul and the Dynamics of Power: Communication and Interaction in the Early Christ Movement*, LNTS 325 (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 118.

<sup>137</sup> Ehrensperger, *Paul and the Dynamics of Power*, 119.

argument is her identification of several descriptions of fathers teaching children in Old Testament pseudepigrapha:

Thus, *1 En.* 81 presupposes a narrative world in which a father teaches his children in a combination of oral and written instruction. A similar situation is presupposed in the Epistle of Enoch (*1 En.* 92.1), and a narrative of fatherly teaching concludes the book of *Enoch* (*1 En.* 108). Other examples of fathers passing on their teaching to their children/students can be found in the pseudigraphic genre of *Testaments*, where the final teaching of an Israelite patriarch is presented, as e.g., in the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*.... The *Testament of Levi* includes the following teaching (sic) ‘Listen to the word of Levi, your father, and pay heed to the instruction of God’s friend. I am instructing you, my children, and I reveal truth to you, my beloved ones.’<sup>138</sup>

Ehrensperger then isolates Paul’s use of parental metaphors in 1 Cor 4:14-21 and 1 Thess 1-2, 4. She notes that Paul’s language in 1 Cor 3-4 also has analogues in Jewish discussions of education (e.g., Philo’s use of the “milk and solid food” trope in *Congr.* 15-19 [cf. 1 Thess 2:7; 1 Cor 3:1-2]).

Ehrensperger’s identification of Jewish analogues to Paul’s paternal metaphor, however limited in scope, illustrates the danger of interpreting Paul’s metaphors in light of only Greco-Roman or only Jewish educational traditions. Though she seems to be unaware of Dutch’s work, the textual parallels she adduces require us to ask whether a Pauline paternal metaphor should be read against exclusively Hellenistic or exclusively Jewish comparative material. Perhaps Jewish and Greco-Roman education shared some assumptions, either because their educational traditions hit upon the same answer to a shared problem—i.e., who should be a child’s first teacher—or because these educational traditions cross-pollinated during the Hellenistic period.

---

<sup>138</sup> Ehrensperger, *Paul and the Dynamics of Power*, 124. Quoting T. Levi 83-90.

### C. Conclusion: Jewish Education and 1 Cor 1-4

Modern scholarship has devoted more attention to projects comparing Paul with Greco-Roman education than to Jewish education. Some of the reasons for this will be explored in the next chapter. However, Conzelmann and Ehrensperger have, each in their own way, complicated the notion that educational motifs in 1 Corinthians can be understood without some appreciation for Jewish education in the Second Temple Period. Conzelmann has identified an entire class of educational motifs that has gone overlooked by scholars who focus exclusively on Greco-Roman education: the scholastic social function of the wisdom tradition. If we adopt Conzelmann's reading, all of the sapiential language in 1 Corinthians contributes to constructing an image of Paul as a Jewish sage. Ehrensperger has also complicated any attempt to read Paul's paternal metaphors without giving due attention to their use in Jewish sources. Though she limited the scope of her investigation to a single class of metaphor, her results raise a question of great importance. How should we interpret Paul's educational motifs and concepts if they appear to have parallels in both Jewish and Greco-Roman education?

### IV. Chapter Conclusion

Interest in 1 Corinthians and ancient education is on the rise. Though the scholarship of the mid-twentieth-century—especially the work of Judge, Malherbe, and Conzelmann—laid the tracks for future research, much of the work surveyed here saw publication at some point in the last decade. These works differ in kind, quality, and interpretation of the subject matter. Nevertheless, there appears to be a budding scholarly

consensus that an informed reading of 1 Cor 1-4 must account for the educational motifs in these chapters.

The scholarly projects surveyed above demonstrate the potential value of a clear and comprehensive statement regarding the nature, extent, and function of educational discourse in 1 Cor 1-4. To date, scholarship on education in 1 Corinthians has either focused on traditional research questions which have governed so much interpretation of 1 Corinthians since Baur (e.g., What was the Corinthian wisdom? Who were Paul's opponents?), or demonstrated the importance of one facet of ancient Greek, Roman, or Jewish education (e.g., Hellenistic philosophy, the Jewish wisdom tradition). Much of this scholarship has implicitly assumed a stark (and outdated) division between Hellenistic and Jewish educational mores. In response to this need, the following chapters aim to describe the educational motifs in 1 Cor 1-4 on their own terms, in light of the educational systems which might have informed Paul's language. It is to understanding these educational systems and their interrelationships that we now turn.

### Chapter 3:

#### Greek, Roman, and Jewish Educational Institutions: An Overview

The goal of this chapter is to introduce the features of the Greek, Roman, and Jewish education educational traditions which bear the greatest resemblance to Paul's argument in 1 Cor 1-4. Other than the selection and arrangement of data, nothing in the following pages is innovative or novel. Instead of focusing on either Greco-Roman or Jewish education to the exclusion of the other, this chapter discusses both traditions. Rather than limit the survey of Greco-Roman education to a discussion of philosophical or rhetorical education, the following pages focus primarily on Greco-Roman primary and secondary education. Similarly, this chapter's discussion of Jewish education will focus not only on works of the Jewish wisdom tradition produced in the Hellenistic period, but also on Philo's educational theory.

#### I. Greco-Roman Education

##### A. Unity and Diversity in Greco-Roman Education

Education was as ubiquitous in Greek and Roman antiquity as taxation or warfare, a feature of the social landscape in every place where there were Greeks, Romans, or peoples conquered by Greeks and Romans.<sup>1</sup> One of the basic challenges for describing

---

<sup>1</sup> The reader interested in familiarizing themselves with ancient Greek and Roman education should consult the following sourcebooks: Laurent Pernot, *À l'école des anciens: Professeurs, élèves et étudiants*. (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2008); Mark Joyal, Iain McDougal, and John Yardley, eds., *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook* (New York: Routledge, 2009). Major works of secondary scholarship on ancient Greek and Roman education include: Werner Jaeger, *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*, 3 vols. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1939); Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity*; Stanley F. Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977); Kaster, *Guardians of Language*; Marc Kleijwegt, *Ancient Youth: The Ambiguity of Youth and the Absence of Adolescence in Greco-Roman Society* (Amsterdam: Gieben, 1991); Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students*; idem, *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001); idem, *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Alexandria*

education in the first-century CE is that the Romans themselves were recipients of Greek παιδεία and adapted it for their own use.<sup>2</sup> It would be an oversimplification to treat Greco-Roman education as a single entity. For the purposes of the present study, however, these two traditions may be discussed in tandem, as their similarities were greater than their differences.

Even so, there are some differences between Greek and Roman education.

Although the basic outline of their educational systems held steady in every geographical locale of the Greek and Roman worlds, it is no surprise that there is some variation, however limited. As Alan Booth has noted, there is evidence of a two-track educational system in Rome, one for the rich, who began their studies under a *grammaticus*, and one for the less well off, who began with a *ludi magister*.<sup>3</sup> Likewise, though education was not generally a responsibility of the state, there were some exceptions to this rule, such as

---

(Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007); Konrad Vössing, *Schule und Bildung im Nordafrika der römischen Kaiserzeit* (Brussels: Latomus, 1997); Claude Calame, *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece: Their Morphology, Religious Role and Social Functions* (Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997); Teresa Morgan, *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds* (New York: Cambridge, 1998); Yun Lee Too, ed., *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity* (Leiden: Brill, 2001); Judith Evans Grubbs and Tim Parkin, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Childhood and Education in the Classical World* (New York: Oxford, 2013); Lisa Maurice, *The Teacher in Ancient Rome: The Magister and his World* (Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2013); W. Martin Bloomer, ed., *A Companion to Ancient Education* (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2015).

<sup>2</sup> See the description in, e.g., Marrou, *History of Education in Antiquity*, 242-54; Tim Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature in the Roman Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 90-131; Hardwick, *Reception Studies*, 29-30.

<sup>3</sup> Alan Booth, "Elementary and Secondary Education in the Roman Empire," *Florilegium* 1 (1979): 1-14; cf. Robert Kaster, "Notes on 'Primary' and 'Secondary' Schools in Late Antiquity," *TAPA* 113 (1983): 323-46. Kaster's article demonstrates that Booth correctly identifies some fluidity in a student's progression through the educational system, but that sufficient references to a three-tiered educational system are attested to warrant the continued use of the traditional three-tiered model. See as well Christian Laes, *Children in the Roman Empire: Outsiders Within* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011), 122-26, who points out that the division between primary and secondary teachers was not always clear. In most cases, there may have been little to no difference between grammarians and *ludi magistrati*.



Sparta and Athens in Classical Greece,<sup>4</sup> and a few instances in the Hellenistic world in which euergetic benefactors endowed teachers for a city.<sup>5</sup> In most cases, however, the responsibility of educating children tended to fall to parents. Even in the early Principate there was no centrally mandated curriculum, teacher training, or compulsory enrollment.<sup>6</sup> Education was a private affair, the responsibility of families. No matter how eager for education or well-off a family may have been, some parts of a student's general education were, for good or ill, determined by the amenities of the educational marketplace.<sup>7</sup> Not every hamlet had the educational resources to see an eager student all the way from their alphabet to rhetorical prowess.

Lack of state involvement, limited finances, and geographical restrictions could well have caused the Greco-Roman educational system to fragment into a host of micro-systems, so it is noteworthy that the single most pronounced feature of Greek and Roman education in the first-century CE was its uniformity across chronological, geographic, linguistic, cultural, and economic boundaries.<sup>8</sup> From the Hellenistic period until late Antiquity, the Mediterranean basin enjoyed a remarkably stable educational system, complete with shared assumptions about the processes of teaching and learning.<sup>9</sup> Even a

---

<sup>4</sup> And perhaps in parts of southern Italy. See Diodorus Siculus, 12.12.4-13.4, on one sixth century law-giver, Charondas, and his institution of universal education in Catane.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Polybius 31.31, which describes the contribution of the Hellenistic king Eumenes, who sold a large amount of grain in order to pay for the education of Rhodian youths.

<sup>6</sup> Cicero, *Rep.* 4.3.3.

<sup>7</sup> See the remarkable first-century CE letter of a son, Neilos, to his father in *P.Oxy.* 18. 2190. Neilos laments the lack of qualified teachers in his town. Cf. *P.Oxy.* 930, which records the plight of students lacking teachers either for want of funds or because their teacher has moved on from one town to another.

<sup>8</sup> Contra Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 59-61.

<sup>9</sup> The most influential statement regarding the unity of ancient Mediterranean education may be found in Marrou, *History of Education in Antiquity*, e.g., 265. Marrou judged that the system of encyclical education

monumental study like that of Konrad Vössing, focused as it is on education in a limited geographic area (North Africa), does not demonstrate the existence of an educational culture significantly distinct from the educational cultures of, say, Rome, Bordeaux, or Asia Minor.<sup>10</sup> Where we can identify diversity in the contents and methods of ancient education we should understand them, as Morgan puts it, as “variations on a theme whose dominant characteristic is still its high degree of uniformity across the Hellenistic and Roman worlds.”<sup>11</sup>

### B. Progress in Greco-Roman Education

What, then, did participation in this educational system entail? The traditional tripartite division of ancient education remains a useful way of outlining this educational system, even if it may represent an educational ideal attainable only by a minority, not a universal practice.<sup>12</sup> As we observed in the previous chapter, most studies comparing 1 Cor 1-4 and Greco-Roman education have focused almost exclusively on higher

---

was established in the Hellenistic period, adopted with little variation by the Romans, and continued until the end of antiquity. This line of argumentation has been followed by almost all subsequent scholarship on ancient education (e.g., Christian Laes, “Schoolteachers in the Roman Empire: A Survey of the Epigraphical Evidence,” *Acta Classica* 50 [2007]: 111). Thus, Criatore’s *Gymnastics of the Mind* can draw on both school-texts from second-century Bordeaux as well as Hellenistic and Roman Egypt, using them as evidence of the same educational phenomenon. For a more skeptical view, see Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education*, 123-24.

<sup>10</sup> See, e.g., Christian Laes, review of *Schule und Bildung im Nordafrika der römischen Kaiserzeit*, by Konrad Vössing, *Gnomon* 73 (2001): 673-77.

<sup>11</sup> Morgan, *Literate Education*, 51.

<sup>12</sup> See Marrou, *History of Education*, 142-216; Kaster, “Notes on ‘Primary’ and ‘Secondary’ Schools,” 323-46. Likewise, Christoph Marksches notes that “three stages of instruction are to be distinguished for the imperial period (admittedly not as mechanically and strictly as Marrou still thought): the elementary instruction for the urban upper stratum; the higher instruction; and the education via orators, philosophers, and lawyers.” (Christoph Marksches, *Christian Theology and its Institutions in the Early Roman Empire: Prolegomena to a History of Early Christian Theology*, trans. Wayne Coppins [Waco: Baylor, 2015], 33). As an alternative model, Morgan suggests that we think of ancient curricula in terms of a universal curricular core surrounded by a more flexible periphery (Morgan, *Literate Education*, 67-73).

education, that is, rhetoric and philosophy. As I will show in the next two chapters, however, the majority of the educational motifs found in 1 Cor 1-4 correspond most closely with ancient discussions of primary or secondary education rather than tertiary education.<sup>13</sup> The present chapter focuses on these earliest educational stages.

The first stage of the educational process, generally supervised by a διδάσκαλος or *ludi magister*, was concerned with the student's acquiring basic literacy and numeracy: the fundamentals of writing, reading, and mathematics. George Kennedy suggests, perhaps optimistically, that the majority of freeborn children in Rome would have received at least this much education.<sup>14</sup> Educated slaves often received the same education as freeborn children (albeit possibly in different schools),<sup>15</sup> and inscriptional evidence suggests that a large percentage of elementary (and even secondary) teachers were either slaves or freedmen.<sup>16</sup>

Though the first and second stages of Greco-Roman education could blend together, it was at the second stage that the pupil moved beyond the rudiments of literacy and numeracy to study under a γραμματιστής or *grammaticus*. The grammarian's primary

---

<sup>13</sup> As Marksches has observed, of the three basic stages of ancient Greek and Roman education, scholarship on early Christianity has typically privileged study of tertiary philosophical and rhetorical training as comparative material for early Christian theology and institutions (*Christian Theology and its Institutions*, 33-34). In contrast, Marksches begins his discussion of educational institutions and their impact on nascent Christianity by surveying "the first level of formal education and ask how a second- or third-century Christian from the upper class might have experienced it" (*Christian Theology and its Institutions*, 34). See too Marksches, "Lehrer, Schüler, Schule: Zur Bedeutung einer Institution für das antike Christentum," in *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike*, ed. Ulrike Egelhaaf-Gaiser and Alfred Schäfer, STAC 13 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002), 97-119. Starting with primary education is an important move, since elite philosophical culture likely did not filter down to the popular level of the family living just at or above the subsistence level in the Roman Empire (See Robert C. Knapp, *Invisible Romans* [Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011], 105-6).

<sup>14</sup> George Kennedy, *Quintilian: A Roman Educator and his Quest for the Perfect Orator* (Sophrone, 2013), 38-39.

<sup>15</sup> See esp. Maurice, *The Teacher in Ancient Rome*, 115-37.

<sup>16</sup> Christian Laes, "School-teachers in the Roman Empire."

responsibility was to introduce the reading and interpretation of classical literature, especially Homer.<sup>17</sup> It was at this time that the student would also nominally study the disciplines comprising encyclical education (ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία): grammar, rhetoric, dialectic, arithmetic, geometry, musical theory, and astronomy. There is no evidence that these peripheral disciplines were studied as regularly or zealously as grammar, or that a student would even have access to the host of specialized teachers needed to fill out such a broad course of study.<sup>18</sup> The second stage of a classical education also introduced the student to the progymnasmata, a primer in the study of rhetoric.<sup>19</sup> Though it was not common for an individual to complete all of these studies (students so accomplished were a decided, if difficult to quantify, minority), encyclical education served as shorthand for an scholastic ideal, the learning that every educated person should strive to possess.

Finally, in the third stage, a student was qualified to study under a teacher of rhetoric or a philosopher, though philosophical study was decidedly the less popular of the two options.<sup>20</sup> Of these three stages, however, it is the first, and to a lesser extent, the

---

<sup>17</sup> Cf., e.g., Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.9.1. Though Euripides's *Phoen.* was also common. See Raffaella Cribiore, "The Grammarian's Choice: The Popularity of Euripides's *Phoenissae* in Hellenistic and Roman Education," in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Yun Lee Too (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 241-60.

<sup>18</sup> On encyclical education, see L.M. de Rijk, "Ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία: A study of its original meaning," *Vivarium* 3 (1965): 24-93; Ilsetraut Hadot, *Arts libéraux et philosophie dans la pensée antique* (Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1984), esp. 263-93; D. A. Russell, "Arts and Sciences in Ancient Education," *Greece and Rome* 36 (2010): 210-25; W. Martin Bloomer, *The School of Rome: Latin Studies and the Origins of Liberal Education* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011).

<sup>19</sup> On the progymnasmata, see esp. Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, *The Chreia in Ancient Rhetoric: The Progymnasmata*, SBLTT 27 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986); Ronald F. Hock and Edward N. O'Neil, *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises*, WGRW 2 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2002); Ronald F. Hock, *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Commentaries on Aphthonius's Progymnasmata*, WGRW 31 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2012); Ruth Webb, "The progymnasmata as Practice," in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Yun Lee Too (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 289-316; George A. Kennedy, *The Progymnasmata: Greek Handbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*, WGRW 10 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2003).

<sup>20</sup> On ancient tertiary education, see M.L. Clarke, *Higher Education in the Ancient World* (New York: Routledge, 2012); Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 220-44. Marrou, *History of Education in Antiquity*,

second, which will prove most relevant to the study of Pauline educational motifs in 1 Corinthians.

### C. Ancient Literary Sources for Greco-Roman Education

Our most important surviving sources for the study of Greek and Roman education are literary and papyrological. The former provides the bulk of the evidence for this study. No picture of education in antiquity would be complete that ignores the many papyri found in Egypt or the inscriptional evidence scattered throughout the Mediterranean.<sup>21</sup> Cribiore has demonstrated that many surviving school exercises are dedicated to teaching pupils to write their names, a topic not found in literary corpora.<sup>22</sup> But such evidence adds only minor details to the otherwise thorough picture preserved in the literary sources themselves. Consequently, we will closely examine the distinctive contributions that Quintilian, Ps.-Plutarch, and some Hellenistic and Roman philosophers made to ancient educational theory. While it would be profitable to study the philosophies of education reflected in the Platonic corpus or Cicero, the sources discussed here have been selected as the most historically contemporaneous with Paul.

---

284-91. On rhetorical education, see Teresa Morgan, "Rhetoric and Education," in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*, ed. Ian Worthington (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 303-19; Cribiore, *The School of Libanius*. On philosophical education, see B.J. Hijmans, *Askesis: Notes on Epictetus's Educational System* (Assen: Van Gorcum, 1959); Schmeller, *Schulen im neuen Testament*, 46-92; Carlo Natali, "Schools and Sites of Learning," in *The Greek Pursuit of Knowledge*, ed. J. Brunschwig and G. E. R. Lloyd (Cambridge, MA: Belknap, 2003), 40-66.

<sup>21</sup> On the papyri relevant to the study of ancient education, see esp. Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students*; idem, "Education in the Papyri," in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, ed. Roger Bagnall (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009), 320-37.

<sup>22</sup> Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students*, 139-52.

## 1. Quintilian

The *Institutio Oratoria* of Marcus Fabius Quintilianus provides our “most complete description of the content of *enkyklios paideia*” as well as “our longest and fullest source in either Latin or Greek for what he [Quintilian] claims are actual contemporary educational practices.”<sup>23</sup> Written around 95 CE, it provides a firsthand account of one of the Roman Empire’s most prominent educators, a teacher who had spent at least two decades devoted to “the training of the young” (*erudiendis iuuenibus*).<sup>24</sup> Interestingly, Quintilian claims to have spoken on behalf of Bernice of Judaea during his years as a lawyer.<sup>25</sup> He gained such notoriety that at the end of his career he served as personal tutor to Domitian’s two grand-nephews, and his previous students included Pliny the Younger and possibly Tacitus.<sup>26</sup> We know of no Roman educator of greater significance for the study of education in the early empire than Quintilian.<sup>27</sup> The first two books of his monumental *Inst.* deal with the education that prepares a student for rhetorical training, while books three through twelve cover rhetorical training itself.

---

<sup>23</sup> Morgan, *Literate Education*, 37. For the best available overview of Quintilian’s life and the educational import of the *Inst.*, see George Kennedy, *Quintilian*. See too James Murphy, *Quintilian on the Teaching of Speaking and Writing* (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987), ix-xlv; William Smail, *Quintilian on Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1966); W. Martin Bloomer, “Quintilian on Education,” in *A Companion to Ancient Education*, ed. W. Martin Bloomer (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2015), 347-57.

<sup>24</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* Pr.1.

<sup>25</sup> *Inst.* 4.1.19. Cf. Acts 25:23.

<sup>26</sup> D.A. Russell, *Quintilian: The Orator’s Education*, 5 vols., LCL 124-29 (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001), 1:3.

<sup>27</sup> On Quintilian as educator, see esp. Kennedy, *Quintilian*; Gordon Laing, “Quintilian, the Schoolmaster,” *Classical Journal* 15 (1920): 515-34; Murphy, *Quintilian*, ix-xlv.

The goal of Quintilian's educational system was simple to state but difficult to achieve.<sup>28</sup> Quintilian strives to describe the education of the ideal orator:

I am proposing to educate the perfect orator (*oratorem ... perfectum*), who cannot exist except in the person of a good man (*vir bonus*). We therefore demand of him not only exceptional powers of speech, but all the virtues of character as well. I cannot agree that the principles of upright and honourable living should, as some have held, be left to the philosophers.... And so, though I admit that I shall use some ideas found in philosophical books, I would contend that these truly and rightfully belong to our work, and are strictly relevant to the art of oratory.... We are often obliged to speak of justice, courage, temperance, and the like—and all these topics have to be developed by Invention and Elocution: how then can there be any doubt that whatever intellectual power and fullness of diction are required, the orator has the leading role?<sup>29</sup>

For Quintilian, the goal of training in rhetoric is integral to the development of the good man, the *vir bonus*.<sup>30</sup> Quintilian, like Cicero,<sup>31</sup> or Dionysius of Halicarnassus,<sup>32</sup> argues that before sophistry emerged, rhetoric and philosophy were naturally linked and should be equally developed in the good man. As Quintilian puts it, in some halcyon past “philosophers and orators were taken to be the same.”<sup>33</sup> Quintilian's orator is consequently “the sort of man who can truly be called ‘wise,’ not only perfect in morals (*moribus perfectus*) ... but also in knowledge and in his general capacity for speaking.”<sup>34</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup> *Inst.* 1.Pr.19-20.

<sup>29</sup> *Inst.* 1.Pr.10-13 (Russell, LCL). Cf. *Inst.* 1.2.3; 1.10.4-8.

<sup>30</sup> Alan Brinton, “Quintilian, Plato, and the ‘Vir Bonus,’” *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 16 (1983): 167–84; Michael Winterbottom, “Quintilian and the Vir Bonus,” *JRS* 54 (1964): 90–97; Arthur E. Walzer, “Quintilian's ‘Vir Bonus’ and the Stoic Wise Man,” *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 33 (2003): 25–41.

<sup>31</sup> To whom he appeals in *Inst.* 1.Pr.13. Cf. Cicero, *Inv.* 1.3.4; *De or.* 3.56-81.

<sup>32</sup> *Ant. Or.* 1.4 (Usher, LCL).

<sup>33</sup> *Inst.* 1.Pr.13 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>34</sup> *Inst.* 1.Pr.18-19 (Russell, LCL).

Quintilian's lofty educational goals reflect what will become a common theme among literary sources for ancient primary education: that the aim of education is the acquisition of goodness, virtue, and capacity for right behavior.<sup>35</sup>

Quintilian's *vir bonus* required a specific educational program. We can list Quintilian's requirements briefly. First, his father should have high expectations for his son.<sup>36</sup> The earliest expressions of such paternal care will be procuring the right nurses, those who are of excellent moral character and who speak well themselves.<sup>37</sup> The child's father and mother should be educated to their full potential so that they can provide, or at least assist in, his earliest education.<sup>38</sup> When it is time for the student to have a pedagogue, the father should ensure that this servant is also educated.<sup>39</sup> The budding orator requires the very best available teachers, just as Aristotle, the greatest philosopher of his day, was the best available primary teacher for Alexander.<sup>40</sup> Teachers of the highest moral standing should be sought, whether they are employed in the home or in the publicly available schools.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> This is the case with our major surviving literary sources for education. The *chreiai* studied in the process of a literate education provide further reasons for a young student's work, including economic advantage. See Morgan, *Literate Education*, 125-44.

<sup>36</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.1-3.

<sup>37</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.4-5.

<sup>38</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.6.

<sup>39</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.8, 23.

<sup>40</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.10.

<sup>41</sup> *Inst.* 1.2.4-5.



The ideal orator's education proper begins in the home around the age of three with the teaching of moral behavior and of the alphabet.<sup>42</sup> He should learn to identify letters and syllables, and to trace their outlines for himself on a wax tablet, eventually writing names.<sup>43</sup> The student also begins training his voice with tongue-twisters at this age.<sup>44</sup> In Quintilian's educational scheme, all of this early literate education takes place in the home, under the guidance of his parents and the hired help, nurses and pedagogues.<sup>45</sup> When it comes to starting the child with a *magister*, Quintilian debates the relative merits of schoolrooms and private teachers, ultimately suggesting that the best practice is for the parent to choose judiciously from among the available public schools.<sup>46</sup> In these schools, Quintilian notes the literary and rhetorical progress students made,<sup>47</sup> but he focuses especially on how a student's character was shaped by proximity to others. The presence of other children makes one ambitious and competitive, "and though ambition may be a fault in itself, it is often the cause of virtues."<sup>48</sup>

After this primary education, the student advances to study under a *grammaticus*, whose job is to teach "correct speech and the interpretation of the poets."<sup>49</sup> At the same time that a student studied with a grammarian, he should also study with specialist

---

<sup>42</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.16-19.

<sup>43</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.25-36.

<sup>44</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.37.

<sup>45</sup> *Inst.* 1.2.1

<sup>46</sup> "Public," in the sense of "outside of the home." *Inst.* 1.2.1-16.

<sup>47</sup> *Inst.* 1.2.26.

<sup>48</sup> *Inst.* 1.2.22.

<sup>49</sup> *Inst.* 1.4.1-2 (Russell, LCL).

teachers in other disciplines of the traditional encyclical education, such as music and astronomy.<sup>50</sup> This period should also include some introduction to philosophy.<sup>51</sup> The *grammaticus*, however, will focus primarily on building a child's literary facility by further instruction in the properties of vowels and general orthography,<sup>52</sup> especially by teaching the reading and writing of *chreiai*.<sup>53</sup> The study of reading, writing, and the other disciplines in the traditional encyclical education, Quintilian hopes, will prepare the student to become the ideal orator. But these disciplines are not the sources of his goodness or eloquence. For Quintilian, "the orator, who ought to be a wise man, will not be produced by the mathematician or the musician or any of the other subjects ... but these arts will help him to attain perfection."<sup>54</sup> Only students who are suitably prepared by this course of study should pursue tertiary education,<sup>55</sup> i.e., rhetorical training.<sup>56</sup> The remaining books of the *Institutes* are largely devoted to discussion of this training.

## 2. Ps.-Plutarch

The name Ps.-Plutarch refers to the author or authors who wrote treatises in the name of Plutarch of Chaironeia.<sup>57</sup> The date and provenance of *De Liberis Educandis* as a

---

<sup>50</sup> *Inst* 1.4.4; 1.10-12.

<sup>51</sup> *Inst* 1.4.4.

<sup>52</sup> *Inst* 1.4.6-29.

<sup>53</sup> *Inst*.1.9.3-6.

<sup>54</sup> *Inst*. 1.10.6.

<sup>55</sup> *Inst*. 2.2.3.

<sup>56</sup> *Inst*. 2.1.1-13.

<sup>57</sup> For the traditional argument ascribing *Lib. ed.* to an author other than Plutarch, see Daniel Wyttenbach, *Animadversiones in Plutarchi opera moralia*, 3 vols. (Leipzig: Teubner, 1820), 1:1-30. Wyttenbach

pseudepigraphical work are difficult to determine. The best hypotheses suggest that it comes from roughly the same time as Plutarch's undisputed corpus,<sup>58</sup> and that it may even reflect a lost work on education by Chrysippus (to which Quintilian also makes regular reference).<sup>59</sup> Francesca Albini finds the treatise similar enough to Plutarch's own oeuvre that she takes it as the starting point of her investigation of family and character formation in Plutarch's authentic corpus.<sup>60</sup> For a work cited so frequently in specialized studies of ancient education, it has yet to attract the scholarly attention it merits.<sup>61</sup>

Though many have identified a Stoic bent in *De Liberis Educandis*, Berry contends that "Pseudo-Plutarch's ideas on education had already been enunciated over and over again by Stoics and non-Stoics alike and the treatise sounds very like any late Greek or Roman outline of the principles of education; it is not surprising that there are similarities between it and Quintilian or Tacitus."<sup>62</sup> In sum, so far as we are able to cross reference Ps.-Plutarch with our other literary sources on ancient education, it provides a recognizable depiction of education in the Early Roman Empire. The irreplaceable value of *De Liberis Educandis* is due to its being the only surviving Greek source dedicated to

---

concludes, "Quis igitur eius est Scriptor? Nescio: Plutarchum non esse, scio" (*Animadversiones*, 28). Some authorities still think it possible that Plutarch himself was the author. See, e.g., Marrou, *History of Education in Antiquity*, 397.

<sup>58</sup> Edmund Berry, "The *De Liberis Educandis* of Pseudo-Plutarch," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 63 (1958): 387.

<sup>59</sup> Adolf Dyroff, *Die Ethik der alten Stoa* (Berlin: Calvary, 1897), 295. Cf., e.g., *Inst.* 1.11.17. Chrysippus held that the standard Greek education was suitable preparatory training for future philosophers. Cf. Diogenes Laertius, 7.127.

<sup>60</sup> Francesca Albini, "Family and the Formation of Character in Plutarch," in *Plutarch and his Intellectual World*, ed. Judith Mossman (London: Gerald Duckworth, 1997), 59-71.

<sup>61</sup> See the erudite but unpublished commentary on *Lib. ed.* by N.J.S. Abbott, *The Treatise De Liberis Educandis Attributed to Plutarch* (DPhil thesis, Oxford University, 1980).

<sup>62</sup> Berry, "The *De Liberis Educandis* of Pseudo-Plutarch," 388. Berry's article still provides the best readily accessible introduction to the document.

education written during the early Empire, one which claims to be familiar with previous works on education.<sup>63</sup> Its author reiterates many points that were central to Quintilian's pedagogical program, and yet it provides a distinctive outlook on the goal of education.<sup>64</sup>

In contrast to Quintilian, Ps.-Plutarch is concerned with the training of philosophers. Philosophical life is especially evident in a student's behavior, ethics, or virtue, variously referred to as τὸς τρόπους, τὴν ἀρετήν, or τὴν καλοκαγαθίαν.<sup>65</sup> For Ps.-Plutarch, the acquisition of virtue and education are intrinsically linked, because they require the same three human faculties and capacities:

As a general statement, the same assertion may be made in regard to moral excellence that we are in the habit of making in regard to the arts and sciences, namely, that there must be a concurrence of three things in order to produce perfectly right action (τὴν παντελεῖ δικαιοπραγίαν), and these are: nature, reason, and habit (φύσιν καὶ λόγον καὶ ἔθος). By reason I mean the act of learning (τὴν μάθησιν), and by habit constant practice (τὴν ἄσκησιν). The first beginnings come from nature, advancement from learning, the practical use from continued repetition, and the culmination from all combined; but so far as any one of these is wanting, the moral excellence must, to this extent, be crippled (ἀνάγκη χωλὴν γίγνεσθαι τὴν ἀρετήν).<sup>66</sup>

For Ps.-Plutarch, all primary education is propaedeutic to the eventual acquisition of virtuous living that comes via the study of philosophy. "Now the free-born child," he writes, "should not be allowed to go without some knowledge ... of every branch of what is called general education (τῶν καλουμένων ἐγκυκλίων παιδευμάτων); yet these he

---

<sup>63</sup> *Lib. ed.*, 1d.

<sup>64</sup> See the discussion of Greek education in the Roman Empire in Tim Whitmarsh, *Greek Literature and the Roman Empire*, 90-129.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. *Lib. ed.* 1a, 2b, 3e, 4b.

<sup>66</sup> *Lib. ed.* 2a-b (Babbitt, LCL).

should learn only incidentally ... but philosophy he should honor above all else (τὴν δὲ φιλοσοφίαν πρεσβεύειν).<sup>67</sup> To illustrate the relationship between early education and philosophy, Ps.-Plutarch employs a metaphor found in Diogenes Laertius,<sup>68</sup> one that will reappear slightly altered in Philo. He compares encyclical education to Penelope's maidservants in the *Odyssey*, while Penelope herself serves as the allegorical type of philosophy.<sup>69</sup> Lesser men settle for the maidservants, but the philosopher pursues Penelope. For Ps.-Plutarch, philosophical life expresses itself ethically especially in control of one's tongue and temper.<sup>70</sup>

Though less specific than Quintilian in its description of the ways and means of ancient primary education, *De Liberis Educandis* is nonetheless an invaluable essay, full of advice to ancient fathers concerned for their sons' educations. For Ps.-Plutarch, the first step in educating one's child is to exercise caution in procreation, to ensure that both the father and the mother are of honorable birth and family (i.e., not prostitutes),<sup>71</sup> and even to avoid drunkenness before intercourse.<sup>72</sup> This insistence on sound procreative practice fits well with Ps.-Plutarch's belief that nature is one of the three necessary qualities for the development of correct action.<sup>73</sup>

---

<sup>67</sup> *Lib. ed.* 7c (Babbitt, LCL). On the role of reading and gymnastic education, cf. 8b-d.

<sup>68</sup> Diogenes Laertius, 2.79-80. See W.E. Helleman, "Penelope as Lady Philosophy," *Phoenix* 49 (1995): 283-302.

<sup>69</sup> *Lib. ed.* 7d.

<sup>70</sup> *Lib. ed.* 7d-f, 10b-11c.

<sup>71</sup> *Lib. ed.* 1a-d, 5d.

<sup>72</sup> *Lib. ed.* 1d-2a.

<sup>73</sup> *Lib. ed.* 2a-b. Quoted above.

Regarding the child's earliest education, Ps. Plutarch has much in common with Quintilian's emphasis on the formation of virtuous character. Ps.-Plutarch is concerned that parents not do anything to disgrace or mislead their children.<sup>74</sup> He calls for nurses and pedagogues of the highest available moral and intellectual quality<sup>75</sup> and he insists that a father should do everything in his power to procure the very best possible teachers.<sup>76</sup> "For to receive a proper education," Ps.-Plutarch argues, "is the source and root of all goodness."<sup>77</sup>

In one area, however, Ps.-Plutarch diverges from Quintilian. He explicitly denounces sophistry.<sup>78</sup> He does not denounce all rhetoric. He advises students to follow the Aristotelian "golden mean" in their rhetoric, avoiding both the hyperbolic style of the sophists and the melodrama of the actor, opting instead for "a discourse composed of a series of short sentences."<sup>79</sup> In this respect, he is like an inverted Quintilian. Each author insists on some knowledge of philosophy and rhetorical felicity, but Quintilian emphasizes rhetoric, whereas Ps.-Plutarch emphasizes philosophy. Only philosophy, Ps.-Plutarch contends, provides remedies for the ailments of the mind,<sup>80</sup> and the mind and its rational capacity alone are what distinguish humans from animals.<sup>81</sup> Like Quintilian's

---

<sup>74</sup> *Lib. ed.* 1c.

<sup>75</sup> *Lib. ed.* 3c-4a.

<sup>76</sup> Διδασκάλους γὰρ ζητητέον τοῖς τέκνοις, οἱ καὶ τοῖς βίοις εἰσὶν ἀδιάβλητοι καὶ τοῖς τρόποις ἀνεπίληπτοι καὶ ταῖς ἐμπειρίαις (*Lib. ed.* 4b).

<sup>77</sup> Πηγὴ γὰρ καὶ ρίζα καλοκαγαθίας τὸ νομίμου τυχεῖν παιδείας (*Lib. ed.* 4b).

<sup>78</sup> *Lib. ed.* 6a-7a.

<sup>79</sup> *Lib. ed.* 7a-b (Babbitt, LCL).

<sup>80</sup> *Lib. ed.* 7d.

<sup>81</sup> *Lib. ed.* 5e.

ideal orator, Ps.-Plutarch's philosopher is the man who is philosophically sophisticated yet civically engaged.<sup>82</sup> One further way in which fathers can aid in the education of this philosopher is by making themselves good examples for imitation so that sons, "by looking at their fathers' lives as at a mirror, may be deterred from disgraceful words and deeds."<sup>83</sup> While Ps.-Plutarch represents one middle-Platonic iteration of educational theory, the syncretism of his argument raises a question: What did philosophical schools in the late Republic and early Empire think of primary education?

### 3. Elementary Education according to Hellenistic and Roman Philosophy

Beyond *Lib. ed.* we do not possess any philosophical treatise from the late Hellenistic period or early Roman Empire devoted entirely to the problems of education. Lacking Chrysippus's oft-referenced work on education, there is no surviving tractate akin to Plato's *Republic*.<sup>84</sup> But philosophers in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds did refer to the problems of education with sufficient regularity that we can give a rough outline of various positions on education among philosophical schools. In particular, we can observe the outlines of a debate about the general education a typical student might encounter before beginning to study philosophy. Was a traditional education necessary before one began to study philosophy?

---

<sup>82</sup> *Lib. ed.* 8a.

<sup>83</sup> *Lib. ed.* 14a.

<sup>84</sup> On Chrysippus, see Ralph Doty, "Chrysippus' Theory of Education," *Journal of Thought* 20 (1985): 70-75.

For many Stoics, middle Platonists, and Pythagoreans, a traditional primary and secondary education were considered essential preparation for philosophical study.<sup>85</sup> According to Diogenes Laertius, Aristippus, a follower of Socrates, compared encyclical education to Penelope's handmaids and philosophy to Lady Penelope.<sup>86</sup> The middle Platonist Alcinous agreed with Aristippus's evaluation of the value of παιδεία. The would-be philosopher must not only possess a character naturally inclined toward virtue but must also have that innate character "combined with correct education and suitable nurturing (παιδείας μὲν ὀρθῆς καὶ τροφῆς τῆς προσηκούσης)."<sup>87</sup> The authentic Plutarch argued that while philosophy is indeed the pinnacle of education, the study of poetry is a necessary prerequisite, a stop along the way for those who would achieve virtue.<sup>88</sup> Given Quintilian's regular allusion to Chrysippus, it is no surprise that all our evidence suggests that he thought of general education as appropriately propaedeutic to philosophy.<sup>89</sup>

On the other hand, some Stoics, especially Zeno, criticized encyclical education.<sup>90</sup> The Epicureans and Cynics rejected traditional education wholesale.<sup>91</sup> Diogenes Laertius quotes a famous letter of Epicurus, in which he advises a young man to avoid education

---

<sup>85</sup> For a discussion of encyclical education as propaedeutic to philosophy, see Sandnes, *The Challenge of Homer*, 59-67.

<sup>86</sup> Diogenes Laertius, 2.79-80. See discussion in Helleman, "Penelope," 287.

<sup>87</sup> Alcinous, *Didask.* 1.4 (trans. Dillon). But note that encyclical education may not have been a prerequisite for all middle Platonic aspirants. Cf. Justin Martyr's discussion of his conversion to Platonism in *Dial.* 2, in which a Pythagorean refuses to teach him because he lacked the requisite education, but a Platonist takes him in anyway.

<sup>88</sup> Plutarch, *Adul. amic.* 15f, 36d-37b.

<sup>89</sup> Cf. Diogenes Laertius, 7.129.

<sup>90</sup> Cf. Seneca, *Ep.* 88.

<sup>91</sup> Joyall, McDougall, and Yardley, eds., *Greek and Roman Education*, 127-28.



altogether (παιδείαν δὲ πᾶσαν, μακάριε, φεῦγε).<sup>92</sup> In place of the traditional education, Epicurus established his own system for his disciples.<sup>93</sup> Epicurus's system was divided into two basic stages, one for beginners, and one for the advanced. In the first, students learned the basic doctrines of Epicurus's system and memorized primary Epicurean texts; in the second, students worked to grasp the finer points and implications of what they had learned as beginners. Epicurean schools accepted anyone, at any age, and at any stage of life, and psychagogy was an essential component of Epicurean education. The Epicurean education teaches us that even those ancients who abandoned the standard, pan-Mediterranean educational system invented their own replacements, and those replacements tended to involve theories and methods similar to traditional general education. Structured taxonomically (with clearly defined stages), Epicurean education still emphasized the importance of memorizing large bodies of literature, and it still employed more advanced persons as teachers in order to instruct neophytes.

Besides describing their distinctive educational systems,<sup>94</sup> the surviving writings of Hellenistic and Roman philosophers make numerous references to the educational theory and practice of primary and secondary schools. These references provide an essential data set for cross-checking the claims of the major literary sources discussed above. If nothing else, philosophical writings comprise a large body of Hellenistic and Roman literature composed by recipients of traditional Greco-Roman educations,

---

<sup>92</sup> Diogenes Laertius, 10.6.

<sup>93</sup> On Epicurean education, see esp. Elizabeth Asmis, "Basic Education in Epicureanism," in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, ed. Yun Lee Too (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 209-39. See also Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*.

<sup>94</sup> In addition to Asmis's study of Epicurus, see esp. B.J. Hijmans, *Askesis*.

indispensable first-hand accounts from recipients of the system Quintilian and Ps.-Plutarch describe.

## II. Second Temple Jewish Education

### A. Interpreting the Evidence

For those accustomed to the abundant sources for Greco-Roman education, the evidence for Jewish education in antiquity is painfully scanty. It is not surprising that one major study of Israelite education bears the subtitle *Across the Deadening Silence*.<sup>95</sup> According to Catherine Hezser, “The main problem in dealing with Jewish education in antiquity is the sparseness and lack of historical reliability of the respective literary sources. The only literary source which explicitly refers to the organization of Jewish education in antiquity is the text transmitted in the Babylonian Talmud (b.B.B. 21a).”<sup>96</sup> Hezser’s caution should be contrasted with the confidence of Klostermann and Lemaire, each of whom assert that there was a network of schools that extended throughout even pre-exilic Israel.<sup>97</sup> The truth lies somewhere closer to the middle. Not all ancient Jewish education is as opaque as Hezser indicates, yet direct evidence for Jewish education is

---

<sup>95</sup> James Crenshaw, *Education in Ancient Israel: Across the Deadening Silence*, ABRL (New York: Doubleday, 1998). On Jewish and Israelite education other than Philo, see too Nathan Drazin, *The History of Jewish Education from 515 B.C.E to 220 C.E.* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1940); Eliezer Ebner, *Education in Ancient Israel during the Tannaitic Period 10-220 CE* (New York: Bloch, 1956); Eric Heaton, *The School Tradition of the Old Testament: The Bampton Lectures for 1994* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994); Nili Shupak, “Learning Methods in Ancient Israel,” *VT* 53 (2003): 416-26.

<sup>96</sup> Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, TSAJ 81 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 46.

<sup>97</sup> August Klostermann, “Schulwesen im Alten Israel,” in *Theologische Studien Theodor Zahn zum 10. Oktober 1908 dargebracht*, ed. Gottlieb Nathanael Bonwetsch (Leipzig: Deichert, 1908), 193-232; Lemaire, *Les écoles et la formation de la Bible*.

sparse, especially when compared with the evidence for Greco-Roman education.<sup>98</sup> The question of whether or not there were formal schools in pre-exilic Israel will no doubt remain a matter of vigorous debate,<sup>99</sup> but beginning with Ben Sira's reference to his *bet midrash* (οἶκῳ παιδείας) in the second-century BCE (Sir 51:23), the data for ancient Jewish educational institutions improves markedly.

A growing consensus regarding Jewish education in the Hellenistic period has emerged in the wake of David Carr's *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*. Carr argues that while elite males had doubtless received educations throughout Israelite history, Jewish education changed in the Hellenistic period to educate a greater number of Jewish males in long-form texts that were understood to be templates for moral life.<sup>100</sup> Many such long-form texts were to Jews in Yehud what Homer was for educated Greeks. These Jewish texts came to function as a Hellenistic style anti-Hellenistic curriculum.<sup>101</sup> The

---

<sup>98</sup> For a helpful overview, see Leo G. Perdue, *The Sword and the Stylus: An Introduction to Wisdom in the Age of Empires* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 70-80.

<sup>99</sup> Scholars arguing for the existence of schools include: Lorenz Dürr, *Das Erziehungswesen im Alten Testament und im antiken Orient* (Leipzig: Hinrichs 1932); Lemaire, *Les écoles et la formation de la Bible*; Émile Puech, "Les écoles dans l'Israël préexilique: données épigraphiques," in *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1986*, ed. J.A. Emerton, *VetTSup* 40 (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 189-203; Bernhard Lang, "Schule und Unterricht im alten Israel," in *La sagesse de l'Ancien Testament*, ed. Maurice Gilbert, *BETL* 51 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979), 186-201; Heaton, *The School Tradition of the Old Testament*; G. I. Davies, "Were There Schools in Ancient Israel?" in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel: Essays in Honour of J. A. Emerton*, ed. J. Day, R. P. Gordon, and H. G. M. Williamson (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995), 199-211.

A significant number of scholars reject this hypothesis, especially as argued by Lemaire. These dissenters include: David W. Jamieson-Drake, *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archaeological Approach*, *JSOTSup* 109 (Sheffield: Almond Press, 1991); R.N. Whybray, *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament*, *BZAW* 135 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974); Menahem Haran, "On the Diffusion of Literacy and Schools in Ancient Israel," in *Congress Volume, Jerusalem 1986*, ed. J.A. Emerton, *VTSup* 40 (Leiden: Brill, 1988), 81-95; Crenshaw, *Education in Ancient Israel*, 100-108; Stuart Weeks, *Early Israelite Wisdom* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1994), 132-56. All of the above either deny the presence of schools or argue that their presence was extremely limited (i.e., limited to scribal families, or to the city of Jerusalem).

<sup>100</sup> Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 287. Similarly, see Perdue, *The Sword and the Stylus*, 282, on the "democratization" of Jewish education in the Hellenistic period.

<sup>101</sup> Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 253-72. Similarly, Davies, *Scribes and Schools*, 83.

development of this curriculum was an appropriate reaction to a curricular model developed after Alexander the Great's death by which "Greek culture could be identified and distributed and the Greek ruling class could be defined."<sup>102</sup> On Carr's reading, every text of the Hebrew Bible (and many extra-canonical texts, besides) could be read as evidence of Jewish education in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.<sup>103</sup> The texts that were incorporated into a canon survived because they were taught. Though Carr was not the first to suggest that the Hebrew Bible emerged from Jewish educational institutions,<sup>104</sup> his point is well taken. One function of ancient Jewish texts was to serve as the contents of a distinctively Jewish curriculum. Ancient Jewish literature can be read as evidence of what Jewish teachers taught and what ancient Jewish students learned.

But other features of Jewish education, such as how, who, and why teachers taught are less clear. Some adventurous scholars are beginning to reexamine the literature in an attempt to piece together a coherent picture of Second Temple Jewish παιδεία,<sup>105</sup> including the study of literacy in Roman Palestine.<sup>106</sup> The Philonic corpus figures

---

<sup>102</sup> Morgan, *Literate Education*, 23.

<sup>103</sup> Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*, 287.

<sup>104</sup> See Lemaire, *Les écoles et la formation de la Bible*, esp. 72-85; Davies, *Scribes and Schools*, esp. 74-87.

<sup>105</sup> See esp., the dissertation in progress of Jason Zurawski, "Second Temple Jewish *Paideia* within its Hellenistic Contexts," (PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2016); Carr, *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart*; Catherine Hezser, *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*, esp. 39-94; Chris Keith, *The pericopae adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus*, NTTSD 38 (Leiden: Brill, 2009); idem, *Jesus' Literacy: Scribal Culture and the Teacher from Galilee*, LNTS 413 (New York: T&T Clark, 2011); idem, *Jesus against the Scribal Elite: The Origins of the Conflict* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014); Matthew Goff and Karina M. Hogan, ed., *From Musar to Paideia: Pedagogy in Early Judaism and Early Christianity* (Atlanta: SBL Press, forthcoming).

<sup>106</sup> Hezser, *Jewish Literacy*, esp. 39-94.

prominently in this venture,<sup>107</sup> but so do Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon, and even 1-2 Samuel.<sup>108</sup> This scholarly turn to Second Temple Jewish education ought to be especially welcome for Paulinists, since Paul himself associated Judaism with education. Romans 2:20-21, for example, lists being a “corrector of the foolish” (παιδευτὴν ἀφρόνων) and a “teacher of children” (διδάσκαλον νηπίων) among the list of traits in which a hypothetical Jewish teacher (or gentile Judaizer?) might boast.<sup>109</sup>

For students of ancient education, then, Jewish education provides a special challenge. Stated simply, we may know only a little about whom and how Second Temple Jews taught,<sup>110</sup> but the surviving literature provides ample evidence of what they taught. The goal of the following pages is to survey the literary sources for Second Temple Jewish education which shed the most light on 1 Cor 1-4, especially what little we can discern about ancient Jewish teachers, their students, and their curricula. Of all the texts available, the surviving writings of Philo and the Jewish wisdom literature from

---

<sup>107</sup> See, e.g., Hindy Najman, “Text and Figure in Ancient Jewish *Paideia*,” in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*, ed. Mladen Popović, JSJSup 141 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 253-65.

<sup>108</sup> On 1-2 Samuel, see Thomas Bolin, “1-2 Samuel and Jewish *Paideia* in the Persian and Hellenistic Periods,” in *Deuteronomy-Kings As Emerging Authoritative Books: A Conversation*, ed. Diana Vikander Edelman, ANEM (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014), 133-58.

<sup>109</sup> On the identity of Paul’s interlocutor, see Runar Thorsteinsson, *Paul’s Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography* (Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 2003); Matthew Thiessen, “Paul’s Argument against Gentile Circumcision in Romans 2:17-29,” *NovT* 56 (2014): 373-91.

<sup>110</sup> There are hints about the didactic methods they may have employed. See, e.g., James L. Crenshaw, “The Primacy of Listening in Ben Sira’s Pedagogy,” in *Wisdom, You Are My Sister: Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Michael L. Barré, CBQMS 29 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1997), 172-87; Benjamin G. Wright, “Torah and Sapiential Pedagogy in the Book of Ben Sira,” in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of ‘Torah’ in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*, ed. Bernd U. Schipper and D. Andrew Teeter, JSJSup 163 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 157-86.

the Hellenistic period provide the best evidence for Second Temple Jewish education.<sup>111</sup>

Much work remains to be done to elucidate the educational components of these texts, but it is possible to describe Jewish education in the Hellenistic and Roman world in such a way as to illumine Paul's work in his early Christian communities.

## B. Ancient Literary Sources for Jewish Education

### 1. Philo

In the corpus of Paul's older contemporary Philo, we find a vision of education which fuses Jewish education with Hellenistic παιδεία. Philo himself received a Greek education,<sup>112</sup> and his writings contain so many references to παιδεία that Morgan considers Philo one of our most significant literary sources for Greek education.<sup>113</sup> In this fusion of educational traditions, Philo's primary concern is the formation of young Jews. Although Philo gives careful descriptions of Hellenistic encyclical education and almost no clear description of distinctively Jewish educational practices, he views a Greek education as propaedeutic to the formation of a pious Jew, much as Seneca viewed encyclical studies as preliminary to the study of philosophy.<sup>114</sup> Maren Niehoff writes,

---

<sup>111</sup> Josephus and the sectarian texts of the Dead Sea Scrolls are also relevant. The following chapters will reference these sources when appropriate, though a full discussion of them is unnecessary here.

<sup>112</sup> Cf. *Congr.* 74-76. Some argue that this passage is not autobiographical, but Alan Mendelson rightly regards such readings as overly suspicious (*Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria*, HUCM 7 [Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1982], 26).

<sup>113</sup> Morgan, *Literate Education*, 34 n.114.

<sup>114</sup> On Philo's view of the process of educating Jewish children from birth until adulthood, see Maren Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*, TSAJ 86 (Tubingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001), 161-86. Additionally, see esp. F.H. Colson, "Philo on Education," *JTS* 18 (1916-17): 151-62; Thomas Conley, "General Education in Philo of Alexandria." (Protocol of the 15<sup>th</sup> Colloquy of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 9 March 1975). Mendelson, *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria*; Gregory Sterling, "'The School of Sacred Laws: The Social Setting of Philo's Treatises,'" *VigChr* 53 (1999): 148-64.

Given Philo's determination to perpetuate the Jewish way of life in children, we must investigate how he described the contents of education which would transform new-born children into authentic Jews. A survey of his discussions on this topic immediately reveals a striking fact: while Philo says little about specifically Jewish ways of education, he assumed general and especially Greek forms of *paideia*. All of these were in remarkable harmony with each other and furthered the aims of Jewish education.<sup>115</sup>

While references to παιδεία and encyclical education are scattered liberally throughout Philo's corpus, the most thorough presentation of Philo's view of the nature and merit of Hellenistic encyclical education occurs in his *Congr.*, which we will discuss below.

Before discussing Philo's perceptions of Hellenistic education, we ought to attempt to summarize his discussions of Jewish educational traditions not described by Quintilian or Ps.-Plutarch. Philo says frustratingly little about distinctively Jewish educational practices in Alexandria. But his opinion is that Jewish youths should enjoy some education "in the teaching of their race and of their fathers ... from their earliest years to acknowledge the One in substance, the supreme God."<sup>116</sup> According to Philo, one of the great weaknesses of Hellenistic education was its failure to present monotheism to children at this formative stage.<sup>117</sup> Philo at several points assumes that Jewish children will receive an early childhood education in monotheism that is administered both by parents and by professional teachers.<sup>118</sup> He gives the greatest attention to the roles of parents, however, who, he contends, are the child's natural

---

<sup>115</sup> Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*, 177.

<sup>116</sup> *Praem.* 162 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>117</sup> Cf. *Spec.* 1.313.

<sup>118</sup> Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*, 162, 177. Cf. *Spec.* 1.314, which refers to training under "divinely gifted men" (Colson, LCL). *Spec.* 1.332 refers to education in monotheism which begins at the cradle.

instructors and guides.<sup>119</sup> Parents provide good archetypes that can be imitated,<sup>120</sup> and fathers, in particular, bear the burden of their children's earliest educations.<sup>121</sup>

In addition to early education under parents and Jewish teachers, it is clear that for Philo the synagogue was an educational institution.<sup>122</sup> In *Spec.* 2.63-64 he indicates that one should not pursue secular studies on the Sabbath,<sup>123</sup> and in *Mos.* 2.215-16, Philo writes that

it was customary on every day when opportunity offered, and pre-eminently on the seventh day, as I have explained above, to pursue the study of wisdom with the ruler expounding and instructing the people what they should say and do (διδάσκοντος ἅ τε χρῆ πράττειν καὶ λέγειν), while they received edification and betterment in moral principles and conduct. Even now this practice is retained, and the Jews every seventh day occupy themselves with the philosophy of their fathers, dedicating that time to the acquiring of knowledge and the study of the truths of nature. For what are our places of prayer throughout the cities but schools (διδασκαλεῖα) of prudence and courage and temperance and justice and also of piety, holiness and every virtue by which duties to God and men are discerned and rightly performed?<sup>124</sup>

---

<sup>119</sup> *Det.* 143; *Spec.* 2.228.

<sup>120</sup> *Virt.* 197.

<sup>121</sup> Cf. *Congr.* 177. See also Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*, 180-81.

<sup>122</sup> Perhaps the synagogue was the social-location for educating Jewish children in ancient Alexandria. If so, it would resemble the educational function of the synagogue in the rabbinic period. On the educational function of the synagogue in the rabbinic period, see, e.g., Lee I. Levine, *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*, 2nd ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005), 442-45.

<sup>123</sup> Mendelson, *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria*, 32-33.

<sup>124</sup> Colson, LCL. Cf. Philo, *Legat.* 156.



Even when describing the synagogue, Philo describes it as a philosophical school dedicated to the acquisition of virtue. It is also possible that Philo himself operated a private school for advanced students.<sup>125</sup>

Philo's description of the goal of education reveals that his educational theory is irreducibly Jewish. Philo, Quintilian, and Ps.-Plutarch agreed that education should be oriented toward something higher than mastery of the curriculum itself. Quintilian's goal was the education of the rhetorically apt *vir bonus*. Ps.-Plutarch aimed at the civically engaged, philosophically virtuous man. Philo argued that education should terminate in the acquisition of wisdom, which he defined as a stage of development beyond philosophy. For Philo,

just as the school subjects (τὰ ἐγκόκλια) contribute to the acquirement of philosophy, so does philosophy to the getting of wisdom. For philosophy is the practice or study of wisdom, and wisdom is the knowledge of things divine and human and their causes. And therefore just as the culture of the schools is the bond-servant of philosophy, so must philosophy be the servant of wisdom. Now philosophy teaches us the control of the belly and the parts below it, and control also of the tongue. Such powers of control are said to be desirable in themselves, but they will assume a grander and loftier aspect if practiced for the honour and service of God.<sup>126</sup>

Niehoff aptly summarizes Philo's opinion of Hellenistic education as leading "to religious insight and, more importantly, to a renewed commitment to the Jewish God.

This is a remarkable position on the part of Philo."<sup>127</sup> Philo is only able to maintain this

---

<sup>125</sup> Sterling, "The School of Sacred Laws," 148-64. See too H.A. Wolfson, *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*, 2 vols. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1948) 1:79. For an alternative (agnostic) view, see Robert M. Grant, "Theological Education at Alexandria," in *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*, ed. Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring, SAC; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 179-80.

<sup>126</sup> *Congr.* 79-80 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>127</sup> Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*, 182.

position, she contends, because of his conviction that the best parts of philosophy originated with Moses or imitated generally Mosaic principles.<sup>128</sup>

Given his interest in the formation of pious Jews, it is noteworthy that Philo's description of Greek education differs in no significant way from that described by Quintilian or Ps.-Plutarch.<sup>129</sup> The only obvious difference between the Greco-Roman norm and Philo is that Philo suggests that children should begin Hellenistic education at the age of ten.<sup>130</sup> Philo's most systematic statement regarding encyclical studies may be found in *Congr.* An allegorical interpretation of Gen 16:1-6, *Congr.* presents Abraham as a type of the student who first mated with encyclical education (i.e., Hagar) until he was prepared to mate fruitfully with philosophy itself (i.e., Sarah):<sup>131</sup> "For we," writes Philo, "are not capable as yet of receiving the impregnation of virtue unless we have first mated with her handmaiden, and the handmaiden of wisdom is the culture gained by the primary learning of the school course (θεραπεινὴς δὲ σοφίας ἢ διὰ τῶν προπαιδευμάτων ἐγκύκλιος

---

<sup>128</sup> Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*, 183. Note, however, that while Philo is highly critical of sophistry, he does not ignore training in rhetoric as a component of encyclical education. Cf. *Somn.* 1.205; *Congr.* 17. See also Mendelson, *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria*, 7-10.

<sup>129</sup> Cf. Philo's discussion of Moses's education in *Mos.* 1.23, which Philo characterizes as a Greek education, probably the sort of Greek education he himself received. See John M.G. Barclay "Manipulating Moses: Exodus 2:15 in Egyptian Judaism and the New Testament," in *Text as Pretext: Essays in Honour of Robert Davidson*, ed. Robert P. Carroll, JSOTSup 138 (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1992), 38.

<sup>130</sup> As Colson notes, Philo appears to be unique among ancient authors in suggesting that children should encounter formal education at such a late age. He suggests that this is because ten is the perfect number (157; Cf. *Congr.* 88, 121). Niehoff is incorrect to assert that Philo suggests that children should begin encyclical education at seven; presumably she has assimilated Philo with Quintilian (Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*, 175 n.52; cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.15-19). I suggest that Colson makes too much of the number ten. Quintilian suggests that a child should begin his education out of the home at seven, but *ludi magistri* did not usually teach the encyclical disciplines which are the subject matter of *Congr.* It would not be unusual for a child to begin their secondary studies at ten.

<sup>131</sup> *Congr.* 9-11, 23.

μουσική).”<sup>132</sup> In this way, Philo structures *Congr.* around a distinctively Jewish version of the Penelope allegory found in Ps.-Plutarch et al.<sup>133</sup> These preparatory studies include the common branches of learning, grammar, astronomy, music, geometry, rhetoric, and dialectic.<sup>134</sup> Note as well that while Philo appears to lump grammar in with the other disciplines, he also distinguishes between a lower stage of grammar which taught basic literacy and a higher stage of grammar which taught the reading and interpretation of the poets and historians, and it is likely that this lower stage would have preceded the other disciplines of his encyclical education.<sup>135</sup>

To summarize: Philo expected children to receive early instruction in Judaism from their parents (and other unspecified religious instructors) before progressing through the standard Hellenistic education and ultimately ending their studies with philosophical education. He is vague about the earliest stage, but his discussions of the contents and methods of primary education and philosophical education are essentially identical with Ps.-Plutarch, for whom primary education ought to serve as preparation for philosophical study. Or, as Philo puts it, “I greet the training of the schools ... as the junior and the handmaid, but I have given full honour to knowledge and wisdom as the full-grown and the mistress.”<sup>136</sup> He differs from Quintilian in his estimation that philosophy is greater

---

<sup>132</sup> *Congr.* 9 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL). Cf. *Congr.* 35: “the virtue which comes through teaching ... needs the fruits of several studies, both those born in wedlock, which deal with wisdom, and the base-born, those of the preliminary lore of the schools” (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>133</sup> Cf. *Lib. ed.* 7d.

<sup>134</sup> *Congr.* 15-17. Cf. *Congr.* 74-76, in which Philo describes his own education.

<sup>135</sup> *Congr.* 148. Even then, students should undertake encyclical studies with the understanding that such training, properly pursued, leads one to the study of philosophy (On philosophy as the natural end of primary education, cf., e.g., *Congr.* 146-50; *Post.* 101-102.)

<sup>136</sup> *Congr.* 154 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

than rhetoric rather than vice versa. Some scholars have argued that Philo's thinking on education reflects a Stoic outlook,<sup>137</sup> but, as was the case with Ps.-Plutarch, this need not be the case. Philo's views on education dovetail with those of the Stoa, but they were so traditional, nearly ubiquitous in the ancient Mediterranean world, that they need not be defined as "Stoic."

## 2. Wisdom Literature

As with the writings of the Greek and Roman Philosophers, it is impossible to summarize each way in which Jewish wisdom literature contributes to our understanding of Jewish education in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. Rather than review the entire Jewish wisdom tradition, the following pages focus especially on the evidence of Sirach and 4QInstruction, two representative Jewish wisdom texts from the Hellenistic period. These two texts will figure prominently in the following chapters, along with other Jewish wisdom literature such as Wisdom of Solomon and the Hodayot.<sup>138</sup> Jewish wisdom literature is relevant to the present investigation of 1 Corinthians not only because many of its ideas and concepts resemble Paul's own, but because it was produced in schools of wisdom. As such, it provides evidence for understanding the teachers who wrote it and the students for whom it was written.

---

<sup>137</sup> Yehoshua Amir, *Die hellenistische Gestalt des Judentums bei Philon von Alexandrien* (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983), 118-28; John Dillon, *The Middle Platonists: A Study of Platonism, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220* (London: Duckworth, 1977), 141. In contrast, see Wolfson, *Philo*, 1:145-47.

<sup>138</sup> The hymnic form notwithstanding, the Hodayot were strongly influenced by the wisdom tradition. See, e.g., Sarah Tanzer, "The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the Hodayot" (PhD diss., Harvard University, 1987). It is becoming increasingly clear that the Hodayot are dependent upon 4QInstruction. See Armin Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*, STDJ 18 (Leiden: Brill, 1995), 297; Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*, STDJ 44 (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 206; Matthew Goff, "Reading Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the Hodayot," *DSD* 2 (2004): 263-88.

Paul's arguments often resemble the arguments found in Jewish wisdom literature. One thinks of the invective against idolatry in both Romans and Wisdom of Solomon. It is less commonly suggested that Paul and the authors of the wisdom tradition shared a common *Sitz im Leben*, a scholastic setting. And yet scholarship on the wisdom tradition regularly identifies wisdom literature with Jewish education. According to Michael Fox, "the authors of Wisdom Literature were teachers, whether in the school or the home, and as such they give thought to the means and possibilities of education."<sup>139</sup> Ben Sira's isolated reference to his house of instruction (οἶκος παιδείας) is a clear indicator of a scholarly datum regarding the authors of Jewish wisdom literature (Sir 51:23): The authors of Sirach and 4QInstruction, as well as of other wisdom texts from this period, were teachers.<sup>140</sup>

As John Collins has noted, the texts which bear witness to the Jewish sapiential tradition were not only compiled by teachers of wisdom, but were used "as instructional material."<sup>141</sup> It was not by accident that these texts were used in educational settings. The sages who composed them were not isolated intellectuals. These texts are relevant not only because they arose from an educational setting, but also because they allow for a partial reconstruction of the nature and roles of Jewish sages and their students. Sirach

---

<sup>139</sup> Michael V. Fox, "Who Can Learn? A Dispute in Ancient Pedagogy," in *Wisdom, You Are My Sister: Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O.Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*, ed. Michael L. Barré, CBQMS 29 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1997), 62.

<sup>140</sup> Leo Perdue summarizes the social function of scribes like Ben Sira. They were "teachers in the local assembly houses and houses of study throughout the Hellenistic world. This points to an increased democratization of learning that would have included both the sages who interpreted the Torah and other traditions of Jewish tradition [sic], and laypeople offering instruction during Sabbath and festival periods. Some ... like Ben Sira, were teachers who educated leaders and scribes for various roles in Judah as a Seleucid colony" (*The Sword and the Stylus*, 282).

<sup>141</sup> John J. Collins, "Wisdom Reconsidered, in Light of the Scrolls," *DSD* 4 (1997): 281. See too André Lemaire, "The Sage in School and Temple," in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, ed. John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 165-81.

and 4QInstruction are particularly useful in this respect, because they demonstrate the diverse perspectives which arose within the Jewish wisdom tradition even within Palestine.

### i. Sirach

According to the prologue to Sirach—probably composed ca. 175 BCE and translated into Greek in the late second-century BCE<sup>142</sup>—the author of the book set out to “to write something pertaining to instruction and wisdom (παιδείαν καὶ σοφίαν), so that by becoming familiar also with his book those who love learning (οἱ φιλομαθεῖς) might make even greater progress in living according to the law (διὰ τῆς ἐννόμου βιώσεως).”<sup>143</sup> If Ben Sira’s grandson accurately described his intentions, this educational goal was firmly rooted within the wisdom tradition, but it is a wisdom which is keenly aware of Hellenistic conceptions of παιδεία.<sup>144</sup> Di Lella suggests that the lack of a clear organizing

---

<sup>142</sup> See David S. Williams, “The Date of Ecclesiasticus,” *VT* 44 (1994): 563-66. Some suggest that the translation was completed shortly after the death of Ptolemy VIII. See, e.g., John J. Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, OTL (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997), 18; Patrick W. Skehan and Alexander A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, AB 39 (Garden City, NY; Doubleday, 1987), 134.

<sup>143</sup> The textual tradition of Ben Sira is complicated. Some of the Hebrew survives, as well as numerous translations into Greek, Syriac, and Latin. On the text, see esp. Joseph Ziegler, *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*, Septuaginta 12/2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965); Pancratius C. Beentjes, *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and A Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*, VetTSup 68 (Leiden: Brill, 1997); Skehan and Di Lella, *Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 55-62; Jean-Sébastien Rey and Jan Joosten, eds., *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira: Transmission and Interpretation*, JSJSup 150 (Leiden: Brill, 2011).

<sup>144</sup> Theophil Middendorp argues that “Ben Sira schreib ein Schulbuch nach griechischem Muster” and that the “griechische Schulsystem muss damals vorbildlich gewirkt haben; so verstehen wir, das ein ähnlich aufgebautes Schulbuch für den Hebräischen Unterricht sich aufdrängte. Gleichzeitig konnte es nur Erfolg haben, wenn griechische Zitate nicht hervorgehoben wurden.” *Die Stellung Jesu Ben Siras zwischen Judentum und Hellenismus* (Leiden: Brill, 1973), 33-34. Middendorp has been rightly criticized for over-emphasizing Ben Sira’s intellectual dependence on Greek sources (see, e.g., Jack T. Sanders, *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom*, SBLMS 28 [Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983]; Collins, *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 39-40). Some scholars see Ben Sira as antagonistic toward Hellenism (e.g., Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 1:131-53; Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* [Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011], 143-44). Others see him as charting a middle course between extreme Hellenism and

principle in the book “may be due to the fact that individual sections or poems represent Ben Sira’s final editing of class notes he had compiled over a period of years.”<sup>145</sup>

Ben Sira’s concept of wisdom was complicated.<sup>146</sup> He was perfectly comfortable with the study of wisdom which arose from: “(1) the sapiential tradition as it is transmitted through the sages; (2) the observation of the created order; and (3) the Torah.”<sup>147</sup> Ben Sira thus advises his students to seek wise counsel. “If you see an intelligent person,” he writes, “rise early to visit him; let your foot wear out his doorstep” (6:36). He also urges them to observe God’s wisdom at work in the created order: “Good is the opposite of evil, and life the opposite of death; so the sinner is the opposite of the godly. Look at all the works of the Most High; they come in pairs, one the opposite of the other” (33:14-15). God is also said to have distributed wisdom to all of creation (1:9). Sirach 24:1-22 contains a hymn in praise of wisdom reminiscent of the words of Lady Wisdom in Prov 8:1-11. Sirach 24:23 summarizes this hymn, stating, “All this is the book of the covenant of the Most High God, the law that Moses commanded us as an inheritance for the congregations of Jacob.” At the same time, Ben Sira claims that all wisdom comes from the Lord (1:1), and he argues that the ideal sage seeks to learn from other cultures (39:4).<sup>148</sup> Wisdom in Ben Sira feels torn between two poles, one

---

equally extreme Jewish conservatism (e.g., Perdue, *The Sword and the Stylus*, esp. 263-70). Collins is probably correct when he concludes: “There were features of the Hellenistic ethos of which Ben Sira did not approve, especially in the area of sexual morality, but other features were so much part of his cultural context that he would never have perceived them as foreign” (*Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*, 35).

<sup>145</sup> Di Lella and Skehan, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 10.

<sup>146</sup> For a helpful description of the relationship between the various sources of Ben Sira’s teaching, see Wright, “Torah and Sapiential Pedagogy.”

<sup>147</sup> Wright, “Torah and Sapiential Pedagogy,” 169.

<sup>148</sup> Cf. 34:10-13.

universalizing, and one particular to Jewish tradition. Greg Schmidt Goering has offered the best interpretation of wisdom in Ben Sira. He argues that, according to Ben Sira, there are two apportionments of wisdom. “In one apportionment, YHWH gives a general wisdom to all human beings, and in another apportionment he gives a special wisdom to his chosen people, Israel.... Neither completely universal, nor wholly particular—that is the conundrum of wisdom.”<sup>149</sup>

At least a portion of Ben Sira’s wisdom was a wisdom only for God’s chosen people, the Israelites. It is the election of Israel that makes them wisdom’s natural students.<sup>150</sup> The principle of God’s election can be clearly seen in Sir 33:7-15.<sup>151</sup> In Sir 33:7-9, Ben Sira asks why some days are of greater importance than others. The answer is that God has chosen some days, setting them apart as festivals, sacred occasions. By analogy, Ben Sira suggests that, just as God distinguished between sacred and common days:

All human beings come from the ground, and humankind was created out of the dust. In the fullness of his knowledge the Lord distinguished them and appointed their different ways. Some he blessed and exalted, and some he made holy and brought near to himself; but some he cursed and brought low, and turned them out of their place. Like clay in the hand of the potter, to be molded as he pleases, so all are in the hand of their Maker, to be given whatever he decides. Good is the opposite of evil, and life the opposite of death; so the sinner is the opposite of the godly.

---

<sup>149</sup> Greg Schmidt Goering, *Wisdom’s Root Revealed: Ben Sira and the Election of Israel*, JSJSup 139 (Leiden: Brill, 2009), 9. Yet of the two apportionments of wisdom, Ben Sira accords the greatest honor to the Torah. See Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 75-80; Friedrich V. Reiterer, “The Interpretation of the Wisdom Tradition of the Torah within Ben Sira,” *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 209-32.

<sup>150</sup> See Goering, *Wisdom’s Root Revealed*; Sigurd Grindheim, *The Crux of Election: Paul’s Critique of the Jewish Confidence in the Election of Israel*, WUNT 2/202 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005), 35-40.

<sup>151</sup> Goering, *Wisdom’s Root Revealed*, 49-61.



Look at all the works of the Most High; they come in pairs, one the opposite of the other. (Sir 33:10-15)

In the case of holy days and holy people, it is God's choice that makes the difference. And God distributes a special apportionment of wisdom to the people whom he chooses, in this case, Israel.<sup>152</sup> As Sir 17:17 notes, "He appointed a ruler for every nation, but Israel is the Lord's own portion." God may have given a portion of wisdom to all human beings (17:1-7), but to some he gives special knowledge, the "law of life" (προσέθηκεν αὐτοῖς ἐπιστήμην καὶ νόμον ζωῆς ἐκκληροδότησεν αὐτοῖς), which are part and parcel of the covenant (17:11-12). Hence, the Torah becomes the distinctive wisdom for the elect (cf. 24:23).

As a part of this instruction, Ben Sira took the time to describe his ideal sage, the Jewish teacher of wisdom. John Gammie has identified numerous ways in which Ben Sira's description of the sage conforms to the presentation of the wise person in Proverbs. For example, Ben Sira's sage will be pious and prayerful (Sir 18:27, 39:5; Prov 14:2; 15:29, 33), capable of hiding his thoughts from those who cannot appreciate them (Sir 19:7-12; Prov 25:9-10), etc.<sup>153</sup> The clearest discussion of Ben Sira's prototypical sages comes in Sir 38:34c-39:11, a passage which is probably autobiographical.<sup>154</sup> This sage studies ancient texts assiduously: "He seeks out the wisdom of all the ancients, and is concerned with prophecies; he preserves the sayings of the famous and penetrates the subtleties of parables; he seeks out the hidden meanings of proverbs and is at home with

---

<sup>152</sup> Goering, *Wisdom's Root Revealed*, 89-101.

<sup>153</sup> John G. Gammie, "The Sage in Sirach," in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, ed. John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 359.

<sup>154</sup> See, e.g., Pancratius C. Beentjes, *Happy the One Who Meditates on Wisdom (Sir 14,20): Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 115-22. See too Skehan and Di Lella, *Ben Sira*, 451-53.

the obscurities of parables” (39:1-3). Additionally, the sage is an advisor to nobles (39:4).<sup>155</sup> Ben Sira’s sage also has a cosmopolitan flair and is open to learning from other cultures: “He travels in foreign lands and learns what is good and evil in the human lot” (39:4b).<sup>156</sup> Such cosmopolitanism is reasonable, given Ben Sira’s understanding of wisdom as a gift bestowed upon all humanity. His ideal sage is also a bastion of piety, committed to prayer (39:5), and reliant upon the spirit of God for his wisdom. “If the great Lord,” Ben Sira writes, “is willing, he will be filled with the spirit of understanding (πνεύματι συνέσεως ἐμπλησθήσεται)” (39:6). In fact, “The Lord will direct his counsel and knowledge, as he meditates on his mysteries” (39:7). What the sage has learned, both from the spirit of understanding and the study of Torah, he will in turn teach to others (39:8), and as a result he is assured lasting renown (39:9-11).

### iii. 4QInstruction

Like Sirach, the wisdom text from cave 4 at Qumran known variously as Sapiential Work A, *Musar leMevin*, and now, most commonly, 4QInstruction, also emerges from an educational *Sitz im Leben*.<sup>157</sup> Though originally skeptical about the notion that 4QInstruction contained the teachings of a sage to his students, Eibert Tigchelaar eventually conceded that it was actually quite likely that the text preserved

---

<sup>155</sup> Gammie, “The Sage in Sirach,” 360-61, 63.

<sup>156</sup> On Ben Sira’s cosmopolitanism, see Gammie, “The Sage in Sirach,” 363-64.

<sup>157</sup> “4QInstruction presumes some sort of pedagogical setting and seeks to inculcate a love for learning: ‘Increase in understanding greatly, and from all of your teachers (משכילכה) get ever more instruction’ (4Q418 81 17; cf. 4Q418 221 3)” (Goff, “Reading Wisdom,” 265).

just such a didactic tradition.<sup>158</sup> Matthew Goff has also repeatedly emphasized the educational context of 4QInstruction.<sup>159</sup> The exact date and provenance of the document are uncertain, but 4QInstruction antedates the Qumran community and was probably composed during the second-century BCE.<sup>160</sup>

Unlike Ben Sira's relentlessly practical advice, the author of 4QInstruction provides his audience with a blend of mundane and esoteric wisdom. In addition to basic instructions on loci common to the wisdom tradition (such as dealing with women, restraint in eating and drinking, etc.), 4QInstruction blends the wisdom tradition and an apocalyptic outlook.<sup>161</sup> At 4QInstruction's core is the revealed mystery of the רז נחיה, "the mystery which is to be," or, possibly, "the mystery of existence," which is the primary source of wisdom for the addressee.<sup>162</sup> Though the meaning of this phrase, which occurs

---

<sup>158</sup> See Eibert J.C. Tigchelaar, "The Addressees of 4QInstruction," in *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran*, ed. Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller, STDJ 35 (Leiden: Brill, 2000), 62-75; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding ones*, 245-46; Shane A. Berg, *Religious Epistemologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Heritage and Transformation of the Wisdom Tradition* (PhD diss., Yale University, 2008), 36.

<sup>159</sup> Matthew J. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, STDJ 50 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 27-28, suggests that "4QInstruction is a pedagogical composition devoted to the ethical development of its intended audience." Similarly, idem, *4QInstruction*, WLAW 2 (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013), 12. See also John Strugnell and Daniel J. Harrington, *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2. 4QInstruction (Musar le Mevin): 4Q415ff. With a Revision of 1Q26*, DJD 34 (Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 20-21, who suggest that the text's original social setting was for use in training scribes and other functionaries for service in a royal court in the second- and third-centuries BCE.

<sup>160</sup> See, e.g., Matthew J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, VTSup 116 (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 65-67; idem, *4QInstruction*, 27-29; Torleif Elgvin, "Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction," in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20-22 May 2001*, ed. John J. Collins, Gregory Sterling, and R.A. Clements, STDJ 51 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 83.

<sup>161</sup> On wisdom and apocalyptic in 4QInstruction, see Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 13, 21; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 19-23. For evidence that 4QInstruction is the address of a teacher to a student, see Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 245-46.

<sup>162</sup> On the רז נחיה, see esp. Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, 30-42.

more than twenty times in 4QInstruction has been hotly debated,<sup>163</sup> Goff is probably correct that the רז נהיה

signifies knowledge about how the natural order functions. The text's teachings encourage the addressee to better understand and succeed in the world. In this sense the mystery that is to be pertains to all of the composition's instruction, including its practical advice. Its teachings are 'mysteries' that are grounded in the larger mystery that is to be. The composition merges a pedagogical and eudemonistic ethos with appeals to revelation.<sup>164</sup>

Nevertheless, the רז נהיה is a broad concept, the revealed wisdom which allows the student to understand divine plans and action in creation, the progression of human history, and even eschatological mysteries. It defies easy categorization, and scholars should be wary of simple definitions of this key term.

Who, then, were the recipients of this mystery? As with Ben Sira, the recipients of 4QInstruction's wisdom were understood to be eligible for wisdom on the grounds of their election.<sup>165</sup> There are two significant ways in which 4QInstruction identifies its recipients as elect. In the first, the addressees are said to be entrusted with the cultivation of the Garden of Eden, in which the garden is a symbol of wisdom. Thus 4Q 423 1 reads: "And every fruit of the produce and every delightful tree, desirable for making one wise. Is it not a de[*lightful and desirable*] garden.... He has given you authority (המשילכה) over it to till it and keep it."<sup>166</sup> As Goff notes, the verb המשיל in 4QInstruction regularly

---

<sup>163</sup> Cf. 1Q27 1 i 3-4; 1QS 11:3-4.

<sup>164</sup> Goff, *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*, 39. For other interpretations of the mystery that is to be, see Torleif Elgvin, "An Analysis of 4QInstruction" (PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997), 80-81; Armin Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 58, suggests that it is synonymous with Torah.

<sup>165</sup> On the elect status of the recipients of 4QInstruction, see esp. Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*; Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 36-44; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 17-19.

<sup>166</sup> Unless otherwise noted, translations of 4QInstruction are taken from Goff, *4QInstruction*.

denotes the elect status of the addressee, as one who has been entrusted with wisdom by God.<sup>167</sup> 4QInstruction also describes two types of human beings on the basis of exegesis of the creation accounts. Some people belong to the type of human being known as the “fleshly spirit” (רוח בשר) while others were “spiritual” (עם רוח).<sup>168</sup> According to the author of 4QInstruction, the “spiritual” people have access to the רז נחיה as well as to another enigmatic a source of divine wisdom—“the vision of Hagu”—while the fleshly people are refused access to this wisdom.<sup>169</sup>

But 4QInstruction also designates the elect status of its addressees by claiming that God has given them an inheritance with the angels: “And among all the angels he has cast your lot and your glory he has greatly magnified.”<sup>170</sup> In this way, God is said to have separated the elect student from the “fleshly spirit” (רוח בשר) (4Q418 81). Since the fleshly spirit was to be destroyed in the eschatological judgment (4Q416 1), elect status for the student is a promise of eternal life.<sup>171</sup> However, a second major benefit of having an inheritance with the angels is that God gives access to wisdom to the spiritual people, but he denies it to the fleshly spirit (cf. 4Q417 1 i 17). The recipient of 4QInstruction, like the angels, was a “first-born son” (4Q418 81 5), an appellation commonly applied to the

<sup>167</sup> Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 37. Cf., e.g., 4Q416 iii 11-12.

<sup>168</sup> 4Q417 1 i 13-18. Cf. 4Q 416 1 12.

<sup>169</sup> 4Q417 1 i 16.

<sup>170</sup> Trans. Goff., *4QInstruction*, slightly modified. Cf. 1QS 11:7-8; 1QH<sup>a</sup> 19:14-15.

<sup>171</sup> “The *mebin*, in his reflection upon this teaching, was likely supposed to identify with the spiritual people, and thus realize that he is like the angels, not the fleshly spirit. The addressee has affinity with the angels, which distinguishes him from the rest of humankind, those who are not in his elect community” (Goff, *4QInstruction*, 17). See too Benjamin G. Wold, *Women, Men, and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMevin and its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions*, WUNT 2/201 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005).

angels.<sup>172</sup> Thus, as in Sirach, election is essential to the complete reception of divine wisdom.

Lastly, it is worth noting that 4QInstruction is addressed to students from a distinctive social class. Though it has been suggested that the addressee of 4QInstruction was a scribe training for an administrative position in a state bureaucracy, this is unlikely.<sup>173</sup> 4QInstruction emphasizes repeatedly that its recipients are poor and that they belong to a low social class.<sup>174</sup> The sage writes, “Praise his name always, for from poverty he has lifted your head and with the nobles he has set you. Over an inheritance of glory he has given you dominion. Seek his favor always. You are poor—do not say, ‘I am poor, so I will not seek knowledge.’ Bring your shoulder under all instruction and in all ... purify your heart with much intelligence.”<sup>175</sup> In the midst of poverty, God has chosen the pupil of 4QInstruction, and God’s choice is the equivalent of elevation out of poverty. In this respect, 4QInstruction is unlike Sirach, which has a positive regard for wealth and the opportunities for the study of wisdom which it brings.<sup>176</sup>

The identity and qualifications of the sage in 4QInstruction are less clear than they are in Sirach. “The teacher figure of 4QInstruction never emerges as a distinct personality” yet “the speaker can reasonably be understood as the teacher who instructs

---

<sup>172</sup> See Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning*, 233.

<sup>173</sup> *DJD* 34, 20-21.

<sup>174</sup> Cf. 4Q415 6 2; 4Q416 iii 2, 8, 12, 19; 4Q418 177 5. See as well Benjamin G. Wright III, “The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature,” in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20-22 May 2001*, ed. John J. Collins, Gregory Sterling, and R.A. Clements, STDJ 51 (Leiden: Brill, 2004), 101-23; Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 53-61

<sup>175</sup> 4Q416 2 iii 11-13.

<sup>176</sup> Cf. Sir 3:17-18; 10:27; 13:24; 14:11-16; 25:3; 34:3; 40:18; 44:6; 47:18.

the addressee.”<sup>177</sup> As we shall see, though 4QInstruction will shed little light on Paul’s role as a teacher, it and the literature it influenced provide useful analogues to Paul’s presentation of the members of the Corinthian community.

### III. Conclusion

The texts and authors surveyed in this chapter provide literary witnesses to the educational traditions that were operative when Paul wrote 1 Corinthians. This presentation of the historical data is rather different from the educational traditions and institutions privileged in the studies of Judge, Munck, and White, each of whom suggested that rhetorical and philosophical education provided the most likely parallels to Paul’s language in the Corinthian correspondence. I hope to demonstrate instead that many of the closest literary and conceptual parallels to Paul’s language may be found in discussions of Greco-Roman primary education and the Jewish wisdom tradition. While I agree with Conzelmann that the educational setting of the wisdom tradition provides a helpful analogue to 1 Cor 1-4, I am less concerned in this study with identifying the Corinthian community as a school than with understanding the nature of Paul’s argument. Moreover, scholarship to date has sorely undervalued the Philonic corpus as a source for analyzing Jewish education in antiquity. With the above survey of Greco-Roman and Jewish education in mind, it is to the identification of educational motifs in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21 that we now turn.

---

<sup>177</sup> Goff, *4QInstruction*, 12.

## Chapter 4:

### Ancient Education in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21

As a first foray into the text of 1 Corinthians, this chapter has two modest goals. First, it will identify any passages in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21 that contain the language, logic, or imagery of the ancient educational traditions and institutions surveyed in the previous chapter.<sup>1</sup> The simplest and most effective way to achieve this goal is to set Paul's text alongside parallel descriptions of ancient education, observing the striking similarities in thought and expression. Second, once these educational motifs are suitably evident, I will propose a preliminary conclusion regarding the significance of these educational motifs: Their most basic function is to present the Corinthian community as a school in which Paul and the apostles are teachers, the Corinthians are students, and the information delivered to the Corinthians by the apostles is a curriculum.<sup>2</sup> This chapter's analysis of the educational language in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21 will make it possible in chapter 5 to identify similar educational motifs and logic in 1 Cor 1:10-2:16. Once new educational motifs are identified, it is natural to inquire after the exegetical payoff resulting from this identification. It will be the task of chapter 6 to reassess the entire argument of 1 Cor 1:10-4:21.

---

<sup>1</sup> I begin with 1 Cor 3:1-4:21 not because Paul's readers would have read 1 Corinthians out of sequence, but because these chapters explicit educational motifs in a higher concentration than any other portion of the epistle.

<sup>2</sup> The educational motifs catalogued here are neither coded discourse aimed directly at the educated elite, nor mere literary flourishes that allow Paul to describe himself as a teacher (Dutch, *Paul and The Educated Elite*, 302; White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 169).



## I. The Evidence: Educational Language and Imagery

Before analyzing the text, I will make a few comments on the ways in which Paul uses educational language. There are three types of educational motifs in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21. The first is direct use of teaching and learning vocabulary, such as *μανθάνω* in 4:6 and *διδάσκω* in 4:17.<sup>3</sup> The second are *topoi*, or commonplaces, allusions to common features of the ancient classroom, such as Paul's warning that he may come bearing a rod (4:24). These two types of educational motifs are relatively easy to identify.

The third type of evidence is less obvious. 1 Corinthians 3:1-4:21 contains an unusually rich cluster of images and metaphors. Paul calls his earliest message "milk, not solid food" (3:1). He alternately compares the relationship between himself and the Corinthians to the connection between farmers and fields, as well as architects and buildings (3:6-9; 3:10-17). He calls himself a "steward of the mysteries" (4:1-2) and the Corinthians' father (4:14-15). This catalogue of metaphors seems scattered, drawn at random from unrelated components of ancient Mediterranean life. What have agriculture, architecture, nursing, mystery cults, and fatherhood to do with one another?

Modern scholarship has adopted three general strategies for analyzing these metaphors. The first has been to identify some point central to Paul's argument and then demonstrate how these diverse metaphors work cooperatively to advance that point. For example, Dale Martin and others argue that Paul's metaphors in 1 Cor 3-4 establish his tendency to reverse social status.<sup>4</sup> The second strategy, rather than seeking a unifying

---

<sup>3</sup> On explicit teaching and learning vocabulary in 1 Corinthians, see Smith, *Pauline Communities as 'Scholastic Communities.'*

<sup>4</sup> Dale B. Martin writes, "The apostles are only servants (3:5) and farm laborers (3:6-8). Chapter 4 begins with Paul's insistence that the apostles are simple servants (*hypēretai*) or managerial slaves (*oikonomoi*) of Christ" (*The Corinthian Body* [New Haven: Yale, 1995], 102). Similarly, see Andrew Clarke, *Secular & Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical & Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-6*, AGJU 18

theme in Paul's metaphors, chooses to focus on one metaphor at a time, exploring its source domain for clues to its meaning. John Goodrich, in his study of 1 Cor 4:1, surveys the various roles of οἰκονόμοι in the Hellenistic and Roman worlds, arguing that when Paul calls himself a "steward of God's mysteries," the most likely source domain for his metaphor was the role played by ancient household administrators.<sup>5</sup>

This chapter, like the study of Adam White, will adopt a different approach to Paul's metaphors.<sup>6</sup> Once Paul's metaphors are read alongside other ancient uses of similar metaphors, it becomes clear that while they may originate in discrete source domains, all share a single target domain: ancient Mediterranean education. A source domain is "a conceptual domain that we use to understand another conceptual domain (the target domain). Source domains are typically less abstract than target domains. For example, in the conceptual metaphor LIFE IS A JOURNEY, the conceptual domain of journey is typically viewed as being less abstract or less complex than that of life."<sup>7</sup> In 1 Cor 1-4, source domains like nursing infants, sowing in a field, or constructing a building are less abstract than the concept of education. This basic approach to metaphor provides the guiding principle for the comparative analysis of the next two chapters.<sup>8</sup>

---

(Brill: Leiden, 1993), 118-19; Anthony Thiselton, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 303.

<sup>5</sup> E.g., John Goodrich, *Paul as an Administrator of God in 1 Corinthians*, SNTMS 152 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012). Similarly, see Norman Young, "PAIDAGOGOS: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor," *NovT* 29 (1987): 150-76; Jay Shanor, "Paul as Master Builder: Construction Terms in First Corinthians," *NTS* 34 (1988): 461-71.

<sup>6</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, esp. 169-73.

<sup>7</sup> Zoltán Kövesecs, *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 252. Emphasis original.

<sup>8</sup> For an analogous use of metaphor theory to guide literary analysis of a New Testament composition, see Troy W. Martin, *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter*, SBLDS 131 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992).

When the Greeks and Romans described their educational systems, they used metaphors with source domains ranging from horticulture to the gymnasium.<sup>9</sup> Sometimes an image is distinctive within an author's corpus. Plutarch, for example, regularly compares students to bees searching out nectar amidst thorny plants.<sup>10</sup> Other metaphors are shared by a variety of sources. Many ancient authors held that the process of education was comparable to struggling up a high mountain, progressing from the rote memorization of the alphabet at the base to eventual rhetorical or philosophical prowess.<sup>11</sup> Though Paul's metaphors in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21 fall into the latter category, occurring in a range of ancient discussions of educational theory and practice, only a handful of them have been rightly interpreted as references to education. Those already identified can be discussed relatively quickly, with a summary of the relevant secondary scholarship and a list of the most relevant literary parallels. Others will warrant more substantial discussion, either because of their relative obscurity, or because their interpretation is contested.

A final, potentially confusing feature of Paul's reception of Greek, Roman, and Jewish educational metaphors is that Paul seems to draw from Greco-Roman and Second Temple Jewish educational traditions in tandem. There are several possible explanations for this phenomenon. First, it may be that the historical Paul was familiar with a Jewish education in which elements of the wisdom tradition and Greco-Roman primary education were already synthesized. We can glimpse this sort of educational tradition in

---

<sup>9</sup> See Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 15-18; Morgan, *Literate Education*, 242-70.

<sup>10</sup> E.g., *Adul. amic.* 32e-f.

<sup>11</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 12.10. 78-80; Lucian, *Hermot.* 5. See Morgan, *Literate Education*, 262; Criboire, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 1.

Philo's writings, in which encyclical education is pressed into the service of the formation of pious Jews. Since the actual *ordo* of ancient Jewish education, both in Palestine and the Hellenistic diaspora, remains highly speculative, it is safe simply to treat the many references to education dotting 1 Cor 1-4 as a "hybrid," a single conceptual entity drawn comprised from otherwise diverse source materials.<sup>12</sup> Paul favors neither the school of the Jewish scribe nor the classroom of the Roman *ludi magister*. All of the individual instances of educational language, metaphors, and logic are individual points of a larger structure. Paul has characterized the community as a school, and it is this controlling image which provides the bedrock for his argument.<sup>13</sup> The following pages examine these motifs—educational vocabulary, *topoi*, and metaphors—in their canonical sequence.

## II. Educational Motifs in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21

### A. Milk and Solid Food (3:1-4)

Paul's first educational metaphor occurs in 3:1-4. In these verses, Paul likens his instruction to the food appropriate for children in the earliest stages of human development: "I could not speak to you as spiritual people, but rather as people of the flesh, as infants in Christ. I fed you with milk (γάλα), not solid food (βρῶμα), for you

---

<sup>12</sup> Hardwick, *Reception Studies*, 9.

<sup>13</sup> Steven J. Kraftchick has warned against a merely ornamental approach to metaphor, one which combs the surface of the New Testament looking for source and target domains; instead, Kraftchick urges us to see metaphor as constitutive of speech (Steven J. Kraftchick, "Seeking a More Fluid Model: A Response to Jouette M. Bassler," in *Pauline Theology, Volume II: 1&2 Corinthians*, ed. David M. Hay [Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989]), 32-33.

were not ready for solid food” (3:1-2).<sup>14</sup> When Paul employs this dietary metaphor, he is doubtless referring his audience back to his argument in 1 Cor 1:18-2:16, in which he distinguished the λόγος of the cross (1:18) from the higher wisdom which he reserved for the mature (2:6). The challenge in interpreting 3:1-4 is to determine the significance of Paul’s application of a dietary metaphor to the λόγος of the cross and wisdom.

Modern scholarship is divided on the meaning of this metaphor. One interpretive strategy argues that Paul intended to contrast the wholesome food of the gospel from the unhealthy food that his audience found in Corinthian culture.<sup>15</sup> The latter diet is commonly understood to be sophistic rhetoric.<sup>16</sup> A second trend reads the “milk and solid food” metaphor as a reference to two tiers of early Christian instruction. On this reading, the Corinthians have received and understood the most basic Christian instruction but have not advanced to more weighty knowledge.<sup>17</sup> Dutch, White, and Zeller have strengthened this second stream of interpretation, noting that the same distinction between milk and solid food occurs in Hellenistic and Roman discussions of education.<sup>18</sup> Dutch argues that Paul’s milk and solid food terminology would be immediately

---

<sup>14</sup> This distinction between the mature and immature and the education appropriate for each reappears in 1 Cor 14:20. Paul there orders that the Corinthians μη παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσὶν ἀλλὰ τῇ κακίᾳ νηπιάζετε, ταῖς δὲ φρεσὶν τέλειοι γίνεσθε.

<sup>15</sup> See, e.g., Morna Hooker, “Hard Sayings: 1 Cor 3:2,” *Theology* 69 (1966):19-22; James Francis, “As Babes in Christ—Some Proposals regarding 1 Cor. 3:1-3,” *JSNT* 7 (1980): 41-60.

<sup>16</sup> Francis, “As Babes in Christ,” 53.

<sup>17</sup> See, e.g., Walter Grundmann, “Die νήπιοι in der urchristlichen Paranese,” *NTS* 5 (1958-59): 188-205; C.K. Barrett, *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, HNTC (New York: Harper & Row, 1968), 79-80; Hans Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*, Hermeneia (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975), 71-72.

<sup>18</sup> Gordon Fee cites Philo, *Agr.* 9 and Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.16.26, but he does not consider the ways in which those texts employ the milk and solid food metaphor in the context of discussions of ancient educational theory and practice (Gordon D. Fee, *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*, NICNT [Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010], 124 n. 12). Similarly, Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 290 n. 347.

recognizable to the Corinthian community, concluding: “For those who apparently boasted in philosophy and criticised Paul for not giving them advanced instruction he uses a common education image to show them as relative beginners.”<sup>19</sup> Similarly, Zeller notes that Paul, by only addressing the Corinthians as immature (ὡς νηπίοις) “bringt die Assoziation von Säuglingen und ihrer Ernährung mit sich, ein Bildfeld, das in der hellenistischen Pädagogik eingesetzt wird, um den Elementarunterricht von höherer Weisheit abzuheben.”<sup>20</sup>

Even a cursory reading of ancient educational literature confirms Dutch and Zeller’s suspicions. First, as we have already observed, literary descriptions of ancient education were concerned with the hypothetical pupil’s nurses who were counted among a child’s earliest educators.<sup>21</sup> The educational responsibilities of the nurse should inform our readings of the nursing imagery which appears throughout Paul’s corpus.<sup>22</sup>

Moreover, the specific metaphor “milk for infants, solid food for the mature” appears frequently to describe stages of progress within ancient curricula. Quintilian writes that “study also has its infancy and, as the rearing of what will one day be the strongest bodies begins with breast feeding and the cradle, so the great speaker of the future once cried as a baby ... puzzled by the shape of letters.”<sup>23</sup> Quintilian “would urge

---

<sup>19</sup> Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 254. Similarly, White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 184-86.

<sup>20</sup> Dieter Zeller, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, KEKNT 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010), 152.

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.4-5; Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.* 3c. See Kennedy, *Quintilian*, 38, 43.

<sup>22</sup> 1 Thess 2:7. On which, see esp. Malherbe, *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*, 35-48. See also O. Larry Yarbrough, “Parents and Children in the Letters of Paul,” in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks*, ed. L. Michael White and O. Larry Yarbrough (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 132-33; Beverly Roberts Gaventa, *Our Mother St. Paul* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007), esp. 41-50.

<sup>23</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.21 (Russell, LCL).

teachers ... like nurses to be careful to provide softer food for still undeveloped minds and to suffer them to take their fill of the milk of the more attractive studies” (*iucundioris disciplinae lacte patiantur*).<sup>24</sup> Quintilian clearly compares the first stages of primary education correspond to “milk,” implying that later studies are the equivalent of solid food.

Philo, *Agr.* 9 strongly resembles 1 Cor 3:1-4. There Philo not only employs the “milk and solid food” metaphor, but also distinguishes between the mature and the immature just as Paul has done. Philo writes,

Since the food for children is milk, but for adults its bread is made from grain (ἐπεὶ δὲ νηπίοις μὲν ἔστι γάλα τροφή, τελείοις δὲ τὰ ἐκ πυρῶν πέμματα), so for the soul too there would be milky food products during the age of childhood, namely the preliminary studies of encyclical culture (τὰ τῆς ἐγκυκλίου μουσικῆς προπαιδεύματα), but the subjects that are mature (τέλεια) and suitable for men are the teachings of practical wisdom, moderation and every kind of excellence (φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀπάσης ἀρετῆς ὑψηλῆς). These, when sown and planted in the understanding, will produce crops that are most beneficial, namely fine and praiseworthy deeds.<sup>25</sup>

Additionally, note how Philo places the “milk and solid food” metaphor in close proximity to an agrarian metaphor, just as Paul has done in 1 Cor 3:1-9.

Philo regularly employs the imagery of milk and solid food to describe the difference between primary and philosophical education. In *Congr.* 19, after summarizing the various disciplines of Hellenistic encyclical studies,<sup>26</sup> Philo writes, “The simple and milky foods (γαλακτώδεσιν) of infancy come first. Just so you may consider that the

---

<sup>24</sup> *Inst.* 2.4.5.

<sup>25</sup> Trans. Albert C. Geljon and David T. Runia, *Philo of Alexandria: On Cultivation: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, PACS 4 (Leiden: Brill, 2013), 46-47. Cf. *Prob.* 160; *Congr.* 19.

<sup>26</sup> *Congr.* 15-18.

school subjects (τὰ ἐγκύκλια) and the lore which belongs to each of them stand ready to nourish the childhood of the soul, while the virtues are grown-up food, suited for those who are really men.”<sup>27</sup>

Philosophers also described levels of education as different diets. Epictetus goads his students “when something is taken away, to give it up readily and without delay, being grateful for the time in which he had the use of it—all this if you do not wish to be crying for your nurse and your mammy!”<sup>28</sup> Stobaeus likewise records Arcesilaus’s concern for a youth beginning his philosophical education without first having received the necessary encyclical education: “Arcesilaus, upon observing a certain young man listening to philosophical discourses before being educated (πρὶν παιδευθῆναι), said, ‘The most beautiful and nourishing fruits of Demeter are not suited to children at birth, but rather nurses’ milk (τὸ δὲ γάλα τῶν τιτθῶν).’”<sup>29</sup>

This metaphor persisted into Late Antiquity. In a letter to his grandson, Ausonius of Bordeaux (c. 310-395 CE) recalls his own years spent as a grammarian:

And not without skill do I, thy grandfather, counsel thee thus, but from the experience gained in training a thousand minds. Many from their infant years (*lactantibus annis*) have I myself brought up, and, cherishing them in my bosom and hushing their complaints, have stolen their tender years from their fond nurses. Presently, as boys, with mild warnings and gentle threats I lured them to

---

<sup>27</sup> *Congr.* 19 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>28</sup> *Diatr.* 2.16.29 (Oldfather, LCL).

<sup>29</sup> My translation. Ἀρκεσίλαος ὄρων τινα νεανίσκον φιλοσόφων λόγων κατακούοντα πρὶν παιδευθῆναι, οὐδὲ τοὺς τῆς Δήμητρος, ἔφη, καρποὺς καλλίστους καὶ τροφιμωτάτους ὄντας εὐθὺς ἐκ γενετῆς τοῖς παισὶν ἀρμόζειν, τὸ δὲ γάλα τῶν τιτθῶν (Stobaeus, *Anth.* 2.31.28).



seek through sourness for ripe success and pluck sweet fruit sprung from a bitter root (*carpturi dulcem fructum radicis amarae*).<sup>30</sup>

Ausonius likens the lower levels of education to milk, and the higher to solid food, and suggests that his position as a grammarian, a teacher of the basics, is the metaphorical equivalent of the nursemaid.

Perhaps the closest analogue to 1 Cor 3:1-4 may be found in Heb 5:11-14, which not only distinguishes between milk and solid food, but also asserts that infants need milk and that the mature solid food is for the mature (πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος ... νήπιος γὰρ ἐστὶν ... τελείων δέ ἐστὶν ἢ στερεὰ τροφή). In a context redolent with other educational language and imagery, scholars generally agree that the author of Hebrews is distinguishing between two tiers of Christian teaching.<sup>31</sup> In the face of such parallels it is hard to agree with Hooker et al. that Paul is not distinguishing between two levels of instruction. The members of the Corinthian community must grow from immaturity to maturity before they will be prepared for his advanced instruction.

---

<sup>30</sup> Ausonius, *Ep.* 22.66-70 (Evelyn-White, LCL). On this text, Christian Laes writes, “Ausonius presents his education as a mixture of moderate strictness and a friendly attitude towards children. The milk and friendliness of the *nutrix* is replaced by the milk of the learning process and the kind teacher. This image is not only found in Ausonius’ works: the education of the cultural elite is presented as the transition from liquid to solid food, a natural and benevolent process” (Laes, “School-Teachers,” 121-22).

<sup>31</sup> See, esp. Harold W. Attridge, who notes, “These and the following two verses contain imagery widely used in Greek literature, and especially in popular philosophy, for describing all levels of education” (*A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*, Hermeneia [Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989], 158). See also Craig R. Koester, *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 36 (New York: Doubleday, 2001), 301-3, 308-10; Paul Ellingworth, *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*, NIGTC (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993), 305-10. Otto Michel argues, however, that the metaphor comes from the mystery cults (*Der Brief an die Hebräer*, KEKNT 13 [Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966], 236). Cf., to a lesser extent, 1 Peter 2:2: ὡς ἀρτιγέννητα βρέφη τὸ λογικὸν ἄδολον γάλα ἐπιποθήσατε, ἵνα ἐν αὐτῷ ἀξήθητε εἰς σωτηρίαν.

B. Sowers, Waterers, Fields, and Seed (3:5-9)

In 3:5-9, Paul shifts from the metaphorical matrix of childhood diet to another source domain: agriculture. He writes, “I planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the growth. So neither the one who plants nor the one who waters is anything, but only God who gives the growth. The one who plants and the one who waters have a common purpose, and each will receive wages according to the labor of each” (1 Cor 3:6-8). Like the dietary metaphor of 3:1-4, Paul’s agricultural metaphor is also found in many discussions of ancient education.

Not all commentators have recognized this common use of the metaphor.<sup>32</sup> Dale Martin, Andrew Clarke, and Anthony Thiselton treat Paul’s agrarian metaphor jointly with the architectural metaphor of 3:10-17. Martin and Clarke argue that the tasks of architect and builder are menial roles, shedding light on Paul’s “non-status” conception of leadership,<sup>33</sup> whereas Thiselton sees it as reinforcing both apostolic low-status and high-status simultaneously.<sup>34</sup> Thiselton also comments that Paul’s agrarian terminology indicates the Corinthians’ need for “the nurture and care of those who have been assigned to this task by the owner [God],” though he does not indicate what such “nurture” might imply or require.<sup>35</sup>

On the other hand, Dutch and White have both identified the educational valence of Paul’s agricultural terminology, but they are divided on how to interpret its function.

---

<sup>32</sup> Zeller provides a long catalogue of Jewish uses of agricultural metaphors that may shed light on Paul’s usage (*Der erste Brief*, 158-59).

<sup>33</sup> Martin, *The Corinthian Body*, 102; Clarke, *Secular & Christian Leadership in Corinth*, 118-19.

<sup>34</sup> Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 302.

<sup>35</sup> Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 307.

Dutch claims that the metaphor reminds the socially elite Corinthians of their own education,<sup>36</sup> and White suggests that the metaphor presents both Paul and Apollos as teachers.<sup>37</sup> As we shall see, White is closer to the mark.

Paul's agrarian metaphor likens teachers' activities to planting and watering, two images that commonly occur in ancient discussions of education. The transferences in Paul's agrarian metaphor are straightforward. The Corinthian community is the field, the farmers are the apostles, and the seed is the teaching Paul provided them during his initial visit to Corinth. Ancient authors regularly employ agricultural metaphors to describe the educational process from early childhood through philosophical training. Indeed, agrarian educational metaphors are attested in Greek, Roman, and Jewish discussions of ancient education.<sup>38</sup>

Quintilian and Ps.-Plutarch both use similar agrarian metaphors. While many of Quintilian's metaphors for the process of education were agrarian,<sup>39</sup> *Inst.* 9.2.3, provides the closest parallel to 1 Cor 3:5-9. According to Quintilian, the ideal student is well tilled soil into which the teacher can sow his teaching like seed: "And just as it takes two parents to produce a human being, and as the seed is scattered in vain, if the ground is hard and there is no furrow to receive it and bring it to growth, even so eloquence can never come to maturity, unless teacher and taught are in perfect sympathy."<sup>40</sup> Ps.-Plutarch uses a nearly identical metaphor describing teachers, students, and curricula.

---

<sup>36</sup> Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 260.

<sup>37</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 195-98.

<sup>38</sup> See Morgan, *Literate Education*, 255-60; Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 256-60.

<sup>39</sup> Morgan, *Literate Education*, 252. Cf., e.g., Quintilian, *Inst.* 1. Pr.27.

<sup>40</sup> *Inst.* 9.2.3. Cf. *Inst.* 1.3.5.

According to Ps.-Plutarch, in education, “Just as in farming, first of all the soil must be good, secondly, the husbandman skillful, and thirdly, the seed sound, so, after the same manner, [the] nature [of the student] is like to the soil (γῆ μὲν ἔοικεν ἢ φύσις), the teacher to the farmer (γεωργῶ δ’ ὁ παιδεύων), and the verbal counsels and precepts like to the seed (σπέρματι δ’ αἱ τῶν λόγων ὑποθῆκαι καὶ τὰ παραγγέλματα).”<sup>41</sup> A similar agrarian metaphor recurs later in *Lib. ed.*, when Ps.-Plutarch describes teachers as those who tend the plants of the youths:

I come now to a point which is more important and weighty than anything I have said so far. Teachers must be sought for the children who are free from scandal in their lives, who are unimpeachable in their manners, and in experience the very best that may be found. For to receive a proper education is the source and root of all goodness. As husbandmen place stakes beside the young plants, so do competent teachers with all care set their precepts and exhortations beside the young, in order that their characters may grow to be upright (ἵν’ ὀρθὰ τούτων βλαστάνῃ τὰ ἦθη).<sup>42</sup>

When read alongside *Lib. ed.* 2b, this passage indicates that Ps.-Plutarch regards noble patterns of behavior, or good moral character, as springing from the conjunction of the soil of the student, the flowering of earliest teaching, and the ongoing husbandry of the teacher.<sup>43</sup> The only way in which Paul’s metaphor differs from Ps.-Plutarch’s is in Paul’s insistence on the necessity of God’s work in the educative process.

Philo also regularly employs agricultural imagery in his discussions of primary education. When describing the disciplines that comprised encyclical education, he compares them to seed that will one day bear full fruit when their philosophical potential

---

<sup>41</sup> *Lib. ed.* 2b. (Babbitt, LCL); Cf., *Lib. ed.* 2e-f; 8b; 9b-c.

<sup>42</sup> *Lib. ed.* 4b-c (Babbitt, LCL).

<sup>43</sup> This is similar to Philo’s discussion of good behavior as a natural end of education. Cf. *Agr.* 9. quoted above.

matures. For example, he argues that the study of geometry will “sow in the soul ... the seeds of equality and proportion, and by the charm of its logical continuity will raise from those seeds a zeal for justice.”<sup>44</sup> Likewise, when discussing memory, one of a good student’s most important capacities, Philo suggests that it is the component of human nature which bears fruit in education. He writes,

the holy word names memory Ephraim, which by interpretation is ‘fruit-bearing,’ while reminding or reminiscence is called in the Hebrew Manasseh, that is, ‘from forgetfulness.’ For it is quite true that the soul of the rememberer has the fruits of what he learned and has lost none of them, whereas the soul of the reminded comes out of forgetfulness which possessed him before he was reminded.<sup>45</sup>

Philo’s metaphor is unlike that of Paul, Ps.-Plutarch, or Quintilian in that it is the discipline of geometry itself which does the sowing (and not the teacher), but it nonetheless demonstrates how common (and flexible) these agricultural metaphors were when employed in descriptions of ancient education.

In addition to Paul’s self-presentation as the farmer who sowed the seed, he also identifies Apollos as a farmer who waters the initial planting. The metaphor of watering occurs in a variety of Greco-Roman and Jewish texts describing the role of the teacher. Ps.-Plutarch compares the mind to crops, writing that “just as plants are nourished by moderate applications of water, but are drowned by many in succession, in the same fashion the mind is made to grow by properly adapted tasks, but is submerged by those which are excessive.”<sup>46</sup> We should note a similar but not exactly parallel occurrence of a

---

<sup>44</sup> *Congr.* 16 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>45</sup> *Congr.* 40-41 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>46</sup> *Lib. ed.* 9b (Babbitt, LCL).

watering metaphor in Philo, *Post.*: “The quality of these souls he teaches very fully, leading us on by degrees, using the ordinary arts as the means of instruction. For he shows us Hagar filling a water-skin and giving the child drink. Hagar represents imperfect training, being handmaid of Sarah who represents perfect virtue.”<sup>47</sup> In contrast, “Rebecca is discovered watering her pupil not with gradual progress, like Hagar, but with perfection.”<sup>48</sup> Philo’s use of watering imagery is striking, given that he, like Paul, makes God a participant in the educational process. For Paul, God is the hidden agent who causes the seeds planted and watered by terrestrial instructors to sprout and grow (3:7), while for Philo, God is the one who provides encyclical and philosophical education as the water for childlike souls who have just begun their studies.

While Ps.-Plutarch and Philo used watering imagery to describe properly adapted instruction, Ben Sira uses the image of watering to describe the instruction of the sage. After identifying the law as a source of wisdom and instruction (*παιδεία*) that flows like water (Sir 24:23-29), Ben Sira says of himself:

As for me, I was like a canal from a river, like a water channel into a garden. I said, ‘I will water my garden (*ποτιῶ μου τὸν κήπον*) and drench my flower-beds. And lo, my canal became a river, and my river a sea. I will again make instruction (*παιδείαν*) shine forth like the dawn, and I will make it clear from far away. I will again pour out teaching like prophecy (*διδασκαλίαν ὡς προφητείαν ἐκχεῶ*), and leave it to all future generations. Observe that I have not labored for myself alone, but for all who seek wisdom. ( Sir 24:30-34)

---

<sup>47</sup> *Post.* 130 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>48</sup> *Post.* 132 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

In this metaphor, Torah is a source of wisdom, and wisdom is like water. When the sage metaphorically “waters his garden,” he is teaching wisdom to his students.<sup>49</sup>

### C. Building God’s Temple (3:9b-17)

In 3:9b, Paul equated the Corinthian community with “God’s field, God’s building.” In 3:10-17 he will develop this architectural metaphor just as he had the dietary and agricultural metaphors in 3:1-9. Here he presents himself as the chief architect who laid a foundation (3:10-11), compares other apostles and teachers to others building upon that foundation (3:10-15), and ultimately demonstrates the importance of the edifice by revealing it as the community which comprises “God’s temple” (3:16-17). In 3:10-13, Paul commingles this construction metaphor with images of eschatological judgment:

According to the grace of God given to me, like a skilled master builder I laid a foundation, and someone else is building on it. Each builder must choose with care how to build on it. For no one can lay any foundation other than the one that has been laid; that foundation is Jesus Christ. Now if anyone builds on the foundation with gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, straw—the work of each builder will become visible, for the Day will disclose it, because it will be revealed with fire, and the fire will test what sort of work each has done. (1 Cor 3:10-13)

Many commentators have rightly divined the construction metaphor’s semantic meaning without identifying its common usage in ancient educational discourse. Barrett reads Paul’s architectural imagery as a reference to the apostle’s evangelistic work at the founding of the community.<sup>50</sup> Similarly, Fee sees it primarily as a metaphorical means of

---

<sup>49</sup> Cf. the description of the sage’s teaching in 1QH<sup>a</sup> 16:16-27. On which, see Berg, *Religious Epistemologies*, 234.

<sup>50</sup> Barrett, *First Epistle*, 87.

describing Paul's apostolic founding of the Corinthian community and of delivering a warning against would-be leaders within the Corinthian community who are building on his foundation.<sup>51</sup> Fitzmyer and Collins suggest that Paul's references to architecture should be read in light of a fourth-century BCE description of temple building and repair, which employs vocabulary similar to Paul's.<sup>52</sup> John Lanci is relatively alone when he argues for giving sustained attention to Paul's architectural language. He suggests that the images of building in 1 Cor 3 are connected to the later references to communal edification in the remainder of the letter.<sup>53</sup>

In contrast to studies that highlight the founding of communities or the social status of leaders, J. Duncan M. Derrett rightly suggests that Paul's architectural metaphor has an educational valence. "Paul," Derrett writes, "is using foundation-laying not only as a metaphor (as at 1 Cor. 14:4) for the commencement of a religious community ... but also the better-known metaphor of introductory teaching, a 'foundation-course.'"<sup>54</sup> The remainder of Derrett's study focuses not on the educational significance of the metaphor but rather on the roles of ancient architects. White too suggests that the metaphor functions to present Paul as a teacher, though he cites no parallel uses of the metaphor in to describe education in ancient literature.<sup>55</sup> While there are fewer uses of architecture

---

<sup>51</sup> Fee, *First Epistle*, esp. 137-39.

<sup>52</sup> Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, AB 32 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008), 197; Raymond F. Collins, *First Corinthians*, SP 7 (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1999), 149.

<sup>53</sup> John R. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery* (New York: Lang, 1997), 69.

<sup>54</sup> J. Duncan M. Derrett, "Paul as Master-Builder," *EvQ* 69 (1997): 130. As evidence, Derrett cites Heb 6:1; Philo, *Cher.* 101-105; *Gig.* 30; *Mut.* 211; Plutarch, *Fort. Rom.* 320b.

<sup>55</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 197-98.



metaphors than, e.g., the dietary metaphor, in discussions of education in antiquity, the former is sufficiently attested to be read as an metaphor used to describe education.

At the outset of his *Inst.*, Quintilian remarks that his work has a very different cast than others who have set out to describe the education of the ideal orator. These other works

have started with the assumption that their pupils were perfect in every other branch of learning, and that they simply had to add the finishing touch; this was either because they despised the earlier stages of education as trivial, or because they thought they were not their concern ... or, most probably, because they had no hope of winning favour for their talents by dealing with subjects which, however necessary, are very far from being showy—just as, in buildings, the rooftops are seen, but the foundations are hidden (*ut operum fastigia spectantur, latent fundamenta*).<sup>56</sup>

For Quintilian, then, the development of the orator is akin to the construction of a building. The studies in which the youngest child embarks form the foundations, while the eventual rhetorical training is the equivalent of a building's roof. Quintilian is adamant that "one cannot reach the top in any subject without going through the elementary stages."<sup>57</sup>

Philo uses a similar metaphor in *Cher.* 101-102, arguing that good birth (εὐφυΐα) and teaching (διδασκαλία) provide foundations for the construction of the soul,<sup>58</sup> while the disciplines of encyclical education serve as pediment-like decoration:

---

<sup>56</sup> *Inst.* 1. Pr.4 (Russell, LCL). Cf. Quintilian's discussion of the importance of writing in *Inst.* 10.3.3.

<sup>57</sup> *Inst.* 1. Pr.5 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>58</sup> Exactly what διδασκαλία refers to here is ambiguous. It could describe either the childhood education in Judaism to which Philo regularly alludes but never describes in detail, or it could refer to literate and numerate education in public schools.

If therefore we call the invisible soul the terrestrial habitation of the invisible God, we shall be speaking justly and according to reason; but that the house may be firm and beautiful, let a good disposition and knowledge be laid as its foundations (θεμέλιοι μὲν ὑποβεβλήσθωσαν εὐφυῖα καὶ διδασκαλία), and on these foundations let the virtues be built up in union with good actions, and let the ornaments of the front be the due comprehension of the encyclical branches of elementary instruction (ἢ ἀνάληψις τῶν ἐγκυκλίων προπαιδευμάτων); for from goodness of disposition arise skill, perseverance, memory; and from knowledge arise learning and attention, as the roots of a tree which is about to bring forth eatable fruit, and without which it is impossible to bring the intellect to perfection.<sup>59</sup>

Similarly, in *Mut.* 211, Philo contends that “All the lessons and all the admonitions of instruction (πάντα τὰ ἀκούσματα καὶ μαθήματα) are built up and established on the nature which is calculated to receive instruction (φύσει παιδείας δεκτικῆ), as on a foundation previously laid.”<sup>60</sup> As in 1 Cor 3:10-17, Philo’s edifice is a dwelling place for God. But unlike Paul’s temple, Philo is concerned with the construction of the individual soul, not the manufacture of a community.

Perhaps the most relevant use of this “foundation-course” metaphor occurs in Heb 6:1-2: “Therefore let us go on toward perfection, leaving behind the basic teaching about Christ (τὸν τῆς ἀρχῆς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγον), and not laying again the foundation (θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι): repentance from dead works and faith toward God, instruction about baptisms, laying on of hands, resurrection of the dead, and eternal judgment.” Here the

---

<sup>59</sup> (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>60</sup> Plutarch recounts Romulus’s early formation thus: “To begin with, who would not at once declare touching the birth, the preservation, the nurture, the development of Romulus (τὴν Ῥωμύλου γένεσιν καὶ σωτηρίαν καὶ τροφήν), that Fortune laid the foundations, and that Virtue finished the building (αὐξήσιν τὴν μὲν Τύχην ὑποβολὰς κατατεθεῖσθαι τὴν δ’ Ἀρετὴν ἐξωκοδομηκέναι)” (*Fort. Rom.* 320b)?

author of Hebrews directly correlates the foundation with the contents of a first level of Christian teaching.<sup>61</sup>

#### D. Stewards of God's Mysteries (4:1-2)

In 4:1-5 Paul shifts metaphors yet again. Having identified himself as a nurse, a sower of seed, and an architect concerned with foundations, Paul now classifies himself and Apollos “as servants of Christ and stewards of God’s mysteries,” who must “be found trustworthy” (4:1-2). The phrase “stewards of God’s mysteries” (οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ), however, has proven remarkably difficult to interpret.

Not surprisingly, the History of Religions School argued that 1 Cor 4:1-2 likened Paul to a mystagogue.<sup>62</sup> The functionaries of the Eleusinian mysteries, however, tended to be known as ἐπιμεληταί rather than οἰκονόμοι,<sup>63</sup> a fact which presumably led Richard Reitzenstein to omit discussion of 1 Cor 4:1-2 in his classic survey of early Christianity and the mystery cults.<sup>64</sup> Terminological difficulties notwithstanding, John Reumann capably demonstrated that οἰκονόμοι could serve religious functions, especially in

---

<sup>61</sup> Attridge notes that Heb 6:2 “refers to ‘teaching’ ... about the rituals of baptism and laying on of hands, and about the eschatological doctrines of resurrection and judgment. It is just possible that the two-part formula reflects a distinction between initial proclamation and instruction of catechumens” (Attridge, *Hebrews*, 153). See also Ellingworth, *Epistle to the Hebrews*, 310-16; Koester, *Hebrews*, 304, 310-11.

<sup>62</sup> So, e.g., Hans Windisch, *Paulus und Christus: Ein biblisch-religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich*, UNT 24 (Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1934), 221.

<sup>63</sup> Fredrick C. Grant, *Hellenistic Cults: The Age of Syncretism* (New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1953), 15. On the priests at Eleusis, see Christiane Sourvinou-Inwood, “The Priesthoods of the Eleusinian Cult of Demeter and Kore,” *ThesCRA*, 5:60-65.

<sup>64</sup> Richard Reitzenstein, *Hellenistic Mystery-Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance* (Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1978).

mystery cults.<sup>65</sup> Reumann's conclusions received little support from subsequent commentators, and he eventually abandoned the thesis that "stewards of the mysteries" was a term derived from mystery cults. In his later work, however, Reumann continued to observe that the phrase might well have struck some among Paul's readers as mystery cult language.<sup>66</sup> After Reumann, the meaning of the phrase "steward of the mysteries" would remain largely untouched for fifty years with most commentators, including Barrett, Collins, Fee, and Schrage assuming that the phrase means nothing more than that Paul was a dispenser of the gospel.<sup>67</sup>

Benjamin Gladd was the first to seriously reconsider its meaning.<sup>68</sup> He suggested a Semitic background for the phrase, concluding that Paul's self-identification as a "steward of the mysteries" finds its closest parallels in Daniel and the Teacher of Righteousness: Both were authority figures who received apocalyptic revelations and dispensed them to their communities.<sup>69</sup> Despite these structural parallels between Paul's role and those of Daniel and the Teacher of Righteousness, Gladd was forced to admit that the phrase "stewards of the mysteries" has no parallel in Jewish literature written in Greek.<sup>70</sup> He notes instead the parallel with "the men guarding your mysteries" (לְרֹזְמֵיךָ)

---

<sup>65</sup> John Reumann, "'Stewards of God': Pre Christian Religious Application of Oikonomos in Greek," *JBL* 77 (1958): 339-49.

<sup>66</sup> John Reumann, "Οικονομία-Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan *Heilsgeschichte*," *NTS* 13 (1967): 147-67; John Reumann, *Stewardship and the Economy of God* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992), 14.

<sup>67</sup> E.g., Barrett, *First Epistle*, 99-100; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 172; Fee, *First Epistle*, 158-60; Wolfgang Schrage, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, 4 vols., EKK 7 (Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991-2001), 1:321.

<sup>68</sup> Benjamin Gladd, *Revealing the mysterion: The Use of Mystery in Daniel and Second Temple Judaism with its Bearing on First Corinthians*, BZNW 160 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008), 165.

<sup>69</sup> Gladd, *Revealing the Mysterion*, 190.

<sup>70</sup> Gladd, *Revealing the Mysterion*, 171.

משמרת [א]נשי in 1QS36 16:2.<sup>71</sup> The similarities between the two expressions are certainly striking, but we ought to remain open to other interpretive possibilities.

In contrast to Gladd's focus on Jewish conceptions of mystery, a number of scholars have argued that Paul's language draws primarily on the administrative valence of the Greek term οἰκονόμος,<sup>72</sup> especially managerial slavery.<sup>73</sup> Conzelmann, Thiselton, and Zeller have each focused on the problem of ancient stewardship.<sup>74</sup> In this vein, Goodrich has recently provided the first monograph length study of the various roles of οἰκονόμοι, concluding that οἰκονόμοι served three basic functions—royal administrators, civic administrators, and private household administrators<sup>75</sup>—and that Paul's use of the metaphor best reflects a subset of that third class which Goodrich calls “private commercial administrators.”<sup>76</sup> His useful explication of the roles of ancient stewards notwithstanding, one of Goodrich's most-significant exegetical contributions is his recognition that when Paul writes “stewards of the mysteries” he is employing a

---

<sup>71</sup> Gladd, *Revealing the Mysterion*, 181-82. Gladd was not the first to note this linguistic parallel. Raymond Brown and Marcus Bockmuehl had each identified it but were reticent to suggest that it was anything more than conceptually similar (not, e.g., an indicator of a common Semitic expression that might have influenced Paul). See Raymond E. Brown, *The Semitic Background of the Term “Mystery” in the New Testament*, FBBS 21 (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968), 45; Marcus N. A. Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*, WUNT 2/36 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990), 166 n. 2.

<sup>72</sup> E.g., Peter Artz-Grabner et al., *1 Korinther*, PKNT 2 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006).

<sup>73</sup> Dale B. Martin, *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990).

<sup>74</sup> E.g., Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 83; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 335-38; Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 174-75.

<sup>75</sup> Goodrich, *Paul as an Administrator of God*, 25-71.

<sup>76</sup> Goodrich, *Paul as an Administrator of God*, 105-16, 200.

metaphor, and consequently, that we must be certain to interpret it within its proper source domain.<sup>77</sup>

But a few scholars have thought of the οἰκονόμος as a teacher. Adam White argues that Paul's claim to be an οἰκονόμος encourages the Corinthians to think of him as a household administrator like the salaried tutors described by Lucian.<sup>78</sup> The main problem with White's interpretation is that it focuses exclusively on Paul's claim to be an οἰκονόμος and ignores the mysteries. Weiss also thought the steward of God's mysteries was a teacher, especially a philosophical teacher.<sup>79</sup> He references Epictetus, who describes Diogenes as the ideal Cynic who "has made all mankind his children.... Or do you fancy that it is in the spirit of idle impertinence he reviles those he meets? It is as a father he does it, as a brother, and as a servant of Zeus (ὕπηρέτης τοῦ Διός), who is Father of us all."<sup>80</sup> White and Weiss are correct that the phrase has an educational valence, though not for the reasons that they suggest. Given the lack of clarity regarding the interpretation of 1 Cor 4:1-2, this passage warrants extended treatment.

Ancient education had a decidedly religious component. One Ionian first-century BCE/CE inscription describes the teaching of a certain Mnaseas, who "told of the hallowed secrets of the universe" (τὰ κόσμου σεμνὰ).<sup>81</sup> The best surviving literary sources for Greek and Roman education confirm and supplement the epigraphical

---

<sup>77</sup> Goodrich, *Paul as an Administrator of God*, 12-13.

<sup>78</sup> See White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 200-216. Cf. e.g. Lucian, *Merc. cond.* 12.

<sup>79</sup> Johannes Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, KEKNT 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977), 93 n. 1.

<sup>80</sup> Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.22.81-82 (Oldfather, LCL); cf. *Diatr.* 3.22.95.

<sup>81</sup> *IG* 9.1.880 (Trans., Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education*, 195).

evidence that mystery cults provided metaphorical comparanda for ancient education. Sometimes these comparisons occur on a general level. For example, Ps.-Plutarch suggests that the mystery cults' original purpose was basically educational: Initiates learned to control their tongues. He states that "this is the reason ... why the men of olden time established the rites of initiation into the mysteries, that we, by becoming accustomed to keep silence there, may transfer that fear which we learned from the divine secrets to the safe keeping of the secrets of men."<sup>82</sup>

In his discussion of primary education, Quintilian used initiation language as a metaphor for the process education. "I say nothing," he writes, "of the friendships which endure firm and unbroken to old age, imbued with almost religious feelings of attachment. Initiation in the same studies is no less binding than initiation in the same mysteries (*neque enim est sanctius sacris isdem quam studiis initiari*)."<sup>83</sup> Initiation and education are equally binding, presumably because the recipients of each have received knowledge that cannot be shared with those who have not similarly received it. For Quintilian, the instruction of the grammarian is also an initiation: "It is not that it is a major task to distinguish consonants from vowels, and to subdivide the former into semivowels and mutes. But as we draw near to the inner shrine of this mystery, the great intricacy of the subject will be apparent, for it is capable not only of sharpening childish minds but of exercising the most profound knowledge and erudition."<sup>84</sup> Quintilian also praises Plato for not being satisfied with the education of Athens or of the Pythagoreans

---

<sup>82</sup> *Lib. ed.* 10f (Babbitt, LCL).

<sup>83</sup> *Inst.* 1.2.20 (Russell, LCL). Cf. *Inst.* 5.13.60.

<sup>84</sup> *Inst.* 1.4.6.

in Italy. According to Quintilian, Plato “also visited the priests of Egypt and learned their secrets (*arcana*).”<sup>85</sup> Likewise, Quintilian quotes what he calls a “Greek proverb,” stating that “the uneducated are far away from the Muses and the Graces,”<sup>86</sup> and calls an orator with no musical training an orator with a “coarser muse.”<sup>87</sup>

Ancient authors regularly compared education to initiation into a cult of the Muses.<sup>88</sup> Aulus Gellius prefaces his *Noctes Atticae* with an injunction that anyone lacking sufficient education should leave his work untouched:

Moreover, in order that the perversity and envy of certain half-educated men (*male doctorum hominum*) may be the more aroused, I shall borrow a few anapaests from a chorus of Aristophanes, and the conditions which that wittiest of men imposed for the viewing of his play, I shall lay down for the reading of these notes of mine: namely, that the profane and uninitiate throng (*profestum et profanum vulgus*), averse to the Muses’ play, shall neither touch nor approach them.<sup>89</sup>

As Christian Laes summarizes Gellius: “the world of literacy is represented as an initiation into the temple of the Muses, where the ignorant should not be allowed to enter.”<sup>90</sup> Gellius is adopting a tradition at least as old as Aristophanes,<sup>91</sup> but the same

---

<sup>85</sup> *Inst.* 1.12.15 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>86</sup> *Inst.* 1.10.21 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>87</sup> *Inst.* 1.10.28 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>88</sup> There is no evidence of a mystery cult devoted to the Muses, but the Muses were associated with the mystery cults of other deities. See Alex Hardie, “Muses and Mysteries” in *Music and the Muses: The Culture of ‘Mousikē’ in the Classical Athenian City*, ed. Penelope Murray and Peter Wilson (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 11-37. See esp. pp.11-14 on the “mysteries of the Muses” as literary culture.

<sup>89</sup> Aulus Gellius, *Noct. Att.* Pr. 20-21.

<sup>90</sup> Laes, *Children*, 136. Cf. Kaster, *Guardians of Language*, 16.

<sup>91</sup> Cf. *Ran.* 354-56.



sentiment is present in Aristophanes' philosophical contemporary, Plato, who identifies the disciplines of ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία as gifts of Apollo and the Muses.<sup>92</sup> Moreover, Plato argues that the gifts of the Muses, especially theater, “are shown to be finest when they are approved of by men of adequate education, especially by the lone individual of highest education.”<sup>93</sup> The same metaphor occurs in a third- or fourth-century CE papyrus of unknown provenance. A personal letter reads: “To Aphrodisios, a greeting. First of all, I salute you, and so does everybody in our household. It is a big treat for those who want to be educated when they know how to carry out the tasks entrusted to them and have no desire to pursue foreign pleasures. For those who at first are initiated into the mysteries of the Muses (τὰ μυστήρια τῶν Μουσῶν), it happens to them later.”<sup>94</sup> Diodorus Siculus even argues that the very name “Muses” is etymologically related to the verb “to initiate” (μυεῖν);<sup>95</sup> for the Muses, Diodorus claims, initiation means “the teaching (τοῦ διδάσκειν) of those things which are noble and expedient and are not known by the uneducated (ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπαιδευτῶν ἀγνοούμενα).”<sup>96</sup> For authors like Aristophanes, Plato, and Gellius et al., the Muses have mysteries, and to be lacking in education is the metaphorical equivalent of being uninitiated.

---

<sup>92</sup> *Leg.* 654a, 796c.

<sup>93</sup> *Leg.* 658e.

<sup>94</sup> See Friedrich Priesigke et al., eds., *SB*, 5.7567.8-9 (trans., Cribiore, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 102).

<sup>95</sup> Literally, μυεῖν means “to close.” Plato provides a different etymology in his *Crat.* 406a. Etymologies notwithstanding, for the present argument it is simply significant that Diodorus so closely associates the Muses with education, with education being understood as an initiation into a mystery cult. Μούσας δ’ αὐτὰς ὀνομάσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ μυεῖν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους, τοῦτο δ’ ἐστὶν ἀπὸ τοῦ διδάσκειν τὰ καλὰ καὶ συμφέροντα καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀπαιδευτῶν ἀγνοούμενα (Men have given the Muses their name from the word *muein*, which signifies the teaching of those things which are noble and expedient and are not known by the uneducated) (Diodorus Siculus, 4.7.4 [Oldfather, LCL]).

<sup>96</sup> Diodorus Siculus, 4.7.4 (Oldfather, LCL).

Though this is not the venue for a complete study of the Muses and their function in Hellenistic and Roman culture, we should at least note that they are strongly associated with literacy, especially the earliest stages of education in which one acquired literacy. Diogenes Laertius describes the many statues of the Muses he observed in a school room.<sup>97</sup> Aeschines recounts the festivals of the Muses celebrated in schools.<sup>98</sup> Hellenistic inscriptions endowing schools at Teos and Miletus contain numerous provisions for offerings of incense that the teachers should make to the Muses.<sup>99</sup> In their numerous visual depictions at Pompeii and Herculaneum, the Muses can be easily identified as such—and not as any other female mythological figures—by their depiction with writing implements.<sup>100</sup> Plutarch suggests that “the ancients, observing that all branches of knowledge and craft that attain their end by the use of words belong to one of three kinds, namely the philosophical, the rhetorical, or the mathematical, considered them to be the gracious gifts of three goddesses, whom they named Muses.”<sup>101</sup> Simply put, the Muses provided one divine etiology for many of the various disciplines that comprised Greek and Roman education, from grammar to philosophy. The process of learning these disciplines was metaphorically similar to being initiated into a mystery cult; at the end of the process, the initiate was changed forever. Given the taxonomic order of ancient

---

<sup>97</sup> Diogenes Laertius, 6.69.

<sup>98</sup> Aeschines, 1.10.

<sup>99</sup> For Miletus, see *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 578; for Teos see *SIG*<sup>3</sup> 578. Both are helpfully translated in Joyall, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education*, 134-38.

<sup>100</sup> Elizabeth Meyer, “Writing Paraphernalia, Tablets, and Muses in Campanian Wall Painting,” *AJA* 113 (2009): 569-97. See also Anne Queyrel, “Les Muses à l’école: images de quelques vases du peintre de Calliope,” *Antike Kunst* 31 (1988): 90-102; Alex Hardie, “Philias and the Plane Tree,” *ZPE* 119 (1997): 21-23.

<sup>101</sup> *Quaest. conv.* 746e.

education, the metaphorical correlation of education with the progressive initiations of the mystery cults was natural.

Though it was common to metaphorically compare education to initiation into a mystery cult, none of the authors discussed above uses a phrase like “stewards of the mysteries.” Illuminating, however, is *IG* 12.1.141 (= *GVI* 1916), a second century BCE funerary monument from Rhodes.<sup>102</sup> This inscription preserves the epitaph of an anonymous Rhodian διδάσκαλος who, after a career spanning five decades, wished to be remembered primarily for his teaching.<sup>103</sup> The inscription is especially remarkable for describing this teacher a “president of the mysteries,” a title resonant with Paul’s claim that he and Apollo were “stewards of God’s mysteries. The inscription reads:

[γ]ράμματ’ ἐδίδαξεν ἔτεα πεν[τήκ]ον[θ]’ ὄδε]  
 δύο τ’ ἐπὶ τούτοις καὶ εὐσεβῶν [χ]ῶρός [σφ’ ἔχει].  
 Πλούτων γὰρ αὐτὸν καὶ Κόρη κα[τ]ώικισ[αν],  
 Ἑρμῆς τε καὶ δαιδοῦχος Ἑκάτη προσφ[ιλῆ]  
 [ἄ]πασιν εἶναι μυστικῶν τε [ἐ]πιστά[την]  
 ἔταξαν αὐτὸν πίστεως πά[σ]ης χά[ριν].

vacat

αὐτὸς ἐσελθὼν ξεῖνε σαφῶς μάθε [πόσσα μαθητῶν]  
 [π]λήθη τοὺς πολιοὺς στέψαν ἐμοῦ[ς] κ[ροτάφους].

This man taught letters for 52 years and a chorus of pious ones holds him these regions. For Pluto and Persephone settled him there, and Hermes and torch-bearing Hecate appointed him, a man beloved to all, to be overseer of the Mysteries due to his complete trustworthiness.

[vacat]

<sup>102</sup> Ancient Rhodes was a center of Hellenistic education, from earliest literate schooling through advanced philosophical training. See Klaus Bringmann, “Rhodos als Bildungszentrum der hellenistische Welt,” *Chiron* 32 (2002): 65-81.

<sup>103</sup> See the brief discussion in Joyal, McDougal, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education*, 139.

Stranger, having visited, learn well the large number of pupils who crowned my venerable brow.<sup>104</sup>

Several features of *IG* 12.1.141 are worth noting. It uses the phrase “president of the mysteries,” which is similar to Paul’s “stewards of the mysteries,” and claims that trustworthiness was a required quality for exercising this role. Since 1 Cor 4:1-2 occurs in the middle of a passage filled with common educational metaphors, it is significant that *IG* 12.1.141 is written for an elementary teacher, one who “taught letters.” Moreover, it is noteworthy that in *IG* 12.1.141 our unnamed elementary teacher is said to have been “appointed” to his position by Hermes and Hecate, implying that there is a religious component to the work of the ancient elementary teacher.

From the time of its discovery, the inscription’s educational language captured the academic imagination. In 1902, Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen and Carl Robert noted that the wording of the inscription strongly resembled the underworld and schoolroom scenes on the frieze of a second monument erected for the peripatetic philosopher Hieronymus of Rhodes. The similarities between the frieze and the inscription, they argued, suggested that *IG* 12.1.141 belonged to the Hieronymus frieze.<sup>105</sup> This line of inquiry has governed much of the subsequent discussion of *IG* 12.1.141. Hiller and Robert’s interpretation has met with limited acceptance,<sup>106</sup> but the majority, whose

---

<sup>104</sup> Trans., Joyal, McDougall, and Yardley, *Greek and Roman Education*, 139. Slightly modified.

<sup>105</sup> Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen and Carl H. Robert, “Relief von dem Grabmal eines Rhodischen Schulmeisters,” *Hermes* 37 (1902): 121-43.

<sup>106</sup> See Elisabetta Matelli, “Hieronymus in Athens and Rhodes,” in *Lycos of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes: Text, Translation, and Discussion*, ed. William W. Fortenbraugh and Stephen A. White (New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2004), 289-314.

opinion is best expressed by Graziano Arrighetti,<sup>107</sup> find the argument strained.<sup>108</sup> Weiss was correct that a philosopher—a Diogenes or a Hieronymus—could be described as a servant or steward of the deity, but it is difficult to imagine that such a philosopher would have been remembered as one who “taught letters.” Arrighetti argues instead that the epitaph is for “il maestro di scuola elementare, colui che insegna i rudimenti del leggere e dello scrivere.”<sup>109</sup> Equally important, regarding the mystery cult language, Arrighetti noted that

Né alcun elemento decisivo può esser fornito dalla considerazione che nel fregio compare una scena di carattere misteriosofico: in un'età nella quale tutti e tipi di associazione, e a maggior ragione le scuole, avevano un forte carattere religioso, è chiaro che qualsiasi genere di insegnamento doveva corrispondentemente avere un carattere di iniziazione, e il maestro ricoprire più o meno un ruolo di *μυστικῶν ἐπιστάτης*.<sup>110</sup>

To summarize: schools, like other ancient associations, had a decidedly religious quality to them; the teacher's instruction was like initiation in the mysteries, with the teacher himself playing the role of the initiator (*μυστικῶν ἐπιστάτης*).

The literary and historical contexts of 1 Cor 4:1-2 and *IG* 12.1.141 prevent us from reading *οἰκονόμους μυστηρίων θεοῦ* or *μυστικῶν ἐπιστάτης* as straightforward references to the personnel of the mystery cults. As should now be clear, 1 Cor 3-4 contains numerous educational metaphors and *topoi*, and *IG* 12.1.141 emphasizes its honorand's didactic role as one who “taught letters” for fifty years, instructing a large

---

<sup>107</sup> Graziano Arrighetti, “Ieronimo di Rhodi,” *SCO* 3 (1954): 111-28. See also Ulrich Wilamowitz von Moellendorff, “Die Lindische Tempelchronik,” *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 28 (1913): 42-46.

<sup>108</sup> See esp. P.M. Fraser, *Rhodian Funerary Monuments* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1977), 129-30.

<sup>109</sup> Arrighetti, “Ieronimo,” 126.

<sup>110</sup> Arrighetti, “Ieronimo,” 126.

number of students. Consequently, we ought to consider whether Arrighetti was correct to interpret the ancient primary teacher's role as the metaphorical equivalent of the mystagogue. Though Arrighetti cites no primary or secondary sources in favor of this claim, we have seen that ancient authors regularly compared the process of initiation into a mystery cult to the process of education.

#### E. Not beyond what is Written (4:6)

In 1 Cor 4:6 Paul writes that he has “applied all this to Apollos and myself for your benefit, brothers and sisters, so that you may learn through us (ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε) the meaning of the saying, ‘Nothing beyond what is written,’ so that none of you will be puffed up in favor of one against another.”<sup>111</sup> There is no need to cite ancient parallels of the verb μανθάνω in order to demonstrate the explicitly educational valence of the phrase ἵνα ἐν ἡμῖν μάθητε. Readers of the New Testament most often encounter this verb in discussions of discipleship. But, given the already demonstrable presence of Greco-Roman educational motifs in this portion of Paul's argument, it is helpful to recall that most occurrences of μανθάνω and its cognates in antiquity referred to education.

In addition to containing an explicitly educational verb like μανθάνω, 1 Cor 4:6 contains a likely, if fiercely debated, educational *topos*. The diversity of proposed readings demonstrates the difficulty of the phrase, which some have found unintelligible.<sup>112</sup> Of the many interpretations of the enigmatic phrase μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ

---

<sup>111</sup> On the equally disputed phrase μετεσχημάτισα εἰς ἑμαυτὸν καὶ Ἀπολλῶν δι’ ὑμᾶς, see chapter 6, section II.K.

<sup>112</sup> E.g., Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 86.

γέγραπται,<sup>113</sup> the two most plausible are: (1) that Paul is referring his audience to Scripture, especially the scripture he has already quoted in 1 Cor 1-3;<sup>114</sup> or (2) that Paul is quoting a maxim or χρεία of the sort his audience would have copied time and time again during the earliest stages of their literate educations.<sup>115</sup> The present chapter will attempt to demonstrate that μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται is best interpreted as a maxim or χρεία referencing a student's earliest literate education.<sup>116</sup> To justify such a reading, it is necessary to consider both its strengths and weaknesses.

No surviving school exercise of which I am aware uses the phrase μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται. Nevertheless, one of the particular advantages of interpreting μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται as a rudimentary school exercise is that it provides a ready explanation of the gnomic style of the phrase that is otherwise unparalleled in the Pauline corpus. Yet scholars have still found reason to question this interpretation. To date, Mitchell has

---

<sup>113</sup> For a survey of seven interpretive options, see Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 351-56. See too L.L. Welborn, who provides an exhaustive history of interpretation ("A Conciliatory Principle in 1 Corinthians 4:6," *NovT* 29 [1987], 321-33; James C. Hanges, "1 Corinthians 4:6 and the Possibility of Written Bylaws in the Corinthian Church," *JBL* 117 (1998): 275-98; Ronald L. Tyler, "The History of Interpretation of τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται in 1 Cor 4.6," *ResQ* 43 (2001): 243-52. Though many studies focus on the phrase τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται, the article τὸ is not actually a part of the phrase. Its function simply indicates that Paul is identifying the phrase as quoted material (cf. 14:16). See Fee, *First Epistle*, 168.

<sup>114</sup> As Welborn notes, "The list would almost coincide with the scholars who have written on 1 Cor" ("Conciliatory Principle," 322 n. 10). See, e.g., Morna Hooker, "Beyond the Things which Are Written: An Examination of 1 Cor 4:6," *NTS* 10 (1963-64): 127-32; Barrett, *First Corinthians*, 106; Fee, *First Epistle*, 169; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 86; J. Ross Wagner, "'Not Beyond the Things which Are Written': A Call to Boast Only in the Lord," *NTS* 44 (1998): 279-87; Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 180-81.

<sup>115</sup> For recent surveys of scholars who have adopted this approach, see Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 287-95 and White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 214-16. See esp. John T. Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence*, SBLDS 99 (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988), 122-27; Martin Ebner, *Leidenslisten und Apostelbrief*, FB 66 (Würzburg: Echter, 1991), 33-36; Benjamin Fiore, "'Covert Allusion' in 1 Cor 1-4," *CBQ* 47 (1985): 174 n. 24; Raymond Pickett, *The Cross in Corinth: The Social Significance of the Death of Jesus*, JSNTSup 143 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 78-80; Ronald L. Tyler, "1 Corinthians 4:6 and Hellenistic Pedagogy," *CBQ* 60 (1998): 97-103; Dutch, too, accepts this interpretation (*Paul and the Educated Elite*, 294). On these writing examples, commonly termed *praescriptiones* or *exemplares*, see Criboire, *Writing, Teachers, and Students*, 122-23.

<sup>116</sup> For a concise summary of this writing exercise, see Criboire, *Writing, Teachers, and Students*, 139-52.

provided the most convincing argument against interpreting 1 Cor 4:6 as a reference to early literate education, suggesting that this reading does not sit well in context.

“Fitzgerald’s<sup>117</sup> hypothesis” she writes, “is ingenious but not readily anchored in this particular context in 1 Cor 1-4. Nor is it clear how this domestic image fits with the conflict expressed in the parallel clause ἵνα μὴ εἴς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου.”<sup>118</sup> Consider, however, Fiore’s contrasting conclusion: “The advantage of seeing the phrase in 1 Cor 4:6 in terms of a school exercise is that this preserves the rhetorical harmony of the context and provides a parallel in usage as far as character imitation goes.”<sup>119</sup> Fiore suggests that the whole of 1 Cor 1:18-4:21 is marked by a string of appeals to personal example and he correctly notes that imitation was one of the most important teaching strategies in all of ancient education.<sup>120</sup>

Who, then, is correct? Mitchell or Fiore? The many educational motifs catalogued in this chapter suggest that Mitchell is wrong regarding the limitations of the context; μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται is likely to be only one in a series of educational motifs. Furthermore, Fiore’s explanation of the phrase as an invitation to mimesis also satisfies Mitchell’s concern that reading μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται as a reference to childhood literate education is unconnected to the following clause ἵνα μὴ εἴς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἐνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ

---

<sup>117</sup> Fitzgerald is commonly referred to as the first to suggest that 1 Cor 4:6 might reflect a *chreia*. However, the suggestion had been circulated nearly 30 years earlier by Heinrich Schlier, “ὑπόδειγμα,” *TDNT* 2:32-33.

<sup>118</sup> Margaret M. Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*, HUT 28 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1991), 220 n. 183. Mitchell reads 4:6 as a reference to the scripture Paul has quoted in 3:21 (*Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 220 n. 183.).

<sup>119</sup> Benjamin Fiore, *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*, AnBib 105 (Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986), 323 n.24.

<sup>120</sup> On imitation, see the discussion of 4:16 below.



ἑτέρου: Given that Paul presents himself and Apollos as cooperative teachers, not competitors,<sup>121</sup> if the Corinthians were to imitate their non-competitive ethos, it would prevent them from becoming “puffed up in favor of one against another” (4:6).

At this juncture, it seems reasonable to interpret μὴ ὑπὲρ ᾧ γέγραπται as Paul’s quotation of a maxim referring to the teaching of writing. But Paul and Apollos were not teachers of writing, so whatever the phrase may have originally meant in the school of some forgotten διδάσκαλος, it cannot have the same meaning here. To explain the phrase’s likely meaning, it is helpful to consider ancient texts describing the process of writing maxims like μὴ ὑπὲρ ᾧ γέγραπται in ancient schools, as well as an example of how teachers actually interpreted these maxims. As will become clear, although μὴ ὑπὲρ ᾧ γέγραπται, understood literally, does refer to didactic technique of having children trace pre-inscribed words and phrases, those same words and phrases were often interpreted allegorically to encourage children to pursue moral courses of action like imitating their teachers.

Quintilian and Seneca provide the only practical description from the early Roman Empire of this educational practice.<sup>122</sup> Significantly, Quintilian’s discussion of the technique of producing and copying maxims provides a linguistic analogue to the specific phrase μὴ ὑπὲρ ᾧ γέγραπται. Quintilian describes the Latin *praescriptio* using a close Latin equivalent of this phrase:

Once the child has begun to trace the outlines, it will be useful to have these inscribed as neatly as possible on a tablet, so that the stylus is guided by the grooves. In this way, the child will not make

---

<sup>121</sup> On Paul’s characterization of his and Apollos’s relationship as basically cooperative, see chapter 6, section II.G-K.

<sup>122</sup> Though cf. Plato, *Prot.* 326D.

mistakes as on wax (for he will be constrained by the edges on both sides, and will not be able to stray beyond the marks [*neque extra praescriptum egredi poterit*]), and, by following these well-defined traces so quickly and often, he will strengthen his fingers, and not need the help of a guiding hand placed over his own.<sup>123</sup>

Literally, *neque extra praescriptum egredi poterit* means that the student “will not be able to go beyond the written example.” Some scholars have suggested that μή ὑπὲρ ᾧ γέγραπται must have been a popular maxim, easily recognizable to the Corinthians.<sup>124</sup> Quintilian provides proof that the sentiment, if not the exact wording, was present in ancient educational theory. Quintilian’s depiction of the use of *praescriptiones* in ancient schools is corroborated by Seneca: “Boys study according to direction. Their fingers are held and guided by others so that they may follow the outlines of the letters; next, they are ordered to imitate a copy and base thereon a style of penmanship.”<sup>125</sup>

Ancient educators took care to ensure that the *praescriptiones* they assigned not only taught penmanship but also reinforced moral lessons. Quintilian writes that,

And, as we are still dealing with minor matters, I should like to suggest that the lines set for copying should not be meaningless sentences, but should convey some moral lesson. The memory of such things stays with us till we are old, and the impression thus made on the unformed mind will be good for the character also. The child may also be allowed to learn, as a game, the sayings of famous men and especially selected passages from the poets (which children particularly like to know).<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>123</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.27-28 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>124</sup> See, e.g., Tyler, “1 Cor 4:6 and Hellenistic Pedagogy,” 99-100.

<sup>125</sup> *Ep.* 94.51 (Gummere, LCL).

<sup>126</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.35-36.

The moral benefit of many maxims is self-evident. For example: Ὀρκῶ μὴ χρῶ (Do not take an oath); Παιδείας ἀντέχου (Cling to education); Ὁ μέλλεις, δός (Do what you intend).<sup>127</sup> Given the moralistic contents of such maxims and proverbs, it is no surprise that Quintilian should argue that, in addition to improving penmanship, the habitual copying of maxims was intended to improve the moral fiber of the student.

But some *exemplares* or *praescriptiones*, while memorable and serviceable for teaching penmanship, did not so easily apply to the moral life. When ancient educators went about interpreting and applying the content of maxims to their students, their interpretations are frequently non-literal. Ps.-Plutarch, quoting and discussing a range of such maxims, writes,

‘Abstain from beans’ (Κυάμων ἀπέχεσθαι); means that a man should keep out of politics, for beans were used in earlier times for voting upon the removal of magistrates from office.

‘Do not put food into a slop-pail’ (Σιτίον εἰς ἀμίδα μὴ ἐμβάλλειν); signifies that it is not fitting to put clever speech into a base mind. For speech is the food of thought, and baseness in men makes it unclean.

‘Do not turn back on reaching the boundaries’ (Μὴ ἐπιστρέφεισθαι ἐπὶ τοὺς ὅρους ἐλθόντας); that is, when people are about to die and see the boundary of their life close at hand, they should bear all this with serenity and not be faint-hearted.<sup>128</sup>

Hence, while elementary writing instruction is the most natural literal referent for a maxim like μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται, Paul may instead be counting on his audience to read more deeply. He is likening his non-competitive relationship with Apollos to a

---

<sup>127</sup> One common source of such maxims was the Delphic canon. James Harrison has noted that the Delphic canon was reproduced for students to view in gymnasia throughout the Hellenistic world. See Harrison, “Paul and the Ancient Gymnasium,” 33-48; Harrison, “Paul and the Gymnasiarchs,” 141-78. Stobaeus records these maxims in his *Anth.* 3.1.173, and while none is identical to μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται, they are formally similar.

<sup>128</sup> *Lib. ed.* 12f (Babbitt, LCL).

ὑπογραμμός which their puffed-up students ought to imitate. It is just possible that Clement of Rome had exactly this passage in mind when he wrote that Paul “taught righteousness throughout the whole world” (δικαιοσύνην διδάξας ὅλον τὸν κόσμον), by making himself an “example” (ὑπογραμμός) for his audience to imitate (1 Clem 5:5-7). In conclusion, μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται can be read as a maxim or *praescriptio* referring to the earliest stages of literate education.

#### F. Pedagogues (4:14-15)

1 Corinthians 4:14-15 contains two more educational metaphors. Paul writes, “I am not writing this to make you ashamed, but to admonish you as my beloved children. For though you might have ten thousand guardians (μυρίους παιδαγωγούς) in Christ, you do not have many fathers. Indeed, in Christ Jesus I became your father through the gospel.” Here I will provide evidence for the educational function of the pedagogue before discussing the educational responsibilities of parents in the following section.

In 4:14-15 Paul distinguishes his own role as father from the role of other apostles as pedagogues.<sup>129</sup> Scholars offer differing versions of the role and function of the pedagogue. Weiss holds that pedagogues “keineswegs ‘Lehrer’ waren, sondern dass ihnen hauptfächlich die äusserliche Erziehung zur guten Sitte ... anvertraut war.”<sup>130</sup> Barrett suggests that pedagogues are primarily guardians, but that the metaphorical Corinthian pedagogues might teach some Christian wisdom,<sup>131</sup> while Conzelmann

---

<sup>129</sup> For a general survey of the role and status of pedagogues, see Young, “*PAIDAGOGOS*,” 150-76.

<sup>130</sup> Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 116.

<sup>131</sup> Barrett, *First Epistle*, 115.

maintains that pedagogues had no teaching responsibilities whatsoever.<sup>132</sup> Collins, on the other hand, argues that the contrast between “pedagogues” and “father” was in fact a contrast between two different types of revered teacher,<sup>133</sup> and Zeller also notes that the pedagogue could be a “bezahlten Lehrer.”<sup>134</sup>

Classical scholarship’s opinion is similarly divided. Following Marrou, it is commonly asserted, that pedagogues were caretakers who were especially concerned with early moral formation but not entrusted with the tasks of literate, numerate, or philosophical education.<sup>135</sup> Bonner, Booth, and Cribiore have challenged this claim, arguing that a child’s pedagogue might aid with teaching basic reading and writing in the context of the pupil’s home.<sup>136</sup>

The cause for the academic dispute over the function of pedagogues is that so few descriptions of pedagogues in action have survived from antiquity. The evidence tells us more about their social status than their educative roles. Dio and Epictetus both describe the position of pedagogue as one which a poor (but presumably free) man might take as honorable employment,<sup>137</sup> and Christian Laes, in a study of 100 Greek and Latin inscriptional references to pedagogues from the Hellenistic and Imperial periods, observes that while the majority of pedagogues were or had been slaves, their designation

---

<sup>132</sup> Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 91. Similarly, Fee, *First Epistle*, 185; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:356.

<sup>133</sup> Collins, *First Corinthians*, 192.

<sup>134</sup> Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 191 n. 625.

<sup>135</sup> Marrou, *History of Education in Antiquity*, 217-18; Young, *PAIDAGOGOS*, 159-65.

<sup>136</sup> Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome*, 37-40; Booth, “Elementary and Secondary Education,” 3; Cribiore, *Writing, Teachers, and Students*, 16. See as well, Kennedy, *Quintilian*, 43.

<sup>137</sup> Dio Chrysostom, *Or.* 7; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 3.26.7; Cf. Plutarch, *Vit. pud.* 830b.

as a pedagogue “might testify of a certain prestige which was attached to the profession, or pride from the part of those who practiced it.”<sup>138</sup>

Quintilian and Plutarch both describe the requisite moral qualities for a suitable pedagogue,<sup>139</sup> but only Quintilian treats the educative function of the pedagogue. Specifically, Quintilian suggests that pedagogues should limit themselves to teaching what they know.

Regarding his *paedagogi*, I would add that they should either be thoroughly educated (this is the first priority) or know themselves to be uneducated. Nothing can be worse than those who, having got just beyond the alphabet, delude themselves that they have acquired some knowledge. They both scorn to give up the role of instructor and, conceiving that they have a certain title to authority (a frequent source of vanity in this class of persons), become imperious and sometimes even brutal teachers of their own foolishness.<sup>140</sup>

One might object that Quintilian’s reference to uneducated pedagogues demonstrates that they were not teachers. But this would over read the evidence. Quintilian claims to prefer educated pedagogues who can teach to the extent that their own education allows. His injunction that pedagogues should limit their teaching to the appropriate subject is akin to his instruction to grammarians, i.e., that they not flatter themselves by attempting to teach rhetoric.<sup>141</sup> Indeed, the mere fact that Quintilian finds it necessary to warn against pedagogues teaching beyond their expertise is evidence that pedagogues did serve as

---

<sup>138</sup> Christian Laes, “Pedagogues in Greek Inscriptions in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity,” *ZPE* 171 (2009): 116.

<sup>139</sup> Ps-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.* 4a-b.

<sup>140</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.8 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>141</sup> *Inst.* 2.1.4-6. “If a teacher,” he writes, “is quite uneducated (*erit plane inpolitus*), and has barely crossed the threshold of his profession, he will confine himself to the rules commonly known from teachers’ manuals; a more learned man will be able to add many more” (*Inst.* 1.1.8 [Russell, LCL]).

teachers, just as his critique of over-reliance on corporal punishment is evidence of its widespread practice.<sup>142</sup> If we allow for Quintilian’s interpretation of the pedagogue as a type of home-tutor, it could explain Tacitus’s reference to one Anicetus as the Emperor Nero’s *educator*; this is the same Anicetus whom Suetonius calls Nero’s *pedagogus*.<sup>143</sup> In at least one inscription, it seems that a pedagogue was the functional equivalent of a teacher.<sup>144</sup> Ultimately, whether or not pedagogues were teachers, Quintilian, Ps.-Plutarch, et al. leave no doubt that they were essential figures in a child’s education.

#### G. Parent Teachers (4:14-15, cont’d)

In contrast to the pedagogue, Paul presents himself as the Corinthians’ “father.”<sup>145</sup> While this self-designation might initially appear to move Paul’s discourse away from the tropes common to ancient education and toward the life of the ancient family—as Schmeller concludes<sup>146</sup>—it actually increases the likelihood that Paul is drawing on ancient educational motifs. The parent, and especially the father, was ideally the first educator of the child.

Not all interpreters have observed the resonance between Paul’s paternal role and his didactic responsibility. Many see in Paul’s claim to be the Corinthians’ father nothing more than a reference to his special role in founding the community,<sup>147</sup> not to mention the

---

<sup>142</sup> For Quintilian’s view of corporal punishment, see the discussion of 4:21 below.

<sup>143</sup> Suetonius, *Nero* 35.2; Tacitus, *Ann.* 14.3. For discussion, see Laes, *Children in the Roman Empire*, 115.

<sup>144</sup> See Laes, “Pedagogues in Greek Inscriptions,” 121.

<sup>145</sup> On parental responsibilities in education, see Robert Dutch, *The Educated Elite*, 184-91.

<sup>146</sup> Schmeller, *Schulen im Neuen Testament*, 138.

<sup>147</sup> Barrett, *First Epistle*, 115; Fee, *First Epistle*, 183.

authority that results from being the founder.<sup>148</sup> Even Dutch argues that Paul's paternal imagery functions primarily to present the Corinthian community as a fictive household. This, he contends, is an egalitarian move, in which those Corinthians who were not members of elite households find themselves suddenly in fictive kinship relationships with socially elite members of the community who were actually born in elite households.<sup>149</sup>

Other scholars have noted that Paul's self-identification as a father to the Corinthians carries educational overtones. Ehrensperger suggests that since Paul's fatherhood language occurs in close proximity to the "milk and solid food metaphor" (discussed above), and since both terms occur in Philonic discussions of education, he is working within a "Jewish educational setting."<sup>150</sup> Collins also notes that education and socialization were an essential component of a Jewish father's role, and that by identifying himself as a father Paul has put himself in a relatively greater position of authority when compared with the Corinthians' pedagogues.<sup>151</sup> White likewise argues that the paternal metaphor is primarily an educational metaphor.<sup>152</sup>

The educative duties of parents in Second Temple Judaism are especially evident in the wisdom tradition.<sup>153</sup> Consider Sir 7:23: τέκνα σοί ἐστίν; παίδευσον αὐτὰ καὶ

---

<sup>148</sup> Fee, *First Epistle*, 183; Elizabeth Castelli, *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power* (Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1991), 101; Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 192.

<sup>149</sup> Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 216-19. Similarly, Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, esp. 81-98.

<sup>150</sup> Ehrensperger, *Paul and the Dynamics of Power*, 130.

<sup>151</sup> Collins, *First Corinthians*, 192-93.

<sup>152</sup> White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 218-23.

<sup>153</sup> See Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 192, who notes how common the metaphor was in Ancient Near Eastern wisdom traditions.



κάμψον ἐκ νεότητος τὸν τράχηλον αὐτῶν.<sup>154</sup> Ben Sira repeatedly compares himself as a father to his students, addressing them as his sons; in Sir 3:1, for example, he exhorts, Εμοῦ τοῦ πατρὸς ἀκούσατε, τέκνα, καὶ οὕτως ποιήσατε, ἵνα σωθῆτε (cf., e.g., 2:1; 3:1; 3:17; 4:1; 6:23; etc.).<sup>155</sup> Likewise the *mebaqqer*, the instructor at Qumran, is metaphorically compared to a father.<sup>156</sup> In 1 En. 81, Enoch is a teacher to his son Methuselah. Josephus also emphasizes his own father's role in his early education (*Vita* 7-9). Jubilees 47:9 identifies Amram, Moses's father, as the one who taught him to write. Sanh. 19b reasons that if a man teaches Torah to another man's son, it is as if he himself had fathered the boy.<sup>157</sup> Even B. Bat. 21a, the most valuable Rabbinic description of Jewish education, indicates that before the institution of Jewish schools, one either learned from one's father or not at all. Philo, however, is perhaps the most explicit in his descriptions of parents' educative responsibility:

I say, then, that the maker is always senior to the thing made and the cause to its effect, and the begetters are in a sense the causes and the creators of what they beget. They are also in the position of instructors (ὀφηγητῶν) because they impart to their children from their earliest years everything that they themselves may happen to know, and give them instruction (ἀναδιδάξαντες) not only in the various branches of knowledge which they impress upon their young minds, but also on the most essential questions of what to choose and avoid, namely, to choose virtues and

---

<sup>154</sup> Cf., e.g., Sir 8:9: μὴ ἀστόχει δηγήματος γερόντων, καὶ γὰρ αὐτοὶ ἔμαθον παρὰ τῶν πατέρων αὐτῶν· ὅτι παρ' αὐτῶν μαθήσει σύνεσιν καὶ ἐν καιρῷ χρείας δοῦναι ἀπόκρισιν); 30:3 (ὁ διδάσκων τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ παραζηλώσει τὸν ἐχθρὸν καὶ ἐναντι φίλων ἐπ' αὐτῷ ἀγαλλιᾶσεται.

<sup>155</sup> On paternal imagery in the wisdom tradition, see Robert Gordis, "The Social Background of Wisdom Literature: Dedicated to Professor Louis Ginzberg in Honor of his seventieth Anniversary," *HUCA* 18 (1943-44): 83-84.

<sup>156</sup> CD 13:7-10.

<sup>157</sup> Both Barrett and Zeller quote Sanh. 19b in their commentaries on 1 Cor 4:15, but neither suggests that Paul's paternal imagery thereby takes on an educational valence (Barrett, *First Epistle*, 115; Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 192).

avoid vices and the activities to which they lead. Further, who could be more truly called benefactors than parents in relation to their children?<sup>158</sup>

The motif of the parent-teacher is equally common in Greek and Roman sources.<sup>159</sup> Quintilian emphasizes that children are naturally quick to learn and that “the man who shares this conviction, must, as soon as he becomes a father, devote the utmost care to fostering the promise shown by the son whom he destines to become an orator.”<sup>160</sup> This “fostering the promise” includes choosing the right nurses and pedagogues,<sup>161</sup> but it also places demands on both father and mother:

As regards parents, I should like to see them as highly educated as possible, and I do not restrict this remark to fathers alone. We are told that the eloquence of the Gracchi owed much to their mother Cornelia, whose letters even to-day testify to the cultivation of her style.... And even those who have not had the fortune to receive a good education should not for that reason devote less care to their son’s education; but should on the contrary show all the greater diligence in other matters where they can be of service to their children.<sup>162</sup>

Only Quintilian’s emphasis on the formative role of parents in a child’s education explains his later suggestion that students should regard their teachers as being *in loco parentis*.<sup>163</sup> A rhetor should “adopt a paternal attitude towards his pupils, and regard

---

<sup>158</sup> *Spec.* 2.228 (Colson, LCL).

<sup>159</sup> On parental roles in Roman education, see, e.g., Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome*, 98-104; Crihiore, *The School of Libanius*, 138-39.

<sup>160</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.3 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>161</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.4-5, 10; 1.2.4-5; cf. Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.* 3c-5c; 9d; 11d-13a.

<sup>162</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.6-7 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>163</sup> Cf. Apuleius, *Flor.* 18.18; 20.2. Apuleius claims to honor his teachers as he honors his parents. See also Laes, *Children in the Roman Empire*, 131.

himself as taking the place of those whose children are entrusted to him.”<sup>164</sup> Students, likewise, “should love their masters not less than their studies, and should regard them as the parents not indeed of their bodies but of their minds.”<sup>165</sup>

Plutarch provides a narrative description of an ideal father-educator in his life of Cato the Elder:

After the birth of his son, no business could be so urgent, unless it had a public character, as to prevent him from being present when his wife bathed and swaddled the babe.... As soon as the boy showed signs of understanding, his father took him under his own charge and taught him to read, although he had an accomplished slave, Chilo by name, who was a school-teacher, and taught many boys. Still, Cato thought it not right, as he tells us himself, that his son should be scolded by a slave, or have his ears tweaked when he was slow to learn, still less that he should be indebted to his slave for such a priceless thing as education. He was therefore himself not only the boys’ reading-teacher, but his tutor in law, and his athletic trainer, and he taught his son not merely to hurl the javelin and fight in armour and ride the horse, but also to box, to endure heat and cold, and to swim lustily through the eddies and billows of the Tiber.<sup>166</sup>

Given the Jewish, Roman, and Greek tendency to think of the father as a teacher (and teachers, consequently, as metaphorical fathers), it is entirely natural that Eph 6:4 would also assign an educative role to the father: “fathers, do not provoke your children to anger, but bring them up in the discipline and instruction of the Lord (ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νοουθεσίᾳ κυρίου).”

---

<sup>164</sup> *Inst.* 2.2.5 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>165</sup> *Inst.* 2.9.1 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>166</sup> *Cat. Maj.* 20.2-4 (Perrin, LCL).

### H. Mimesis (4:16)

1 Cor 4:16 contains another educational *topos*. When Paul exhorts the Corinthians to imitate him (μιμηταί μου γίνεσθε), he draws on one of the most common didactic techniques in all of ancient education. Scholarly discussions of the imitation motif in Paul's letters tend to fall into two camps. In the first, many highlight the literary or theological functions of mimesis within 1 Corinthians (or the *corpus Paulinum*, more broadly), noting that Paul's injunction that the community imitate him, is an command to imitate Christ. Barrett reads 4:16 in light of 11:1<sup>167</sup> and argues that the phrase reveals the life of an apostle as a representation of the life of Christ to those who have no experience of Christ's own manner of life. The Corinthians had never seen Jesus, but Paul had lived with them for a year and a half.<sup>168</sup> Similarly, Schrage: "Der Apostel ist aber nicht ein zweiter Christus und nicht qua Apostel nachahmenswert, sondern weil und sofern er sich selbst an Christus orientiert und sein Leben in Reflex des Gekreuzigten ist."<sup>169</sup> For Thiselton, the primary purpose of the command is to present Paul, the suffering Apostle of the peristasis catalogue, as a model for the community that itself shares in the identity of the crucified Christ.<sup>170</sup> Collins takes a slightly different tack, observing that while Paul's explicit commands that the Corinthians imitate him (in 4:16 and 11:1) have garnered much attention, even when Paul does not use the term μίμησις or its cognates he does repeatedly present himself and his opinions as examples to be followed: e.g., in 7:8

---

<sup>167</sup> "Be imitators of me, as I am of Christ."

<sup>168</sup> *First Epistle*, 116.

<sup>169</sup> *Der erste Brief*, 1:357.

<sup>170</sup> *First Epistle*, 371. Similarly, see William Spencer, "The Power in Paul's Teaching (1 Cor 4:9-20)," *JETS* 32 (1989): 51-61.

regarding marriage and celibacy, in 13:1-3 regarding spiritual gifts, and in 14:1-19 on glossolalia and prophecy.<sup>171</sup>

A second group of interpreters gives greater attention to the ancient Mediterranean social contexts in which mimetic behavior was common.<sup>172</sup> Elizabeth Castelli provides a Foucauldian study of μιμέομαι and its cognates, investigating its use in cultic and religious settings, aesthetic mimesis (in e.g., poetry and art), cosmological theory, imitation of the divine in philosophical traditions, imitation of kings in Hellenistic political philosophy, and, lastly, imitation in education and ethical instruction.<sup>173</sup> But it is Fiore who provides the most extensive study of the theme of imitation in Greek and Roman literary texts currently available.<sup>174</sup> Though his study aims to explain the nature and purpose of the pastoral letters, he does consider portions of Paul's undisputed letters.<sup>175</sup> Fiore sees appeals to personal example as a major theme unifying all of 1 Cor 1-4: "After the initial thanksgiving and exhortation (1:4-17), there follow three paradigmatic sections (1:18-2:5; 2:6-3:5; 3:6-4:5), each containing a general statement and one or two applications. A clarification of the meaning and purpose of the figurative language comes next and with it a questioning of the community's self-esteem by direct charge and contrast."<sup>176</sup>

---

<sup>171</sup> *First Corinthians*, 193-94.

<sup>172</sup> See, e.g., Wilhelm Michaelis, "μιμέομαι," *TDNT* 4.668-69.

<sup>173</sup> Castelli, *Imitating Paul*, 59-87.

<sup>174</sup> Fiore, *Personal Example*, esp. pp. 58-64, on the use of *mimesis* in rhetorical education.

<sup>175</sup> See esp. Fiore's discussion of *mimesis* in 1 Corinthians in *Personal Example*, 312-44.

<sup>176</sup> Fiore, *Personal Example*, 315; Cf. Brian J. Dodd, *Paul's Paradigmatic 'I': Personal Example as Literary Strategy*, *JSNTSup* 177 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 48-61.

Fee, like Barrett et al., claims that Paul's call for imitation is essentially Christocentric. He also identifies the role of imitation in ancient households, noting that mimesis was integral to the father-child relationship.<sup>177</sup> Fee also notes that *mimesis* was an integral concept in ancient education but he does not press the point.<sup>178</sup> Conzelmann, on the other hand, focuses exclusively on the role of imitation in the teacher-student relationship.<sup>179</sup> Zeller emphasizes both Paul's paternal role and the common practice of students' imitating their teachers: "In der Erziehung werden Eltern und Lehrer zu den nächsten Vorbildern. Die Gemeinde ahmt Paulus nach, indem sie seine massgebende Lehre übernimmt."<sup>180</sup> According to De Boer, imitation is a "bringing to expression, representation, and portrayal" which entailed a transfer of character or identity in relationships like parent-child, teacher-pupil, and god-human.<sup>181</sup> Imitation was an important concept in many aspects of ancient life, including Greek and Roman religion, politics, household life, education, and more. In 1 Cor 4:16, however, with its close proximity to Paul's self-identification as father (4:15) and his allusion to his habitual teaching (4:17), Zeller is correct to focus on *Erziehung* as the right context for interpreting Paul's exhortation to imitation.

---

<sup>177</sup> *First Epistle*, 186-88.

<sup>178</sup> *First Epistle*, 186 n.24.

<sup>179</sup> Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 92

<sup>180</sup> Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 193. Note as well Weiss's citation of Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.2.3 and 1.6.3 (Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 118).

<sup>181</sup> Willis Peter De Boer, *The Imitation of Paul: An Exegetical Study* (Kampen: Kok, 1962), 15-16.

Learning by imitation is perhaps the oldest and best attested of all Greek didactic strategies.<sup>182</sup> Such is the case with the relationship between Phoenix and Achilles in Homer: Phoenix—whom Ps.-Plutarch describes as the ideal pedagogue<sup>183</sup>—tells Achilles the story of how he himself restrained his rage as a young man and lived to see better days, encouraging Achilles to do the same.<sup>184</sup> Isocrates wrote that “the teacher, for his part, must so expound the principles of the art with the utmost possible exactness as to leave out nothing that can be taught, and, for the rest, he must in himself set such an example of oratory that the students who have taken form under his instruction and are able to pattern after him will, from the outset, show in their speaking a degree of grace and charm which is not found in others.”<sup>185</sup>

Quintilian, though recognizing its limits,<sup>186</sup> places particularly high stock in imitation as a pedagogical tool, situating “power of imitation” just behind a good memory in his list of traits desirable in a young student: “For this is a sign that the child is teachable: but he must imitate merely what is taught, and must not, for example, mimic someone’s gait or bearing or defects.”<sup>187</sup> The importance of imitation does not decline, even as the child advances from studying with a *grammaticus* to beginning his studies with a *rhetor*. Quintilian notes that a living teacher inspires greater rhetorical prowess in his students than even reading the works of great past rhetors.

---

<sup>182</sup> On imitation in literate education, see, e.g., Criboire, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 132-33.

<sup>183</sup> *Lib. ed.* 4b.

<sup>184</sup> *Il.* 9.434-605.

<sup>185</sup> *Soph.* 17-18 (Norlin, LCL).

<sup>186</sup> *Inst.* 10.2.4.

<sup>187</sup> *Inst.* 1.3.1.

He should declaim daily himself and, what is more, without stint, that his class may take his utterances home with them. For however many models for imitation he may give them from the authors they are reading, it will still be found that fuller nourishment is provided by the living voice, as we call it, more especially when it proceeds from the teacher himself, who, if his pupils are rightly instructed, should be the object of their affection and respect. And it is scarcely possible to say how much more readily we imitate those whom we like.<sup>188</sup>

Thus, describing the relationship between teachers and students, Quintilian contends that students should greatly desire to be like their teachers (*Inst.* 2.9.2). Finally, he writes:

it is a universal rule of life that we should wish to copy what we approve in others. It is for this reason that boys copy the shapes of letters that they may learn to write, and that musicians take the voices of their teachers, painters the works of their predecessors, and peasants the principles of agriculture which have been proved in practice, as models for their imitation. In fact, we may note that the elementary study of every branch of learning is directed by reference to some definite standard that is placed before the learner. We must, in fact, either be like or unlike those who have proved their excellence. It is rare for nature to produce such resemblance, which is more often the result of imitation. But the very fact that in every subject the procedure to be followed is so much more easy for us than it was for those who had no model to guide them, is a positive drawback, unless we use this dubious advantage with caution and judgment.<sup>189</sup>

Ps.-Plutarch advises fathers that they “ought above all, by not misbehaving and by doing as they ought to do, to make themselves a manifest example to their children, so that the latter, by looking at their fathers’ lives as at a mirror, may be deterred from disgraceful deeds and words.”<sup>190</sup> Additional examples abound.<sup>191</sup>

---

<sup>188</sup> *Inst.* 2.2.8.

<sup>189</sup> *Inst.* 10.2.2-3.

<sup>190</sup> *Lib. ed.* 14a (Babbitt, LCL).

<sup>191</sup> Suetonius describes the Greek origins of Roman grammatical study by emphasizing the Romans’ imitation of a Greek envoy, Crates: “In my opinion then, the first to introduce the study of grammar into



Mimesis also appears in educational contexts in Hellenistic Jewish literature.

Philo and Josephus describe Moses as a teacher to be imitated. Philo writes of Moses in his time on Sinai, “Thus he beheld what is hidden from the sight of mortal nature, and, in himself and his life displayed for all to see, he has set before us, like some well-wrought picture, a piece of work beautiful and god-like, a model for those who are willing to copy it (μιμεῖσθαι). Happy are those who imprint ... that image in their souls.”<sup>192</sup>

### I. Teaching in All the Churches (4:17)

In 4:17, Paul’s language lies explicitly within the semantic domain of ancient education. He writes, “For this reason I sent you Timothy, who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, to remind you of my ways (τὰς ὁδούς μου) in Christ Jesus, as I teach them everywhere in every church (καθὼς πανταχοῦ ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ διδάσκω).”

There is no need to cite ancient parallel occurrences of the verb διδάσκω, as if it were necessary to prove that he was indeed describing the educational process.<sup>193</sup> It is necessary to summarize previous interpretation of this verse. Weiss focuses on the tradition history underlying Paul’s claim, identifying similar clusters of teaching

---

our city was Crates of Mallos, a contemporary of Aristarchus. He was sent to the senate by king Attalus between the second and third Punic wars, at about the time when Ennius died; and having fallen into the opening of a sewer in the Palatine quarter and broken his leg, he held numerous and frequent conferences during the whole time both of his embassy and of his convalescence, at which he constantly gave instruction, and thus set an example for our countrymen to imitate. Their imitation, however, was confined to a careful criticism of poems which had as yet but little circulation, either those of deceased friends or others that met with their approval, and to making them known to the public by reading and commenting on them” (*Gramm.* 2 [Rolfe, LCL]).

<sup>192</sup> *Mos.* 1.28.158-59. Cf. Josephus, *Ant.* 1.19.20.

<sup>193</sup> See Smith, *Pauline Communities as ‘Scholastic Communities,’* 54-66.

terminology and references to God's "ways" in the Psalms (esp. Ps 24:4 LXX)<sup>194</sup> but he does not seriously discuss the function of v. 17 in context. He judges the reference to "all the churches" too Catholic, and thus, a likely interpolation.<sup>195</sup> Most have followed Weiss's suggestion that the Hebrew Bible (or Jewish halakhic logic, generally), provides the closest analogue for Paul's language. These commentators regularly note that Paul's "ways" imply not only the content taught but the ethical modes of behavior which the content implies.<sup>196</sup> Zeller is exceptional when he defines Paul's ways merely as "die Gegenstand seiner Lehre," his teaching's subject-matter.<sup>197</sup>

It is striking that the commentary tradition tends to ignore the implications of Paul's claim that what he taught the Corinthians he teaches "in all the churches." Read one way, 1 Cor 4:17 might imply that Paul had a curriculum that he taught in every one of his communities. This would suggest that Paul's communities were irreducibly scholastic. Paul's statement in 1 Cor 4:17 could provide a starting-point for a subsequent investigation of the scholastic nature of Pauline communities. For the present, however, Paul's use of explicitly educational terminology in 4:17 enables us to see him depicting himself as the teacher of a Corinthian school.

---

<sup>194</sup> Τὰς ὁδοῦς σου, κύριε, γνώρισόν μοι καὶ τὰς τρίβους σου διδάξόν με (see Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 119).

<sup>195</sup> "Πανταχοῦ ἐν πάσῃ ἐκκλησίᾳ," writes Weiss, "bringt sehr stark den Gedanken der Katholizität zum Ausdruck.... Aber wie wir dort die Echtheit der betr. Worte bezweifelt und sie auf den Redaktor zurückgeführt haben (*Der erste Korintherbrief*, 120).

<sup>196</sup> Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 92-93; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 359; Fee, *First Epistle*, 189; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 374.

<sup>197</sup> Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 193. But he is probably correct to do so: we cannot assume that a Greek word bears a fundamentally Semitic sense. See esp. James Barr's critique of those who argue that πίστις in the New Testament bears the same semantic range as the Hebrew terms for faith (*The Semantics of Biblical Language* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961], 161-205).

### J. Memory (4:17, cont'd)

In addition to Paul's claim to teach the same thing in every church, 1 Cor 4:17 contains at least one more subtle pedagogical topos: an allusion to a student's natural capacity for memory. "For this reason," he writes, "I sent you Timothy, who is my beloved and faithful child in the Lord, to remind you of my ways in Christ Jesus."

Many commentators gloss over Timothy's function as the one who will remind the Corinthians, choosing instead to focus on the content of that reminiscence, Paul's "ways."<sup>198</sup> Zeller contends that ἀναμνησκείν indicates that Timothy's message to the Corinthians will be nothing more than they have already heard.<sup>199</sup> Thiselton suggests that Paul, by emphasizing Timothy's faithfulness, indicates that Timothy's "stance and conduct," rather than merely (or even primarily) his intellectual teaching, will serve as a reminder for the Corinthians.<sup>200</sup> But memory was a very common topic for ancient educational theorists.

Most ancient discussions of primary education emphasize the importance of the natural capacity of the student. Quintilian, for example, writes:

There is one point which I must emphasize at the start: without the help of nature, precepts and techniques are powerless. This work, therefore, must not be thought of as written for persons without talent, any more than treatises on agriculture are meant for barren soils. And there are other aids, also, with which individuals have to be born: voice, strong lungs, good healthy, stamina, good looks. A modest supply of these can be further developed by methodical training; but sometimes they are so completely lacking as to destroy any advantages of talent and study, just

---

<sup>198</sup> E.g., Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 224; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 200; Conzelmann, *I Corinthians*, 92.

<sup>199</sup> Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 194 n. 639.

<sup>200</sup> Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 374. On the meaning of ἀνάμνησις in the Eucharist, see Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 878-82.

as these themselves are of no profit without a skilled teacher, persistence in study, and much continuous practice in writing, reading, and speaking.<sup>201</sup>

Of all the gifts of nature prized in ancient education, one of most desirable traits a student could possess was the power of memory.<sup>202</sup> Quintilian suggests that “As soon as a boy is entrusted to him, the skilled teacher will first spy out his ability and his nature. In children, the principal sign of talent is memory. There are two virtues of memory: quickness of grasp and accurate retention.”<sup>203</sup> Even as the budding orator is beginning to recognize letters and syllables by sight and write names he should copy sentences which

convey some moral lesson. The memory of such things stays with us till we are old, and the impressions thus made on the unformed mind will be good for the character also. The child may also be allowed to learn, as a game, the sayings of famous men and especially selected passages from the poets.... Memory ... is very necessary to the orator; there is nothing like practice for nourishing and strengthening it, and, since the age-group of which we are now speaking cannot as yet produce anything on its own, it is almost the only faculty which the teacher’s attention can help to develop.<sup>204</sup>

Quintilian is no outlier in his praise of students of extraordinary memory. Philo chides students who need to be reminded of what they have learned, writing that “reminiscence (ἀνάμνησις) takes the second place to memory (μνήμη), and so with the reminded and the rememberer.”<sup>205</sup> Philo goes so far as to correlate true memory with the fully educated philosopher and the need to be reminded with the immature student, i.e.,

---

<sup>201</sup> *Inst.* 1.Pr.26-27 (Russell, LCL). Cf. Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib ed.* 2a-3b; Philo, *Mut.* 211.

<sup>202</sup> See Morgan, *Literate Education*, 246, 250-51.

<sup>203</sup> *Inst.* 1.3.1 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>204</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.36-37 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>205</sup> *Congr.* 39 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

the one who settles for Hagar rather than Sarah: “For it is quite true that the soul of the rememberer (ἡ μὲν τοῦ μεμνημένου ψυχῆ) has the fruits of what he learned and has lost none of them, whereas the soul of the reminded (ἡ δὲ τοῦ ἀναμνήσει) comes out of forgetfulness which possessed him before he was reminded. The man of memory then is mated to a legitimate wife, memory; the forgetful man to a concubine.”<sup>206</sup>

Further examples abound. We need only mention a few. Ps.-Plutarch suggests that “Above all, the memory of children should be trained and exercised.... This, then, is to be trained in either case, whether one’s children be naturally gifted with a good memory, or, on the contrary, forgetful.”<sup>207</sup> The Middle Platonist Alcinous, in his discussion of the qualities necessary for the formation of the philosopher, insists on “a ready capacity to learn, and a good memory.”<sup>208</sup> Sextus Empiricus, in his *Contra Grammaticos*, writes that “Now since grammatistic through the intention of letters heals a most slothful disease, namely forgetfulness, and supports a most necessary activity, memory, nearly everything depends on it and without it one can neither teach others any of life’s necessities nor learn anything profitable from anyone else.”<sup>209</sup>

#### K. The Rod (4:21)

1 Cor 4 concludes with another reference to ancient education. Paul asks the Corinthians whether he should “come to you with a stick” (ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω) or “with love

---

<sup>206</sup> *Congr.* 41 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL). Cf. Philo’s rebuke of those who listen to philosophical lectures and promptly forget what they have heard in *Congr.* 63-66.

<sup>207</sup> *Lib ed.* 9e-f (Babbitt, LCL).

<sup>208</sup> *Didask.* 1.3 (trans. Dillon).

<sup>209</sup> Sextus Empiricus, *Math.* 1.52 (trans. Blank).

in a spirit of gentleness” (4:21). Given the prevalence of corporal punishment in Greek and Roman education,<sup>210</sup> many see this instance as a relatively straightforward adoption of a topos common to the Hellenistic and Roman schoolroom.<sup>211</sup> A significant body of scholarship has proposed alternative readings, however. Some have argued that Paul’s reference to the rod may be a nod to Roman imperial authority, possibly to a staff carried by a lictor.<sup>212</sup> It is more common for scholars to identify Paul’s appeal to the rod as an allusion to the Hebrew Bible. Thiselton protests (but does not argue) that ἐν ῥάβδῳ ἔλθω refers not to “the whip of the Hellenistic schoolmaster ... but the ‘rod of correction’ of OT and LXX traditions.”<sup>213</sup> Similarly, Fee argues that the rod is an extension of Paul’s paternal metaphor in 4:15, and that reading the rod as a reference to the ancient classroom results in an “unfortunate breaking of the imagery.”<sup>214</sup>

---

<sup>210</sup> For a helpful overview of the practices of corporal punishment in ancient Greek and Roman education, see Alan D. Booth, “Punishment, Discipline, and Riot in the Schools of Antiquity,” *Echos du Monde Classique* 17 (1973): 107-14.

<sup>211</sup> Carl Schneider, “ῥάβδος,” *TDNT* 6:966-70.

<sup>212</sup> See, e.g., Eva Marie Lassen, “The Use of the Father Image in Imperial Propoganda and 1 Corinthians 4:1-21,” *TynBul* 42 (1991): 127-36, esp. 136 n. 40; Dodd, *Paul’s Paradigmatic ‘I,’* 74; Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 160.

<sup>213</sup> Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 378. Against Thiselton, note that the “rod of correction” in the Hebrew Bible is an image strongly associated with the education of the young. Cf., e.g., Prov 13:24, 22:15, 23:13-14, 29:15. Prov 29:15 is particularly interesting, since it associates the acquisition of wisdom with the parent’s use of the rod. Derivatively, the rod can appear as an element of a parental metaphor describing God’s relationship with Israel (e.g., 2 Sam 7:14). Consequently, even if “the rod” in 1 Cor 4:21 is not the Hellenistic schoolmaster’s beating-stick, reflecting a purely Jewish background, it would remain within the grammar of ancient educational theory and practice.

<sup>214</sup> *First Epistle*, 192 n. 48. See also Collins, *First Corinthians*, 202; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 118-19.

Both Thiselton and Fee rely heavily on David Daube,<sup>215</sup> who begins his discussion of the topos by noting that Paul, before threatening the Corinthians with the rod,

contrasts himself, the one father of the Corinthian church, with its thousands of schoolmasters or attendants.... Hence, when he threatens ‘the rod’ he may have in mind either the punishing role that a father must sometimes assume, or the punishing role of the schoolmaster or attendant as opposed to the loving one of the father—or, indeed, as I incline to believe, both and neither, the metaphor being used in a general indeterminate sense.<sup>216</sup>

Daube’s essay is not an exegetical study of 1 Cor 4:21 but rather a lexical critique of Schneider’s argument that Paul must be referring to the Hellenistic schoolmaster since in Jewish education it was not the rod but the strap that was employed in corporal punishment.<sup>217</sup> Fee and Thiselton have focused on Daube’s “either/or” and neglected his suggestion that Paul’s reference to the rod might be grounded in both the ancient household and educational theory.

In contrast to Fee and Thiselton, Zeller does not cite Daube but recognizes that the rod belongs to both the school and household: “Der Stock,” he writes, “der in der antiken Erziehung in Familie und Schule unentbehrlich war, steht für scharfe Disziplinarmaßnahmen wie den 5,1-5 verfügten Ausschluss.”<sup>218</sup> The key, as he rightly notes, is that the rod’s proper context is neither in simply the house nor the school, but rather in an activity common to them both, in “Erziehung,” the “education” or “bringing

---

<sup>215</sup> David Daube, “Paul a Hellenistic Schoolmaster?” in *Collected Works of David Daube*, ed. Calum Carmichael, 4 vols. (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000), 2:801-3.

<sup>216</sup> Daube, “Paul a Hellenistic Schoolmaster?,” 2.801.

<sup>217</sup> See Schneider, “ῥάβδος,” *TDNT* 6:966-70.

<sup>218</sup> *Der erste Brief*, 195-96.

up” of the child. Since we have noted that even the role of father was integral to primary education in antiquity, Fee’s fear that a reference to the schoolroom might “break the imagery” reflects a false dichotomy.

Even a cursory study of ancient education demonstrates the prevalence of the rod. The rod was nearly synonymous with ancient primary education, where corporal punishment was dispensed liberally.<sup>219</sup> Quintilian writes:

Flogging a pupil is something I do not at all like, though it is an accepted practice and Chrysippus approves. In the first place, it is humiliating and proper only for slaves; and certainly it is an infringement of rights (as it is agreed to be at a later age). Secondly, if a boy is so lacking in self-respect that reproof is powerless to put him right, he will even become hardened to blows, like the worst type of slave. And finally, there will be no need for this form of punishment if there is always someone there to make sure the work gets done. As it is, we try to make amends for the negligence of the paedagogi not by forcing boys to do the right thing but by punishing them for not having done it. Moreover, though you may compel a child with blows, what can you do with a young man who cannot be threatened like this and who has more important lessons to learn? And again, when children are beaten, the pain and fear often have results which it is not pleasant to speak of.”<sup>220</sup>

As Philo puts it, “But the rod is the symbol of education, for without being looked at sternly, and chastised for some causes, it is impossible for anyone to be admonished and corrected to any good purpose.”<sup>221</sup> Additionally, Philo writes:

Fathers have the right to upbraid their children and admonish them severely (ἐμβριθέστερον νοουθετεῖν) and if they do not submit to threats conveyed in words to beat and degrade them and

---

<sup>219</sup> See, e.g., Marrou, *History of Education in Antiquity*, 272; Booth, “Punishment, Discipline, and Riot,” 107-14; See also Laes, *Children in the Roman Empire*, 137-47.

<sup>220</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.3.14-17 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>221</sup> *Post.* 97. Cf. *Fug.* 150.



put them in bonds (τύπτειν καὶ προηλακίζειν καὶ καταδεῖν). And further if in the face of this they continue to rebel, and carried away by their incorrigible depravity refuse the yoke, the law permits the parents to extend the punishment to death, though here it requires more than the father alone or the mother alone. So great a penalty should be the sentence, not only of one of them but of both.<sup>222</sup>

Unlike Quintilian, Philo's view of beatings is quite positive.<sup>223</sup>

But Philo is closer to the ancient norm than Quintilian's ideal. One of the grammarians remembered by Suetonius, one Lucius Orbilius Pupillus, was so fond of corporal punishment that Suetonius and Horace remember him by the epithet *plagosus*, "the beater."<sup>224</sup> In Herodas's third Mime, a mother asks a teacher to beat her son "until his soul hangs on his lips."<sup>225</sup> One visual representation of a schoolroom from Pompeii depicted one student being caned beneath a colonnade while a group of children sat in a row nearby.<sup>226</sup>

By the time of Paul, however, some prominent educators like Quintilian were beginning to question this legacy of severity. Ps.-Plutarch suggests that corporal punishment should be avoided, at least in the case of free-born children of honorable parentage.<sup>227</sup> This is a stark departure from a previous generation of educational theorists,

---

<sup>222</sup> *Spec.* 2.232 (Colson, LCL).

<sup>223</sup> For Philo's positive take on corporal punishment, see Niehoff, *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*, 176 n. 54.

<sup>224</sup> Suetonius, *Gramm.* 9; Horace, *Ep.* 2.1.70.

<sup>225</sup> Herodas, 3.1.

<sup>226</sup> Reproduced in Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome*, fig. 11.

<sup>227</sup> *Lib. ed.* 8f-9a.

who, like Aristotle, maintained that play had no part in education, since learning came only through suffering.<sup>228</sup>

### III. Conclusion: The Significance of the Educational Motifs

Paul's argument in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21 consistently employs educational motifs, ranging from a straightforward use of the verb διδάσκω, to allusions to the schoolmaster's beating-stick, to subtle metaphors comparing the teacher to a mystagogue. Rather than being limited to a single educational tradition, Paul's motifs frequently occur in both Greco-Roman and Jewish educational literature. Parallels with Greco-Roman primary education and the wisdom tradition are particularly strong. Whether this is because Paul, like Philo, was familiar with a Hellenized Jewish educational system is possible but must remain a matter of speculation.

When these educational motifs are set in series, it becomes possible to suggest one way in which Paul's adoption of educational language and imagery ought to impact our reading of 1 Cor 3:1-4:21. Specifically, the education motifs catalogued here map the most essential components of ancient schools onto the Corinthian community: Paul and Apollos are portrayed as teachers, the Corinthians as students, and Paul's instruction as an ancient curriculum. Let us consider each of these three components of the school in succession, correlating them with the appropriate educational motifs.

Perhaps the most prominent function of the educational motifs is to depict Paul as a teacher. It is Paul who provided milk for the Corinthian's delicate digestive systems (3:2). He too is the one who planted the first seeds which, properly tended, should

---

<sup>228</sup> *Pol.* 8.1339a28 (ὅτι μὲν οὖν δεῖ τοὺς νέους μὴ παιδιᾶς ἔνεκα παιδεύειν, οὐκ ἄδηλον [οὐ γὰρ παίζουσι μανθάνοντες· μετὰ λύπης γὰρ ἢ μάθησις]).

produce virtuous behavior in his students (3:6). Moreover, Paul laid a foundation for the Corinthians' future growth, a stage of education which, according to Quintilian, was often overlooked since it seemed less interesting than rhetorical training (3:10). As a mystagogue, Paul introduced the Corinthians to the first stages of Christian instruction, just like the unnamed διδάσκαλος, the teacher of letters celebrated in *IG* 12.1.141 (4:2). Like all good teachers, Paul adduces himself as an example for his students to imitate, both by employing a gnomic phrase that might well have served as a paradigm for young students learning basic penmanship (4:6) and by explicitly calling for his students to mimic him (4:16). Though not their biological father, Paul could claim the same sort of paternity that the ancients—from Quintilian to Ben Sira—would ascribe to teachers (4:15). This catalogue of motifs lends greater force to Paul's claim to teach in all his communities. The choice of the verb διδάσκω was not accidental (4:17). Like any teacher in antiquity, Paul regarded reproof and discipline as necessary aspects of his role as a teacher (4:14, 21).

Just as the educational motifs in 1 Cor 3:1-4:21 portray Paul as a teacher, these same motifs characterize the Corinthians as students in an ancient elementary school. They are infants, requiring milk, not solid food (3:1-2). They are the ground into which Paul sowed the first seed (3:6). If the community is being built into a temple in which God dwells, when Paul was with them they needed a foundation, not columns or pediments (3:10, 16). Like children first learning to write, the Corinthians ought to imitate Paul and Apollos (4:6, 16). And if Paul is a father, they are his children (4:14), a designation harking back to Paul's addressing them "as infants" (ὡς νηπίοις) (3:1). While

pedagogues could accompany their charges well beyond their childhood,<sup>229</sup> corporal punishment was largely applied during a student's tender years (4:21).

Finally, in addition to depicting himself as a teacher and the Corinthians as students, Paul has portrayed the contents of his instruction as an ancient curriculum. This is most clearly the case in 3:1-4, when Paul claims that he provided the Corinthians with milk rather than solid food. Additionally, his teaching was the seed sown into the Corinthians (3:6) as well as the foundation which he laid (3:10). The contents of Paul's teaching were the mysteries entrusted to him (4:1), as well as the "ways" which he taught "in all the churches (4:17).

1 Cor 3:1-4:21 contains a significant cluster of educational motifs, several of which have been overlooked in scholarly treatments of this text. These educational motifs function in Paul as they do in Quintilian or Philo. When read consecutively, Paul's educational motifs identify three basic components of any school in the Corinthian community: teachers, students, and a curriculum. Paul's argument in 3:1-4:21 does not stand in isolation, however, but rather extends the argument begun in 1:10-2:16. This raises the question of whether the educational motifs in 3:1-4:21 are a distinctive feature of this portion of his argument, with little or no bearing on the interpretation of the remainder of 1 Cor 1-4, or whether the rest of 1 Cor 1-4 also contains ancient educational discourse. We turn now to examine instances of educational language and logic in 1 Cor 1:10-2:16.

---

<sup>229</sup> Indeed, some pedagogues may have followed their young masters into the latter's early twenties (see, e.g., Laes, *Children in the Roman Empire*, 119).

## **Chapter 5:**

### **Ancient Education in 1 Cor 1:10-2:16**

On the surface, 1 Cor 1:18-2:16 lacks vivid educational motifs like the metaphors catalogued in the previous chapter. Paul's adaptation of ancient educational discourse, however, was not limited to the use of illustrative metaphors. The educational motifs observed in 3:1-4:21 encourage us not only to skim the surface of the text for references to education, but also to mine it more deeply. If 3:1-4:21 used clear educational language to describe the Corinthian community as a school, perhaps additional educational themes can illumine certain passages in 1:10-2:16 at both the ornamental and the structural levels. Consider the following seven instances which bear linguistic or conceptual similarities with ancient schools. Like the texts discussed in chapter 4, these passages illustrate that Paul treats the Corinthian community as a school beginning in 1 Cor 1:10-2:16. Like chapter 4, the goal of this chapter is simply to identify educational elements of 1 Cor 1:10-2:16, leaving chapter 6 to explain the exegetical significance of these elements.

#### I. Educational Motifs in 1 Cor 1:10-2:16

##### A. Factions as Competing Schools (1:10-13)

In 1 Cor 1:10-17, Paul raises the issue of the Corinthians' factionalism, one of the most significant problems facing the community. The most relevant verses read,

Now I appeal to you, brothers and sisters, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that all of you be in agreement and that there be no divisions among you, but that you be united in the same mind and the same purpose. For it has been reported to me by Chloe's people that there are quarrels among you, my brothers and sisters. What I mean is that each of you says, 'I belong to Paul,' or 'I

belong to Apollos,' or 'I belong to Cephas,' or 'I belong to Christ.' Has Christ been divided? Was Paul crucified for you? Or were you baptized in the name of Paul? (1 Cor 1:10-13)

It has long been recognized that 1 Cor 1:10-13 gives the impression of a fragmented Corinthian community, an ideally unified social group now divided into factions associated with one or another notable Christian leader. The literature on this topic is abundant, and the factions have received a wide variety of competing interpretations.<sup>1</sup> For the purposes of the present exercise, we need only answer one question: Can these factions be reasonably construed as competing schools? On one hand, L.L. Welborn and Margaret M. Mitchell have each argued for a predominately political interpretation of the factions, in which the various parties resemble rival partisan blocs within fractious city-states or other polities, such as voluntary associations.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand, some have suggested that the factions were discrete schools, with the Corinthians subdividing themselves into pools of disciples.<sup>3</sup>

Both interpretations are plausible. Welborn and Mitchell can point to specific vocabulary that calls to mind political discussions of harmony and stasis. Since Paul describes the Corinthian situation using politically loaded terminology such as *σχίσματα*, *ἔριδες*, and *ζῆλος*, and identifies the factions on the basis of their alliances with specific

---

<sup>1</sup> Identifying the nature of these factions has been one of the most consistently investigated questions in modern NT scholarship. See esp., Baur, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde;" idem, *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ*, 268-320; For a renewed defense of Baur's thesis, see Goulder, *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth*, esp. 1-16. See also Nils Dahl, "Paul and the Church at Corinth according to 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21," in *Christian History and Interpretation*, ed. William Farmer, C.F.D. Moule, and Richard R. Niehbur (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967), 313-35; Johannes Munck, "The Church without Factions: Studies in 1 Corinthians 1-4," in idem, *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind* (London: SCM, 1959), 135-67.

<sup>2</sup> L.L. Welborn, "On the Discord in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Ancient Polities," *JBL* 106 (1987): 85-111; Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, esp. 65-99. See further, Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 115-18.

<sup>3</sup> E.g., Munck, "The Church without Factions," 153; Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 41; White, *Where is the Wise Man?* 7.

leadership figures, Welborn concludes that “It is impossible to resist the impression that Paul describes the situation in the church in terms like those used to characterize conflicts within city-states by Greco-Roman historians.”<sup>4</sup> On the other hand, Munck, Winter, and White read the factions as schools, largely on the grounds of their respective reconstructions of the Corinthians’ wisdom as sophistic rhetoric (or, in the case of White, as higher education). Some Corinthians, it appears, preferred Apollos to Paul because he more closely resembled the educated ideal to which they themselves aspired.<sup>5</sup>

Beyond the educational implications of the Corinthians’ wisdom, there are two additional reasons, both derived from the literary context of 1 Cor 1-4, to agree with Munck, Winter, and White’s view of the factions as schools. The first reason is rather straightforward. The educational motifs that we observed in 3:1-4:21 demonstrate that Paul makes frequent use of educational motifs in the first unit of 1 Corinthians. Perhaps this is because he founded the Corinthian community on a scholastic model; or perhaps the Corinthian factions are styling themselves as schools, and he is adapting his response to the Corinthians’ expectations; or perhaps both of these hypotheses are true. In any case, Paul’s use of strong educational language typecasts the community as a school.

Secondly, Paul occasionally accuses the members of these factions of boasting, especially in their human leaders (1:29-31; 3:21; 4:7). As we have seen in the previous chapter, Paul characterized these human functionaries (himself included) as teachers. Boasting in its most basic form is an attempt to present oneself as more distinguished than one’s compatriots, to draw a distinction that renders one superior to another. The

---

<sup>4</sup> Welborn, “On the Discord in Corinth,” 86.

<sup>5</sup> E.g., White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 3, 205.

Corinthians' boasting in men is readily explainable in light of the competitive ethos of ancient education, where it would be natural to boast in the authority or prowess of one's teachers. Bruce Winter has convincingly correlated competition within the Corinthian community with the competition-filled educational institutions of Greece and Rome. He focused his analysis largely on competition within rhetorical schools,<sup>6</sup> but competition was one of the defining characteristics of lower stages of education, as well as rhetorical education.

E.A. Judge correctly observes that one major goal of Greek and Roman schools was to establish the supremacy of an educated individual over both his educated peers and the mass of uneducated people of lower social standing.<sup>7</sup> In the Byzantine period, Eustatius's *Vita Eutychii* records a prayer of the young Eutychius that illustrates this competitive attitude. His request is striking. "Lord," he prays, "grant to me a good mind, so that I may learn my letters and triumph over my companions."<sup>8</sup> Though a late source, Eustatius's *Vita Eutychii* captures the competitive spirit of the Greco-Roman educational tradition, which was a natural outgrowth of a highly competitive society.<sup>9</sup> Competition in schools took two general forms: competition among students, which was intended to

---

<sup>6</sup> Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, esp. 36-38. Similarly, see Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 302.

<sup>7</sup> E.A. Judge, "The Conflict of Educational Aims in the New Testament," 700-701.

<sup>8</sup> Eustatius, *Vita Eutychii Patriarchae Constantinopolitani*, 213-15: Κύριε, ἀγαθὸν νοῦν χάρισαί μοι, ἵνα μάθω τὰ γράμματα καὶ νικῶ τοὺς ἐταίρους μου. My translation.

<sup>9</sup> Morgan writes: "Roman education was steeply hierarchical, with literates at each level looking down on those below. It was highly competitive; so much so that it may be better to think of competition as a structural feature of Roman cultural life, rather than as a means to an end.... The competitive element in education supported that attitude and helped to preserve the status quo, as well as sweetening the pill when social flexibility was inevitable, by disguising new members of the élite as belonging to the same ancient élite culture" ("Assessment in Roman Education," *Assessment in Education* 8 [2001]: 20).



hone ambition, and competition amongst teachers to recruit students or obtain noble patrons, which was often a matter of economic necessity.

Quintilian thought that competition was absolutely essential, since “any person who has no one with whom to compare himself is bound to rate himself too highly.”<sup>10</sup> To that end, he describes favorably one regular competition which he remembered from his own schools days. The good student, he writes,

will think it a disgrace to be outdone by a contemporary, and a fine thing to do better than his seniors.... I remember that my own masters maintained a practice which was not without its uses. Having distributed the boys in classes, they made the order of speaking depend on ability, so that the place in which each of them declaimed was a consequence of the progress which they thought he had made. Judgments were made public; that itself was a tremendous honor, but to be top of the class was most wonderful. The decision was not permanent; the end of the month brought the defeated pupil the chance to compete again, and so success did not encourage the victor to relax.”<sup>11</sup>

Quintilian was not alone in his experience of constant competition in the schoolroom. Hellenistic cities would regularly hold public events in which students competed with one another, striving, for example, to outdo their compatriots in their recitations of poetry.<sup>12</sup> Plutarch describes how one prominent Roman general, Sertorius, in order to Romanize the Iberian inhabitants of Osco, paid for the education of the youth in the city. According to Plutarch, the Iberians “were captivated by what he did with their boys,” noting especially that “the fathers were wonderfully pleased to see their sons, in purple-bordered togas, very decorously going to their schools, and Sertorius paying their

---

<sup>10</sup> *Inst.* 1.2.18 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>11</sup> *Inst.* 1.2.23-24 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>12</sup> See Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome*, 135.

fees for them, holding frequent examinations, distributing prizes to the deserving, and presenting them with the golden necklaces which the Romans call ‘bullae.’”<sup>13</sup>

It seems that the most renowned teachers were those who not only prepared their students for public competition but also integrated competition into their students’ classroom experience. Suetonius describes competition in the school of the grammarian Marcus Verrius Flaccus, who

gained special fame by his method of teaching. For to stimulate the efforts of his pupils, he used to pit those of the same advancement against one another, not only setting the subject on which they were to write, but also offering a prize for the victor to carry off. This was some old book, either beautiful or rare. He was therefore chosen by Augustus as the tutor of his grandsons and he moved to the Palace with his whole school, but with the understanding that he should admit no more pupils. He gave instruction in the hall of the house of Catulus, which at that time formed part of the Palace, and was paid a hundred thousand sesterces a year.<sup>14</sup>

Suetonius provides excellent evidence of the value that Romans placed on competition in education. It seems to have been Flaccus’s ability to introduce rivalry into his lessons that led to Augustus’s selection of him to serve as his grandchildren’s grammarian. Bonner notes also the “fierce competition” amongst teachers engendered by the fee-paying system.<sup>15</sup> These economic pressures could often lead teachers to overpromise and under-deliver.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> Plutarch, *Sert.* 575 (Perrin, LCL).

<sup>14</sup> Suetonius, *Gramm.* 17.1-2 (Rolfe, LCL).

<sup>15</sup> Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome*, 156.

<sup>16</sup> Such fee paying systems contributed to the less than impressive record of Greek sophists. Isocrates spoke for many critics of the sophists when he wrote, “But these professors have gone so far in their lack of scruple that they attempt to persuade our young men that if they will only study under them they will know what to do in life and through this knowledge will become happy and prosperous. More than that, although they set themselves up as masters and dispensers of goods so precious, they are not ashamed of asking for them a price of three or four minae!” (*Soph.* 3 [Norlin, LCL])

It is essential to understand this competitive educational ethos, as it provides an explanation for why the Corinthians would split into factions. If the Corinthian church resembled a school, it would be only natural—especially for Corinthians with some formal education—to seek for ways to achieve higher status in this new environment. Some might have been tempted to treat communal gatherings as the public festivals in which students competed against one another for *bullae*. One way in which they might accomplish this goal would be by associating themselves with the best available teacher. Moreover, if they assumed that Paul and Apollos were operating like Greco-Roman teachers, be they grammarians or sophists, they could be forgiven for assuming that Paul and Apollos were competitors.

#### B. The Cross and Wisdom as Elements of a Curriculum (1:18-25; 2:6-16)

In 1 Cor 1:18-25, Paul describes the λόγος of the cross, which “is foolishness (μωρία) to those who are perishing, but to us who are being saved it is the power of God” (1:18), indeed “the power of God and the wisdom of God” (θεοῦ δύναμιν καὶ θεοῦ σοφίαν) (1:24). Subsequently, in 2:6-16, Paul claims that in addition to this “foolishness,” the apostles, when among a mature audience (ἐν τοῖς τελείοις), “do speak wisdom (σοφίαν), though it is not a wisdom of this age or of the rulers of this age, who are doomed to perish” (2:6).

The connection between the wisdom of God revealed in the λόγος of the cross and the wisdom that Paul provides to the mature is not immediately clear.<sup>17</sup> There are three basic interpretive possibilities. Some have suggested that the “wisdom” of 2:6 is actually

---

<sup>17</sup> For an overview, see Hans-Christian Kammler, *Kreuz und Weisheit*, WUNT 159 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003), 176-85.

identical in content with the precept of the cross.<sup>18</sup> Others suggest that this wisdom is better understood as a more developed form of the precept of the cross.<sup>19</sup> Finally, a third group concludes that it may be a “higher” or “deeper” wisdom with content unrelated to that found in the precept of the cross.<sup>20</sup> From this third group, a few have noted that Paul’s wisdom teaching is consistent with ancient educational theory, which insisted that advanced instruction should only be provided to those who have received the requisite preliminary training.<sup>21</sup>

The educational metaphor distinguishing between milk and solid food, discussed in the previous chapter, provides the single best reason to read the cross and wisdom as successive levels of curricular attainment. In 3:1-4, Paul asserted that while he withheld solid food from his Corinthian students, he gave them “milk” that suited their immaturity.

---

<sup>18</sup> E.g., Kammler, *Kreuz und Weisheit*, 189-91, who argues that the two must be completely identical.

<sup>19</sup> See, e.g., C.F.G. Heinrici, *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*, KEK 5 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896), 93; Hooker, “Hard Sayings,” 21; Ulrich Wilckens, refers to “eine vertiefende Interpretation des anfänglichen λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ” (“Zu 1 Kor 2,1-16,” in *Theologia Crucis, Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Carl Andresen and Günter Klein [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979], 513); Fee, *First Epistle*, 101-3. Schrage, too, seems to identify closely the cross and the wisdom of 2:6. Although he notes that Paul “Gewiss ... so an, dass man eine Weisheit auf Höhere Ebene mit neuen Inhalten für Fortgeschrittenen erwartet.” He also notes: “die Weisheit von V 6 is nicht alternativ zu der mit dem Gekreuzigten identifizierten Weisheit von 1,24.30 zu verstehen (vgl. auch V 12). Nirgendwo findet sich den auch ein Hinweis, dass die Kreuzespredigt auf eine elementare Anfangsverkündigung beschränkt werde” (Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:240). Karl Olav Sandnes, *Paul, One of the Prophets? A Contribution to the Apostle’s Self-understanding*, WUNT 2/43 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991), 84; Sigurd Grindheim, “Wisdom for the Perfect: Paul’s Challenge to the Corinthian Church,” *JBL* 121 (2002): 696.

<sup>20</sup> See, e.g. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 53-55; Grundmann, “Die νήπιοι in der urchristlichen Paränese,” 191; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 79-80; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 83-85; Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*, 138-40, 151-52; Gerd Theissen, *Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987), 346-52.

<sup>21</sup> Markus Bockmuehl contends that “the passage remains consistent with a commonplace of both pagan and Jewish religion in antiquity: secret divine wisdom is properly reserved for those who are qualified.... I am inclined to see this disposition in Paul as a pedagogical measure and as a matter of straightforward common sense” (*Revelation and Mystery*, 159). Conzelmann likewise concluded that “Das Wort vom Kreuz ist der *einzig* Inhalt der predigt Paulus. Von ii. 6 ff her gesehen wird daraus die Erklärung eines verläufigen Verzichts: Das Wort vom Kreuz ist nur die untere Stufe der Lehrer” (“Paulus und die Weisheit,” 238).

As we observed, the common function of the “milk and solid food” metaphor was to distinguish between a higher and a lower level of curricular progression. Encyclical studies should follow rather than proceed the study of the alphabet, just as rhetoric and philosophy should follow encyclical studies. Given Paul’s use of this dietary metaphor, we ought to be on the lookout for possible two-tiered curricula in 1 Cor 1-4. The λόγος of the cross which Paul taught to all corresponds with milk, whereas the hidden wisdom of 2:6-16 corresponds with the solid food. Paul’s claim that he divided his teaching into at least two discrete levels demonstrates his reliance on a commonplace in educational theory ancient and modern: that some learning is propaedeutic, and that instruction ought to be adapted to the capacities of one’s students.

This taxonomic approach to education began in primary schools, in which students learned the rudiments of literacy. Dionysius of Halicarnassus describes the process by which children learned to read:

When we are taught to read, first we learn by heart the names of the letters, then their shapes and their values, then, in the same way, the syllables and their effects, and finally words and their properties, by which I mean the ways they are lengthened, shortened, and scanned; and similar functions. And when we have acquired knowledge of these things, we begin to write and read, syllable by syllable and slowly at first. It is only when a considerable lapse of time has implanted firmly in our minds the forms of the words that we execute them with the utmost ease, and we read through any book that is given to us unfalteringly and with incredible confidence and speed.<sup>22</sup>

---

<sup>22</sup> *Comp.* 25 (Usher, LCL).

For Quintilian, too, children should be taught the alphabet and syllables in the proper order,<sup>23</sup> and teachers should teach only the curriculum proper to their station.<sup>24</sup> He describes the student's progression through these levels of curricula with a metaphor which recurs throughout ancient treatises on education: the ascent of a high mountain.<sup>25</sup> Quintilian writes:

Brilliant, sublime, and richly endowed, [the orator] is lord of all the resources of eloquence which lap around him. The man who has reached the top no longer has an uphill struggle. The hard work in the climb is at the bottom; the further you go, the easier the gradient and the richer the soil. And if, by perseverance, you rise above even these gentler slopes, the fruits offer themselves without effort, and all things come forth unbidden—though unless they are harvested daily, they wither away.<sup>26</sup>

This same metaphor appears throughout Greek and Roman sources. In the *Table of Cebes*, true education—philosophy—is depicted as the ascent of a steep path.<sup>27</sup> The same metaphor appears in satirical form in Lucian's *Hermotimus*, in which an eponymously named student of philosophy explains the state of his philosophical education after twenty years of study. "I am just beginning," explains Hermotimus to his friend Lycinus, "to get a glimpse of my way there. Virtue, says Hesiod, lives far away, and the path to her is long and steep and rough, with plenty of sweat for travelers.... I couldn't be other than perfectly happy if I were at the top. At this moment I am still

---

<sup>23</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.31-32.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. *Inst.* 1.1.8; 2.1.1-13.

<sup>25</sup> See Morgan, *Literate Education*, 262; Criboire, *Gymnastics of the Mind*, 1.

<sup>26</sup> *Inst.* 12.10.78-79 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>27</sup> *Tabula*, 15.1-3. On the *Tabula*, see John T. Fitzgerald and L. Michael White, *The Tabula of Cebes*, SBLTT 24 (Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983). See the helpful commentary in Rainer Hirsch-Luipold, ed., *Das Bildtafel des Kebes: Allegorie des Lebens* (Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft: Darmstadt, 2005).

beginning, Lycinus.”<sup>28</sup> The task of the teacher who assists the student, suggests Lycinus to Hermotimus, is to “let down his own teaching from the top like Zeus’s golden rope in Homer, and clearly pull and lift you up to himself and Virtue.”<sup>29</sup> Implicit in this metaphor is that the teacher must let down the appropriate length of rope to reach his student toiling on the slope below.

All Greek and Roman education, from the study of the alphabet to rhetorical or philosophical training, was intentionally structured to introduce students to basic concepts before attempting to teach them more advanced ones. Progymnastic exercises were also structured according to levels of increasing difficulty,<sup>30</sup> and were themselves preparation for study with a rhetor. Even philosophical replacements for standard Greco-Roman general education like that of Epicurus were structured in a taxonomy distinguishing basic from advanced instruction.<sup>31</sup> When Paul in 1:18-2:16 distinguishes between a wisdom which he proclaimed to all and a wisdom which he reserves for the mature, he is drawing on one of the most basic didactic strategies known to ancient education.

### C. Sage, Scribe, and Sophist (1:20)

Until this point, the identification of educational language, logic, or imagery in 1 Corinthians has required some familiarity with the subtleties of ancient education. 1 Cor

---

<sup>28</sup> *Hermot.* 2 (Kilburn, LCL).

<sup>29</sup> *Hermot.* 3 (Kilburn, LCL).

<sup>30</sup> Kennedy, *Progymnasmata*, ix-x; Hock and O’Neil, *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises*, 82

<sup>31</sup> Asmis, “Basic Instruction in Epicureanism,” 216.

1:20, however, contains a comparatively direct reference to ancient education, specifically to several of the ancient world's most iconic teachers. After referencing the claim of Isa 29:14 LXX that God will sovereignly abnegate human wisdom (1:19), Paul writes: "Where is the one who is wise (σοφός)? Where is the scribe (γραμματεύς)? Where is the debater of this age (συζητητής)? Has not God made foolish the wisdom of the world" (1:20)? As prototypical human wise men, the sage, scribe, and debater's duties included teaching their wisdom to the next generation. Scholars are divided on the exact referents of the terms σοφός, γραμματεύς, and συζητητής,<sup>32</sup> but the terms most likely refer to the philosopher, the Jewish scribe, and the sophist, respectively. Here there is no need to adduce parallel texts, only to demonstrate that these figures were, in addition to their other functions, ancient educators.

Paul's reference to the "wise man," σοφός, refers either to a generic category for a person of great learning, or, more particularly, to the figure of the ancient philosopher.<sup>33</sup> Both readings are plausible, but given the likelihood that the Corinthians' wisdom borrowed from Stoic philosophy, it seems most likely that σοφός in 1:20 refers to a philosopher.<sup>34</sup> In this instance, we ought to bear in mind not only the philosophers' writings, or their polemical conflict with other philosophical schools, but also recall that many philosophers were, in practice, educators. They provided an important alternative to

---

<sup>32</sup> For discussion, see esp. Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:176-77; Winter, *Philo and Paul among the Sophists*, 188-89.

<sup>33</sup> For the former, see esp. see H.A.W. Meyer, who suggested that σοφός was a generic term, with γραμματεύς and συζητητής referring to the Jewish scribe and Hellenistic sophist, respectively (*Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians*, trans. D. Douglas Bannerman and William P. Dickson, 2 vols., KEKNT 6 [Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1877-79] 1:39). For the later, more particular view, see Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 28; Fee, *First Epistle*, 71; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 162.

<sup>34</sup> See Brookins, "The Wise Corinthians" and "Corinthian Wisdom."



the study of rhetoric for those few students who advanced beyond the study of grammar. We catch regular glimpses of the educational context of Epictetus oeuvre,<sup>35</sup> and even Epicurean communities, which reacted strongly against traditional education, were schools dedicated to inculcating a new παιδεία in their followers.<sup>36</sup> In their funerary monuments, philosophers could be depicted in the act of teaching.<sup>37</sup> As the interrogative in 1:20 makes clear (ποῦ), these philosophers are conspicuously absent from the Corinthian community, providing a foil for the apostles.

Along with the sage, Paul points out that the scribe (γραμματεὺς), is also absent from the Corinthian community. Dutch has argued that the γραμματεὺς should be construed as a minor official associated with ephebic education in the gymnasium.<sup>38</sup> But this interpretation is only plausible if one accepts Dutch's hypothesis that Paul, in 1 Corinthians, is critiquing the elite members of the community by using language and imagery which calls to mind their gymnastic education. In the context of the pericope, it is more likely that γραμματεὺς refers to a Jewish scribe.<sup>39</sup> In 1:22-24 Paul makes it clear that the wisdom which God reveals in the cross confronts both Greek and Jewish wisdom. Hence, the γραμματεὺς is a scribe, much like in Ben Sira (Sir 10:5, 38:24). Sirach 38:24, an autobiographical description of the ideal scribe,<sup>40</sup> uses γραμματεὺς for

---

<sup>35</sup> See Hijmans, *Askesis*, 33-53.

<sup>36</sup> Asmis, "Basic Instruction in Epicureanism."

<sup>37</sup> E.g., Hieronymus of Rhodes. See Elisabetta Matelli, "Hieronymus in Athens and Rhodes," 289-314.

<sup>38</sup> Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 284-87. Similarly, Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 108.

<sup>39</sup> Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 28; Fee, *First Epistle*, 71; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:176; to a limited extent, Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 164.

<sup>40</sup> Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 10-11.

the Hebrew סופר.<sup>41</sup> Additionally, as Davies notes, “where education extends beyond the scribal school, it is still likely to be the scribes who educate.”<sup>42</sup> Hence, the scribe was not simply a record keeper, copyist of manuscripts, or a sort of notary public who drew up deeds of sale and other contracts. Scribes certainly fulfilled all these functions but they also served as teachers of Jews youths, educating them in the texts which Carr et al. have identified as the core of the Second Temple Jewish curriculum.

The difficulties with interpreting Paul’s term “debater” (συζητητής) are well known. This New Testament *hapax legomenon* occurs only one other time in all of Greek literature (Ign. *Eph.* 18.1), which is itself a quotation of 1 Cor 1:20. While its etymology is relatively straightforward, the identification of the prototypical wise man to which it refers remains uncertain. Etymological grounds could justifiably lead to reading συζητητής as a reference to the figure of the philosopher. Zeller concludes on etymological grounds that “Verwandte Begriffe wie ζητητής, (συ)ζητεῖν, (συ)ζητήσις sind in der philosophischen Berufsphilosophen erkennen.”<sup>43</sup> The noun probably refers to a teacher other than the philosopher (whom Paul has already dubbed “the sage” [σοφός]). While there is no definitive linguistic evidence, I conclude from the context that Paul regards the συζητητής as the sophist,<sup>44</sup> the ancient equivalent of today’s university

---

<sup>41</sup> Di Lella comments, “In the Judaism of Ben Sira’s time, the scribe ... was a well-travelled, cultured, and pious Jew who was highly trained in the Sacred Scriptures, especially the Law; his principal responsibility was to instruct others in the glories of Israel’s religious heritage and wisdom” (Skehan and Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 450).

<sup>42</sup> Davies, *Scribes and Schools*, 76. Cf. Matt 7:29, where Jesus’s teaching is favorably compared with the teaching of the scribes (ἦν γὰρ διδάσκων αὐτοὺς ὡς ἐξουσίαν ἔχων καὶ οὐχ ὡς οἱ γραμματεῖς αὐτῶν).

<sup>43</sup> Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 108. See also Manfred Lautenschlager, “Abschied vom Disputierer: Zur Bedeutung von συζητητής in 1 Kor 1,20,” *ZNW* 83 (1992): 276–85.

<sup>44</sup> Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 189; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 163-64.

professors.<sup>45</sup> Though the present study has given pride of place to primary educational intuitions, it is worth reminding ourselves that even the vast majority of Quintilian's *Institutio Oratoria*, our single greatest source for ancient primary education, are dedicated to describing rhetorical education.

When Paul distances himself and the community from the sage, the scribe, and the debater, he is demonstrating not only the absence of worldly wisdom from the community, but also the difference between the apostles and the other major teachers of wisdom whom the Corinthians might have found appealing. Each of these three figures ought to be understood as a teacher of higher wisdom, and as representatives of extra-communal educational institutions, they have nothing to do with the Christians in Corinth.

#### D. The Nature of the Students: Wisdom for the Elect (1:26-31)

For Paul, the wisdom which he and other apostles teach is beyond the purview of any sage, scribe, or sophist, no matter what their qualifications are. Interestingly, Paul also indicates that this wisdom lies beyond the capacities of most students. Paul reminds the Corinthians that they were called to receive God's wisdom:

Consider your own call, brothers and sisters: not many of you were wise by human standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth. But God chose what is foolish in the world to shame the wise; God chose what is weak in the world to shame the strong; God chose what is low and despised in the world, things that are not, to reduce to nothing things that are, so that no one might boast in the presence of God. He is the source of your life in Christ Jesus, who became for

---

<sup>45</sup> On the sophists' educational function, see Bowie, "The Importance of the Sophists," 29-59; Morgan, "Rhetoric and Education," 303-19; Criboire, *The School of Libanius*.

us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption, in order that, as it is written, “Let the one who boasts, boast in the Lord.” (1 Cor 1:26-31)

The vast majority of recent scholarship on 1 Cor 1:26-31 has been devoted to questions regarding the Corinthians’ social status, especially the community’s degree of social stratification. In these studies, the “not many” have received a degree of attention disproportionate to their numbers, though perhaps not their influence, in the community.<sup>46</sup> But a straightforward reading of 1:26-31 reveals that the conceptual engine driving Paul’s argument is not primarily sociological dynamics, but God’s calling of the Corinthians. Paul’s rehearsal of Corinthian social status is incidental to the larger point that for those whom God calls, Jesus becomes a special source of wisdom.<sup>47</sup>

Ancient educators understood that their students should be suited to the learning process. This is why Quintilian spent so much time discussing the nature of young children, which he felt was naturally attuned to school lessons.<sup>48</sup> Ps.-Plutarch also emphasized the importance of a nature (φύσις) disposed to receive instruction.<sup>49</sup> It was

---

<sup>46</sup> The foundational statement on social stratification in Corinth remains Gerd Theissen, “Social Stratification in the Corinthian Community: A Contribution to the Sociology of Early Hellenistic Christianity,” in *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*, trans. John H. Schütz (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982), 69-102. Though Theissen’s thesis has been challenged by Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty, and Survival*, there remains a “new consensus” that the Corinthian community contained members of a range of social classes. See Abraham J. Malherbe, *Social Aspects of Early Christianity* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983), 86-87; Wayne A. Meeks, *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983), esp. 51-72. Steven Friesen’s works have made discussions of economic status more terminologically precise. See esp. idem, “Poverty and Paul: Beyond the So-Called New Consensus,” *JSNT* 26 (2004): 323-61; Steven Friesen and Walter Scheidel, “The Size of the Economy and the Distribution of Income in the Roman Empire,” *JRS* 99 (2009): 61-91. See Bruce Longenecker, *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010). For the most comprehensive overview of the Corinthian social stratification currently available, see Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom*, 104-52.

<sup>47</sup> Conzelmann, “Paulus und die Weisheit,” 236.

<sup>48</sup> Cf., e.g., *Inst.* 1.1.1-3.

<sup>49</sup> Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.* 1b-d; 2b.

common to understand a student's learning abilities as results of noble parentage or proper procreative practice.

Within the wisdom tradition, however, we can catch glimmers of another way to answer the question "Who can learn?"<sup>50</sup> Instead of appealing to the capacities of children for memorization or ambition, some sages suggested that students who can receive divine wisdom are God's elect, a special group set apart by God and distinguished by their reception of equally special knowledge. While election traditions in Second Temple Judaism were diverse and multifaceted,<sup>51</sup> Jewish sages occasionally employed the concept of election to indicate either that Israel in general or their students in particular were a special group, set apart by God to receive an equally special distribution of wisdom. This trend is particularly clear in 4QInstruction and Sirach.<sup>52</sup>

The author of 4QInstruction denoted the *mebin*'s elect status by demonstrating both his separation from the non-elect, "the fleshly spirit," and stating that God has instead given him a place among the angels (4Q418 81 1-5). Goff writes, "The *mebin*, in his reflection upon this teaching, was likely supposed to identify with the spiritual people, and thus realize that he is like the angels, not the fleshly spirit. The addressee has affinity with the angels, which distinguishes him from the rest of humankind, those who are not

---

<sup>50</sup> See Fox, "Who Can Learn?" 62-77.

<sup>51</sup> See Sigurd Grindheim, *The Crux of Election*, 35-76.

<sup>52</sup> The connection between election and revealed wisdom is also present in sources beyond the wisdom tradition proper. Consider, e.g., 1 En. 93:10, which claims that at the completion of the seventh week, which is characterized by the presence of great apostasy, "there shall be elected the elect ones of righteousness from the eternal plan of righteousness, to whom shall be given sevenfold instruction concerning all his flock" (Unless otherwise noted, translations of 1 Enoch are taken from James H. Charlesworth, ed., *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*, 2 vols. [Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009]).

in his elect community.”<sup>53</sup> The notion that wisdom belonged properly to the angels is not original to 4QInstruction. 1 Enoch 42:1-2, for example, suggests that when wisdom could not find a suitable dwelling place among human beings it withdrew “to her place and she settled permanently among the angels.” It is no surprise that 4Q417 1 should indicate that God has given special insight to these elect, spiritual persons, insight withheld from the fleshly spirit. In addition to comparing the elect to the angels, 4QInstruction further expresses the notion that wisdom is reserved for an elect group by indicating that the *mebin* has been given the authority, like the protoplast, to tend the trees of the Garden of Eden. These trees are said to be sources of wisdom for the *mebin*,<sup>54</sup> which may indicate that the author of 4QInstruction believed that his students could attain to the wisdom of Adam in the garden.<sup>55</sup>

Ben Sira likewise connects election with the attainment of wisdom, but unlike the author of 4QInstruction he was not concerned with the distinction between angels and fleshly spirits. Ben Sira’s concern is to explain the difference between the wisdom which he saw spread throughout the peoples and cultures of the known world and the Torah, the book of wisdom proper to God’s chosen people, Israel. The notion that God dispensed wisdom liberally among all the nations can be seen clearly in Sir 1:9b-10b: “It is he who created her; he saw her and took her measure; he poured her out upon all his works, upon all the living according to his gift; he lavished her upon those who love him.”<sup>56</sup> Greg Schmidt Goering has convincingly demonstrated that this passage distinguishes between

---

<sup>53</sup> Goff, *4QInstruction*, 17.

<sup>54</sup> 4Q423 1.

<sup>55</sup> Goff, *4QInstruction*, 19.

<sup>56</sup> NETS.

a general dispensation of wisdom to all people and a special gift of wisdom which is available only to the elect, to those who love God.<sup>57</sup> As in other two-stage creation accounts, Ben Sira's opening poem moves from describing the general condition of humanity to explaining the special status of those who love God, whose reward is special wisdom.<sup>58</sup> In the hymn contained in Sir 24, Wisdom states, "Then the creator of all commanded me, and he who created me put down my tent and said, 'Encamp in Iakob, and in Israel let your inheritance be'" (24:8).<sup>59</sup> This wisdom can only be the Torah, for Ben Sira continues: "All these things are the book of the covenant of the Most High God, a law that Moses commanded us, an inheritance for the gatherings of Iakob" (24:23).<sup>60</sup> The Torah, however, is not a book given to the nations but rather to Israel in particular. It follows, then, that in Ben Sira's schema God has chosen to provide Israel with a special source of wisdom, and this special wisdom is perhaps the distinguishing sign of their election.<sup>61</sup>

This is the same logical pattern that we see in 1 Cor 1:26-31, in which Paul associates God's call of the Corinthians with their comprehension of Jesus, "who became for us wisdom from God." Those whom the world would consider wise teachers—sage, scribe, and sophist—are unable to recognize God's wisdom, revealed specially in Jesus

---

<sup>57</sup> Goering, *Wisdom's Root Revealed*, 21-24, 69-102.

<sup>58</sup> On two-stage creation accounts, see Richard J. Clifford, *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible*, CBQMS 26 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1994), 42-49.

<sup>59</sup> NETS.

<sup>60</sup> NETS. The literature on the identical relationship of wisdom and Torah in Sirach is voluminous. For a helpful discussion and extensive footnotes, see Wright, "Torah and Sapiential Pedagogy in the Book of Ben Sira"; similarly, Eckhard J. Schnabel, *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics*, WUNT 2/16 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1985), 10-15.

<sup>61</sup> There may be a similar correlation of election and revealed wisdom in Wisdom of Solomon. See Greg Schmidt Goering, "Election and Knowledge in the Book of Wisdom," in *Studies in the Book of Wisdom*, ed. Géza Xeravits and József Zsengellér, JSJSup 142 (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 163-82.

(1:18-25). This raises a natural question: How is it that the largely “foolish” Corinthians have been able to perceive God’s wisdom when it escapes even the capacities of the wise? Like 4QInstruction and Sirach, Paul suggests that such perception is the result of God’s election. God can bestow wisdom upon whomever he chooses, and God has chosen “to shame the wise” (1:27).

#### E. The Good Teacher Speaks Well (2:1-5)

In 1:17, Paul claims that he intentionally avoided speaking ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου, that is, with eloquent or persuasive diction or argumentation. He adopted this *modus operandi* “so that the cross of Christ might not be emptied of its power.” In 2:1-5, he expands on the reasons for his chosen style:

When I came to you, brothers and sisters, I did not come proclaiming the mystery of God to you in lofty words or wisdom. For I decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ, and him crucified. And I came to you in weakness and in fear and in much trembling. My speech and my proclamation were not with plausible words of wisdom, but with a demonstration of the Spirit and of power, so that your faith might rest not on human wisdom but on the power of God. (1 Cor 2:1-5)

Over the last twenty years, it has become increasingly common to read ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου in 1:17 and similar phrases and terms in 2:1-5 as ancient rhetorical technical terms.<sup>62</sup> On the basis of this terminology, many conclude that the Corinthians’ preferred “wisdom” was sophistic rhetoric.<sup>63</sup> While this hypothesis certainly has more to recommend it than its

---

<sup>62</sup> E.g., ὑπεροχὴν λόγου (2:1), πειθοῖ [ς] σοφίας [λόγοις] (2:4), ἀποδείξει (2:4). For discussions of these terms, demonstrating that they are not, in fact, explicitly rhetorical, see Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom*, 44-48.

<sup>63</sup> See, e.g., Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 7; Litfin, *St. Paul’s Theology of Proclamation*; Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship*, 92; Shi, *Paul’s Message of the Cross as Body Language*, 157-72.



antecedents (i.e., the Gnostic hypothesis),<sup>64</sup> it can no longer be taken for granted. As noted above, Brookins has convincingly demonstrated that the traditional arguments undergirding the rhetorical hypothesis, especially arguments from the semantic domain of key  $\lambda\omicron\gamma$ - and  $\sigma\omicron\phi$ - stem terms, are more naturally suited to descriptions of ancient philosophical discourse.<sup>65</sup> His identification of Stoic parallels for the ethical issues confronted by Paul in 1 Cor 5-15 further strengthens his argument.<sup>66</sup> Yet, as we have already observed, sophists and philosophers were educators, each with their distinctive modes of speech. Given Paul's tendency to present himself as a teacher, it is surprising that he should decry eloquent speech. By rejecting standard canons for eloquence, he appears to distance himself from one of the most commonly accepted roles of a good teacher: that they should serve as models of excellent speech.

This ideal, according to Quintilian, pertained not only to ancient tertiary educators but also to a child's first tutors:

First of all, make sure the nurses speak properly. Chrysippus wished them, had it been possible, to be philosophers; failing that, he would have us choose the best that our circumstances allowed. No doubt the more important point is their character; but they should also speak correctly. These are the first people the child will hear, theirs are the words he will try to copy and pronounce.<sup>67</sup>

This same principle held true for the child's parents, even the mother.<sup>68</sup> Quintilian suggests that even if parents, nurses, slaves, and pedagogues lack the requisite education,

---

<sup>64</sup> See esp. Lütgert, *Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth*; Ulrich Wilckens, *Weisheit und Torheit*; Walther Schmithals, *Gnosticism in Corinth*.

<sup>65</sup> Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom*, esp. 17-61.

<sup>66</sup> Brookins, "The Wise Corinthians," 51-76.

<sup>67</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.4-5 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>68</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.6-7.

“let there be anyway one person always at hand who knows the right ways of speaking, and who can correct on the spot any faulty expression used by the others in the pupil’s presence, and so stop it becoming a habit.”<sup>69</sup> All of this serves to demonstrate that Quintilian, the man who advocated that fathers ought to secure the very best available teachers for their children,<sup>70</sup> considered a teacher’s powers of speech to be perhaps his most important quality.

Ps.-Plutarch, too, who was more concerned with the production of philosophical virtue than rhetorical eloquence, advises that the young student should be surrounded with “Greeks” who are “distinct of speech (περίτρανα λαλεῖν), so that the children may not be contaminated by barbarians and persons of low character, and so take on some of their commonness. The proverb-makers say, and quite to the point, ‘If you dwell with a lame man, you will learn to limp.’”<sup>71</sup> He then launches into a long section describing the right manner of speech for students (6b-7c), a topic which was also a particular concern of Quintilian.<sup>72</sup>

We naturally expect that eloquence was a *sine qua non* for a budding rhetorician, but Quintilian’s and Ps.-Plutarch’s insistence on a teacher’s distinct speech are perfectly sensible within a primary classroom as well. The teaching of writing often took place via dictation exercises, in which the teacher would quote a line or two of poetry, and the students would copy it down exactly. Since corporal punishment could be the result of poor performance on classroom exercises, one can imagine that students themselves

---

<sup>69</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.11 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>70</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.10, 23-24; 1.2.5.

<sup>71</sup> Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.* 4a.

<sup>72</sup> See, e.g., his discussion of reading aloud in *Inst.* 1.8.1-3, or of imitating the comic actor in 1.11.1-18.

would prefer teachers with clear diction. Bonner notes that this system posed problems: “Sometimes a boy failed to hear a word properly, or could not spell it, or the master’s enunciation was not as clear as it should have been, and not all teachers were conscientious in correcting errors. It is often the mistakes ... which indicate to papyrologists that they have before them a schoolroom exercise.”<sup>73</sup>

Paul’s denunciation of persuasive or eloquent speech stands diametrically opposed to the clarity of voice expected of ancient educators. While we will wait until the next chapter to explain the significance of Paul’s style of speech for the interpretation of the broader argument of 1 Cor 1-4, we should at least note that when Paul shrugs off rhetorical or philosophical standards for speech, he also appears to reject one of the most fundamental qualities of any ancient teacher.

#### F. The Teacher as Mediator of Revealed Wisdom (2:10b-13)

While Paul may distance himself from some basic qualifications for good Greco-Roman teachers, in the following pericope he makes a claim typical of Jewish wisdom teachers in the Second Temple Period—that he taught the wisdom which he received from the Holy Spirit:

For the Spirit searches everything, even the depths of God. For what human being knows what is truly human except the human spirit that is within? So also no one comprehends what is truly God’s except the Spirit of God. Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the Spirit that is from God, so that we may understand the gifts bestowed on us by God. And we speak of these things in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to those who are spiritual. (1 Cor 2:10b-13)

---

<sup>73</sup> Bonner, *Education in Ancient Rome*, 177.

There are several exegetical puzzles in this text (esp. the referent of the first person plural and the meaning of the Greek phrase πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες),<sup>74</sup> but Paul's broader point is relatively clear. He and some other unnamed persons have received God's Spirit, which knows things beyond the purview of normal human perception. So endowed, Paul can teach these divinely revealed "spiritual things" to members of his communities. His stated reliance upon the Spirit for the contents of his teaching is strikingly similar to the epistemologies of the teachers whose practices are reflected in the Hodayot, Ben Sira, and the Wisdom of Solomon.<sup>75</sup> Though any text which treats the Spirit as the active agent inspiring prophecy, or the source of wisdom, emphasizes the revelatory nature of the Spirit, the Hodayot—which are dependent upon 4QInstruction<sup>76</sup>—Ben Sira, and Wisdom of Solomon provide the closest conceptual and linguistic parallels to Paul's claims to knowledge in 1 Cor 2:10.<sup>77</sup>

Claims to special knowledge are one of the most distinctive features of the community at Qumran.<sup>78</sup> Though the origin or revelatory mechanism of the pre-Essene *maskil's* knowledge in 4QInstruction is unclear,<sup>79</sup> in the case of the Hodayot, teachers

---

<sup>74</sup> See chapter 6, section II.E.

<sup>75</sup> Regarding these epistemologies, see Leo G. Perdue, "Revelation and the Problem of the Hidden God in Second Temple Wisdom Literature," in *Shall Not the Judge of the Earth Do What is Right? Studies on the Nature of God in Tribute to James L. Crenshaw*, ed. David Penchansky and Paul L. Redditt (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000), 206.

<sup>76</sup> On the relationship between 4QInstruction and the Hodayot, see Lange, *Weisheit und Prädestination*, 297; Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 206; Goff, "Reading Wisdom at Qumran," 263-88.

<sup>77</sup> On the Spirit as giver of knowledge in Qumran and Paul, see Jörg Frey, "Paul's View of the Spirit in Light of Qumran," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature*, ed. Jean-Sébastien Rey, STDJ 102 (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 255.

<sup>78</sup> W.D. Davies, "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls," *HTR* 46 (1953): 113-39.

<sup>79</sup> Berg, *Religious Epistemologies*, 52.

derive their knowledge from the Spirit.<sup>80</sup> Consider 1QH<sup>a</sup> 20:11-13, which reads, “And I, the instructor (משכיל), have known you, my God, through the spirit which you gave to me, and I have listened loyally to your wonderful secret (לסוד פלאכה) through your holy spirit. You have opened within me knowledge of the mystery of your wisdom, the source of your power.”<sup>81</sup> Similarly, in Sir 39:6, a passage dedicated to the description of the ideal sage,<sup>82</sup> the sage is said to be filled with “a spirit of understanding” (πνεύματι συνέσεως ἐμπλησθήσεται); interestingly, Ben Sira also correlates his teaching with prophecy (ἔτι διδασκαλίαν ὡς προφητείαν ἐκχεῶ καὶ καταλείψω αὐτήν εἰς γενεὰς αἰώνων) (24:34).<sup>83</sup> Finally, in Wis 9:13-16, the sage mourns because of humanity’s incapacity to know God’s counsel and will:

For who can learn the counsel of God? Or who can discern what the Lord wills? For the reasoning of mortals is worthless (λογισμοὶ ... θνητῶν), and our designs are likely to fail; for a perishable body (φθαρτὸν ... σῶμα) weighs down the soul and this earthy tent burdens the thoughtful mind. We can hardly guess at what is on earth, and what is at hand we find with labor; but who has traced out what is in the heavens?

---

<sup>80</sup> See Martti Nissinen, “Transmitting Divine Mysteries: The Prophetic Role of Wisdom Teachers in the Dead Sea Scrolls” in *Scripture and Tradition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, JSJSup 126 (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 513-33.

<sup>81</sup> Unless otherwise noted, translations of the Dead Sea Scrolls other than 4QInstruction are taken from Florentino García Martínez, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1999). Cf 1QH<sup>a</sup> 5:24-25.

<sup>82</sup> See, e.g., Pancratius C. Beentjes, “Scripture and Scribe: Ben Sira 38:34c-39:11,” in idem, *Happy the One Who Meditates on Wisdom (Sir 14,20): Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira* (Leuven: Peeters, 2006), 115-22.

<sup>83</sup> See, e.g., Leo G. Perdue, “Ben Sira and the Prophets,” in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella*, ed. Jeremy Coley and Vincent Skemp, CBQMS 38 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 2005), esp. 135-42.

Yet humanity is not utterly lost. “Who,” the sage asks in 9:17, “has learned your counsel, unless you have given wisdom (σοφίαν) and sent your holy spirit (τὸ ἅγιόν σου πνεῦμα) from on high?”<sup>84</sup>

The religious epistemologies of 1QH<sup>a</sup> 20, Ben Sira’s ideal sage, and the Wisdom of Solomon are strikingly similar to Paul’s argument in 2:6-16: God and God’s “wonderful secret” may be known through the revelatory agency of the Spirit. Moreover, in the cases of 1QH<sup>a</sup> 20 and Ben Sira, these epistemologies are specifically connected with sage. In this respect, they differ from the “empirical” religious epistemology found in Qoheleth, in which careful reflection upon natural phenomena is the way to wisdom.<sup>85</sup> Paul, like the anonymous teacher of 1QH<sup>a</sup> 20, Ben Sira, and the Wisdom of Solomon, claims that he knows God’s secrets through the agency of God’s own Spirit. This knowledge, and not eloquence, lends him authority as a teacher.

### G. Adapting Instruction for the Student (2:13-16)

In 1 Cor 2:13-16, Paul hints at the reason why he did not provide the Corinthians with more advanced wisdom he received from the Spirit:

And we speak of these things in words not taught by human wisdom but taught by the Spirit, interpreting spiritual things to those who are spiritual. Those who are unspiritual do not receive the gifts of God’s Spirit, for they are foolishness to them, and they are unable to understand them because they are spiritually discerned. Those who are spiritual discern all things, and they are themselves subject to no one else’s scrutiny. ‘For who has known the mind of the Lord so as to instruct him?’ But we have the mind of Christ. (1 Cor 2:13-16)

---

<sup>84</sup> Cf. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 12:29-32.

<sup>85</sup> Michael V. Fox, “Qoheleth’s Epistemology,” *HUCA* 58 (1987): 137-55.

As we have observed, Paul and other ancient educators divided their curriculum into multiple, successive stages. If we could ask an ancient teacher why it was essential so to divide his curriculum, he would have replied that human nature required it. Not all students were suited to the curriculum of advanced educational stages. This is the logic of Paul's distinction between "those who are unspiritual" (ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος) and "those who are spiritual (ὁ δὲ πνευματικός) in vv. 14-15. He will develop this distinction in 3:1, when he will claim that he could not address the Corinthians "as spiritual people" (ὡς πνευματικοῖς) but only "as people of the flesh" (ὡς σαρκίνοις).<sup>86</sup>

All pedagogy presupposes a measure of anthropological reflection. Teachers in antiquity, whether Greeks,<sup>87</sup> Romans,<sup>88</sup> or Jews,<sup>89</sup> tended to categorize their students according to their talents and habits. Paul's use of πνευματικός and ψυχικός 1 Cor 2:14-15 are beholden to Jewish exegesis of the creation narratives in Gen 1-2.<sup>90</sup> It is possible that when Paul uses the term ψυχικός the term has a meaning akin to the רוה בשר of 4QInstruction (e.g., 4Q418 81).<sup>91</sup> Pearson, and others after him, assumed that the

---

<sup>86</sup> Cf. the similar distinction in Rom 7:14.

<sup>87</sup> Cf., e.g., Ps-Plutarch, *Lib. ed. 2a*, which emphasizes the importance of a student's "nature," and *Lib. ed. 5e*, which discusses the special contributions of "mind" and "reason" to nature.

<sup>88</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.1-2 assumes that most children were naturally inclined to learning, and *Inst.* 1.3.1-5 identifies good students based on their capacity for memory and imitation.

<sup>89</sup> See the helpful discussion of Proverbs and Egyptian wisdom teaching in Michael V. Fox, "Who Can Learn?"

<sup>90</sup> Cf., 1 Cor 15:44-49. On the creation traditions, see the exegesis of 2:6-16 in chapter 6, section II.E. See esp., Birger A. Pearson, *The pneumatikos-psychichos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and its Relation to Gnosticism*, SBLDS 12 (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press, 1973), 15-26.

<sup>91</sup> See Matthew Goff, "Being Fleshly or Spiritual: Anthropological Reflection and Exegesis of Genesis 1-3 in 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians," in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood*, ed. Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor W. Thompson, WUNT 284 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 41-59.

presence of these creation traditions were examples of Paul's quoting the Corinthians' own "wisdom" (understood as a form of Hellenistic-Judaism) back at them;<sup>92</sup> however, since the Corinthians' "wisdom" was more likely a form of Stoicism, when Paul develops Jewish creation traditions we should read them as components of his own thinking.<sup>93</sup>

While Glad has previously correlated Paul's didactic adaptability with the psychagogic practice of the Epicureans, adaptability was equally essential for ancient teachers working at lower curricular levels.<sup>94</sup>

It was common for ancient Jewish, Greek, and Roman authors to insist that teachers should teach their students only what is appropriate for their developmental stage, and students ought to focus on learning what is appropriate for their stage of development. This is the type of curricular logic structuring an admonition like Sir 3:21-24:

Things too difficult for you do not seek, and things too strong for you do not scrutinize. The things that have been prescribed for you, think about these, for you have no need of hidden matters. With matters greater than your affairs, do not meddle, for things beyond human understanding have

---

<sup>92</sup> See esp., Richard A. Horsley, "Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos: Distinctions of Spiritual Status among the Corinthians," in idem, *Wisdom and Spiritual Transcendence at Corinth: Studies in First Corinthians* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008), 1-20; James A. Davis, *Wisdom and Spirit: An Investigation of 1 Corinthians 1.18-3.20 against the Background of Jewish Sapiential Traditions in the Greco-Roman Period* (Lanham: University Press of America, 1984); Gerhard Sellin, "Das 'Geheimnis' der Weisheit und das Ratsel der 'Christuspartei' (zu 1 Kor 1-4)," *ZNW* 73 (1982) 69-96; idem, *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten: Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung von 1 Korinther 15*, FRLANT 138 (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986); Gregory E. Sterling, "'Wisdom among the Perfect': Creation Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism and Corinthian Christianity," *NovT* 37 (1995): 355-84.

<sup>93</sup> Similarly, e.g., Egon Brandenburger, *Fleisch und Geist: Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit*, WMANT 29 (Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968). Brandenburger uses Philo to illumine Paul's own thinking (rather than the background of the Corinthians).

<sup>94</sup> Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 53-89, 236-95.



been shown to you. For their presumption has led many astray, and their evil fancy has diminished their understanding.<sup>95</sup>

Ben Sira was concerned that students' ambitions for learning not get the better of them. Philo, however, recognized that it was not always overeager students that led to the premature study of advanced topics. He thinks that teachers

who when they set about giving their lessons keep in view their own great superiority and not the capacity of their pupils, are simpletons, who are not aware how vast is the difference between a lesson and a display. For the man who is giving a display uses to the full the rich yield of the mastery which he possesses, and without let or hindrance brings forward into the open the results of hours spent in labour by himself at home. Such are the works of artists and sculptors. In all this he is trying to gain the praise of the public. The man, on the other hand, who is setting out to teach, is like a good doctor, who with his eyes fixed not on the vastness of his science but on the strength of his patient, applies not all that he has ready for use from the resources of his knowledge—for this is endless—but what the sick man needs, seeking to avoid both defect and excess.<sup>96</sup>

For this reason, Philo argues, “we must not grant everything to everybody, but what corresponds (in kind) to the need (or business) of those who want something.”<sup>97</sup>

As we would by now expect, Quintilian also insists that it is the teacher's duty to provide only the instruction to which their students were suited. He suggests that it was the teacher's first job, before all else, to take stock of the natural abilities of the students gracing their classroom.<sup>98</sup> This is especially so for young students, who, unless their

---

<sup>95</sup> NETS.

<sup>96</sup> Philo, *Post.* 141 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>97</sup> Philo, *Post.* 141-142 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>98</sup> *Inst.* 1.3.1-7.

teachers provide properly adapted tasks, will find learning to be fear-inducing rather than pleasant.<sup>99</sup> Quintilian worries that

Elementary students will scarcely dare raise themselves to any hope of reproducing what they believe to be a crowning achievement of eloquence; they will prefer to embrace what is closest to them, just as vines trained on trees climb to the top by first taking hold of the lower branches. So true is this that it is the master's own duty too, if (that is) he prefers the serviceable to the showy, not to begin by overloading his pupils' limited strength when he is dealing with unformed minds, but to keep his own powers under control and come down to his hearer's intellectual level.<sup>100</sup>

This same concern appears in Ps.-Plutarch, who, like Philo and Quintilian, saw the virtue in tailoring one's instruction to their students' needs and capacities:

It is this: in their eagerness that their children may the sooner rank first in everything, they lay upon them unreasonable tasks, which the children find themselves unable to perform, and so come to grief; besides, being depressed by their unfortunate experiences, they do not respond to the instruction which they receive. For, just as plants are nourished by moderate applications of water, but are drowned by many in succession, in the same fashion the mind is made to grow by properly adapted tasks, but is submerged by those which are excessive. Children must be given some breathing-space from continued tasks, for we must bear in mind that our whole life is divided between relaxation and application.<sup>101</sup>

Perhaps the Corinthians, like overeager students, desire to find themselves in the first ranks, progressing in Christian παιδεία beyond the capacities of their fellows. The teacher's task, according to Ps.-Plutarch, is to assess the abilities of their wards and give them the instruction they need, not the instruction they want.

---

<sup>99</sup> *Inst.* 1.1.20.

<sup>100</sup> *Inst.* 1.2.26-27 (Russell, LCL).

<sup>101</sup> *Lib. ed.* 9b-c (Babbitt, LCL).

While some have argued vigorously against the notion that Paul advocated a two-tiered Christianity in Corinth, the parallel texts adduced here demonstrate that Paul's concern was not to separate the Corinthians into groups of average and gifted students, but rather, like a good teacher, to explain that his care for his students required that he adapt his instruction to their developmental stage. Paul recognized that he would be doing the Corinthians no favors if he taught them mysteries for which they were not prepared, just as parents would be derelict if they fed steak to an infant. The divisions, so troubling to many scholars, between the *πνευματικός* and the *ψυχικός* are not, for Paul, rigid anthropological markers but rather heuristic terms denoting stages progress in the Christian life, progress which Paul describes using basic educational logic.

## II. Conclusion: The Community as School in 1:18-2:16

Paul's passing allusion to three of the most recognizable teachers in antiquity—sage, sophist, and scribe—notwithstanding, 1:18-2:16 lacks explicit educational metaphors and *topoi* comparable to those observed in 3:1-4:21. Nevertheless, ancient educational theory and practice is no less present in 1:18-2:16 than it is in 3:1-4:21. Paul's argument relies on many basic educational concepts for its force. The distinction between milk and solid food, discussed in the previous chapter, enables us to identify the *λόγος* of the cross (1:18) and higher wisdom (2:6) as the corresponding elements of that particular metaphor, and Paul's distinction between *πνευματικός* and *ψυχικός* in 2:14-15 betrays not a rigid anthropological dualism but a pedagogical concern to tailor instruction for the capacities of one's students.

The educational motifs in 1 Cor 1:18-2:16 fulfill the same function as the educational motifs in 3:1-4:21: They present Paul as a teacher, the members of the community as students, and the contents of Paul's instruction as components in a curriculum with successive stages. If the above summary has achieved its goal, it should now be clear that educational discourse is a constant feature in Paul's argument in 1 Cor 1-4. Consequently, we turn now to provide a reading of Paul's argument in these, the opening chapters of 1 Corinthians, seeking to understand the ways in which he has received and adapted Greek, Roman, and Jewish educational practices and institutions in order to address the Corinthian crisis.

## Chapter 6:

### Good Teachers, Bad Students, and the Argument of 1 Cor 1:10-4:21

The persistent educational imagery, language, and logic we have observed throughout 1 Cor 1-4 may not be a magic key which will unlock every mystery in this text, but it can provide leverage on at least one vexing and critical issue: the lack of scholarly agreement over what, exactly, Paul is arguing in 1 Cor 1-4 and how he is arguing it. Given the material provided in the previous chapters, I will argue that in 1 Cor 1-4 Paul presents the community as a school to two distinct but related ends: to rehabilitate his reputation among the Corinthians and to correct the errors that led to their fractured community. To achieve the first goal, Paul crafts his apology to present himself specifically as a good teacher, rather than as a generic moral individual. In order to achieve his second goal, he admonishes the Corinthians by likening them to poor students. Paul goes about defending himself and critiquing the Corinthians by drawing on the conventions of a particular vision of ancient education. Paul explains that he only behaves as one would expect a good teacher to behave, and that the Corinthians are his students who have failed to learn a very basic lesson while claiming to be wise.

#### I. Censure and Apology: The Argumentative Aims of 1 Cor 1-4

Previous scholarship is sharply divided regarding the question of the rhetorical mode in which Paul addresses the Corinthians.<sup>1</sup> Some read 1 Cor 1-4 as a censure

---

<sup>1</sup> See the overview of these rhetorical modes in Johan S. Vos, "Die Argumentation des Paulus in 1 Kor 1:10-3:4," in *The Corinthian Correspondence*, ed. Reimund Bierenger, BETL 125 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996), 87-88.

(ἐπιτίμησις) of the Corinthians' factionalism,<sup>2</sup> while others read it as Paul's apology (ἀπολογία)<sup>3</sup> for his apostolic ministry.<sup>4</sup> Most interpreters have assumed or claimed outright that only one of these argumentative modes could be at play in 1 Cor 1-4, but, as Bruce Winter has shown, this is a false dichotomy. The material in these chapters does not fit into a single rhetorical genre.<sup>5</sup> Exegetes err when they insist that ancient rhetorical genres occupied hermetically sealed containers, inexorably separated from one another. Argumentative modes that were discrete in theory were often blended in practice, and in the case of 1 Cor 1-4, Paul required both ἀπολογία and ἐπιτίμησις. He must identify the Corinthians' error and censure those propagating it but he must also rehabilitate his

---

<sup>2</sup> Ernest Best, "The Power and Wisdom of God," in *Paolo: A Una Chiesa Divisa (1 Cor 1-4)*, ed. Lorenzo de Lorenzi (Rome: Abbazia di S. Paolo, 1980), 14; Stanley K. Stowers, *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*, LEC 5 (Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986), 96, 108, 128; Fiore, *Personal Example*, 168-76; Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 117; Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, esp. 209-10.

<sup>3</sup> See esp., F.C. Baur, "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde," esp. 84-85, where he reads 1 Cor 1-4 as "der erste apologetische Abschnitt, im welchem der Apostel eine Rechtfertigung seiner apostolischen Auctorität und Wirksamkeit gibt." See too, Dahl, "Paul and the Church at Corinth;" Dahl later argued that 1 Cor 1-4 contains "apologetic elements" (*Studies in Paul* [Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977], 61 n.50); Peter Marshall, *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul's Relations with the Corinthians*, WUNT 2/23; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987), 217; Karl Planck, *Paul and the Irony of Affliction*, SemeiaSt (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987), 12-24; Litfin, *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation*, 171, 185; Fee, *First Epistle to the Corinthians*, 48-49; Vos, "Die Argumentation des Paulus," 89-90.

<sup>4</sup> Alternatively, David W. Kuck argues that 1 Cor 1-4 is neither admonitory nor apologetic but paraenetic (*Judgment and Community Conflict: Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5*, NovTSup 66 [Leiden: Brill, 1992], 223-39). Kuck suggests that Paul is encouraging the Corinthians to behave in ways which they already know to be moral. This implies that the Corinthians have understood the meaning of Paul's teaching, which is unlikely.

<sup>5</sup> Winter writes that Paul's "apologia must be seen as his critique of the Corinthians and not simply a justification of his *modus operandi*. Like Aristides, who concluded his apologetic oration to a friend with 'Call these remarks a defense (ἀπολογία), or if you wish, a well intentioned censure (ἐπιτίμησις), or even a combination of the two,' Paul in 1 Corinthians 1-4 clearly combines both" (*Philo and Paul among the Sophists*, 182. Citing Aelius Aristides, *Or.* 33.34). The blend of apology with other rhetorical modes was not unique to Aristides or Paul. On Josephus's similar blend of these two rhetorical modes, see Aryeh Kasher, "Polemic and Apologetic Modes of Writing in *Contra Apionem*," in *Josephus's Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Missing Portion in Greek*, ed. Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison, AGJU 34 (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 143-86.

reputation among his Corinthian critics. Otherwise, why should they listen to Paul for the remainder of the epistle?

While Winter is correct that both apology and rebuke permeate our text, there is a good reason that so many interpreters have struggled with the genre of 1 Cor 1-4. Reading 1 Cor 1-4 as both apology and censure makes it difficult to interpret the epistle's opening movement as a single, cohesive passage. If Paul oscillates between defense and reprimand, does it not appear as though the introduction to 1 Corinthians contains at least two sub-arguments that are not necessarily compatible? The following pages will advance Winter's conclusions by arguing that Paul's adaptation of common elements of ancient educational theory and practice lends cohesion to 1 Cor 1-4. If Paul has a single goal in 1 Cor 1-4, it is to put the Corinthian school in right working order, and that involves reestablishing the teacher's authority and disciplining unruly students.

## II. Exegesis of 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21

### A. The Community unlike the Schools (1:10-17)

As is often the case in Paul's letters, his introduction and thanksgiving set the thematic stage for the ensuing argument.<sup>6</sup> The same is true in 1:1-9—the epistle's

---

<sup>6</sup> Peter T. O'Brien, *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009), 261-63. On the thanksgiving, see Paul Schubert, *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings*, BZNW 20 (Berlin: Töpelmann, 1939). Philip L. Tite argues that "the prescript ... was an opening act of discursive positioning of the sender(s) and recipient(s)" ("How to Begin, and Why? Diverse Functions of the Pauline prescript with a Greco-Roman Context," in *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, PAST 6 [Leiden: Brill, 2010], 59). David W. Pao likewise notes that Paul's introductory thanksgivings offer "a preview of the theological emphases in the body of the respective epistles" ("Gospel within the Constraints of an Epistolary Form: Pauline Introductory Thanksgivings and Paul's Theology of Thanksgiving," in *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*, ed. Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams, PAST 6 [Leiden: Brill, 2010], 104).

salutation (vv. 1-3) and thanksgiving (vv. 4-9)—which culminate with Paul’s thanks for the fellowship (κοινωνία) with Christ that Christians share (1:9; cf. 2:2).<sup>7</sup>

After extolling the blessings of fellowship with Jesus, Paul immediately addresses the problem of the Corinthian factions, which resemble rival Greco-Roman schools (1:10-12).<sup>8</sup> He cannot skirt this issue, fearing that his letter will further alienate any in the community who have already found him lacking.<sup>9</sup> Paul urges “that all of you be in agreement and that there be no divisions (σχίσματα) among you, but that you be united in

---

<sup>7</sup> The force of the genitive in the phrase κοινωνίαν τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν is ambiguous. It could reflect either participation in Christ or fellowship that Christians have with one another. For the former, see Barrett, *First Epistle*, 40; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 29; for the latter, see, e.g., Ben Witherington III, *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995), 89. Given that Paul will emphasize conformity to Christ throughout 1 Corinthians, the former seems more likely (cf. e.g., 1:30a).

<sup>8</sup> See chapter 5, section I.A. For any who prefer to interpret the factions as ancient polities other than schools, like political parties within a divided city state, it is worth noting that several ancient sources correlate a well-educated citizenry with social unity. Josephus is a prime example. In *C. Ap.* 2.145-89, Josephus argues that social unity is the result of the successful joining of word and deed in a community’s educational system. Jews, he contends, enjoy communal unity because the Law, the Mosaic constitution, orders Jewish society by means of the right balance of λόγος and practice ἔργον; this is because Moses had both a sufficiently lofty conception (λόγος) of the divine and a system of right behavior (ἔργον) that accorded with his high theology (*C. Ap.* 2.164-67). This social harmony, Josephus argues, made the Jews an exemplary polity, especially when compared with fractious Greek city-states. Greek philosophers also knew some truths about God—albeit truths they had learned from Moses (*C. Ap.* 2.168). But, when compared with Moses, who made his λόγος publicly available in the Torah, Josephus finds them lacking, because they “confined their philosophy to a few and did not dare to disclose the truth of their doctrine to the masses, who were in the grip of opinions. But our legislator, by putting deeds in harmony with words (τὰ ἔργα παρέχων σύμφωνα τοῖς λόγοις), not only won consent from his contemporaries but also implanted this belief about God in their descendants, [such that it is] unchangeable” (*C. Ap.* 2.169 [trans. Barclay]). On Josephus’s description of the Jewish constitution and education, see esp. John M.G. Barclay, “Matching Theory and Practice: Josephus’ Constitutional Ideal and Paul’s Strategy in Corinth,” in idem, *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews*, WUNT 275 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011), 81-106; Tessa Rajak, “The *Against Apion* and the Continuities in Josephus’s Political Thought,” in *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction* (Leiden: Brill, 2002), 195-218; Yehoshua Amir, “Θεοκρατία as a Concept of Political Philosophy: Josephus’ Presentation of Moses’ *Politeia*,” *Scripta Classica Israelica* 8-9 (1985-88): 83-105; Christine Gerber, *Ein Bild des Judentums für Nichtjuden von Flavius Josephus: Untersuchungen zu seiner Schrift Contra Apionem* (Leiden: Brill, 1997). It would be entirely natural for Paul to address a problem of social disunity by returning to the principles learned in the course of a citizen’s education.

<sup>9</sup> Dahl, “Paul and the Church at Corinth,” 325.



the same mind and the same purpose” (1:10).<sup>10</sup> These are the “quarrels” (ἔριδες) of which Chloe’s emissaries informed Paul.<sup>11</sup> The Corinthians’ divisions are the results of these quarrels,<sup>12</sup> evidence that they have adopted a Greco-Roman scholastic ethos which led members of the community to align themselves exclusively with one or another teacher.<sup>13</sup>

After naming the problem in 1:10-11, Paul makes a first attempt in 1:12-17 to undermine this scholastic ethos. Though his arguments here are not linear, they set the stage for several of his more developed arguments in 1:18-4:21. Paul first asserts that, whatever the number of apostles, Christ is undivided (1:13). His biting, rhetorical questions implicitly censure the Corinthians for falling away from unity in Christ. 1 Corinthians 1:13a— “Has Christ been divided?”—makes it clear that Paul thinks Christ and factionalism are incompatible, but the question does not explain why.<sup>14</sup> A city, after all, can be one, sharing common purposes and institutions, and yet admit a multitude of teachers of different capabilities and schools of thought. Even so, the implied answer to Paul’s question is absolutely clear: Christ has not been divided. Christ is one, and the Corinthians were baptized in his name, not in the names of Paul or Apollos (1:13b; cf. 3:23). Hence, if they are in Christ, they must be one. Paul will expand on this thesis at

---

<sup>10</sup> For a political interpretation of 1:10 and the factions, see Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 68-80. For a rhetorical/educational interpretation, see Munck, “The Church without Factions,” 152-54.

<sup>11</sup> Fee, *First Epistle*, 54-55.

<sup>12</sup> On the relationship between the four figures named as heads of the parties and the parties themselves, see esp. Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:142-48.

<sup>13</sup> Munck, “The Church without Factions,” 152-54; Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 302; White, *Where is the Wise Man?* 3, 205.

<sup>14</sup> Paul’s arguments leave some premises unstated. See John D. Moores, *Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New Perspective*, SNTSMS 82 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995); Marc J. Debanné, *Enthymemes in the Letters of Paul*, LNTS 303 (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2006).

length in 3:5-4:5, where he will indicate that he and Apollos cooperate, teaching the same students in the same place. Their work is complementary, not competitive (cf. 3:1-4:6).

Furthermore, in 1:14-16 Paul rejoices that he limited the number of baptisms he performed in Corinth. Given baptism's importance as an initiation ritual in early Christian communities, it is striking that Paul expresses relief that he refrained from baptizing many Corinthians during his foundational visit (1:14-16). Rather than lessening the importance of baptism in Pauline communities, this claim serves a particular end in the argument. It allows Paul to renounce any claim to authority over a Pauline faction that might have special loyalty to him as the apostle who baptized them.<sup>15</sup> Since all were baptized into Christ's name (1:13b), not even Crispus, Gaius, or the household of Stephanus can properly claim special membership in a Pauline faction (1:14-16). For any who had interpreted their baptism as a reason for identifying with one apostle instead of another, Paul insists that the functionary performing the baptism is nothing compared with Christ.

Lastly, in 1:17, Paul alludes to the primary reason why some Corinthians came to prefer other teachers to him. When proclaiming the gospel, he intentionally avoided eloquent discourse, speaking οὐκ ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου. Some members of the Corinthian community had evaluated Paul and the other apostles according to the standards of wisdom regnant in Hellenistic schools of philosophy or rhetoric.<sup>16</sup> Paul's defensive tone in 1:17 has rightly led some to categorize 1 Cor 1-4 as an apology. As Best points out,

---

<sup>15</sup> Barrett, *First Epistle*, 48; Fee, *First Epistle*, 61-62; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:155; Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 94.

<sup>16</sup> Munck, "The Church without Factions," 152-54; Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 302; White, *Where is the Wise Man?* 3, 205.

“It (sic) Paul felt his position to be threatened, then we should expect to see the nature of the threat in v.17.... Were there some in Corinth who said that God had sent them to speak ἐν σοφίᾳ λόγου?”<sup>17</sup>

Paul’s rejection of eloquent discourse might be viewed as a potential obstacle to the present argument that he relies upon the logic and imagery of education to present himself and Apollos as teachers. If Paul presents himself as a good teacher, how can he reject something as fundamental to the teacher as elegant speech?<sup>18</sup> In 1:17, Paul defends himself by explaining that the discursive style prized by ancient educators would have diminished the power of his message, the Messiah’s cross (ἵνα μὴ κενωθῆ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ). It is not that he could not speak eloquently, but that he chose not to. An accomplished teacher knows when and why to use polished discourse. Paul will make clear in 1:18-25 and 2:1-5 exactly why eloquent discourse and the cross are incompatible.

1 Corinthians 1:10-17 introduces not only Paul’s argumentative goals of apology and censure but also several of the most important themes by which he will defend himself and critique the Corinthians: 1) Paul’s explanation of his mode of discourse when speaking about the cross will be one of the key components of his apology, 2) his attempt to undermine the legitimacy of the Pauline faction should also be interpreted as an apologetic move, and 3) by addressing the problem of baptism he reassures adherents of other factions that he is not attacking them to the exclusion of his own followers.

In addition to these apologetic themes, 1:10-17 has also highlighted the Corinthians’ factionalism as a serious error that is incompatible with the undivided

---

<sup>17</sup> Best, “The Power and Wisdom of God,” 13.

<sup>18</sup> On the importance of a teacher’s elegant speech, see chapter 5, section I.E.

Christ. Yet Paul does not simply order the Corinthians to reunite and be done with it. Instead, as his argument plays out, it will become clear that while he understands factionalism as incompatible with Christian life, he also sees it as a symptom of a deeper problem with the Corinthians' understanding of the implications of the cross.

### B. The Precept of the Cross (1:18-25)

In 1:18-25, Paul offers an exposition of the λόγος of the cross, the first stage of his distinctive curriculum,<sup>19</sup> with special emphasis on the differences between the λόγος of the cross and the wisdom common in Greeks, Roman, and Jewish schools. We ought to dwell at length upon the λόγος of the cross, since it is perhaps the key to the entire argument of 1 Cor 1-4. The phrase ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ has been subject to two distinct, albeit complementary, interpretations. One emphasizes the phrase's semantic content, while the other emphasizes the form or style of Paul's preaching. Against this dichotomy, Best rightly observes that while "these two aspects [form and content] are probably not wholly distinguishable ... on each occasion one may be more emphasized than the other."<sup>20</sup> In the present instance, it is likely that ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ in 1:18 emphasizes the contents of Paul's teaching rather than his style.<sup>21</sup>

---

<sup>19</sup> On the taxonomic structure of Paul's curriculum, see, e.g., chapter 4, sections II.A-C; chapter 5, section I.B.

<sup>20</sup> Best, "Power and Wisdom," 14.

<sup>21</sup> In 2:1-5, Paul will discuss the problem of his inelegant discursive style. But this discussion of rhetorical style is best understood as an attempt to prove that his deeds conform to a previously stated precept, specifically the precept of the cross. For such an argument to hold, however, he must first define the precept and its implications, which is the task of 1:18-25.

The best reason to read ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ as a reference to content rather than form comes from analysis of the dietary metaphor of 3:1-4.<sup>22</sup> In that passage, the λόγος of the cross is the metaphorical equivalent of milk, while other, higher wisdom is solid food.<sup>23</sup> In all of the parallel occurrences of the “milk and solid food” metaphor, the milk designated an early curricular stage of education which prepared students for later, more advanced stages. Quintilian’s and Philo’s uses of this dietary metaphor make it especially clear that this milk was the contents of the education in question, the curriculum being taught.<sup>24</sup> Consequently, ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ can be construed as a heuristic term for the first and foundational lesson that Paul taught the Corinthians. To emphasize that Paul presents ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ as the contents of a curriculum, I will translate ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ as “the precept of the cross.” As will be seen in the exegesis of 1:26-4:21, Paul relies on that content to justify his behavior (especially explaining the harmony between his curriculum and his manner of teaching), and to demonstrate that the Corinthians’ behavior is not in harmony with the precept of the cross.<sup>25</sup>

The exact content of the precept of the cross admits multiple interpretations. Conzelmann calls the precept of the cross “an exhaustive statement of the content of the gospel,” while Barrett more modestly suggests that “the genitive [τοῦ σταυροῦ] ...

---

<sup>22</sup> See chapter 4, section II.A.

<sup>23</sup> See Grundmann, “Die νήπιοι in der urchristlichen Paränese,” 188-205; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 79-80; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 71-72. *Contra* Hooker, “Hard Sayings: 1 Cor 3:2,” 19-22; Francis, “As Babes in Christ,” 41-60.

<sup>24</sup> Cf., e.g., Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.4.5; Philo, *Agr.* 9.

<sup>25</sup> See, e.g., Alexandra R. Brown, *The Cross and Human Transformation: Paul’s Apocalyptic Word in 1 Corinthians* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995), 74.

denotes the theme of the *message*, or discourse.”<sup>26</sup> At bare minimum, the precept of the cross must be a heuristic term denoting the propositional content of the instruction that Paul delivered to the community during his first and foundational stay in Corinth. Given Paul’s claim in 2:2 that he “decided to know nothing among you except Jesus Christ, and him crucified,” the precept of the cross probably entails at least the first stage in the creedal outline Paul provides in 15:1-11, especially vv. 3b-5 which summarize Christ’s death;<sup>27</sup> 15:1-2, 11 indicate that the contents of this outline were already known and accepted among the Corinthians, presumably as a result of Paul’s founding of the community.<sup>28</sup> It requires little intellectual courage to assume that the precept of the cross refers to the early Christian *datum* that Jesus of Nazareth was crucified by the Romans, a death deplorable to Jews, Romans, and Greeks alike.<sup>29</sup> As a summary of the content of the precept of the cross, Hengel is close to the mark when he writes that “separated from the particular death of Jesus on the cross, the Pauline ‘word of the cross’ would become vague and incomprehensible speculation.”<sup>30</sup> Yet in 1 Cor 15:3b it is not simply Jesus who

---

<sup>26</sup> Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 41; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 51. Emphasis original. See also Kammler, *Kreuz und Weisheit*, 55, who asks whether “the words ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ designate the *gospel*, or do they mean the apostolic *preaching*.” My translation. Emphasis original.

<sup>27</sup> On Paul’s use of preformed tradition in 1 Cor 15:1-11, see, e.g., John Kloppenborg, “An Analysis of the Pre-Pauline Formula 1 Cor 15:3b-5 in Light of Some Recent Literature,” *CBQ* 40 (1978): 351-67; David M. Moffitt, “Affirming the ‘Creed’: The Extent of Paul’s Citation of an Early Christian Formula in 1 Cor 15,3b-7,” *ZNW* 99 (2008): 49-73.

<sup>28</sup> Fee, calls 15:3-5 “the *content* of the gospel Paul preached” (*First Epistle*, 720. Emphasis original). Similarly, Zeller reads v. 3a and following “als vordringliches Hauptstück der Verkündigung des Apostels” (*Der erste Brief*, 461). See Edsall, *Paul’s Witness to Formative Early Christian Instruction*, 75-77.

<sup>29</sup> See, e.g., Martin Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977); David W. Chapman, *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010), esp. 223-59; Shi, *Paul’s Message of the Cross as Body Language*, 53-80; John Granger Cook, *Crucifixion in the Mediterranean World*, WUNT 327 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014).

<sup>30</sup> Hengel, *Crucifixion*, 20.

was crucified, but the Messiah (ὅτι Χριστὸς ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κατὰ τὰς γραφὰς). A crucified Jesus may be a martyr, but a crucified Messiah is a scandal and an affront.<sup>31</sup>

The precept of the cross will serve as a polestar for the remainder of Paul's argument in 1:26-4:21. Paul does not need to restate explicitly the contents of the precept of the cross, because it was the core of his teaching during his first visit to Corinth. Both he and the Corinthians are already familiar with it. That shared knowledge allows him to base his censure and apology on another commonly held cultural assumption: the presupposition that individuals and social groups ought to reflect a harmonious synthesis of λόγος and ἔργον. Just as Plato's Socrates based the harmony of the democratic city-state on the interplay between word and deed,<sup>32</sup> and a host of philosophers and moralists argued that the good man was recognizable on the basis of the harmony of his λόγος and ἔργον,<sup>33</sup> so Paul will defend his virtue and expose the Corinthians' error by playing on

---

<sup>31</sup> Cf., e.g., 1 Cor 1:23; Gal 3:13.

<sup>32</sup> See the lengthy discussion in Gerald M. Mara, *Socrates's Discursive Democracy: Logos and Ergon in Platonic Political Philosophy* (Albany: SUNY, 1998).

<sup>33</sup> Cf. e.g., Cleanthes in Diogenes Laertius, 7.5.171; Musonius Rufus, *Frag.* 10.1.3; Epictetus, *Diatr.* 2.9.19-22. For a thorough discussion of these and other texts and the moral implications of λόγος and ἔργον, see H. Wayne Merritt, *In Word and Deed: Moral Integrity in Paul* (New York: Lang, 1993), 61-109. Merritt notes that "in formal apologetic-polemic genres" demonstrating that one is or is not an individual in whom λόγοι and ἔργα are combined is "a constituent of an accusation or defense" (Merritt, *In Word and Deed*, 3, citing, among others, Gorgias, *Hel.* 11.1, 7, 8; *Pal.* 11a.6, 34; Xenophon, *Mem.* 1.1.10, 19, 20; 1.2..16, 17, 59; 1.3.1; 1.5.6; Plato, *Apol.* 23d; 31e-32a; 32d; 38c; 40a-b; Isocrates, *Soph.* 3.6-8; Ps.–Isocrates, *Demon.* 15; Lysias, 9.14). Note that Paul adopts exactly this strategy when making his defense in 2 Cor 10-13 (Merritt, *In Word and Deed*, 111-52). In response to those Corinthians who would say of Paul that "His letters are weighty and strong, but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech contemptible," Paul replies, "Let such people understand that what we say by letter (τῷ λόγῳ δι' ἐπιστολῶν) when absent, we will also do when present (παρόντες τῷ ἔργῳ)" (2 Cor 10:10-11). Likewise, in Galatians, when confronting Peter in Antioch, Paul accuses him of hypocrisy on the grounds that Peter's behavior does not accord with the gospel (Gal 2:14): Peter's λόγος and ἔργον are incompatible. As the exegesis of 1:18-2:5 will demonstrate, Paul argues that his teaching practices accord with the precept of the cross, ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ, whereas the Corinthians' factionalism springs from their taste for elements of broader Corinthian culture which do not. See also n. 8 above.

this common value. Given that Paul presents himself as a teacher and his message as a curriculum, it is worth noting that the good teacher, like the virtuous man, must demonstrate consistency between the precepts that he teaches and the fashion in which he teaches those precepts. Ps.-Plutarch's definition of the good primary teacher, for example, does not insist that he should come from a strong academic pedigree. Instead the author advises that the teacher's character should accord with the moral precepts he will instill in his young charges.<sup>34</sup>

Yet, given Paul's use of this common trope, it is important to remember that the logic of his particular linking of precept and practice is not common. In other words, the contrast between Paul's precept of the cross and the teaching of Greco-Roman schools could not be sharper. In 1:18b-25 Paul presents the precept of the cross as a manifestation of divine wisdom which is antithetical to all other so-called wisdoms. Paul first seeks to reform the Corinthians' understanding of the precept of the cross by proposing a paradox.<sup>35</sup> The cross is simultaneously "folly" (μωρία) (1:18)<sup>36</sup> and divine power (δύναμις) and wisdom (σοφία) (1:18, 24).<sup>37</sup> Though it is likely that the Corinthians'

---

<sup>34</sup> Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.* 4c.

<sup>35</sup> See e.g., A.T. Hanson, *The Paradox of the Cross in the Thought of St. Paul*, JSNTSup 17 (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987), 13-19; Helmut Merklein, "Das paulinischen Paradox des Kreuzes," *TTZ* 106 (1997): 81-98; Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 107.

<sup>36</sup> For a novel interpretation of the significance of μωρία in 1 Cor 1-4, see L.L. Welborn, *Paul, the Fool of Christ: A Study of 1 Corinthians 1-4 in the Comic-Philosophic Tradition*, JSNTSup 293 (London: T&T Clark, 2008). For Welborn, Paul uses μωρία language to present himself as a type of the "comic-fool."

<sup>37</sup> Paul's initial juxtaposition of μωρία and δύναμις (rather than μωρία and σοφία) appears to "weaken" the "formal antithesis" or paradoxical quality of his argument (cf. Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 41). But this is ultimately insignificant. The shape of the argument in 1:18-25 relies on the diametrical opposition between "the wisdom of the world" and "the wisdom of God," as is shown in 1:24. Following Paul's concern to maintain the power of the cross (ἵνα μὴ κενωθῆ ὁ σταυρὸς τοῦ Χριστοῦ) (1:17), it is entirely natural to begin the new pericope by emphasizing the cross's power (note the explanatory γάρ in 1:18). And one must not forget that Paul prominently associates gospel and divine power (cf., e.g., Rom 1:16). In sum, the "weakened antithesis" is a consequence of Paul's deft correlation of power and wisdom.



predilection for Stoic philosophy led them to misinterpret the precept of the cross, Paul does not specify the precise “wisdom” which has led them astray.<sup>38</sup> He is not mounting a frontal assault on Corinthian Stoicism (or any other particular school of thought) but rather any person claiming to possess wisdom while failing to recognize that the wisdom of God is revealed in the crucified Messiah. This, for Paul, is the acid test of wisdom: Does one admit that God reveals his wisdom in the crucifixion? One can, nevertheless, imagine Stoic pupils wrestling to understand how the cross could be wise and foolish simultaneously.

The answer for Paul is that the cross is only paradoxical for those persons who have already adopted a standard of wisdom. The precept of the cross is not a conclusion to a Greek philosopher’s proof. Rather, it is an axiomatic first principle that gives rise to new proofs. As such, any attempt to fit the cross into predetermined paradigms of wisdom is doomed to failure. One will either conclude that there is no wisdom to be found in a crucified person or decide that their metric for wisdom is deficient. For Paul, once an individual decides that the precept of the cross is “folly,” their status as one of “the perishing” (τοῖς ἀπολλυμένοις) becomes manifest. Conversely, those being saved (τοῖς σωζομένοις) through the foolish kerygma (1:21) recognize that the cross is “power and wisdom” (1:18). Paul and the Corinthians, those being saved, can recognize the divine wisdom in the cross. They are among “the called” (1:24; cf. 1:1-2, 9, 26). For them, the cross is—or ought to be—the paradigmatic example of God’s wisdom.

Some of the Corinthians may have been tempted to interpret Paul’s definition of wisdom as special pleading, an attempt to justify why his teaching seemed so paltry when

---

<sup>38</sup> For a thorough summary of the history of scholarly speculation regarding the Corinthians’ wisdom, see Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom*, 1-5.

compared with that of the Stoa. Isaiah 29:14 LXX serves as Paul's proof-text against such a counterargument. God there informs Isaiah that he "will ... destroy the wisdom of the wise, and the discernment of the discerning I will hide."<sup>39</sup> For Paul, the very failure of human wisdom, its inability to provide knowledge of God, is itself a manifestation of God's wisdom (1:21). God's wisdom, unlike "the wisdom of the world,"<sup>40</sup> is divinely revealed (1:20), and those whom the rest of the world considers wise, are unable to perceive it. Such is the case of the sage, scribe, and sophist, the world's most revered teachers.<sup>41</sup> These teachers will be conspicuously absent when Paul describes the social makeup of the community in 1:26-31. It is their very "wisdom" which makes it more difficult to recognize that the cross is a manifestation of divine wisdom, since any standard of human wisdom perceives the cross as scandal and foolishness (1:22-23).

In contrast to these teachers, Paul asserts that "we proclaim Christ crucified, a stumbling block to Jews and foolishness to Gentiles" (1:23). The shift from the first person singular to the first person plural is significant, the first of several such shifts in 1 Cor 1-4 (cf. 2:6-16). The plural here is not a "literary plural," Paul referring to himself

---

<sup>39</sup> Isa 29:14 (NETS). On the function of Isa 29:14 in 1 Cor 1:19, see H. H. Drake Williams, who suggests that the text bears messianic overtones (*The Wisdom of the Wise: The Presence and Function of Scripture within 1 Cor. 1:18-3:23*, AGJU 49 [Brill: Leiden, 2001], 48-49, 56-58). Other Jewish Wisdom texts claim that Wisdom is difficult to perceive and hidden even from those who claim to be wise. Cf. e.g., Sirach 6:22: "For Wisdom is like her name, and she is not conspicuous to many" (σοφία γὰρ κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτῆς ἐστὶν καὶ οὐ πολλοῖς ἐστὶν φανερά) (NETS).

<sup>40</sup> This is not to imply that Paul does not think that a source of Jewish Wisdom like the Torah was not a product of divine revelation. Note his claim in 1:22 that Jews seek "signs" while Greeks are preoccupied with "wisdom." Paul thinks that one must be "in Christ" in order to rightly interpret the divine revelation in the Torah (cf. 2 Cor 3:7-16).

<sup>41</sup> On σοφός, γραμματεὺς, and συζητητής as educators, see chapter 5, section I.C. The split between Jewish and Pagan exemplars of wisdom is in keeping with Paul's argument that the cross is inscrutable when viewed from the perspective of either Jewish or Greek conceptions of wisdom (1:22-23). See e.g., Fitzmyer, *First Corinthians*, 156.

using the royal “we.”<sup>42</sup> Such uses of the plural are almost nonexistent in Paul’s corpus.<sup>43</sup> Instead, the plural should be construed as an additional Pauline strategy for confronting factionalism: He claims that he and the other apostles all bring the same instruction, the crucified Messiah. To all of those whom God calls, from apostles to neophytes, the crucified Messiah reveals a foolishness wiser than any worldly wisdom, and a weakness stronger than any human strength (1:25). And, as we shall see, Paul and the apostles have taken this wisdom as the foundation for their teaching and lifestyle (cf. 4:9-13). It necessarily follows that the apostles are not like rival philosophers, promising that their doctrines alone show the way to the good life and that the doctrines of their competitors are sure to delude students.

In conclusion, Paul, in 1:18-25, has stated clearly one characteristic of the precept of the cross. The most basic level of his curriculum, the cross, stands in contradistinction to the world’s wisdom (cf. 1:17). Paul’s discussion of the cross might initially strike his audience as a digression from his censure of the Corinthians and defense of his own ministry in 1:10-17. But his presentation of the cross as a wisdom which obviates all other wisdoms will undergird his argument throughout 1 Cor 1-4. If teachers, like other moral actors, ought to exhibit harmony between word and deed, it follows that since Paul’s own λόγος is the precept of the cross, a precept antithetical to traditional canons of wisdom, his behavior must follow suit, challenging accepted standards not only for the behavior of the good teacher but of the respectable citizen. Likewise, if students should imitate their teachers, and their teachers’ behavior should exemplify their curricula, it

---

<sup>42</sup> Similarly, Fee, *First Epistle*, 75 n.34.

<sup>43</sup> Samuel Byrskog, “Co-Senders, Co-Authors, and Paul’s Use of the First Person Plural,” *ZNW* 87 (1996): 249.

follows that the Corinthians too ought to see the precept of the cross as a standard and norm for their own behavior. If their apostles all teach the same crucified Jesus, their apostles must be unified in a way that they Corinthians have yet to appreciate.

### C. Called to Receive Wisdom (1:26-31)

Since the precept of the cross, the wisdom which Paul teaches, is utterly alien to the wisdom prevalent in ancient Corinth, one could fairly ask how it is that any of the Corinthians have received the cross. Why would anyone intentionally align themselves with something so counterintuitive? Paul's answer is that his students, like the audiences of Sirach, Wisdom of Solomon, and 4QInstruction, have access to special knowledge as a result of their election or calling.<sup>44</sup> Rather than boasting in the social status which ancient education conferred on its recipients, they ought to boast in Christ, the source of special wisdom for those whom God calls.

In 1:26-28, Paul reminds the Corinthians of their election or calling. It is significant that at the time of their calling the majority of the Corinthians were, in terms of social status, closer to one crucified than they were to the upper echelons of Corinthian society. By inviting the Corinthians to "consider your own call" (1:26),<sup>45</sup> Paul asks them to reflect on their social status, relative to greater Corinth, at the time of their calling (1:9).<sup>46</sup> In a society in which one's social worth was "determined by education, wealth,

---

<sup>44</sup> On election and access to wisdom, see chapter 5, section I.D.

<sup>45</sup> On calling, see Stephen J. Chester, *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005), 59-112.

<sup>46</sup> Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 180; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 57; Christophe Senft, *La première épître de Saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*, CNT 2/7 (Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1979), 43. Mark T. Finney, *Honour and Conflict in the Ancient World: 1 Corinthians in its Greco-Roman Social Setting*, LNTS 460 (London: T&T Clark, 2012), 94.

and breeding,”<sup>47</sup> not many of them possessed the qualities of upper-class members of Corinthian society. Unlike the students of the sophists or philosophers who could afford the fees required for a higher education,<sup>48</sup> they were not wise (σοφοί), powerful (δυνατοί), or noble (εὐγενεῖς) (1:26).<sup>49</sup>

On the contrary, Paul claims that the members of his community were τὰ μωρὰ τοῦ κόσμου, “what is foolish in the world,” and ignoble (τὰ ἀγενῆ τοῦ κόσμου) (1:27-28). For Ben Sira, teaching a fool was like trying to glue a broken pot—an exercise in futility.<sup>50</sup> But when Paul calls the Corinthians foolish it is a tongue-in-cheek compliment. In all of these ways, they, at their calling, resembled the precept of the cross: foolish, weak, and insignificant from the perspective of the wisdom of the world (cf. 1:18-25). Their very lowliness made them attractive candidates for God to call.<sup>51</sup> Just as God, in his freedom, confounded the wisdom of the wise by revealing his wisdom in the cross, so

---

<sup>47</sup> David G. Horrell, *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996), 134.

<sup>48</sup> As Winter notes, these were all honorific adjectives used to describe the socially elite students of the sophists. Winter, *Paul and Philo*, 189. See too Finney, *Honour and Conflict*, 95-96.

<sup>49</sup> The vast majority of recent scholarship on 1 Cor 1:26-31 has been devoted to questions regarding the Corinthians’ social status, especially the community’s degree of social stratification. In these studies, the “not many” have received a degree of attention disproportionate to their numbers, though perhaps not their influence, in the community. The foundational statement on social stratification in Corinth remains Theissen, “Social Stratification in the Corinthian Community,” 69-102. Note the challenge to Theissen in Meggitt, *Paul, Poverty, and Survival*. See also Meeks, *The First Urban Christians*, esp. 51-72; Friesen, “Poverty and Paul,” 323-61; Friesen and Scheidel, “The Size of the Economy and the Distribution of Income in the Roman Empire, 61-91. For the most comprehensive overview of the Corinthian social stratification currently available, see Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom*, 104-52.

<sup>50</sup> Συγκολλῶν ὄστρακον ὁ διδάσκων μωρόν (Sir 22:9).

<sup>51</sup> Like the *mebin* of 4QInstruction, the Corinthians are distinguished by their relative poverty. Cf., e.g., 4Q416 2 iii 2-8, 12, 19; 4Q418 177 5. See Goff, *4QInstruction*, 23-26. Though note Tigchelaar’s argument that the *mebin* is not necessarily poor (Tigchelaar, “The Addressees of 4QInstruction,” 62-75). Poverty could be a social element binding the community together. Cf. 4Q415 6 2; 4Q416 2 ii 20; 4Q416 2 iii 8-12. See also Goff, *Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom*, 148-62; Berg, “Religious Epistemologies,” 40. In contrast, Ben Sira’s students were from the middle or upper echelons of society. They could own servants (4:30; 6:11), afford fancy clothing (11:4), and were generally upwardly mobile. See Heaton, *The School Tradition of the Old Testament*, 14-16.

now he continues to confound it by freely choosing (ἐξελέξατο) individuals who are among the lowliest and least of Corinthian society (1:28a).<sup>52</sup> God has chosen the members of the Corinthian community because he intended “to reduce to nothing things that are” (1:28b). This is a restatement of the sentiment, if not the words, of Isa 29:14 LXX (cf. 1:19). Paul’s point appears to be that it would be ridiculous for individuals who were chosen because of their low estate, once chosen, to attempt to change the very characteristic that led to their selection.

As 1:29-30 makes clear, the Corinthians should not boast in newly acquired positions of prominence, but rather in God, who has given them access to the divine wisdom which is hidden from those who occupy positions of authority in their world.<sup>53</sup> From the perspective of a sophist or philosopher they may have been τὰ ἀγενῆ and τὰ ἐξουθενημένα, devoid of wisdom. Despite their appearance, they have Christ, who is their wisdom from God (1:30). It is in Christ, then, that they can boast (1:31). Exactly what improper “boasting” entails in is vague. Paul’s modified citation of Jer 9:23

---

<sup>52</sup> Best, “Power and Wisdom,” 38.

<sup>53</sup> Isa 29:14 again provides the rationale for understanding the disruptive work of God in 1:26-31. One of the pericope’s most striking features is the role that God plays. In addition to calling and choosing the Corinthians (1:27-28), he correspondingly shames (καταισχύνη) and nullifies (καταργήση) the world’s strength and Wisdom. “God,” Paul claims, “chose what ... things that are not, to reduce to nothing things that are” (ἐξελέξατο ὁ θεός, τὰ μὴ ὄντα, ἵνα τὰ ὄντα καταργήση) (1:28). The language here resembles Rom 4:17 in which God “calls into existence the things that do not exist” (καλοῦντος τὰ μὴ ὄντα ὡς ὄντα). As the NRSV’s translation of Rom 4:17 reveals, Paul’s juxtaposition of μὴ ὄντα and τὰ ὄντα is creational language (cf. e.g., Philo, *Spec.* 4.187, τὰ γὰρ μὴ ὄντα ἐκάλεσεν εἰς τὸ εἶναι; see too, Chester, *Conversion at Corinth*, 77-79). In a social context in which “one’s value is determined by education, wealth, and breeding,” Paul argues that God chooses to take those value-markers and status symbols, unmake them, and by an act of creative power replace them with new and diametrically opposed status markers that harmonize with the Wisdom of God revealed in the cross (Horrell, *Social Ethos*, 134). One consequence of this reading is that it becomes clear that not all creational language in 1 Corinthians can be mirror read as evidence of the Corinthians’ position (see, e.g., Sterling, ““Wisdom among the Perfect,”” 355-84).

provides some insight into right boasting in the Lord;<sup>54</sup> in context, one should boast specifically in one's knowledge and understanding of God.<sup>55</sup> Paul will describe Corinthians' improper boasting more explicitly in 3:21-22, noting that they have been boasting in men, that is, in Paul, or Apollos, or Peter, human teachers, who the Corinthians hope will provide a path to excellence or supremacy within the community. Boasting, then, is an attempt to distinguish the elite from the rest, much like the distinctions drawn by Quintilian's teachers, who had the students compete for the highest ranks in the class.<sup>56</sup> Such boasting is a mode of the wisdom of the world.

In 1:26-31 Paul's point might be fairly summarized in this way: By boasting in the wisdom, strength, and wealth against which Paul and Jeremiah warn, the Corinthians have distanced themselves from God's wisdom. One reason they were called by God to receive this wisdom is that the majority of them had no wealth, power, or position. Yet, like the students of Ben Sira or the addressees of 4QInstruction, they have been given special access to divine wisdom on the basis of their election. By boasting improperly, the Corinthians demonstrate that they prefer the "things that are" (τὰ ὄντα), the current world order, despite the fact that God is bringing that order to nothing (1:28). 1 Corinthians 1:26-31 should be read as a rebuke that a teacher like Ben Sira might have

---

<sup>54</sup> On the various functions of Paul's citation of Jer 9:22-23, see Gail R. O'Day, "Jeremiah 9:22-23 and 1 Corinthians 1:26-31: A Study in Intertextuality," *JBL* 109 (1990): 259-67. Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 103-32; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 195-96. Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 121-22.

<sup>55</sup> Τάδε λέγει κύριος Μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ σοφὸς ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ ἰσχυρὸς ἐν τῇ ἰσχύι αὐτοῦ, καὶ μὴ καυχᾶσθω ὁ πλούσιος ἐν τῷ πλούτῳ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐν τούτῳ καυχᾶσθω ὁ καυχώμενος, συνίειν καὶ γινώσκειν ὅτι ἐγὼ εἰμι κύριος ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, ὅτι ἐν τούτοις τὸ θέλημά μου, λέγει κύριος (Jer 9:22-23 LXX).

<sup>56</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.2.23-24.

leveled against students of wisdom who were failing to appreciate the causes for and implications of their calling.

#### D. A Style Suited to the Cross (2:1-5)

In 2:1-5, Paul returns to the question of his style of speech, a problem to which he first alluded in 1:17. His basic contention is that he is being judged by the wrong criteria, since he did not teach the same subject matter as a rhetorician or philosopher.<sup>57</sup> Though Paul rejects the version of eloquence highly valued in ancient schools,<sup>58</sup> he claims to have avoided such eloquence for a reason upon which he and an ancient rhetor would have agreed: One's style of speech ought to conform to the contents of one's message.

Whether one reads ὑπεροχὴν λόγου (2:1), "lofty words," as a reference to sophistic or Stoic rhetorical style,<sup>59</sup> Paul plainly feels that rhetorical styles calibrated to articulate the human wisdom prevalent in greater Corinth are unsuited to speech about

---

<sup>57</sup> If we accept the hypothesis that at least some of the Corinthians exhibited a Stoic outlook, it is worth bearing in mind that philosophers too were concerned with proper modes of discourse, and with matching their discourse and their conduct (Cf., e.g., Maximus of Tyre, *Disc.* 1 [*That the Philosopher's Discourse is Adapted to Every Subject*]; *Disc.* 25 [*That those Discourses are Best which Correspond to Deeds*]). The Stoics themselves practiced and taught rhetoric. Cicero critiques these handbooks in *Fin.* 4.7. Cf. Diogenes Laertius, 7.42. For an overview of these and other primary sources on Stoic rhetoric, see Liebersohn, *The Dispute concerning Rhetoric*, 32-35. As Catherine Atherton has observed, "In a number of ways Stoic rhetorical teaching was ... barely distinguishable from its professional counterparts" ("Hand Over Fist," 393). If some Stoicizing Corinthians interpreted Paul's message as an example of philosophical Wisdom, they were doubtless disappointed. As Atherton has noted, whereas Aristotle, Cicero, and Quintilian assumed that proper style was circumstantial, "this assumption appears to have no place in Stoic stylistics" ("Hand over Fist," 393). Instead, "in both theory and practice, there was, strictly, no difference in style whatsoever between the discourse of the Stoic dialectician, and that of the Stoic orator" ("Hand over Fist," 398, citing Diogenes Laertius, 7.59-60). The Stoic sage's style of discourse ought to be exactly the same, no matter whether the rhetorical situation was deliberative, forensic, encomiastic, or even if he were muttering to himself (Diogenes Laertius, 7.42). What mattered above all was sheer logical argument (Atherton, "Hand over Fist," 400-401. Cf. Cicero, *De or.* 3.65-66). See too, Catherine Atherton, *The Stoics on Ambiguity* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993), 87-92.

<sup>58</sup> On the need for eloquent teachers, see chapter 5, section I.E.

<sup>59</sup> On rhetorical styles, cf., e.g., *Rhet. Her.* 4.11-16; Cicero, *De or.* 3.199.



God's mystery (τὸ μυστήριον τοῦ θεοῦ), the cross (2:1).<sup>60</sup> Paul will continue to play on the concept of "mystery" throughout 1 Corinthians (cf. 2:7; 4:1; 13:2; 14:2; 15:51). He intentionally adopted his manner of speaking, he argues, because (γάρ) "I did not determine to know anything while with you except Jesus Christ and him crucified" (2:2).<sup>61</sup> Thus, Paul's discursive style was a style tailored for his exposition of a mystery, the crucified Messiah.

If Paul is confronting a Stoicising trend in the Corinthian community, it is noteworthy that the hypothesis that one's style should be appropriate to one's circumstances was a foundational assumption of governing sophistic rhetorical style.<sup>62</sup> This is the element of style known as appropriateness.<sup>63</sup> As Atherton has demonstrated, this is the only discernable point at which Stoic stylistics departed from the sophistic norm. The Stoa made no allowance for adapting one's style to the content or context of one's address.<sup>64</sup> Paul's rhetorical style, it seems, might well have alienated Stoicising

---

<sup>60</sup> The mss evidence is evenly split between μαρτύριον and μυστήριον, resulting in one of the most intractable textual cruxes in the Pauline epistles. I take μυστήριον to be the most likely reading. On this variant, see esp. Veronica Koperski, "'Mystery of God' or 'Testimony of God' in 1 Cor 2:1: Textual and Exegetical Considerations," in *New Testament Textual Criticism and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*, ed. Adelbert Denaux, BETL 161 (Leuven: Peeters, 2002), 305-15. Scholarly opinion remains split, though the majority agree that μυστήριον is the original reading. See, e.g., Andreas Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, HNT 9 (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000), 54; Collins, *First Corinthians*, 118. But see Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 53 n.6, who judges the crux unresolvable; Thiselton, *First Epistle* is unclear, commenting on both possibilities, but seems to lean toward μυστήριον (207-11). Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 124, claims that "Inhaltlich passt hier die Lesart μαρτύριον ... besser.... Aber dass Evangelium selber als μαρτύριον im Singular aufgefasst wird, ist sonst eigentlich nur in nachpaulinischen Texten bezeugt (Röm 16:25f, Eph; Kol)." Barrett, *First Epistle*, 62-63, prefers μαρτύριον.

<sup>61</sup> My translation. For the grammatical ambiguities of this clause, especially the placement and significance of the negative οὐ, see Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 211-12.

<sup>62</sup> Winter could be correct when he argues that Paul himself uses some components of sophistic rhetoric to undermine the Corinthians' valuation of rhetoric. See *Philo and Paul*, 237-43.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. Quintilian, who considers "appropriateness" vital to style (*Inst.* 1.5.1; 8.3.11-14; 11.1). See too Cicero, *De or.* 3.210-12; Aristotle, *Rhet.* 3.7 (1048a).

<sup>64</sup> Atherton, "Hand over Fist," 393.

Corinthians because it relied upon a sophistic stylistic principle which the Stoa did not share. Paul's obedience to the notion that style and content ought to be harmoniously coherent required that he develop a style as antithetical to the Corinthians' models of eloquence as the cross was to the wisdom of the world. Had Paul's style mimicked the discourse of the sage, it would have violated this principle, since the sage's wisdom could not recognize wisdom in the cross.<sup>65</sup> Paul's insistence on ensuring that style and content suit one another demonstrates his adjudication between two different forms of didactic expression. In this case, he prefers the logic of sophistic style to Stoic rhetorical style.

After explaining what his rhetorical style was not in 2:1-2, in 2:3-5 Paul describes how it corresponded with another component of ancient rhetoric: his delivery. His physical presentation was characterized by "weakness," "fear," and "much trembling" (2:3).<sup>66</sup> That is, the body language that accompanied his delivery was radically different than that advocated by rhetorical theorists who preferred vigorous, confident gestures and facial expressions to accompany the words spoken.<sup>67</sup> Paul's delivery—weak, fearful, and

---

<sup>65</sup> Paul's reliance upon a basic rhetorical principle does not require us to read all of the technical terminology in 2:1-5 as allusions to ancient rhetoric. For a discussion of terms like *ὑπεροχὴν λόγου* (2:1), *πειθοῖ [ς] σοφίας [λόγοις]* (2:4), and *ἀποδείξει* (2:4), demonstrating that they are not unambiguously explicitly rhetorical, see Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom*, 44-48. Indeed, these terms are more naturally suited to descriptions of ancient philosophical discourse (Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom*, esp. 17-61).

<sup>66</sup> See esp. Shi, *Paul's Message of the Cross*, 157-72. See too Winter, *Philo and Paul*, 147-61. Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 125.

<sup>67</sup> Cicero writes that the ideal orator "will also use gestures in such a way as to avoid excess: he will maintain an erect and lofty carriage, with but little pacing to and fro, and never for a long distance. As for darting forward, he will keep it under control and employ it but seldom. There should be no effeminate bending of the neck, no twiddling of the fingers, no marking the rhythm with the finger-joint. He will control himself by the pose of his whole frame, and the vigorous and manly attitude of the body, extending the arm in moments of passion, and dropping it in calmer moods. Furthermore, what dignity and charm are contributed by the countenance, which has a rôle second only to the voice. After ensuring that the expression shall not be silly or grimacing, the next point is the careful control of the eyes. For as the face is the image of the soul, so are the eyes its interpreters, in respect of which the subjects under discussion will provide the proper limits for the expression of joy or grief" (*Or. Brut.* 59-60 [Hendrickson and Hubbell, LCL]). Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 11.3.66-90. Shi, *Paul's Message of the Cross*, esp. 126-41.

trembling—may have been unlike the “manly” ideal proffered by Cicero.<sup>68</sup> But it did suit a message characterized by “the weakness of God” (τὸ ἀσθενὲς τοῦ θεοῦ) (1:25).

In 2:4, Paul continues to defend his discourse. He spoke not “with plausible words of wisdom” (ἐν πειθοῖ [ς] σοφίας [λόγοις]).<sup>69</sup> Instead of speaking wisdom (cf. 1:25), Paul employed a form of speech characterized by a demonstration of the Spirit and of power (ἐν ἀποδείξει πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως). It is commonly noted that ἀπόδειξις was a technical term referring to an argumentative or rhetorical proof,<sup>70</sup> but it could equally refer to a philosophical proof or demonstration.<sup>71</sup> Given Stoic rhetoric’s stylistic preference for consistent argument, Paul could possibly be claiming to have rejected close-knit logical proofs in favor of a proof characterized by “Spirit and power.” Against such a reading, it seems that the genitives πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως are best understood as objective genitives, the contents and not the qualities of his discourse. Paul is not claiming that miraculous phenomena replaced logic, rhetorical style, or rhetorical delivery.<sup>72</sup> He can and does appeal to pneumatic power in other portions of his corpus to

---

<sup>68</sup> On Paul’s delivery and ancient masculinity, see Shi, *Paul’s Message of the Cross*, 167-68.

<sup>69</sup> This phrase ἐν πειθοῖ [ς] σοφίας [λόγοις] is hopelessly corrupt. The textual tradition contains no fewer than eleven variant readings. Those mss that interpose the adjective ἀνθρωπίνης to qualify σοφίας (e.g., 8<sup>c</sup>, A, C, et al.) are secondary expansions (cf. Bruce M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed. [Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994], 481). More difficult are the adjective πειθοῖ [ς], a *hapax legomenon* in all of Greek literature, and [λόγοις], which is absent in  $\mathfrak{P}^{46}$  but present in the majority of patristic quotations. For a thorough overview of the mss evidence, as well as a survey of modern commentators’ attempts to deal with this crux, see Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 215-16. See too Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 123 n.224.

<sup>70</sup> See, e.g., Timothy H. Lim, “Not in Persuasive Words of Wisdom, but in the Demonstration of the Spirit and of Power,” *NovT* 29 (1987): 147; Pogoloff, *Logos and Sophia*, 138-40; Winter, *Philo and Paul*, 149-50.

<sup>71</sup> Brookins, *Corinthian Wisdom*, 44. Citing, among others, Diogenes Laertius, 7.44, 52, 79; Sextus Empiricus, *Pyr.* 2.135-43.

<sup>72</sup> Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 221-23.

legitimate his apostolic authority (e.g., 2 Cor 12:11-12),<sup>73</sup> but here, when he speaks of δύναμις, he simply appeals to the “power of God” which he has already defined as the precept of the cross (1:18). 1 Corinthians 2:4 contains Paul’s first reference to the Spirit in the epistle. In this case, the reference to the ἀπόδειξις πνεύματος is a transition to the topic of the Spirit which he will address in 2:6-16. There he will argue that the Spirit affords access to God’s mysteries, especially the precept of the cross (cf. 2:10-15).

1 Corinthians 2:1-5 makes a vital contribution to the apologetic element of 1 Cor 1-4. Paul’s explanation of the rhetorical “deficiency” which made him appear unqualified as a teacher turns out to be evidence of his mastery of his subject matter. He has so internalized and conformed himself to the precept of the cross that he can even speak in the manner that best suits his curriculum. If he were to speak as some of the Corinthians doubtless wish he would, he would be speaking poorly, even if elegantly, because he would be improperly representing the cross. This subtle argument buttresses Paul’s self-presentation as a teacher. He recognizes that good teachers must speak well, but as a teacher of the cross, he knows that proper style and delivery must be unlike the style and delivery suited to sophistic disputation or philosophical argumentation. His argument exposes the principle underlying other teachers’ eloquence, whose teaching matters not because their style is eloquent, but because their eloquence is governed by the contents and circumstances of their address. Paul’s own rejection of such eloquence in 2:1 is commensurate with his rejection of human wisdom (σοφία ἀνθρώπων, 2:4).

---

<sup>73</sup> See Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 128.

### E. Higher Wisdom and its Pneumatic Teachers (2:6-16)

As the most enigmatic section of 1 Cor 1-4, 1 Cor 2:6-16 warrants extended treatment.<sup>74</sup> While some other studies read it as a digression, this study understands 1 Cor 2:6-16 to be both a natural extension of the argument Paul has made in 1:18-2:5 and an introduction to several of the major themes of the argument to follow in 3:1-4:21.<sup>75</sup> 1 Corinthians 2:6-16 takes the themes of mystery, knowledge, and the Spirit from 2:1-5 and joins them with Paul's unflattering estimation of the Corinthians' lack of maturity in 3:1-4. By claiming to have a wisdom which he reserves for "the mature" (τοῖς τελείοις) (2:6), whom he also characterizes as "spiritual" (2:13b-15), Paul lays the groundwork for his transition in 3:1, at which point he will have portrayed the Corinthians unflatteringly as "fleshly," "immature," and "unspiritual." Paul's argument in 2:6-16 should be divided into three major sections: vv. 6-9 are focused on the qualities of Paul's wisdom, vv. 10-13a on the pneumatic epistemology of the teachers, and vv. 13b-16 on human capacity for learning divinely revealed wisdom.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>74</sup> 1 Corinthians 2:6-16 has occasionally been read as internally inconsistent with Paul's argument in 1 Cor 1-4 (Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 57) or, contrary to all manuscript evidence, as an interpolation (Martin Widmann, "I Kor 2 6-16: Ein Einspruch gegen Paulus," *ZNW* 70 [1979]: 44-53; William O. Walker Jr., "1 Corinthians 2:6-16: A Non-Pauline Interpolation?" *JSNT* 47 [1992]: 75-94). For the classic argument against such interpolation theories in 1 Corinthians, see Jerome Murphy O'Connor, "Interpolations in 1 Corinthians," *CBQ* 48 (1986): 81-84. Even among the majority who recognize that 1 Cor 2:6-16 is no interpolation, there is a marked tendency to read this passage as if it did not contribute much to Paul's argument in 1 Cor 1-4. Robin S. Barbour speaks for many when he laments that 1 Cor 2:6-16 "seems to sit extremely ill in its context" ("Wisdom and the Cross in 1 Corinthians 1 and 2," in *Theologia Crucis, Festschrift Erich Dinkler*, ed. Carl Andressen [Tübingen: Mohr, 1979], 65).

<sup>75</sup> Similarly, Vos, "Die Argumentation des Paulus," 107.

<sup>76</sup> The internal structure of 2:6-16 is disputed. Vos and Grindheim, who have written two of the most thorough exegetical studies of the pericope, provide different representative readings. Vos argues that 2:6a introduces a tripartite outline based around the three themes of wisdom, speech, and the group to whom Paul speaks: "Die drei Elemente der These V.6a expliziert Paulus im folgenden nacheinander: In 2:6b-12 legt er aus, welche σοφία gemeint ist; in V. 13 geht er näher auf das λαλεῖν dieser σοφία ein, und in V. 14-16 kommt die Gruppe, der diese Weisheitsverkündigung gilt, in den Blick" (Vos, "Die Argumentation des Paulus," 107). Grindheim provides a different but still tripartite outline, organizing his reading around the themes of wisdom (2:6-9), hiddenness and revelation (2:10-12), and the identity of "the perfect" (2:13-16)

Following his rejection of human wisdom in 2:4-5, in 2:6 Paul qualifies his understanding of the wisdom of God. This qualification is accompanied by a major shift in style. Paul abandons the first person singular which has predominated in 1:10-2:1-5 and which he will resume in 3:1 in favor of the first person plural (λαλοῦμεν). The plural here and throughout 2:6-16 refers to Paul himself and to other apostles.<sup>77</sup> As was the case in 1:23, Paul appears to be emphasizing the consistency between him and the other apostles in their approach to teaching Christian wisdom,<sup>78</sup> which would be another blow to the Corinthians' factionalism. The apostles are not divided against themselves, so why should the Corinthians be divided in favor of one or another apostle?

When Paul teaches wisdom, he speaks it only to those he considers mature (ἐν τοῖς τελείοις) (2:6). Though Paul can metaphorically apply mystery cult language to describe himself as a teacher (cf. 4:1-2),<sup>79</sup> the term "mature" (τέλειος) does not reflect the

---

(Grindheim, "Wisdom for the Perfect," 692-709). The major commentaries likewise differ on how to discern the internal structure of the passage. Conzelmann divides the passage into two sections (2:6-9; 2:10-16) (*1 Corinthians*, 57). Fee divides the passage into three sections (2:6-10a; 2:10b-13; 2:14-16) (*First Epistle*, 99). Zeller treats 2:6-15 as one passage, with 2:16 standing on its own (*Der erste Brief*, 129-30).

<sup>77</sup> The plural admits multiple interpretations. First, Paul might be referring to himself and the Corinthians, or, more generally, to all Christians (Collins, *First Corinthians*, 122-23). Secondly, he could be referring to himself and himself alone in the first person plural (Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 131). The best interpretation is that Paul is referring to himself and other significant apostles and teachers, like Cephas and Apollos. In his study of the referents of plural verbs in the Pauline corpus, Byrskog concludes, "we may assume that Paul is in 2, 6-16 thinking of himself as one among other significant leaders of the church" [242]). See too Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 57; Fee, *First Epistle*, 101 n.13; Lindemann, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 95; Schrage writes, "Doch auch wenn Paulus wenig Interesse an fester Ressortgrenzen hat oder bewusst ausgrenzen will, wird λαλοῦμεν wie in 1,17.23; 2,1-5 und 3,1 primär den Apostel mit Einschluss der christlichen Propheten und Lehrer meinen" (*Der erste Brief*, 1:248-49); Vegge, *Paulus und das antike Schulwesen*, 508-9.

<sup>78</sup> Though the exact nature of the relationship between Paul and Apollos will remain a matter of dispute, it is clear that Paul takes pains throughout 1 Corinthians to present himself and Apollos as colleagues and partners, not as competitors (See esp. Mihaila, *The Paul-Apollos Relationship*, esp. 180-212; contra Joop F.M. Smit, "What is Apollos? What is Paul? In Search of the Coherence of First Corinthians 1:10-4:21," *NovT* 44 [2002]: 231-51). Much of the argument in the next major section of the letter (3:5-4:5) is taken up with explaining his and Apollos's respective relationships with each other and the Corinthian community.

<sup>79</sup> See chapter 4, section II.D.

language of the mystery cults. Paul contrasts the τέλειοι not with the uninitiated, the ἀμύητος, but rather with the immature, the νήπιος (cf. 3:1).<sup>80</sup> Instead of the metaphor of initiation, Paul's controlling metaphor is the metaphor of human development from infancy to adulthood. In 2:6, Paul is already laying the groundwork for the "milk and solid food" metaphor to follow in 3:1-4. Since 1:18-25 has explained his milk, Paul will use 2:6-16 to outline his conception of solid food (βρῶμα), before explaining in 3:1-4 why the Corinthians were not ready for it.

We have already observed that Paul, by claiming to separate his curriculum into multiple stages, has adopted one of the most basic didactic strategies in ancient pedagogy.<sup>81</sup> 1 Corinthians 2:6-9 offers a unique glimpse of the distinctively Jewish logic underlying his curricular division. In addition to serving as references to stages in the human life-cycle, his use of τέλειος and νήπιος ought to be understood within the tradition of Jewish anthropological speculation. Like the reference to τὰ μὴ ὄντα and τὰ ὄντα in 1:28, and the πνευματικός and ψυχικός terminology to follow in 2:14-15, Paul's juxtaposition of the τέλειος and νήπιος calls to mind Second Temple Jewish interpretations of the creation narratives found in Gen 1-2. We will provide a fuller analysis of these creation narratives below in our discussion of the terms πνευματικός and ψυχικός. For now, note that Paul's use of τέλειος and νήπιος resembles Philo's use of the same terminology in his interpretation of Gen 2:16-17 in *Leg.* 1.90-94. In *Leg.*, Philo discusses how teaching must be adapted to the capacities of each student. Philo distinguishes between three types of human beings: the φαῦλος, the μέσος or νήπιος, and

---

<sup>80</sup> Pearson, *The pneumatikos-psychichos Terminology*, 27-28; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 232-33.

<sup>81</sup> On multi-stage educational systems, see chapter 4, section II.A-C; chapter 5, section I.B.

the τέλειος. Here it will be useful to quote Philo at length. “There is a difference,” says Philo,

between these three—injunction, prohibition, command accompanied by exhortation (πρόσταξις, ἀπαγόρευσις, ἐντολή καὶ παραίνεσις). For prohibition deals with wrongdoings and is addressed to the bad man (πρὸς φαῦλον), injunction concerns duties rightly done, and exhortation is addressed to the neutral man (πρὸς τὸν μέσον), the man who is neither bad nor good: for he is neither sinning, to lead anyone to forbid him, nor is he so doing right as right reason enjoins, but has need of exhortation, which teaches him to refrain from evil things (χρείαν ἔχει παραινέσεως τῆς ἀπέχειν μὲν τῶν φαύλων διδασκαλίας), and incites him to aim at things noble. There is no need, then, to give injunctions or prohibitions or exhortations to the perfect man (τῷ τελείῳ) formed after the [divine] image, for none of these does the perfect man require. The bad man has need of injunction and prohibition, and the child of exhortation and teaching (τῷ δὲ νηπίῳ παραινέσεως καὶ διδασκαλίας). Just so the perfect master (τῷ τελείῳ) of music or letters (γραμματικῷ ἢ μουσικῷ) requires none of the directions that apply to those arts, whereas the man who stumbles over the subjects of his study does require what we may call laws or rules with their injunctions and prohibitions, while one who is now beginning to learn requires teaching (τῷ δὲ ἄρτι μανθάνοντι [χρεία] διδασκαλίας).<sup>82</sup>

Not only is Philo’s vocabulary similar to Paul’s, but *Leg.* 1.93-94 also suggests that the Genesis creation narratives encouraged not only Jewish reflection on anthropology but also on education.<sup>83</sup> For Philo, education is the means by which the immature person, the

<sup>82</sup> *Leg.* 1.93-94; cf. *Opif.* 134; *QG* 1.8. Pearson capably demonstrates the parallel terminology between *Leg.* 1.93-94 and 1 Cor 2:6 (Pearson, *The pneumatikos-psychichos Terminology*, 29). Pearson fails to observe the explicitly educational language Philo employs in his description of the νηπίος and the τέλειος. The children (the μέσος or νηπίος) have very clear needs: exhortation (παραινέσις) and education (διδασκαλία). In contrast to these children, the mature are described as those who have already mastered two of the key disciplines of encyclical education: grammar and music. Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.4.4, who argues that “*grammaticē* cannot be complete without music” (Russell, LCL). On Philo and the creation of humanity, see esp. Thomas H. Tobin, *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*, CBQMS 14 (Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1983).

<sup>83</sup> Cf. *Leg.* 3.159.



νήπιος, becomes mature, or τέλειος.<sup>84</sup> When these parallel sources are compared to 1 Cor 2:6, it is clear that one can plausibly read Paul's description of the immature and mature persons not as two different types of Christians, but as two stages in Christian progress. It follows that one advances from immaturity to maturity by means of right education.

Though Paul does not state it explicitly in 2:6, he clearly did not think that the Corinthians had grown to maturity during his foundational visit to Corinth. In addition to identifying the audience to whom Paul teaches higher wisdom, 2:6 also describes in greater detail the wisdom which he refrained from teaching the Corinthians. Like the precept of the cross, it "is not a wisdom of this age or of the rulers of this age,<sup>85</sup> who are doomed to perish."<sup>86</sup> As in 1:20, Paul in 2:6 plays on the apocalyptic concept of the present age verses the coming age to suggest that there is a wisdom proper to each age.<sup>87</sup> Paul, like 4QInstruction, has no difficulty blending apocalyptic concepts like the two ages with speculation regarding the nature of wisdom.<sup>88</sup> Though scholars have tended to treat

---

<sup>84</sup> Similarly, Wis 1:5 refers to a "holy spirit of education" (ἅγιον . . . πνεῦμα παιδείας). Levison suggests that the adjective παιδείας indicates "that the spirit becomes holy through instruction" (John R. Levison, *The Spirit in First Century Judaism* [Leiden: Brill, 2002], 70). Cf. Col 1:28, in which the author presents instruction in wisdom as the means to maturity (διδάσκοντες πάντα ἄνθρωπον ἐν πάσῃ σοφίᾳ, ἵνα παραστήσωμεν πάντα ἄνθρωπον τέλειον ἐν Χριστῷ).

<sup>85</sup> "The rulers of this age" could be either social and political elites or cosmic powers and principalities (cf. Col 1:13). The apocalyptic overtones of 1 Cor 2:6-16 notwithstanding, the former is more likely. They are the human social and institutional authorities who were not able to recognize divine wisdom and ended up crucifying the Messiah (2:8). See Grindheim, "Wisdom for the Perfect," 694 n. 20. Wesley Carr, *Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning and Development of the Pauline Phrase hai archai kai exousiai*, SNTSMS 42 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005), 118-20.

<sup>86</sup> Cf. James 3:15-17, which likewise distinguishes between the two ages and two wisdoms. Pearson, *The pneumatikos-psychichos Terminology*, 14, and Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, 212, posit that James is dependent on 1 Corinthians.

<sup>87</sup> On the two ages, cf. e.g., 1 En. 71:15; 4 Ezra 7:50; 1QM 11:5-10.

<sup>88</sup> The wisdom Paul proclaims closely resembles the wisdom disclosed by the sage in 4QInstruction, which also blends elements of the Jewish wisdom tradition with an apocalyptic outlook. On wisdom and apocalyptic in 4QInstruction, see, e.g., Strugnell and Harrington, *DJD* 34, 33; Goff, *Discerning Wisdom*, 13, 21; Goff, *4QInstruction*, 19-23. For evidence that 4QInstruction is the address of a teacher to a student,

Paul as if he were dependent primarily on the apocalyptic tradition or primarily on the wisdom tradition, by Paul's time these two traditions were not so sharply divided as our form-critical tendencies would like to believe.<sup>89</sup>

Just as Paul treats the precept of the cross in 1:18-25 as a first curricular level, so the wisdom to which he refers in 2:6 is best interpreted as a second or advanced level of curriculum, much like a student graduating from study under a *ludi magister* to a *grammaticus*.<sup>90</sup> Some interpreters object to the notion that wisdom in 2:6 refers to didactic content that is different from the contents of the precept of the cross (1:18). If Paul had two wisdoms, one for the mature, and one for the immature, they argue, there would be a two-tiered system of Christianity in Corinth, in which the mature are elevated above the immature. In addition to creating internal divisions in the community, such a system would surely conflict with Paul's theology or the egalitarian ethos of early Christianity.<sup>91</sup> But if Paul is drawing on an educational tradition like Philo's in *Leg.* 1.93-94, we need not draw such a hard and fast distinction between immaturity and maturity,

---

see Tigchelaar, *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones*, 245-46. On the generic blending of wisdom and apocalyptic, see Florentino García Martínez, "Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?" in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, BETL 168 (Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003), 1-16; Collins, "Wisdom Reconsidered," 265-81; idem, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls," in "*Jedes Ding hat seine Zeit...*" *Studien zur israelischen und altorientalischen Weisheit. Diethelm Michel zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. A.A. Diesel et al. (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996), 19-32; idem, "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility," in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, B.B. Scott, and W.J. Wiseman (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 165-86. See also James C. Vanderkam, "The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought," in *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane*, ed. J.D. Martin and P.R. Davies (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1986), 163-76.

<sup>89</sup> See the helpful overview of E. Elizabeth Johnson, "Wisdom and Apocalyptic in Paul," in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, B.B. Scott, and W.J. Wiseman (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993), 263-83.

<sup>90</sup> See chapter 4, section II.A-C; chapter 5, section I.B.

<sup>91</sup> E.g., Fee, *First Epistle*, 99-100; Harrington, *First Corinthians*, 128.

reading νήπιος and τέλειος, πνευματικός and ψυχικός, as if they described unchangeable designations of spiritual status.<sup>92</sup> Philo's presentation of the νήπιος and the τέλειος indicates that there is a permeable boundary separating the two. Education enables a student to cross the threshold dividing childhood from adulthood. There is evidence in the rest of 1 Corinthians that Paul thinks that there are stages of growth or development in Christian maturity. 1 Corinthians 14:16, interestingly, addresses the problem of the neophyte as an individual who is incapable of comprehending the spiritual gifts at work in the community, specifically, those who are "speaking mysteries in the Spirit" (πνεύματι δὲ λαλεῖ μυστήρια, 14:2).<sup>93</sup>

Finally, we should note the way that Paul's reticence to disclose his curriculum improperly characterizes him as a teacher. Quintilian is adamant that teachers should only teach what is appropriate for their students at their particular stage in life.<sup>94</sup> It is also noteworthy that the wisdom tradition emphasizes the sage's ability to conceal his thoughts and keep secrets.<sup>95</sup> One of the roles of the *maskil* at Qumran was to "hide the counsel of the law in the midst of the men of sin," while at the same time being able to "lead them with knowledge and in this way teach them the mysteries of wonder and of truth in the midst of the men of the Community, so that they walk perfectly ... in all that

---

<sup>92</sup> See Horsley, "Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos."

<sup>93</sup> 1 Cor 14:16, for example, references ὁ ἀναπληρῶν τὸν τόπον τοῦ ιδιώτου, a phrase which refers to a newcomer or neophyte in the group. Kevin A. Muñoz, "How Not to Go Out of the World: First Corinthians 14:13-25 and the Social Functions of Early Christian Expansion" (PhD diss., Emory University, 2008), 18-19, 115-32. Cf. e.g., Isocrates, *Soph.* 7, who uses ιδιώτης to mean an uneducated person.

<sup>94</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.15-19; 2.1.7.

<sup>95</sup> Cf. Prov 14:2, 15:29, 33, 25:9-10; Sir 18:27, 19:7-12 39:5. See John G. Gammie, "The Sage in Sirach," 359.

has been revealed to them.”<sup>96</sup> Paul, like the *maskil*, was a teacher whose job was to both conceal and reveal his teaching depending on the character of his audience.<sup>97</sup>

Any apocalyptic overtones from 2:6 are further strengthened in 2:7-8. Here Paul expands his description of the wisdom for the mature, arguing that it was hidden and mysterious.<sup>98</sup> There is a long tradition of comparing Paul’s mysteries with the many references to mysteries in the Dead Sea Scrolls and other wisdom literature.<sup>99</sup> 1QH<sup>a</sup> 17:23 explicitly refers to God’s wisdom as mysterious, and both the Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach contain similar conceptions of mystery.<sup>100</sup> Consider especially Wis 6:22: “I will tell you what wisdom is and how she came to be, and I will hide no secrets (οὐκ ἀποκρύψω ὑμῖν μυστήρια) from you, but I will trace her course from the beginning of creation, and make knowledge of her clear, and I will not pass by the truth.”<sup>101</sup> Doubtless this is the approach the Corinthians wish their teachers would take with them, openly disclosing wisdom and hiding no secrets.

---

<sup>96</sup> 1QS 9:17-19.

<sup>97</sup> On the sage at Qumran, see esp. Carol A. Newsom, “The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Functions of the Maskil,” in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*, ed. John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 373–82.

<sup>98</sup> The syntax of ἐν μυστηρίῳ is ambiguous. It could be read either with λαλοῦμεν or τὴν ἀποκεκρυμμένην. The latter is more probable, as it best suits Paul’s argument throughout 2:6-9 (and 1:18-25) that God’s wisdom is inscrutable to human perception. See, e.g., Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:251; Grindheim, “Wisdom for the Perfect,” 697 n.26.

<sup>99</sup> Early important studies include Raymond Brown, “The Pre-Christian Concept of Mystery,” *CBQ* 20 (1958): 417-43; Béda Rigaux, “Révélation des mystères et perfection à Qumran et dans le Nouveau Testament,” *NTS* 4 (1957-58): 237-62; Joseph Coppens, “‘Mystery’ in the Theology of Saint Paul and its Parallels at Qumran,” in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*, ed. Jerome Murphy-O’Connor (Chapman: London, 1968), 132-58. For more recent comparisons of mystery in Paul and Qumran, see Bockmuehl, *Revelation and Mystery*, 42-56; Gladd, *Revealing the mysterion*, 51-84.

<sup>100</sup> Cf. Wis 2:22; 14:15, 23; Sir 22:22; 27:16, 17, 21.

<sup>101</sup> Cf. Wis 7:13.

But for Paul, God’s wisdom is “hidden in a mystery” (2:7), and the fact that it has been revealed to Paul does not require that he reveal it to the Corinthians. One function of Paul’s use of the term “mystery” is to denote an epistemic limit. Paul has been clear throughout 1:18-2:5 that, apart from election, humans are incapable of perceiving God’s wisdom, especially the wisdom revealed in the cross since God has actively thwarted human rationality (1:19; cf. Isa 29:14 LXX). Paul and the other apostles are themselves dependent upon the revelatory power of God’s Spirit for their knowledge of divine wisdom (2:14-16). As such, God’s wisdom transcends human capacities for perception, much as sounds that are above or below certain frequencies are still sounds although they elude the human eardrum.

In 2:8 Paul claims that if the rulers of this age had known God’s wisdom, “they would not have crucified the Lord of glory.”<sup>102</sup> Note the consistency of Paul’s argumentation. Just as the ancient bastions of wisdom and higher education do not comprehend the precept of the cross (1:20) even when it is clearly proclaimed (2:1-5),<sup>103</sup> so too they do not know the higher, hidden wisdom, which Paul reserves for the mature. Whatever the content of this hidden wisdom, 2:8 states that it had the capacity to forestall the crucifixion. This is telling evidence against those like Hooker and Thiselton who read the “wisdom” of 2:6-16 as synonymous with the precept of the cross.<sup>104</sup> If 1 Cor 15:3-5 contains a rough summary of the precept of the cross, knowledge of the precept of the

---

<sup>102</sup> Cf. Paul’s claim that the mysteries of God are “for our glory” in 2:7.

<sup>103</sup> See chapter 5, section I.C.

<sup>104</sup> Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 233. Hooker contends that, “The wisdom of God is Christ himself (1:30), who is for the Christian the source of all wisdom. It is precisely this wisdom to which Paul refers in 2:6.... In his original proclamation of the Gospel to the Corinthians, Paul offered them only Christ crucified; now, in this discussion of wisdom, he offers them an exposition of the same theme! His ‘meat,’ then, differs very little, after all, from the ‘milk’ which he has already fed to them” (“Hard Sayings,” 21).

cross could not have prevented the actual crucifixion. That would be tantamount to arguing that Japanese knowledge of the bombings of Hiroshima and Nagasaki should have discouraged them from attacking Pearl Harbor. The chronology is impossible. Without the crucifixion, there would be no precept of the cross. It follows that the wisdom of 2:6-16 must be of the same sort of wisdom as the precept of the cross (i.e., divine wisdom that nullifies the wisdom of the world), but its contents cannot be identical. If the perpetrators of the crucifixion had known this hidden wisdom, they would not have crucified the Messiah.

In addition to Paul's elliptical use of ἀλλά,<sup>105</sup> the uncertain source of the quotation in 2:9 is and will remain a major exegetical crux.<sup>106</sup> Wherever the quotation may have originated, its meaning and function in Paul's argument are of greater significance for my analysis. The quotation in 2:9 extends the sentiment of Isa 29:14 LXX, which Paul quoted in 1:19: God's wisdom (the referent of the relative pronoun ἃ in 2:9) confounds human wisdom. There is an essential epistemic limit beyond which God's wisdom lies

---

<sup>105</sup> See Bo Frid, "The Enigmatic ἀλλά in 1 Cor 2:9," *NTS* 31 (1985): 603-11.

<sup>106</sup> For good overviews of the problem, see Klaus Berger, "Zur Diskussion über die Herkunft von I Kor. ii.9," *NTS* 24 (1978): 270-83; Claire Clivaz and Sara Schultess, "On the Source and Rewriting of 1 Corinthians 2:9 in Christian, Jewish and Islamic Traditions (1 Clem 34.8; GosJud 47.10-13; a *ḥadīth qudsī*)," *NTS* 61 (2015): 183-200. If the surviving textual traditions available to us today reflect texts available to Paul, the most commonly assumed sources for the quotation are that, as Origen suggested, it comes from the lost *Apocalypse of Elijah*, or, as Clement of Rome (1 Clem 34:8) assumes, that it is a free citation of Isa 64:3 LXX. See Josef Verheyden, "Origen on the Origin of 1 Cor 2:9," in *The Corinthian Correspondence*, ed. Reimund Bieringer, BETL 125 (Leuven: Peeters, 1996), 491-511. It is also possible that the quotation reflects Paul's use of a *florilegium*, including, in addition to Isa 64:3, Isa 65:17. The previous hypothesis that the quotation comes from the *Testament of Jacob* or the *Gospel of Judas* have been discredited. See Eckhard von Nordheim, "Das Zitat des Paulus in 1 Kor 2:9 und seine Beziehung zum koptischen Testament Jakobs," *ZNW* 65 (1974): 112-20; Otfried Hofius, "Das Zitat 1 Kor 2:9 und das koptische Testament des Jacob," *ZNW* 66 (1975): 140-42; H.F.D Sparks, "1 Kor 2:9: A Quotation from the Coptic Testament of Jacob?" *ZNW* 67 (1976): 269-76; Christopher Tuckett, "Paul and Jesus Tradition: The Evidence of 1 Cor 2:9" in *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall*, ed. Trevor J. Burke and J.K. Elliott, NovTSup 109 (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 55-73. Given that the same quotation appears in Ps.-Philo (*LAB* 26:13), we can reasonably conclude that Paul did not construct the quotation on his own (Henry St. John Thackeray, *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought* [London: MacMillan, 1900], 243-44.).

safely hidden.<sup>107</sup> The Hodayot regularly emphasize the lowliness of humans and their consequent inability to perceive God and God's ways. These individuals are akin to the "fleshly spirit" (רוח בשר) of 4Q417, to whom the vision of Hagu is not given.<sup>108</sup> 1QH<sup>a</sup> 5:19-20 asks, "In the mysteries of your insight you have apportioned all these things.... However, what is the spirit of flesh (רוח בשר) to fathom all these matters and to appreciate your great and wondrous secret?"<sup>109</sup> Paul's point, then, is like that found in 4QInstruction and the Hodayot. Human beings left to fend with their own capacities fall short when they attempt to comprehend divine things.

But the Hodayot do not leave the reader hopelessly alienated from higher knowledge. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 5:24-25 continues: "And I, your servant, have known, thanks to the spirit you have placed in me." Similarly, 1 Cor 2:10 reads, "these things God has revealed to us (ἡμῖν) through the Spirit." Paul and the Hodayot are representatives of a shift in the epistemology of the Jewish sapiential tradition in the Second Temple period, which came to rely upon spirit (or Spirit) as an epistemic aid.<sup>110</sup> As we observed in the previous chapter, Paul, like the sages of the wisdom tradition, presents himself as a teacher who receives wisdom via the revelatory action of the Spirit.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> Cf. e.g. 1 En. 93:11-14.

<sup>108</sup> Goff, "Being Fleshly or Spiritual," 47.

<sup>109</sup> Cf. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 7:25.

<sup>110</sup> Leo G. Perdue suggests that one of the major questions regarding the epistemologies of the wisdom tradition is how "those who wrote wisdom literature think they gained access to God and his ways." Perdue writes, "Over the six centuries in which [wisdom] literature was produced the answer changed from an emphasis on individual freedom and the use of the human natural resources of reason and experience to an emphasis on God's special revelation obtainable only through the divine gift of wisdom that ultimately was seen to be embodied in the Torah (Ben Sira) or the Spirit of God (Wisdom of Solomon)" ("Revelation and the Problem of the Hidden God," 206).

<sup>111</sup> Chapter 5, section I.F.

God's Spirit, Paul contends, is suitable for sounding out even "the depths of God" (τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ). The expression τὰ βάθη τοῦ θεοῦ is unique in the Pauline corpus. As is regularly noted, its closest parallel in the Paul's letters is found in Rom 11:33-35:<sup>112</sup> "O the depth (βάθος) of the riches and wisdom and knowledge of God! How unsearchable are his judgments and how inscrutable his ways! 'For who has known the mind of the Lord? Or who has been his counselor?' 'Or who has given a gift to him, to receive a gift in return?'" Note that Rom 11:34 cites Isa 40:13, just as Paul does in 1 Cor 2:16.<sup>113</sup> Additionally, it is possible that Paul refers to God's depths as a consequence of his quotation of Isa 29:14 in 1:20: "deep" may have been carried over metaleptically from the context of the Isa 29:14 quotation, since Isa 29:15 LXX taunts those who think they have "a plan too deep for the LORD."<sup>114</sup> Whatever the source of the expression, Paul in this passage is simply appropriating the readily comprehensible metaphor of deep water to refer to things which are imperceptible. One can stare into the ocean and know that it has a bottom and yet be unable to see it or dive deep enough to find it.

In 2:11-12 Paul explains his reliance on the Spirit with an analogy. Just as the only one who can truly know even a human's "things" (τὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου) is that human being's spirit, so too only God's Spirit can know God's "things" (τὰ τοῦ θεοῦ). Though Paul's argument resembles the Greek epistemological principle stipulating that "only like

---

<sup>112</sup> Fee, *First Epistle*, 111; Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 141.

<sup>113</sup> Outside of the Pauline corpus, the closest linguistic parallel comes in Rev 2:24, where the Revelator speaks of a "teaching" (τὴν διδαχὴν) propagated by a certain prophetic-teacher whom the text refers to as "Jezebel" (Rev 2:20); the text equates this teaching with "the deep things of Satan" (τὰ βαθέα τοῦ σατανᾶ). It is probably coincidental that the closest linguistic parallel to "the depths of God" is shorthand for the contents of a false teacher's instruction, but the phrase may have a similar didactic valence in 2:10. See Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 257 n. 156.

<sup>114</sup> Οὐαὶ οἱ βαθέως βουλὴν ποιοῦντες καὶ οὐ διὰ κυρίου. On metalepsis, see Richard B. Hays, *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989), 14-21.



can know like,”<sup>115</sup> his emphasis on the distinction between the epistemic limits of divine and human spirits seems more akin to the pneumatology of 1QH<sup>a</sup> 5:19-24. For clarity’s sake, Paul distinguishes the reception of God’s Spirit from the spirit of the world. The referent of “the spirit of the world” is unclear.<sup>116</sup> Perhaps Paul is still playing on Jewish conceptions of spirit and anthropology such as those found in 4QInstruction, the Hodayot, where, as we have seen, the possessors of these wicked or fleshly spirits lacked the knowledge of God. Perhaps Paul’s reference to “the spirit of the world” is meant to distance himself and the other Christian teachers from the airy πνεῦμα of the Stoics.<sup>117</sup> Seneca argued that human rationality was a fragment or effluence of this spirit imbedded in a corporeal body.<sup>118</sup> Paul appears to be distinguishing between two pneumatic epistemologies, one that relies upon the Spirit of God for true divine wisdom, the other that relies on the human wisdom and rationality which fails to perceive God’s wisdom in the cross (1:18-25).

Paul’s language in 2:13a takes an explicit turn toward education. The things God has revealed or freely given (2:10, 12) are the things that he and the other teachers speak “in words not taught by human wisdom (ἐν διδακτοῖς ἀνθρωπίνης σοφίας λόγοις) but taught by the Spirit (ἐν διδακτοῖς πνεύματος), interpreting spiritual things to those who are spiritual.” The primary challenge in interpreting 2:13 is grasping the meaning of the

---

<sup>115</sup> Bertil Gärtner, “The Pauline and Johannine Idea of ‘To Know God’ against the Hellenistic Background: The Greek Philosophical Principle ‘Like by Like’ in Paul and John,” *NTS* 14 (1967-1968): 209-31.

<sup>116</sup> Barrett, *First Epistle*, 70. See also Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 262-63.

<sup>117</sup> Thiselton, *First Corinthians*, 260-61.

<sup>118</sup> Cf., e.g., Seneca, *Ep.* 62.12.

verbal adjective διδακτοῖς, which the NRSV translates as “taught.”<sup>119</sup> In 2:13 Paul is elaborating on the principle governing his speech first discussed in 2:4: He speaks “not in words taught of human wisdom” but rather in “[words] taught of the Spirit.” While 2:4 emphasized the style of his discourse, 2:13 emphasizes the pneumatic origins of his discourse’s content. We should not overlook the obvious educational valence of the verbal adjective διδακτοῖς. Given the passive force of the verbal adjective, Paul describes himself, the teacher, as being taught by the Spirit. While this may distance him from Hellenistic grammarians and rhetors, it places him in the same camp as the Jewish scribe or sage.<sup>120</sup>

After explaining the pneumatic origins of his instruction, 2:13b describes Paul’s didactic procedure. Upon receiving “words ... taught by the Spirit,” he interprets of “spiritual things to those who are spiritual.” Unlike the precept of the cross, which can be spoken openly, one must be spiritual themselves before Paul will teach them some other precepts. The phrase “spiritual things to those who are spiritual” (πνευματικοῖς πνευματικὰ συγκρίνοντες) is grammatically ambiguous. It could mean either that Paul’s discourse among the mature involves “comparing spiritual things with other spiritual things,” or that it involves “interpreting spiritual things to spiritual people.”<sup>121</sup> Context, as well as the participle συγκρίνοντες, provide some assistance in adjudicating between

---

<sup>119</sup> The construction of a verbal adjective ending in -τος with a genitive is unique in the Pauline epistles, though cf. John 6:45, πάντες διδακτοὶ θεοῦ· πᾶς ὁ ἀκούσας παρὰ τοῦ πατρὸς καὶ μαθὼν ἔρχεται πρὸς ἐμέ (quoting Isa 54:13 LXX, πάντα τοὺς υἱοὺς σου διδακτοὺς θεοῦ καὶ ἐν πολλῇ εἰρήνῃ τὰ τέκνα σου). As Lightfoot notes, the construction is most pronounced in classical Greek poetry. J.B. Lightfoot, *Notes on Epistles of St Paul from Unpublished Commentaries* (London: MacMillan, 1904), 180. Lightfoot cites Sophocles, *El.* 343; Pindar, *Pyth.* 9.152. But the construction does occur in 1 Macc 4:7, which describes a group of men as “trained in war” (οὗτοι διδακτοὶ πολέμου).

<sup>120</sup> See chapter 5, section I.F.

<sup>121</sup> For the options, see Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 264-65; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:261-62.

these options. Although ancient authors can use συγκρίνω to describe the process of comparison,<sup>122</sup> the emphasis on knowledge of divine revelation suffusing 2:6-16 makes it is more likely that συγκρίνοντες refers to the interpretation of divine phenomena.<sup>123</sup> The meaning of πνευματικοῖς, however, is most decisive for the interpretation of the phrase. Paul can use πνευματικός adjectivally,<sup>124</sup> but in 2:13 it is better read as a substantive adjective denoting an archetypal class of human being, the same sort of human being whom he has previously described as “mature” (τέλειος).<sup>125</sup>

Paul’s mention of “spiritual things” is a reference to the contents of the wisdom revealed to him by the Spirit. Though Paul will later claim that he and the apostles have “sown” spiritual things among the Corinthians (ἡμεῖς ὑμῖν τὰ πνευματικὰ ἐσπείραμεν [9:11]), extending the Greco-Roman educational agricultural metaphor found in 3:5-9 (cf. esp. 3:6),<sup>126</sup> it does not necessarily follow that he has sown every “spiritual thing” that he had at his disposal. The immaturity of the Corinthians requires him to safeguard some “spiritual things” until his audience is prepared to receive them. Consequently, 2:13 constitutes a defense of Paul’s didactic methods. At some point during his first visit, he concluded that the Corinthians were not yet mature and spiritual, that they were ill-suited to more developed teaching (cf. 3:1-4). 1 Corinthians 2:13 implicitly censures the Corinthians for biting off more wisdom than their baby-teeth could chew. If we are correct to infer from Paul’s argument that the Corinthians are not spiritual but rather

---

<sup>122</sup> Cf. 2 Cor 10:12 (Οὐ γὰρ τολμῶμεν ἐγκρίναι ἢ συγκρίναι ἑαυτοὺς τισιν τῶν ἑαυτοὺς συνιστανόντων).

<sup>123</sup> Cf. Gen 40:8; 41:15; Dan 5:7, 12 (LXX Th.).

<sup>124</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 10:3-4 (τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν βρῶμα ἔφαγον ... τὸ αὐτὸ πνευματικὸν ἔπιον πόμα).

<sup>125</sup> So, e.g., Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 142-43.

<sup>126</sup> See chapter 4, section II.B.

fleshly, Paul did not teach them any higher wisdom because their reaction would have been analogous to those mired in the wisdom of the world when confronted with the cross. It would have struck them as foolishness (μωρία), since Paul’s higher wisdom can only be known “spiritually.”

Next, in 2:14-15, Paul introduces the “psychic” person (ψυχικός ἄνθρωπος), who stands in contrast to the πνευματικός.<sup>127</sup> He will develop this distinction in 3:1, when he will claim that he could not address the Corinthians “as spiritual people” (ὡς πνευματικοῖς) but only “as people of the flesh” (ὡς σαρκίνοις).<sup>128</sup> Paul’s use of πνευματικός and ψυχικός in 2:14-15 are examples of the evaluation of one’s students and adaptation to their capacities that were expected of good teachers, Greek, Roman, and Jewish.<sup>129</sup> But since terminology like πνευματικός and ψυχικός or νήπιος and τέλειος result from Jewish interpretation of the creation narratives, 2:14-15 reveal Paul’s distinctively Jewish approach to the evaluation of students and their capacities. In order to understand Paul’s use of these terms, it will prove helpful here to summarize briefly both the creation narratives and its history of interpretation in the Second Temple period.

These heuristic terms commonly occur in Second Temple Jewish interpretation of the creation narratives. In Gen 1:24-31, God creates both the animals and the man and woman. The earth first brings forth the animals who become “living souls” (Ἐξαγαγέτω ἡ γῆ ψυχὴν ζῶσαν/תוצא הארץ נפש חיה) (Gen 1:24). The man and woman, on the other

---

<sup>127</sup> Jewett’s highly influential discussion of Paul’s anthropological terms like ψυχή, πνεῦμα, and σὰρξ is of limited utility, since he reads all of these terms in the Corinthian correspondence against later, Gnostic anthropology, not Second Temple Judaism. See Robert Jewett, *Paul’s Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings* (Leiden, Brill, 1971).

<sup>128</sup> Cf. the similar distinction in Rom 7:14: Οἶδαμεν γὰρ ὅτι ὁ νόμος πνευματικός ἐστίν, ἐγὼ δὲ σὰρκινός εἰμι πεπραμένος ὑπὸ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν.

<sup>129</sup> See chapter 5, section I.G.

hand, are created according to God’s own image (κατ’ εικόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν/כדמותנו/בצלמנו) (Gen 1:26). As is well known, Genesis 2 contains a second description of the creation of humanity. In Gen 2:7, rather than comparing the man to God’s image and likeness, the man becomes “living soul” (ἐγένετο ὁ ἄνθρωπος εἰς ψυχήν ζῶσαν/ויהי האדם לנפש חיה), just like the animals created in Gen 1:24. It is this second man, the one whose creation resembled the creation of the animals, whom God places in the garden and denies access to the tree of the knowledge of good and evil (Gen 2:17).

Some Second Temple Jews like Josephus and Ben Sira read the two creation accounts as references to the creation of different parts of the human being.<sup>130</sup> Others argued that there were multiple types of humans, each with different capacities for the knowledge of God. On the basis of the creation accounts, 4QInstruction developed the strongly dualistic anthropology that grouped some with the fleshly spirit (רוח בשר) and others with spiritual people (עם רוח).<sup>131</sup> The spiritual people have access to a source of divine wisdom—the enigmatic “vision of Hagu”—while the fleshly people are refused access to this wisdom. Conceptually, 4QInstruction’s distinction between spiritual and fleshly-spirited people appears very similar to Paul’s language.<sup>132</sup> Philo splits the difference between these alternatives. He reads Gen 2:7 as a description of a type of person who consists “of body and soul (ἐκ σώματος καὶ ψυχῆς συνεστῶς),” but this

<sup>130</sup> Josephus produced a description of a trichotomous man: Καὶ δὴ καὶ φυσιολογεῖν Μωυσῆς μετὰ τὴν ἐβδόμην ἡρξαστο περὶ τῆς τάνθρώπου κατασκευῆς λέγων οὕτως· ἔπλασεν ὁ θεὸς τὸν ἄνθρωπον χοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς γῆς λαβών, καὶ πνεῦμα ἐνήκεν αὐτῷ καὶ ψυχὴν. ὁ δ’ ἄνθρωπος οὗτος Ἄδαμος ἐκλήθη (*Ant.* 1.34). Cf. *Sir* 16:24-17:15.

<sup>131</sup> 4Q417 1 i 13-18. Cf. 4Q 416 1 12.

<sup>132</sup> See esp. Goff, “Being Fleshly or Spiritual,” 41-59. Cf. e.g., 4Q423 1, which charges the *mebin* with stewardship of the garden of Eden (cf. Gen 2:15); according to Philo, *QG* 1.8, the garden is the allegorical type of Wisdom. 4Q504 8 also appears to associate the impartation of the spirit at creation with a special reception of knowledge: “[a breath of life] you blew into his nostril, and intelligence and knowledge....”

soulish person's capacity for knowledge is vastly inferior to "the man that came into existence earlier after the image of God (τοῦ κατὰ τὴν εἰκόνα θεοῦ γεγονότος πρότερον)." <sup>133</sup>

Returning to 1 Cor 2:14-15, it is clear that when Paul uses language like πνευματικός and ψυχικός he, like Philo or the author of 4QInstruction, is drawing anthropological insight from the creation narratives. But in one important way, Paul more closely resembles Philo than 4QInstruction. For the author of 4QInstruction, one was by birth either spiritual or fleshly. <sup>134</sup> Those born mired in "fleshly spirit" could not transcend their state to become "spiritual." Paul and Philo, conversely, leave open the possibility that one may rise to become mature or spiritual. Each applies the metaphor of "milk and solid food" to describe the types of education proper to each state; the purpose of drinking milk as an infant is to grow to the point at which one can take solid food (cf. 3:1-4). <sup>135</sup>

Though any Corinthian can hope one day to hear Paul's advanced instruction, the fact remains that only a "spiritual person" (πνευματικός) is suited to solid food, Paul's message of wisdom. It is clear from 2:12 that Paul, along with the other apostles and teachers, is a "spiritual" person, one who possesses God's Spirit (cf. 7:40). The spiritual person, Paul argues, is distinguished by (1) the capacity to investigate all things thoroughly (ἀνακρίνει), and (2) by occupying a place beyond examination (ὑπ' οὐδενός

---

<sup>133</sup> *Opif.* 134 (Colson and Whitaker, LCL).

<sup>134</sup> 4QInstruction's anthropology is strongly deterministic. See esp. Goff, *4QInstruction*, 14-16.

<sup>135</sup> On milk and solid food, see chapter 4, section II.A.

ἀνακρίνεται) (2:15).<sup>136</sup> In the context of his argument, Paul implies that the Corinthians' evaluation of himself and the other apostles is baseless; they have taken to themselves the task which will be the Lord's (cf. 4:1-5). Thus, Paul defends himself by establishing his status as a pneumatic teacher and censures the Corinthians for cross-examining him improperly. The job of students is to listen and obey, not to question their teacher's qualifications.

In support of this argument, Paul cites an edited version of Isa 40:13 LXX, "Who has known the mind of the Lord (νοῦν κυρίου), and who has been his councilor to instruct him (ὃς συμβιβᾶ αὐτόν)?"<sup>137</sup> To this, Paul adds the resounding and enigmatic claim "But we have the mind of Christ (νοῦν Χριστοῦ)" (2:16).<sup>138</sup> What are we to make of the shift in emphasis from Spirit (2:10-14) to mind (2:15-16)? One's construal of the νοῦς Χριστοῦ hangs on this question. There is a connection between mind and spirit in Isa 40:13. Isa 40:13 LXX uses νοῦς to translate the Hebrew כּוּן. Given the prominence of the Spirit and epistemology in 2:6-16, it is tempting to conclude that Paul was aware of this translation, though Paul's familiarity (or lack thereof) with the Hebrew *Vorlage* remains conjectural.<sup>139</sup> Some commentators have treated this νοῦς/כּוּן overlap as a curiosity, while others have claimed that, at least in the case of 1 Cor 2:16, νοῦς is

<sup>136</sup> Cf. 9:3: Ἡ ἐμὴ ἀπολογία τοῖς ἐμὲ ἀνακρίνουσιν ἐστὶν αὕτη. See as well 4:4-5, where Paul argues that judgment is the purview of God and God alone, so the Corinthians should not engage in judgement of anyone (μὴ ... κρίνετε).

<sup>137</sup> NETS. Note as well that Isa 40:14 emphasizes how the Lord's superiority to human justice (τίς ἔδειξεν αὐτῷ κρίσιν;). This may explain why Paul has emphasized the spiritual person's freedom from human judgement.

<sup>138</sup> Rom 12:2 associates Christian progression with the transformation of the mind: καὶ μὴ συσχηματίζεσθε τῷ αἰῶνι τούτῳ, ἀλλὰ μεταμορφῶσθε τῇ ἀνακαινώσει τοῦ νοῦς εἰς τὸ δοκιμάζειν ὑμᾶς τί τὸ θέλημα τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸ ἀγαθὸν καὶ εὐάρεστον καὶ τέλειον.

<sup>139</sup> A.T. Hanson, *Studies in Paul's Technique and Theology* (London: SPCK, 1974), 197; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 275-76.

synonymous with πνεῦμα.<sup>140</sup> On this reading, to have the mind of Christ would be a culminating restatement of 2:12's claim that Paul and the apostles have received God's own Spirit.<sup>141</sup> In context, it seems preferable to read νοῦς Χριστοῦ as a sort of shorthand reference to the special knowledge made available to teachers by the Spirit. One need not conclude that Paul was aware of the Hebrew of Isa 40:13, since Jewish tradition associates reception of the Spirit with the exaltation or perfection of the human intellect. 1QH<sup>a</sup> 6:12-13 reads: "I have known, thanks to your insight that in your kindness towards man you have enlarged his share with the spirit of your holiness. Thus you make me approach your intelligence (לבנתך)."

1 Corinthians 2:6-16 is a particularly vital section for the apologetic tenor of Paul's argument. Paul explains for the Corinthians that he and the other apostles are good teachers, adapting the contents of their instruction for the capacities of their audience.<sup>142</sup> Their authority is rooted in the Spirit who reveals higher wisdom to them directly, without any other intermediary.<sup>143</sup> If any Corinthians preferred Apollos to Paul on the grounds that Apollos's instruction was weightier and more advanced, this would betray a fundamental misunderstanding both of their own maturity and Paul's and Apollos's capacities.

---

<sup>140</sup> Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 69. Fee simply notes that the Hebrew of Isa 40:13 reads רוּחַ (*First Epistle*, 120).

<sup>141</sup> Alternatively, Weiss argued that νοῦς here refers not to human capacity for knowledge ("Organ des Denkens") but rather to a mindset ("Denkweise") (Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 68). Similarly, Jewett, *Paul's Anthropological Terms*, 362; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 275-76, presents a range of interpretive options, but it is unclear which he prefers.

<sup>142</sup> On adaptability, see chapter 5, section I.G.

<sup>143</sup> On pneumatically inspired teachers, see chapter 5, section I.F.



### F. Teaching Recalcitrant Students (3:1-4)

1 Corinthians 3:1-4 is the pivot point connecting the two major portions of Paul's argument in 1 Cor 1-4.<sup>144</sup> If the Corinthians missed Paul's subtle nod to the epistemological and educational implications of the creation narratives of Gen 1-2, in 3:1-4 he falls back upon a more accessible educational metaphor—milk and solid food. With this metaphor, he explains both that the Corinthians were not ready for advanced wisdom, and that he, like a good teacher, limited his lessons accordingly.<sup>145</sup>

In 3:1-2, Paul mounts essentially the same argument as he did in 2:14-15, albeit via a different metaphorical matrix. He could not speak to them as spiritual people, but rather as fleshly persons,<sup>146</sup> the equivalent of “infants in Christ (νηπίοις ἐν Χριστῷ).”<sup>147</sup> Since he was speaking to metaphorical infants, he adapted his teaching accordingly, providing “milk, not solid food, for you were not ready for solid food” (3:2). As we have observed, it was common for ancient authors to describe multiple curricular levels by distinguishing between milk and solid food,<sup>148</sup> diets suited to children and adults, respectively.<sup>149</sup> When Paul uses this metaphor in 3:2, it effectively casts him in the role of

---

<sup>144</sup> Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 150.

<sup>145</sup> On milk and solid food as a common educational metaphor, see chapter 4, section II.A.

<sup>146</sup> Paul, like Philo, can juxtapose several concepts with concepts like “flesh” or “body.” Frey writes of Philo: “dass sich eine Vielzahl von Antithesen ergibt” (Jörg Frey, “Die paulinische Antithese von ‘Fleisch’ und ‘Geist’ und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition,” *ZNW* 90 [1999]: 51).

<sup>147</sup> Conzelmann writes of the contrast between the immature and the mature: “The idea of παιδεία, ‘training,’ suggests itself. But it remains only a suggestion” (*1 Corinthians*, 71).

<sup>148</sup> Cf., e.g., Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.1.21; 2.4.5; Philo, *Agr.* 9; *Congr.* 19; Ausonius, *Ep.* 22.66-70.

<sup>149</sup> See esp. Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 254. Similarly, White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 184-86; Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 152. *Contra* Hooker and Francis who argue that Paul is not differentiating two or more levels of instruction, but rather the true food of the gospel from the false food Paul's audience found in Corinthian culture (Hooker, “Hard Sayings,” 19-22; Francis, “As Babes in Christ,” 41-60).

the good teacher who tailors his instruction to his audience's capacities, the antithesis of the windbag whom Philo lampoons for preferring the sound of his own voice to effective instruction.<sup>150</sup>

In vv. 3-4, Paul returns to the problem he highlighted at the beginning of the epistle—the Corinthians' factionalism. He construes their factionalism as evidence that he was right to withhold higher wisdom from them. While the Corinthians would doubtless grant that there was a time in which they needed to learn the basics, at least some members of the community seem to think that those days are past. For these Corinthians, 3:2-4 must have seemed particularly harsh, since Paul claims that, "Even now you are still not ready, for you are still of the flesh (σαρκικοί). For as long as there is jealousy and quarreling (ζήλος καὶ ἔρις) among you, are you not of the flesh (σαρκικοί), and behaving according to human inclinations?" This "jealousy and strife" is manifesting itself as factionalism. Members of the community, like students choosing between ancient schools, are opting for only one of several available teachers, especially Paul and Apollos (3:4; cf. 1:12). Their merely human behavior (κατὰ ἄνθρωπον περιπατεῖτε) demonstrates that they need to be reminded of Paul's own "ways" (cf. 4:17). Note that Paul does not treat the Corinthians' factionalism as the *Hauptprobleme* which he seeks to remedy.<sup>151</sup> Rather, the emergence of factionalism is a symptom of an underlying problem: The Corinthians have failed to develop from people of the flesh into people of

---

<sup>150</sup> Philo, *Post.* 141-42.

<sup>151</sup> See Roy E. Ciampa and Brian S. Rosner, who suggest that scholars after Mitchell have focused on factionalism in the community too exclusively: "While it is true that disunity is a major theme of the letter, extending beyond chs. 1-4, to give it primacy obscures other equally important concerns. Our contention is that rather than reading 1 Corinthians with Graeco-Roman rhetorical categories in mind, it is better to take OT and Jewish frames of reference as the primary lens that clarifies our understanding of both the form and contents of the letter" ("The Structure and Argument of 1 Corinthians: A Biblical/Jewish Approach," *NTS* 52 [2006]: 207).

the Spirit, which indicates that they have not properly digested the milk which Paul gave them at the beginning. Paul appears to treat the Corinthians' lack of development—evidenced by their factionalism—as a failure to learn. Just as students in a Greek primary school need to learn their alphabet before they copy maxims, so the Corinthians must learn the precept of the cross before advancing to deeper wisdom.

Paul, in 3:1-5, both defends himself and censures the Corinthians. As in 2:6-16, he again claims that he tailored his instruction to suit the capacities of his students. But he also bluntly states that the Corinthians are not ready for anything weightier. Their communal factionalism is evidence of prolonged immaturity, and they require the same milk that he has already given them, not solid food. Paul's logic here is elliptical. It seems *prima facie* true that factionalism is evidence of immaturity, but it is not immediately clear why this should be so. If the Corinthian community is factionalistic, so are the vast majority of ancient schools. The discipline of grammar did not lose its internal coherence because its teachers tried to outdo one another. In the case of 3:1-4, educational logic provides a way to reconstruct some of the missing premises in Paul's argument. Factionalism is immature because the precept of the cross undercuts the Greco-Roman educational values that lead to factionalism. In the cross, Jesus seeks not power and glory as the rulers of this age define it, but the Corinthians' attempts to claim the best teachers for themselves is just such an attempt to accrue power and glory. Factionalism calls not only for appeals to unity (cf. 1:10) but censure for failing to actually learn the precept of the cross and its implications. Their unity and solidarity ought to be grounded in the cross.

### G. The Teachers and their Client (3:5-9)

In 3:5-9, Paul continues his invective against Corinthian factionalism, arguing that though he and Apollos are teachers of a sort, they are not competitors. Their services have been retained by the same client. Paul makes this argument by cleverly modifying a common educational metaphor, which likens the teacher to a farmer and the students to the soil the teacher/farmer cultivates.<sup>152</sup>

Paul's mention of ζῆλος καὶ ἔρις, coupled with Apollos's name in 3:3-4, signaled a transition back to the topic of factionalism.<sup>153</sup> Now, in 3:5-9, Paul relies on subtle modifications of an agricultural educational metaphor to present himself and Apollos not only as teachers but as teachers who have been hired by the same client and are working toward a common goal. Each is a servant, not a master, performing only the tasks that they have been assigned by their superior (3:5). He and Apollos are not seeking the upper-hand over one another, trying to obtain the most prestigious assignments. Instead they are engaged in equally necessary duties that happen to require a specific order of operations. Neither Paul's planting nor Apollos's watering is of greater significance (3:6). Without Apollos to water, the seed Paul sowed would never sprout; without Paul's initial act of sowing, Apollos would be watering an empty field. If we accept Paul's characterization of his and Apollos's duties, there is no reason to assume that their relationship was competitive any more than the grammarian who works to develop a

---

<sup>152</sup> On this agricultural metaphor, see chapter 4, section II.B.

<sup>153</sup> Similarly, Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:290.

child's speed at reading is a competitor of the *ludi magister* who taught the child the alphabet.<sup>154</sup> Their activities are complementary and interdependent.

Consequently, it is God, who ultimately provides all increase (ὁ θεὸς ἠύξανεν), whose agency is most important (3:7b-8).<sup>155</sup> God is the one who enlisted Paul and Apollos to begin with. Paul has, therefore, taken the common metaphor of teacher as farmer and student as field, and enlarged it: The transaction between farmer and field retains its internal logic, but Paul places the emphasis on the field's owner, in this case God. In 3:6-7, he emphasizes that neither he nor Apollos was the cause of the community's growth. Any growth was always the work of God, whose servants their teachers are and with whom they cooperate (cf. 3:9: θεοῦ γὰρ ἐσμὲν συνεργοί). Perhaps this introduction of God into the educational metaphor presents God as a teacher. The notion that God could, in some fashion, fulfill the role of the teacher cooperating with other teachers is foreign to Greek and Roman education but it has antecedents in Jewish educational traditions and can be observed in later Christian tradition.<sup>156</sup> Paul will characterize God as a teacher in 3:19-20, as well.

Since God is the ultimate cause of the Corinthians' development, and since both Paul and Apollos receive their assignments from him (3:5), Paul can conclude that he and Apollos are not only co-teachers in the same enterprise but they are also fundamentally unified, one. The NRSV's "The one who plants and the one who waters have a common

---

<sup>154</sup> On the lack of competition between Paul and Apollos see Barrett, *First Epistle*, 85; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 73; Fee *First Epistle*, 132.

<sup>155</sup> Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 74; Fee, *First Epistle*, 132-33; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 302-303; Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 159.

<sup>156</sup> Cf. Philo, *Post.* 130. For a discussion of how Clement of Alexandria understood God as a teacher, see Ryan Woods, "Providence and Paideia in Early Christian Alexandria" (PhD diss., Emory University, 2013).

purpose” is a very weak rendering ὁ φυτεύων δὲ καὶ ὁ ποτίζων ἓν εἰσιν. Not only do Paul and Apollos have a common purpose, they are “one” (ἓν). They are the polar opposite of the Corinthians, whose community is marked by factions (σχίσματα). Yet their unity does not mean that they are exactly the same. “Einheit, nicht Gleichheit, verbindet die Verkündigenden und Lehrenden.”<sup>157</sup> Their unity comes from the fact that they tend the same field, which belongs properly to neither one of them. Rather, the field, the Corinthian community, belongs to God (3:9), and it is God who will provide each with their due wages (3:8).<sup>158</sup> Attempting to associate oneself with a single teacher and “boasting in men” is a viable option only if the teachers are competing with one another. If one’s teachers are working in the same classroom, even if not at the same time, a student may feel a natural preference for one teacher over the other. But they are not justified in listening to or obeying only their favorite. Loyalty to Paul implies loyalty to Apollos and vice versa.

Finally, in v. 8b Paul introduces a new term into the discussion: the notion of eschatological reward understood as “wages” (μισθός).<sup>159</sup> The fact that 1 Corinthians is the only surviving Pauline letter to use μισθός to refer to an eschatological reward demonstrates not that Paul is referring to a special category of reward available only to apostles, but merely that the agricultural metaphor which he has adopted is informing his word choice.<sup>160</sup> Paul’s decision to blend a common educational metaphor with a

---

<sup>157</sup> Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:292.

<sup>158</sup> Barrett, *First Epistle*, 86.

<sup>159</sup> See, e.g., Kuck, *Judgment and Community Conflict*, 168; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 305.

<sup>160</sup> Cf., e.g., John 4:36 (ὁ θερίζων μισθὸν λαμβάνει καὶ συνάγει καρπὸν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, ἵνα ὁ σπείρων ὁμοῦ χαίρη καὶ ὁ θερίζων); Rom 4:4 (τῷ δὲ ἐργαζομένῳ ὁ μισθὸς οὐ λογίζεται κατὰ χάριν ἀλλὰ κατὰ ὀφείλημα). Contra, e.g., Wilhelm Pesch, “Der Sonderlohn für die Verkündiger des Evangeliums (I Kor 3,

statement regarding impending eschatological judgment is another instance in which he shifts the logic of the Greco-Roman educational system. In this case, he cuts to the economic cause of competition between ancient teachers. From elementary education through teachers of rhetoric or philosophy, ancient teachers were forced by economic necessity to compete for students and the fees that came with them.<sup>161</sup> While at least one ancient grammarian was famous for offering his services free of charge,<sup>162</sup> when Paul alludes to his and Apollos's rewards, he removes one of the basic impediments to cooperative teaching. His and Apollos's recompense for teaching the Corinthians comes not from the Corinthians but from God who commissioned them to tend the Corinthian field. Paul will return to this theme throughout 3:10-4:13. However common competition among teachers may have been, it was neither ideal nor universal. The *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* preserve evidence of teachers working in the same classroom at the same time.<sup>163</sup> Paul presents himself and Apollos as just such cooperative teachers.

---

8.14f. und Parallelen),” in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze: Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*, ed. Josef Blinzler, Otto Kuss, and Franz Mussner (Regensburg: Pustet, 1963), 200, 204, 206. On *μισθός* and other Pauline terms for eschatological reward, see Kuck, *Judgment and Community Conflict*, 167-70. Also see Nathan Eubank, *Wages of Cross-Bearing and Debt of Sin: The Economy of Heaven in Matthew's Gospel*, BZNW 196 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2013), 68-70.

<sup>161</sup> See chapter 5, section I.A.

<sup>162</sup> Cf. Suetonius, *Gramm.* 13.

<sup>163</sup> The *Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana* is a collection of anonymous school-texts dating from the first- to third-centuries CE. These texts are commonly structured around describing the day of a young student, and more than one of them describe school rooms with multiple teachers. For critical editions, translations, and commentary on the *Colloquia*, see Eleanor Dickey, *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana. Volume 1: Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia, Leidense-Stephani, and Stephani*, CCTC 49 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012); idem, *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana. Volume 2: Colloquium Harleianum, Colloquium Montepessulanum, Colloquium Celtis, and Fragments*, CCTC 53 (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015). The *Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia* has the student greet a single teacher upon arriving in the classroom (*ave magister*) (2g), but later describing the work of a junior-teacher (*subdoctorem*) (2n; cf. *Colloquium Celtis*, 34b). The *Colloquium Stephani*, in its description of a student's day, has him arriving at school and immediately greeting his teachers (*primum salutavi praeceptores*) (10a). The *Colloquia* afford rare glimpses into the

1 Corinthians 3:5-9 further critiques the Corinthians' factionalism by dismantling the logical basis for dividing into schools exclusively supporting one or another apostle. Paul and Apollos are one, argues Paul, and their unity arises from the fact not only that they perform different tasks in the same field, but also that they have been hired by the same client and await their wages from that client alone. Paul, like the primary teachers described by Quintilian and Ps.-Plutarch,<sup>164</sup> is satisfied to sow the seed of his precepts into the soil of his students and to let another water them.

#### H. Evaluating the Hired Teachers (3:10-17)

1 Corinthians 3:10-17 strongly resembles 3:5-9. In this passage Paul again splices together a common educational metaphor with a warning regarding impending judgment. Here the teachers are architects or skilled tradesmen who build up their students like buildings.<sup>165</sup> Unlike 3:5-9, 3:10-17 reflects a general principle which applies to all teachers, not merely Paul and Apollos. This passage falls into two larger sections. In 3:10-12, Paul contrasts good and bad building practices, while in 3:13-17 he reflects on the rewards and punishments to which good and bad builders will be subject.

In v. 10, Paul makes good on the transition from the agricultural metaphor to the architectural metaphor that he began in v. 9b. The Corinthians are a temple, God's residence (θεοῦ οἰκοδομή).<sup>166</sup> This temple did not spring into existence of its own accord.

---

daily routine of a young student, and their descriptions of multiple teachers working cooperatively demonstrate that teaching was not always a solo affair.

<sup>164</sup> Cf., e.g., Quintilian *Inst.* 9.2.3; Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.* 2b.

<sup>165</sup> See chapter 4, section II.C.

<sup>166</sup> On the importance of building imagery in 1 Corinthians, see esp. Lanci, *A New Temple for Corinth*; Shanor, "Paul as Master Builder."



Rather, just as an educated person requires fundamental education in the alphabet before ornamental encyclical studies,<sup>167</sup> Paul presents himself as the *ludi magister* who laid the Corinthians' foundation: Christ.<sup>168</sup> Pediments and capitals may draw the audience's eye, but without the foundation set down by the architect, the building will ultimately fall. Paul's job as the master builder was to lay the all-important foundation (ἀρχιτέκτων θεμέλιον ἔθηκα) (3:10). Note that Paul does not claim that his responsibility is to both lay the foundation and complete the construction of the edifice as a whole. To do so would reinforce the logic of the Corinthians' factionalism, since members of a Paul party could claim that Apollos, Peter, or some unnamed teacher may have their own competing visions for the Corinthian temple. To forestall such reasoning, Paul readily admits that another person is currently engaged in building upon the foundation which he and he alone laid (ἄλλος δὲ ἐποικοδομεῖ) (3:10).<sup>169</sup> Just as the farmers rely for their payment upon the field's owner, so the temple's builders work because they hope for payment. "Each builder must choose with care how to build" on the foundation (ἕκαστος δὲ βλέπῃ πῶς ἐποικοδομεῖ). Paul is intriguingly vague about the identities of these other builders (ἄλλος and ἕκαστος). While Apollos is certainly implied,<sup>170</sup> Paul's word choice indicates that this principle applies to all would-be Christian teachers at Corinth.<sup>171</sup> Since

---

<sup>167</sup> On the order of education, see chapter 3, section I.B.

<sup>168</sup> Fee argues that this foundation is Christ himself and not teaching about Christ (Fee, *First Epistle*, 139), but the foundation is more likely a reference back to the contents of 1:18-25 (Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:298; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 310-11).

<sup>169</sup> Schrage writes, "Alles Wirken der Lehrer aber hat nur dann Sinn und Recht, wenn es auf dieses grundlegende Wirken des Apostles bezogen bleibt und sich als Weiterführung der apostolischen Verkündigung versteht" (*Der erste Brief*, 1:297). Similarly, Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 309.

<sup>170</sup> Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 161.

Paul has argued that he could have provided a higher level of teaching under the proper circumstances (e.g., 2:6-9, 3:1-4), this expectation of judgment applies even to him.

Paul appears confident that the foundation he laid, the precept of the cross, is the right one (3:11), but he admits that any teacher must take care to provide the proper instruction, using building materials suited to the foundation. Thus anybody (τις) attempting to build further should use costly materials worthy of a temple of God, not cheaper materials which will not stand the test. Good, silver, and precious stones, unlike wood, hay, and straw, can withstand the fire which will come on the apocalyptic day of judgment (3:12-13).<sup>172</sup> The question teachers must ask of themselves is whether their work will survive the trying fire. If so, they will receive a reward (μισθὸν λήμψεται; cf. 3:8). If not, their work will be revealed as shoddy, and they will forfeit any reward. For them, the day of judgment will be the equivalent of a person who escapes from a house fire without being able to save any of the possessions within the house (3:15).<sup>173</sup>

After this direct warning to any would-be teachers, in vv. 16-17 Paul addresses the whole community. They, collectively, are God's temple, in which God's Spirit dwells.<sup>174</sup> This assertion offers some clarity on Paul's regularly confusing references to

---

<sup>171</sup> Cf., e.g., 3:5, 8, 10 (ἐκάστῳ, ἕκαστος [x2]); 3:10 (ἄλλος), 3:12 (τις). This ambiguity implies that while Paul is certainly referring to himself and Apollos, he is also presenting a more general principle which applies to all Christian teachers, and indeed to all members of the community. This unnamed person may well be a member of the community, one of those who consider themselves more advanced than the rest and who can, as such, participate in the instruction of the less-mature converts; such was the communal psychagogic practice in the philosophical schools. See, e.g., Glad, *Paul and Philodemus*, 124-32, 192-204.

<sup>172</sup> Other references to fire and a day of eschatological judgment include Mal 3:2-3; Dan 7:9-10; 1 En 102:1-2; For "the day" as a reference to the day of eschatological judgment in Paul, cf. 1 Thess 5:4; Rom 13:12. See Barrett, *First Epistle*, 88-89; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:302; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 313. *Contra* Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 76.

<sup>173</sup> Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 77; Witherington, *Conflict and Community*, 134; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 315.

<sup>174</sup> Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:305.

Spirit throughout 1 Cor 1-4. On the one hand, in 1:7, he rejoiced that the Corinthians were “not lacking in any spiritual gift (μὴ ὑστερεῖσθαι ἐν μηδενὶ χαρίσματι) as you wait for the revealing of our Lord Jesus Christ.” On the other hand, in 3:1-4, he claimed that he could not address the Corinthians as spiritual persons (πνευματικοῖς). While some have read Paul’s thanksgiving in 1:7 as ironic or mocking, 3:16 indicates that Paul believes that the Spirit was present in the community. Thus, the term πνευματικός, as it occurs between 2:13 and 3:4, probably refers to a level of Christian maturity and does not indicate the Spirit’s presence or absence from the community.<sup>175</sup> As a community in which God’s Spirit dwells, the Corinthians should realize that all of their teachers run the risk of teaching poorly, displeasing God, and being corrupted by God even as they may potentially corrupt God’s temple.

1 Corinthians 3:9b-17 censures the Corinthians in at least two ways. First, as in 3:5-9, Paul shows the irrationality of their factionalism by presenting himself and Apollos as two builders, cooperating on the same project. Their roles may be different, but their goals are the same: constructing the Corinthians into a temple in which God can dwell. Apollos is not building a rival temple, but is attempting to build upon the foundation Paul laid. Second, 1 Cor 3:9b-17 censures any wise Corinthians who have taken the task of teaching upon themselves and are teaching a wisdom that is fundamentally incompatible with the foundation already in place. By misconstruing the respect owed to each of their teachers, the Corinthians show themselves to be disobedient students.

---

<sup>175</sup> See discussion of 2:13, above.

I. All Things are Yours, and You are God's (3:18-23)

1 Corinthians 3:18-23 has been read as the conclusion of the section in Paul's argument begun in 3:1.<sup>176</sup> But given that Paul will continue to expand on these themes in 4:1-21 and beyond,<sup>177</sup> it is important to understand that it, like 3:1-4, is a summative transition, not a signal that the themes of 1 Cor 3:1-17 will no longer appear in Paul's argument. One might even treat 3:18-23 as a parenthetical aside in which Paul restates for his audience many of the hypotheses from the argument of 1:18-3:17. In this restatement, the juxtaposition between human and divine wisdom, boasting, factionalism, and the supremacy of God are particularly clear, as is the educational significance of each of these hypotheses.

1 Corinthians 3:18-20 begins by restating the conclusions of 1:18-25, where Paul indicated that God's wisdom entailed, paradoxically, the complete obverse of commonly accepted standards for human wisdom. First, none of the Corinthians should deceive themselves (μηδεις εαυτον εξαπατατω [3:18]). The warning against self-deception is probably another subtle allusion to the early chapters of Genesis, where in Gen 3:13 the serpent deceives the woman (ειπεν η γυνη 'Ο οφις ηπάτησέν με, και εφαγον).<sup>178</sup> Like Eve, the Corinthians are also being tempted to acquire advanced knowledge improperly. Paul reminds the Corinthians that becoming truly wise entails becoming a fool in the world's estimation (τις ... μωρος γενέσθω, ινα γένηται σοφός) (3:18; cf. 1:23-25). Paul is not encouraging his audience to behave as if they were insane; he believes that the

---

<sup>176</sup> See Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 79; Fee, *First Epistle*, 150; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 319.

<sup>177</sup> Barrett, *First Epistle*, 93; Fee, *First Epistle*, 158-59.

<sup>178</sup> Cf. Paul's summary of Eve's temptation in 2 Cor 11:3: φοβοῦμαι δὲ μή πως, ὡς ὁ ὄφις ἐξηπάτησεν Εὐαν ἐν τῇ πανουργίᾳ αὐτοῦ, φθαρῆ τὰ νοήματα ὑμῶν ἀπὸ τῆς ἀπλότητος [καὶ τῆς ἀγνότητος] τῆς εἰς τὸν Χριστόν.

community's behavior should be orderly (cf. 14:40). Instead, Paul points the community to conform themselves to the example of the crucified Christ, who is “the power of God and the wisdom of God” (1:24). As in his description of those who do the teaching in 3:5-17, Paul relies on an indefinite pronoun (τις) to characterize the person seeking wisdom, ensuring that the admonition is heard by all, not only Corinth's would-be teachers.<sup>179</sup>

In 1:20 Paul had claimed that God has rendered the world's wisdom foolish (ἐμώρανεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου). So in 3:19, Paul again claims that “the wisdom of this world is foolishness with God.” Whereas Paul cited Isa 29:14 LXX in 1:19 to make this point, here, in 3:19-20 he cites Job 5:13 and Ps 93:11 LXX.<sup>180</sup> The broader context of Job 5:13 is particularly relevant for Paul's argument.<sup>181</sup> In addition to claiming that God “takes the wise in their cleverness—and he subverted the scheming of the wily” (Job 5:13; cf. 1 Cor 1:18-25), Job 5:8-9 claims that “the master of all does great and inscrutable things” (cf. 1 Cor 2:6-9), and “sets on high those that are lowly and lifts up those that are in ruin” (Job 5:11; cf. 1 Cor 1:26-31).<sup>182</sup> Above all, Job 5:17-18 characterizes God as a teacher who corrects his student's errors (cf. 1 Cor 3:5-7).<sup>183</sup> Four

<sup>179</sup> Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 321; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:312

<sup>180</sup> Williams, *The Wisdom of the Wise*, 301-30.

<sup>181</sup> Paul's text does not exactly correspond with Septuagintal traditions. See Berndt Schaller, “Zum Textcharakter der Hiobzitate im paulinischen Schriftum,” *ZNW* 71 (1980): 21-26. See too, Christopher D. Stanley, *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*, SNTSMS 74 (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992), 190; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 322-24.

<sup>182</sup> NETS.

<sup>183</sup> Μακάριος δὲ ἄνθρωπος, ὃν ἤλεγξεν ὁ κύριος· νοθέτημα δὲ παντοκράτορος μὴ ἀπαναίνου. αὐτὸς γὰρ ἀλγεῖν ποιεῖ καὶ πάλιν ἀποκαθίστησιν· ἔπαισεν, καὶ αἱ χεῖρες αὐτοῦ ἴασαντο. About this passage, Carol Newsom writes, “As shocking as such images may be to modern readers, the use of beatings in education was considered appropriate and compatible with a loving relationship (cf. Prov 20:30; 22:15; 23:13-14)” (Carol A. Newsom, *Job, NIB* [Nashville: Abingdon, 1996], 4:381). See also C.L. Seow, *Job 1-21: Interpretation and Commentary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013), 422.

of the great themes of 1 Cor 1-4, then, are present in Job 5:8-16: the confounding of human wisdom (cf. 1 Cor 1:18-25), the inscrutability of God’s own wisdom (cf. 1 Cor 2:1, 6-9), the election of the lowly (cf. 1 Cor 1:26-31), and God as a teacher (cf. 1 Cor 3:5-7).

In the same way, the broader context of Ps 93:11 LXX is metaleptically implied in 1 Cor 3:20. It may be that “the Lord knows the thoughts of human beings, that they are vain” (Ps 93:11 LXX), but Ps 93:10-13 LXX depends for its force upon the image of God as a teacher. The psalmist writes: “He who disciplines nations (ὁ παιδεύων ἔθνη), will he not chastise, he who teaches man knowledge (ὁ διδάσκων ἄνθρωπον γνῶσιν)?” The psalmist continues: “Happy the person whom you discipline (ὄν ἄν σὺ παιδεύῃς), O Lord, and teach him out of your law (ἐκ τοῦ νόμου σου διδάξῃς αὐτόν)” (93:10, 12 LXX).<sup>184</sup> The presentation of God as a teacher in Ps 93 LXX, coupled with Job 5:17-18, lends further support to Paul’s modification of the agricultural educational metaphor in 3:5-7. When Paul writes that “God gave the growth,” he is inserting the Jewish notion of God as teacher into a metaphorical matrix common among Greek, Roman, and Jewish authors (3:6). Implicit in Paul’s argument, then, is the notion that God—not Paul or Apollos—is the most important of the Corinthians’ teachers.<sup>185</sup>

Because human wisdom is foolishness before God, the Corinthians should not boast in mere men (μηδεὶς καυχᾶσθω ἐν ἀνθρώποις) (3:21a).<sup>186</sup> This command recalls Paul’s conclusion in 1:31 that those who boast should boast only in the Lord. Boasting in

---

<sup>184</sup> On teaching language in Ps 94:10-12 (93:10-12 LXX), see Wendy Widder, “To Teach” in *Ancient Israel: A Cognitive Linguistic Study of a Biblical Hebrew Lexical Set*, BZAW 456 (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2014), 178-83.

<sup>185</sup> See discussion of 3:6-7 above.

<sup>186</sup> Cf. 1 Cor 1:29-31.

one or another teacher is ridiculous because, as Paul puts it “all things are yours” (πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστίν) (3:21b).<sup>187</sup> “All things” includes “Paul or Apollos or Cephas” (3:22). In Paul’s presentation of the issue they are not competing functionaries who force the Corinthians to follow one teacher and not the other but collaborative partners for the cultivation or edification of the community.<sup>188</sup> The Corinthians do not need to align themselves exclusively with any single teacher, as they would when choosing a grammarian. As fields and buildings, they can profit from learning from each qualified field-hand or architect. Why boast in one teacher only when they have the same access to them all? The Corinthian community’s school seems more like a classroom boasting several equally-qualified teachers, not like the schools of their Corinthian peers who allied themselves with one teacher at a time. But the “all things” which the Corinthians possess also has a cosmic valence, since their domain includes “the world or life or death or the present or the future” (3:22).

While “all things” may belong to the Corinthians, Paul concludes 3:23 by reminding the Corinthians that they themselves belong to Christ, and Christ in turn belongs to God. The theme of God’s supremacy and rule has been one of the most consistent themes of 1 Cor 1-4, and especially of 3:5-17. Not only is God capable of confounding worldly wisdom (1:20), of calling those whom he chooses (1:27-28), and of revealing wisdom to the appropriate teachers (2:9-10), but God is also the implied owner

---

<sup>187</sup> Πάντα γὰρ ὑμῶν ἐστίν may reflect a Cynic or Stoic principle that all things belong to the sage (cf. Diogenes Laertius, 7.125). See Barrett, *First Epistle*, 96; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 80; Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 172. If this is the case, Paul is subordinating the figure of the sage who possesses all things to God who possesses even the wise.

<sup>188</sup> Munck, “The Church without Factions,” 152-54; Winter, *Philo and Paul among the Sophists*, 141. Fee, *First Epistle*, 153.

of the metaphorical Corinthian field who will reward teacher-farmers for its cultivation (3:8), as well as the deity housed in the metaphorical Corinthian temple (3:16-17).

Ultimately, 1 Cor 3:18-23 not only restates several of the most significant concepts in 1 Cor 1-3, but it also shows the folly of the Corinthians' factionalism. Christ's and God's supreme authority over both the Corinthians and their teachers renders factionalism incoherent. Christ has not been divided (cf. 1:13), the apostles who belong to Christ are not divided (cf. 3:8), and neither should the Corinthians be divided.

#### J. Judging the Stewards (4:1-5)

1 Corinthians 4:1-5 is the opening unit of the final section of 1 Cor 1-4.<sup>189</sup> As he has done in 3:5-9 and 3:10-17, Paul now blends a common educational metaphor with apocalyptic judgment language. If the Corinthians belong to Christ (3:23), so too do Paul and Apollos, Christ's servants (ὕπηρέτας Χριστοῦ) (4:1).<sup>190</sup> Specifically, he and Apollos are "stewards of God's mysteries." Stewardship over divine mysteries provided a common metaphor to explain the act of teaching in Greek and Roman education.<sup>191</sup> According to Paul, both he and Apollos fulfill this role in the community, though in 4:1 Paul makes no attempt to differentiate his and Apollos's respective roles as he has done in 3:6 and 3:10.

In 3:5-9, Paul argued that God—and no one else—will provide his and Apollos's eschatological award. In 3:10-17 Paul warned that harsh judgment was a very real

---

<sup>189</sup> Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 178.

<sup>190</sup> The plural ὑπηρέτας refers to Paul and Apollos. Cf. 4:6. See Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:320.

<sup>191</sup> See chapter 4, section II.D.



possibility. Now, in 4:1-5, Paul seems primarily concerned to explain that God alone has the authority to judge the teachers who have been appointed over the Corinthian community. According to 4:2, the chief principle on which stewards of the mysteries will be judged is their fidelity (ὧδε λοιπὸν ζητεῖται ἐν τοῖς οἰκονόμοις, ἵνα πιστός τις εὐρεθῆ). The Corinthians would presumably prefer eloquent, wise, or powerful stewards, but Paul maintains that faithfulness, not talent or social-standing, will be the grounds of his and Apollos's judgment.<sup>192</sup> Paul does not explain here how faithfulness or fidelity may be identified, but we can infer something of its contents from the controlling metaphor of the teacher as steward of the mysteries.

Most commentators have interpreted Paul and Apollos's stewardship against the backdrop of household stewardship.<sup>193</sup> But a household steward's fidelity is not measured in the same way as the fidelity of a cult-functionary. A steward of the mysteries might prove their fidelity by discussing the secret things only with those who have been initiated. Initiates should safeguard special knowledge and discuss it only among those who are qualified to receive it. Jesus's own discussion of the steward-teacher requires the same circumspection: The "faithful and prudent manager (ὁ πιστὸς οἰκονόμος ὁ φρόνιμος) whom his master will put in charge of his slaves" is distinguished as the one who will "give them their allowance of food at the proper time" (Luke 12:42). I am not here claiming that Paul is aware of this dominical saying, which seems to refer primarily to an authority figure in an early Christian community's service to God,<sup>194</sup> or service to

---

<sup>192</sup> Fee, *First Epistle*, 160.

<sup>193</sup> In addition to Goodrich, *Paul as an Administrator of God*, cf., e.g., Barrett, *First Epistle*, 100; Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 83; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 336-38.

<sup>194</sup> François Bovon, *L'Évangile selon Saint Luc*, 4 vols., CNT 2/3 (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1991-2009), 2:298.

both God and fellow Christians.<sup>195</sup> Rather, I am making the more limited claim that both Paul and the Lukan Jesus used stewardship as a didactic metaphor, and that, in Paul's case, the likely meaning of the faithful steward-teacher is the person who is careful about the audience to whom they disclose instruction. The apostles, like the anonymous teacher of letters from *IG* 12.1.141, understood that what they taught, their curriculum, had been given to humans by a divine being (cf. 1 Cor 2:1, 7) and that they had been given oversight over the dispensation of these mysteries. 1 Corinthians 4:1-2, it seems, serves an apologetic function. It reiterates Paul's claim in 3:1-4 that he did not teach the Corinthians advanced wisdom because of their immaturity. They were not yet prepared for further mysteries.

Because Paul is Christ's steward, it would be a breach of etiquette for the Corinthians to judge him (4:3).<sup>196</sup> The Corinthians' opinions of the relative merits of Paul, Apollos, and Peter lie at the root of the factions. At least some of the Corinthians have evaluated these functionaries from the standpoint of the wisdom taught in ancient schools and have sought to associate themselves with the teacher who promises to distribute the greater portion of wisdom to their students.<sup>197</sup> But for Paul, no human judgment, not even his own, can substantiate his faithfulness to Christ (4:3).<sup>198</sup> A clear conscience is all well and good, but just as it was God who would reward the farmers of the Corinthian field (3:8), and the architects constructing the Corinthian temple (3:14), so

---

<sup>195</sup> Luke Timothy Johnson, *The Gospel of Luke*, SP 3 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), 206.

<sup>196</sup> Kuck, *Judgment and Community Conflict*, 196; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 338.

<sup>197</sup> Munck, "The Church without Factions," 152-54; Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 302; White, *Where is the Wise Man?*, 3, 205

<sup>198</sup> Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 340-42.

Paul waits for the Lord to evaluate him (ὁ δὲ ἀνακρίνων με κύριός ἐστιν) (4:4). As in 3:5-17, this judgment is an eschatological judgment.<sup>199</sup> It will occur only when “the Lord comes, who will bring to light the things now hidden in darkness and will disclose the purposes of the heart” (4:5a). And while Paul has alluded twice to the payment (μισθός) awaiting faithful teachers, in 4:5 he changes the terminology. As a steward of God’s mysteries, he awaits his master’s commendation (ὁ ἔπαινος γενήσεται ἐκάστω ἀπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ). The general point is that it falls to the one who oversees the teacher to judge whether or not the teacher has been providing suitable instruction. As Ben Sira advises, “The wise remain silent until the right moment” (Sir 20:7). If the members of the Corinthian community, then, evaluate Paul and the other apostles in the process of deciding which factionalistic school suits them best, they have overstepped their bounds. Who are they to judge another’s servant (Rom 14:4)?

1 Cor 4:1-5 has both an apologetic and admonitory function. By presenting himself and Apollos as stewards, Paul again explains that one of his primary duties is to adapt his instruction to the developmental capacity of his audience.<sup>200</sup> Just as a hierophant would be dangerously remiss if he spoke openly of mysteries reserved only for an initiate, or an elementary teacher tried to force students who had not yet learned their alphabet to scan poetry, so Paul would have been an unfaithful steward if he had tried to teach the Corinthians anything other than the precept of the cross. For their part, at least some of the Corinthians have erred by evaluating Paul and Apollos by the contents and

---

<sup>199</sup> Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 83-84. Barrett suggests that this may be an anti-Stoic position. Cf. Seneca, *Ira* 3.32.2-3, in which he describes his daily routine of judging himself (Barrett, *First Epistle*, 102).

<sup>200</sup> Schrage notes the apologetic tone of the passage, but does not identify the educational resonances of the passage (*Der erste Brief*, 1:318-19).

styles of the teaching. It is not their place, as the students, to evaluate their teachers but rather for their guardian—in this case, God alone.

#### K. Imitate the Teachers who Embody their Teaching (4:6-13)

Beginning in 1 Cor 4:6, Paul sets out to explain the primary thesis he advanced in 3:5-4:5 and to score one further point: If Paul and Apollos are teachers, their students ought to imitate them, as they embody and practice the curriculum that they teach. Though vague, ταῦτα δέ in 4:6 probably refers to the educational metaphors from 3:5-4:5,<sup>201</sup> which have focused on Paul and Apollos, especially Paul’s argument that they are colleagues, not competitors. Paul now explains why he has treated his relationship with Apollos at such length. He “applied (μετεσχημάτισα) all this to Apollos and myself for your benefit ... so that you may learn through us the meaning of the saying, ‘Nothing beyond what is written,’ so that none of you will be puffed up in favor of one against another” (4:6). There are two major challenges to the interpretation of this claim: the meaning of μετεσχημάτισα and the significance of the maxim μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται.

The verb μετεσχημάτισα has been subject to at least four alternative readings.<sup>202</sup> Of these four options, two are most plausible. Some scholars have read μετεσχημάτισα as evidence that Paul was not actually discussing himself and Apollos, but rather using his and Apollos’s relationship as a stand-in for some of the unnamed, wise Corinthians who were the real rabble-rousers in the Corinthian community; in this way, Paul would have

<sup>201</sup> Zeller renders Ταῦτα δέ simply as “Das (Voranstehende)” (*Der erste Brief*, 178). Jan Lambrecht suggests that it “may point to the general principle that a servant of Christ is but a servant whose work will be judged (3,5-15) and of whom it is required to be found trustworthy” (“Paul as Example: A Study of 1 Corinthians 4,6-21,” in *Collected Studies on Pauline Literature and the Book of Revelation*, AnBib 147 [Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2001], 44).

<sup>202</sup> For a thorough overview, see Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 148-51.

avoided directly confronting these Corinthians, exposing them to unnecessary public shaming.<sup>203</sup> Such arguments rely upon the notion that the warnings against improperly building up the church in 3:13-17 could not actually apply to Paul and Apollos. Second, some read *μετεσχημάτισα* merely as Paul's acknowledgement that he is coming to the end of a portion of argumentation that has relied heavily on metaphor to describe the relationship between himself and Apollos.<sup>204</sup>

These two positions are not necessarily antithetical. The warnings against improperly building upon the foundation that is Christ do indeed apply to any and all who undertake the project of communal edification, Paul and Apollos not least among them. Nevertheless, Paul's language has become unusually oblique in 3:9-22, and the injunction against those who appear wise according to the present standards of the world seems best read as a critique of the wise Corinthians themselves (3:18-22). While the rhetorical valence of *μετεσχημάτισα* does apply here, Paul's description of the dangers inherent in improper education could and do indeed apply to himself and Apollos. Paul is aware of the dangers that come with teaching the community. And because he is aware that he will face God's judgment, he will not even judge himself regarding his teaching (4:4). Warnings against improper evaluation of others and of oneself are valid for Paul and for any "wise" Corinthians, who expect the same eschatological judgment.

Paul's discussion of his and Apollos's cooperative relationship ought to teach the Corinthians *μη ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται*, literally, "Not beyond what is written,"<sup>205</sup> a phrase best

---

<sup>203</sup> David R. Hall, "A Disguise for the Wise: *μετασχηματισμός* in 1 Corinthians 4:6," *NTS* 40 (1994): 143-49. Fiore, "Covert Allusion," 85-102. Similarly, Barrett, *First Epistle*, 106;

<sup>204</sup> See, e.g., Johan S. Vos, "Der *METASXEMATISMOS* in 1Kor 4:6," *ZNW* 86 (1995): 154-72.

<sup>205</sup> My translation.

interpreted as a maxim describing the process of elementary writing instruction.<sup>206</sup> In basic writing instruction, children would trace out, often on wax tablets, exempla which their teacher had inscribed for them. When μή ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται is read as such a maxim, the exegetical payoff is that Paul presents his relationship with Apollos as the example to be copied. The meaning of μή ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται is something that the Corinthians should be able to “learn in us” (ἐν ἡμῶν μάθητε): that is, in the presentation of Paul and Apollos as unified and cooperative co-teachers that Paul has just given the Corinthians in 3:5-4:5.<sup>207</sup> As the verb μανθάνω reveals, the preceding juxtaposition of Paul and Apollos has had the Corinthians’ further education as its goal.<sup>208</sup> The result of so imitating Paul and Apollos’s cooperation will be that “none of you will be puffed up (φουσιῶσθε) in favor of one against another” (4:6). If the Corinthians are not using the wisdom learned from the apostle-teachers as a means to claim for themselves positions of authority or standing within the community, there will be no need for factions.<sup>209</sup>

While the Corinthians’ scholastic ethos has led them to their factionalism, it should be noted that Paul does not abandon or reject out of hand each component of ancient scholastic culture. His response is more even-handed. By comparing himself and Apollos to one of the most basic exercises in the ancient elementary school room, he encourages the Corinthians to imitate their teachers, a didactic technique found in all levels of ancient education.<sup>210</sup> The Corinthians’ desire to learn ought to be encouraged,

---

<sup>206</sup> See chapter 4, section II.E.

<sup>207</sup> Similarly, Lambrecht, “Paul as Example,” 59.

<sup>208</sup> Fee, *First Epistle*, 167.

<sup>209</sup> Barrett, *First Epistle*, 107.

<sup>210</sup> On imitation, see chapter 4, section II.H.

even if they have been going about it the wrong way. Since the Corinthians' teachers are not seeking to dominate one another, neither should the Corinthians try to gain supremacy over their peers. If the Corinthians were really devoted to the teachers whom they have propped up as faction-chiefs, they would recognize that factionalism itself is incompatible with their teachers and their teachers' curriculum.

1 Cor 4:7 follows with a series of rhetorical questions which further undermine the Corinthians' factionalism. "Who is drawing distinctions among you?"<sup>211</sup> Certainly it is not Paul, one of the alleged leaders of the factions. "What do you have that you did not receive? And if you received it, why do you boast as if it were not a gift?" "All things" may belong to the Corinthians (cf. 3:21-23), but they are theirs by gift, not by nature. Why boast in the gifts and not in the God who gave them such gifts? Paul then lampoons the markers of social status in which the Corinthians might boast (4:8). They think that they are already full, rich, and ruling like kings, and that they have achieved these things without their apostles, the supposed heads of their factions (*χωρίς ἡμῶν ἐβασιλεύσατε*). Paul ironically describes the Corinthians as if they were Stoic sages. Brookins writes,

It has long been recognized that the language of 1 Cor. 4:8 finds its closest parallel in the paradoxes ('Already you have become rich [*ἐπλουτήσατε*]! Quite apart from us you have become kings! [*ἐβασιλεύσατε*]'). Verse 10 continues the Corinthians' language—or, at least, Paul continues the language of the paradoxes to characterize them: 'you are ... prudent (*φρόνιμοι*; *SVF* 3.655) ... strong (*ισχυροί*; *SVF* 1.216; cf. 3.567) ... held in honour (*ἔνδοξοι*; *SVF* 3.603).' <sup>212</sup>

---

<sup>211</sup> My translation. Similarly, see Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 182. Against the NRSV ("For who sees anything different in you?").

<sup>212</sup> Brookins, "The Wise Corinthians," 60. See too Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, 106-115, who cites many Stoic parallels; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 109.

Regardless of whether the Corinthians actually espoused an over-realized eschatology, within the context of Paul's argument they are behaving as if the promised judgment which Paul has described in 3:8, 14 and 4:5 were already accomplished and they had received their wages and their praise.<sup>213</sup> However, as 3:8b demonstrates, judgment and its ensuing rewards has not occurred, for the apostles are decidedly not enjoying recompense for their labor (ὄφελόν γε ἐβασιλεύσατε, ἵνα καὶ ἡμεῖς ὑμῶν συμβασιλεύσωμεν).

Additionally, as Fitzgerald has demonstrated, if the Corinthians were untested by real hardship, they would not be able to boast in the proven philosophical virtue expected of the sage.<sup>214</sup>

Instead, the apostles find themselves beset by a host of sufferings, some of which Paul catalogues in vv. 9-13. While Paul's catalogues of sufferings have been the subject of much debate,<sup>215</sup> the primary effect of 1 Cor 4:9-13 is to demonstrate that the Corinthians apostles, rather than living like kings, are embodying the precept of the cross, their wisdom manifest in their distinctive lifestyle. Paul's catalogue of sufferings certainly overlaps with the sufferings expected of a Cynic or Stoic sage, who thought it

---

<sup>213</sup> This does not necessarily imply that the Corinthians had an over-realized eschatology. The concept of eschatological reward is integral to the argument of 3:5-4:5 and not necessarily a mirror image of the Corinthians' own beliefs. On over-realized eschatology, see esp. Anthony C. Thiselton, "Realized Eschatology at Corinth," *NTS* 24 (1978): 510-26. See Dahl, "Paul and the Church at Corinth," 332; Christopher L. Mearns, "Early Eschatological Development in Paul: The Evidence of 1 Corinthians," *JSNT* 22 (1984): 19-35; Barrett, *First Epistle*, 108-109; Fee, *First Epistle*, 172; Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:332-33.

<sup>214</sup> Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 120-36.

<sup>215</sup> On the *peristasis* catalogues, see esp. Plank, *Paul and the Irony of Affliction*; Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*; M. Schiefer Ferarri, *Die Sprache des Leids in den paulinischen Peristasenkatalogen* (Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991). Karl T. Kleinknecht, *Der leidende Gerechtfertigte: Die alttestamentlich-jüdische Tradition vom "leidenden Gerechten" und ihre Rezeption bei Paulus*, WUNT 2/13 (Tübingen: Mohr, 1984).



foolish to boast about untested wisdom.<sup>216</sup> But in the flow of the argument, the chief function of the *peristasis* catalogue of 4:9-13 demonstrates that the apostles conform to the pattern established by the cross.<sup>217</sup> The teachers in whom the Corinthians are currently boasting do not resemble the rhetors, who prepared their students to assume positions of social significance. If the apostles do, as Fitzgerald has argued, resemble philosophical sages due to their endurance of hardship,<sup>218</sup> this is a different sort of endurance, and with a different goal in mind. Their endurance of hardships is not intended to demonstrate their ἀντάρκεια but rather their conformity to God's revealed wisdom, especially, the cross, and it is this conformity to the cross that the Corinthians should imitate.<sup>219</sup> As good teachers, their words and deeds correspond to one another.

It is not necessary here to discuss each element of the *peristasis* catalogue. It is enough to note that several of the hardships Paul catalogues lie quite close to the experiences of crucified individuals in the ancient Mediterranean world, especially being subject to death and being a public spectacle (4:9). When Paul claims that he and the apostles are “fools for Christ's sake (ἡμεῖς μωροὶ διὰ Χριστόν),” he characterizes himself and the apostles as the human equivalent of the foolish wisdom of the precept of the cross from, e.g., 1:18 (Ὁ λόγος γὰρ ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ τοῖς μὲν ἀπολλυμένοις μωρία ἐστίν). They

---

<sup>216</sup> See Fitzgerald's discussion of the hardships which philosophers might endure (*Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 113-114).

<sup>217</sup> Fee, *First Epistle*, 166, 181; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 361. Wolfgang Schrage, “Leid, Kreuz, und Eschaton: Die Peristaskataloge als Merkmale paulinischer *theologia crucis* und Eschatologie,” *EvT* 34 (1974): 859-79. Schrage writes that “Apostolat und *theologia crucis* werden noch einmal miteinander in Beziehung gesetzt, doch im Unterschied zu 2,1-5 wird dieses Leben in der Tiefe nun nicht zur Exemplifizierung der Kreuzespredigt im Gegensatz zu den Weisheitsworten, sondern als Kontrast zum Leben der Gemeinde auf der Höhe und damit zugleich als Modell angeführt” (*Der erste Brief*, 1:330). Similarly Kleinknect, *Der leidende Gerechtfertigte*, 208-304.

<sup>218</sup> Fitzgerald, *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel*, 120-36.

<sup>219</sup> Lambrecht, “Paul as Example,” 61-62.

are those who have become fools so as to be truly wise (3:23). The apostolic experience of hunger, thirst, nakedness, beatings, displacement, manual labor, persecution, and slander provide concrete examples of the life lived in accordance with the precept of the cross, a life which contrasts sharply with the contrary values of broader Corinthian culture (4:11-13). In contrast, the Corinthians are ironically described as the antithesis of these traits characteristic of the cross, demonstrating their failure to imitate Paul who himself imitated Christ (cf. 11:1).

1 Cor 4:6-13 is perhaps the *coup de grâce* of the entire argument of 1 Cor 1-4.<sup>220</sup> Throughout the opening movement of the epistle, Paul has taken great care to explain carefully the precept of the cross and its implications (e.g. 1:18-25). He has relied on the common moral principle that there ought to be a harmonious union of precept and practice both to defend his behavior (e.g., his rhetorical style and delivery in 2:1-5). Now 4:6-13 presents a cruciform lifestyle as the ultimate test of innocence or culpability. Paul and the apostles, like Jesus, endure circumstances that were, from the perspective of Corinthian society, shameful. But at least some of the Corinthians have attempted to accrue honor and status, the converse of the way of the cross. This, paradoxically, is the apostle's great vindication and the Corinthian's great dishonor.<sup>221</sup>

---

<sup>220</sup> Kleinknecht says that 4:6-13 has "den Charakter eines summierenden Höhepunkts der ersten vier Kapitel" (*Der leidende Gerechtfertigte*, 222).

<sup>221</sup> Fee rightly notes that "The cross is not only the paradigm of the gospel, and of God's ways that stand in contradistinction to human ways, but it also serves as the basic model for ministry. It stands as the divine contradiction to a merely human understanding of the role of leaders, such as the Corinthians were exhibiting" (*First Epistle*, 131).

### L. Imitate the Coming Teacher (4:14-21)

1 Cor 4:14-21 is the coda to the first movement of 1 Corinthians. Its primary theme is Paul's promise to visit the community, which demonstrates his affection and care for the community.<sup>222</sup> The overall impression of the pericope is that of a classroom when the teacher has left the room, and the students misbehave until they hear their teacher returning. "I am not writing this (ταῦτα)," Paul writes, "to make you ashamed, but to admonish (νουθετῶν) you as my beloved children" (4:14).<sup>223</sup> The Corinthians' current lack of conformity may not be a cause for shame, but other problems in the community will be (cf. 6:5; 15:34). Since Paul is their father in the fictive kinship paradigm of the teacher-student relationship—he begot them by teaching them the gospel (4:15)—it is worth noting that rebuke is one of the disciplinary methods most recommended by ancient educators. Philo believed that "fathers have the right to upbraid their children and admonish them severely (ἐμβριθέστερον νουθετεῖν) and if they do not submit to threats conveyed in words to beat and degrade them and put them in bonds (τύπτειν καὶ προπηλακίζειν καὶ καταδεῖν)."<sup>224</sup> Corporal punishment remained the most common form of discipline, but verbal rebukes could be effective, and, unlike beatings,

---

<sup>222</sup> Dahl, "Paul and the Church at Corinth," 328-29. Compare the reference to Apollos's possible but uncertain visit in 16:12: Περὶ δὲ Ἀπολλῶ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ, πολλὰ παρεκάλεσα αὐτόν, ἵνα ἔλθῃ πρὸς ὑμᾶς μετὰ τῶν ἀδελφῶν· καὶ πάντως οὐκ ἦν θέλημα ἵνα νῦν ἔλθῃ· ἐλεύσεται δὲ ὅταν εὐκαιρήσῃ.

<sup>223</sup> Cf. the rehearsal of the exodus in Wis 11:9-10: "For when they were tested, although they were being disciplined in mercy (καίπερ ἐν ἐλέει παιδευόμενοι), they learned how the impious, being judged in anger, were tormented. For these you put to the test like a father giving a warning (τούτους μὲν γὰρ ὡς πατὴρ νουθετῶν ἐδοκίμασας), but the others you examined like a stern king passing sentence" (NETS).

<sup>224</sup> *Spec.* 2.232 (Colson, LCL).

were not so degrading as to undermine the students' education by making a free-born child associate themselves with punishments suited to slaves (cf. 4:21).<sup>225</sup>

Paul is understandably concerned not to ruin his students with undue harshness, since he is the Corinthians' father,<sup>226</sup> not merely one of their pedagogues.<sup>227</sup> Contrary to what Schmeller argues, Paul is not adopting a household metaphor to counteract the Corinthians' scholastic vision for the community.<sup>228</sup> Rather, he is contrasting two different types of teacher. His fatherhood resembles the fictive fatherhood that Quintilian and others ascribed to teachers.<sup>229</sup> By casting himself in the role of the father, Paul highlights the importance of his founding role in the community, exemplified by his first proclamation of the gospel (4:15).<sup>230</sup> This does not necessarily diminish the importance of the pedagogues, a group which presumably includes Apollos, but it does claim a special sort of authority for Paul.<sup>231</sup> As their father, he should be the one whom the Corinthians imitate (4:16).<sup>232</sup> Though one could interpret this call to imitation as an unwitting instance in which Paul actually lends support to a Pauline faction, in the flow

---

<sup>225</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.3.13-16.

<sup>226</sup> On fathers as teachers and teachers as fictive parents, see chapter 4, section II.H.

<sup>227</sup> On the pedagogue's educative role, see chapter 4, section II.F.

<sup>228</sup> Schmeller, *Schulen im neuen Testament*, 102-103.

<sup>229</sup> Quintilian, *Inst.* 2.2.5. Cf. Apuleius, *Flor.* 18.18; 20.2.

<sup>230</sup> Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:354. See too Otto Betz, "Die Geburt der Gemeinde durch den Lehrer," *NTS* 3 (1956/57): 314-26. Regarding 1QH<sup>a</sup> 3:1-18, Betz writes, "Es ist naheliegend, dass der Lehrer, der sich als Vater oder Amme seiner Schüler bezeichnen kann, auch das Bild von der Mutter benutzt, die Kinder gebiert" (322).

<sup>231</sup> Zeller, *Der erste Brief*, 191 notes that the pedagogue was a teacher of secondary importance.

<sup>232</sup> On the educative importance of imitating one's father, cf., e.g., Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.* 14a; Philo, *Virt.* 197.

of the argument,<sup>233</sup> imitating Paul must imply not only abandoning their counter-Christian factionalism in favor of the non-competitive relationship that Paul understands himself to share with Apollos (cf. 4:6), but also rejecting the standards of popular wisdom which gave rise to their factionalism and adopting instead the cruciform lifestyle outlined in 4:9-13.<sup>234</sup>

But because Paul is not able to come immediately, he is sending Timothy to the Corinthians as an *aide de memoire* (4:17). As another of Paul's fictive children qua pupils (μου τέκνον ἀγαπητὸν καὶ πιστὸν ἐν κυρίῳ), Timothy appears as an older, more advanced student. There is evidence from ancient schools that one of the older students' tasks was to assist younger students with their less advanced lessons.<sup>235</sup> Timothy's special task, should he arrive in Corinth,<sup>236</sup> is to remind the Corinthians of Paul's "ways" (τὰς ὁδοῦς), paraenetic or didactic instructions which arise as a result of his conformity to the precept of the cross, as defined in 1:18-25 and explained throughout 1 Cor 2-4.<sup>237</sup> Instead of walking like mere human beings (3:3), they ought to walk like their apostle and teacher, whose life is lived in accordance with the precept of the cross. Since these are the ways

<sup>233</sup> So Conzelmann, *1 Corinthians*, 92.

<sup>234</sup> Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 371

<sup>235</sup> Cf., e.g., *Colloquia Moacensia-Einsidlensia*, 2m: "Meanwhile, as the teacher orders, the little ones get up to [practice] letters, and one of the bigger [pupils] gave them syllables" (trans. Dickey).

<sup>236</sup> Though many read ἔπεμψα as an epistolary aorist and assume that Timothy himself delivered 1 Corinthians, Barrett rightly objects that 1 Corinthians itself presents Timothy's promised coming as an uncertain event. 16:10 in particular indicates that Timothy may or may not arrive in Corinth himself ("If Timothy comes [Ἐὰν δὲ ἔλθῃ Τιμόθεος], see that he has nothing to fear among you"). See Barrett, *First Epistle*, 116; Fee, *First Epistle*, 188; Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 375.

<sup>237</sup> Schrage, *Der erste Brief*, 1:359. Most scholars emphasize the Jewish background to Paul's "ways," since the Greek term ὁδοί would not necessarily carry the semantic freight of moral standards or patterns of behavior (see, e.g., Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 374 n.409). See Barrett, *First Epistle*, 117. Conzelmann claims that Paul's ways "are here more especially his *teaching*" and that "διδάσκειν, 'teach' (and διδασχῆ, 'teaching'), likewise belong to the technical terminology of proclamation" (*1 Corinthians*, 92-93. Emphasis original).

that Paul teaches in every church, copying them at Timothy's prompting enables the Corinthians to imitate Paul, their father (cf. 4:16). However, the fact that the Corinthians need to be reminded of something that Paul has already taught them is a gentle rebuke, since capacity for remembering one's lessons was the single most important hallmark of a good student in antiquity.<sup>238</sup>

Finally, in 4:18-21 Paul indicates that in addition to sending Timothy immediately, presumably as the courier of 1 Corinthians, he himself will come. In his prolonged absence, some members of the community have become "puffed up" (ἐφυσιώθησάν τινες) (4:18), the hallmark of knowledge rather than love (cf. 8:1b: ἡ γνῶσις φουσιῶ, ἡ δὲ ἀγάπη οἰκοδομεῖ).<sup>239</sup> As 4:6 revealed, imitating Paul and Apollos's non-competitive relationship is the key to deflating this ethos; Paul's "ways" are not ways of self-aggrandizement (4:17). To that end, Paul promises to do all in his power to visit the Corinthians (4:19a). His coming will provide an opportunity to reckon with those who have become puffed up, paralleling his warning regarding the Lord's return and the judgment he will enact (4:5). Paul suggests that the "puffed up" among the Corinthians have a problem. Their discourse is lacking in power (γνώσομαι οὐ τὸν λόγον ... ἀλλὰ τὴν δύναμιν). In 1:17 and 2:1-5, Paul was clear that he tailored his discourse to the precept of the cross. In that way, instead of a display of human eloquence, the cross's true power would be evident. (4:20).

Finally, in 4:21, Paul asks "What would you prefer? Am I to come to you with a stick (ἐν ῥάβδῳ), or with love in a spirit of gentleness?" Despite the protestations of

---

<sup>238</sup> On the importance of a student's memory, see chapter 4, section II.J.

<sup>239</sup> Cf. 5:2 (καὶ ὑμεῖς πεφυσιωμένοι ἐστὲ καὶ οὐχὶ μᾶλλον ἐπενθήσατε); 13:4 (ἡ ἀγάπη μακροθυμεῖ ... οὐ φουσιῶται).

Thiselton,<sup>240</sup> Paul's allusion to the stick is best construed as a reference to the corporal punishment so common in ancient schools, especially elementary schools.<sup>241</sup> Given that Paul has consistently portrayed the Corinthians as disorderly students, the reference to corporal punishment is entirely expected. Because beatings were often a teacher's first recourse in the struggle to maintain classroom order, the Corinthians, who by now must recognize that their teacher is displeased with them, surely expect some form of discipline. While corporal punishment was the most common form of discipline in ancient schools, Quintilian and Ps.-Plutarch both stated that they preferred teachers to correct students with verbal rebukes rather than beatings.<sup>242</sup> Flogging, Quintilian says, "is humiliating and proper only for slaves," warning that "if a boy is so lacking in self-respect that reproof is powerless to put him right, he will even become hardened to blows, like the worst type of slave."<sup>243</sup> Paul, then, is certainly trying to correct the grave errors which he sees in the community, but by claiming that he is not interested in shaming his students, he puts himself in the same camp as educators like Quintilian and Libanius.

Even Paul's coda in 4:14-21 extends his apology and censure by presenting himself as a good teacher and the Corinthians as poor students. He is a gentle teacher, like a good father, and ought to be imitated. He delegates more mature Christians to assist with his students' instruction. On the other hand, the Corinthians have behaved in such a way that a less gentle teacher might resort to flogging right away. Their primary fault is

---

<sup>240</sup> Thiselton, *First Epistle*, 378. Similarly Fee, *First Epistle*, 193.

<sup>241</sup> See chapter 4, section II.K.

<sup>242</sup> Cf. Quintilian, *Inst.* 1.3.13-16; Ps.-Plutarch, *Lib. ed.*, 9a. See n. 223 above.

<sup>243</sup> *Inst.* 1.3.14. This attitude may also be found in the school of Libanius. See *Or.* 58.38.

that they need reminding of Paul's ways, his standards of behavior which are governed by his fundamental teaching, the precept of the cross.

### III. Conclusion

This chapter has demonstrated that Paul, throughout 1 Cor 1-4, draws on the ethos of ancient educational institutions in order to defend himself and to censure the Corinthians. In many cases, when he defends himself he relies on commonly accepted notions of good teaching, such as the belief that teachers ought to adapt their instruction to suit the capacities of their students for learning. Even when Paul's apology relies on a principle that is not explicitly educational—i.e., the principle that moral people are marked by consistency between the precepts they espouse and the behavior that they practice—educational sources like Ps.-Plutarch demonstrate that teachers could be held to this same standard. Likewise, when Paul admonishes the Corinthians, his logic is that of a teacher admonishing poorly performing students. As we observed, the Corinthians' fundamental error is not their factionalism. Their factionalism, boasting, and puffed-up self-aggrandizement are evidence that they have failed to learn Paul's precept of the cross. The cross may be wisdom and power, but it is a paradoxical wisdom. Its power is evident in the apostolic life-style of homelessness, beatings, imprisonments, etc. While others have recognized that 1 Cor 1-4 does indeed contain elements of both apology and censure, this chapter has demonstrated that Paul relies on explicitly educational logic throughout to achieve each of these argumentative ends. It is the controlling image of the Corinthian community as a school which provides a baseline for both apology and admonition, lending unity and coherence to a potentially confused argument.



## Chapter 7:

### Conclusion: Contributions and Directions for Future Research

This dissertation has made several contributions to the study of Paul and 1 Corinthians. First, it has broadened the scope of parallel material for the study of Paul and ancient education. Whereas previous studies have focused on either Greco-Roman education or Jewish education to the exclusion of the other, this dissertation has attended to texts from both traditions. Second, following Marksches's insistence that students of early Christianity give due attention to the earliest stages of ancient education, this study has provided perhaps the first serious analysis of a Pauline text in light of primary and secondary education, rather than sophistic or philosophical education, exclusively. Third, because this project works with an understanding of ancient education that encompasses all stages of Greek and Roman education as well as Jewish education, it has provided a thorough catalogue of all the instances in 1 Cor 1-4 in which Paul appears to be drawing on educational traditions. The previous work of Dutch and White demonstrated the strong resonance between a few of Paul's phrases and metaphors and educational discourse, but chapters 4 and 5 have significantly increased the list of instances of likely educational language.

Finally, all of these minor contributions have sought to produce a better reading of 1 Corinthians. I have argued that 1 Cor 1-4 can only be fully appreciated when one is aware of Paul's adoption and adaptation of educational traditions for his own argumentative ends. He relies on common notions of good teaching in order to defend his teaching practices against the judgment of certain "wise" Corinthians, as well as equally common notions of good and bad students in order to critique the Corinthians for failing

to live up to the implications of the precept of the cross. When juxtaposed with these teachers and educational institutions, Paul appears as a creative recipient of Greek, Roman, and Jewish assumptions about teaching and learning, one who can shape commonly held views about education to his own argumentative ends. This is a departure from the scholarly trend observed in chapter 2, in which those commentators who have observed points of correspondence between 1 Cor 1-4 and ancient philosophical or rhetorical education tend to mirror-read this data in order to improve their socio-historical reconstructions of the Corinthian community.

While this study has restricted itself to studying a single section of only one Pauline letter, its findings are relevant for a number of research questions beyond the limited confines of 1 Cor 1-4, especially: (1) the interpretation of 1 Corinthians as unified literary composition and (2) clearer understanding of Paul and Pauline Christianity.

Since the publication of Mitchell's *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*, scholars have grown increasingly reticent to partition 1 Corinthians into multiple letters.<sup>1</sup> Yet in his influential study of 1 Cor 1-4, Dahl argued that "The integrity of 1 Corinthians may be assumed as a working hypothesis which is confirmed if it proves possible to understand 1 Cor. 1:10-4:21 as an introductory section with a definite purpose within the letter as a whole."<sup>2</sup> Aside from Mitchell's demonstration that the themes of social harmony and concord (i.e., the antithesis of factionalism) appear in each major section of the letter,<sup>3</sup> the situation is not much changed from the time of Dahl's writing in 1967.<sup>4</sup> I

---

<sup>1</sup> For the most recent noteworthy exception, see Welborn, *Paul, the Fool of Christ*.

<sup>2</sup> Dahl, "Paul and the Church at Corinth," 317.

<sup>3</sup> Mitchell, *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation*.

<sup>4</sup> Dahl, "Paul and the Church at Corinth," 316.

have no wish to question Mitchell's findings, which seem to me to be correct in principle, but this study gives special attention to the way in which education is emphasized above factionalism 1 Cor 1-4 in such a way that education is emphasized above factionalism. This raises a natural question: Might the ancient educational traditions on which Paul draws in 1 Cor 1-4 provide some new leverage for demonstrating the literary integrity of 1 Corinthians? I think so, but it is only possible here to mention some possible ways in which this might be so.

First, there are other educational *topoi* to be found within 1 Cor 5-16. The most obvious of these is the athletic imagery in 9:24-27. As we observed in chapter 2, Dutch has interpreted Paul's references to foot races and boxing as hints that the apostle was critiquing the ethos of the Hellenistic gymnasium.<sup>5</sup> Yet gymnastic imagery provided ancient authors with a common source domain for educational metaphors beyond strict athletic training.<sup>6</sup> If educational motifs extend into the body of the epistle, it might prove fruitful to consider whether some features of the letter which do not, on first reading, appear to resonate with ancient education actually sit quite comfortably alongside other educational literature from antiquity.

If one reads the remaining chapters of 1 Corinthians in light of the scholastic community model which Paul establishes in 1 Cor 1-4, Paul's ethical instructions tend to read much like Ben Sira's classroom notes; Paul comes across as a Christian teacher of wisdom. While every topic Paul addresses has been selected to inform some area of the community's life—either as a result of the Corinthians' letter to Paul or as a result of the oral report of Chloe's people—each topic that Paul addresses is also addressed in the

---

<sup>5</sup> See Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 219-48.

<sup>6</sup> See chapter 2, section II.B.

Second Temple Jewish wisdom tradition. Sexual ethics, moderation in food and drink, right thinking about idolatry, etc. are obviously common wisdom themes. Since scholars regularly find themselves confounded by “the absence of any detectable logic in the arrangement of [1 Corinthians’s] contents,”<sup>7</sup> it is worth noting that this same problem confronts students of Sirach. In the case of Ben Sira, some hypothesize that the lack of a clear organizational pattern is evidence that the book itself originated as an unintegrated series of lecture notes.<sup>8</sup> In the case of 1 Corinthians, the absence of a clear and logical pattern of arrangement is perhaps the result of Paul’s mimicking the literary style of Jewish wisdom texts like Ben Sira or Proverbs, which address a range of topics using a frequently haphazard range of literary genres and strategies. It seems plausible to conclude that the system of social relationships which Paul establishes in 1 Cor 1-4—with Paul as the teacher and the Corinthians as his students—holds steady throughout the remainder of the epistle, with Paul’s discourse taking on the style of a Jewish *Weisheitslehrer*.<sup>9</sup>

In addition to these primarily literary concerns, Paul’s heavy adoption and adaptation of educational themes has implications for future interpretations of the historical Corinthian community. At several points, this study has agreed with the previous hypotheses of Judge, Munck, Dutch, and White that the historical Corinthian community had some affinity with ancient schools. Schmeller, like Dahl before him, holds out the possibility that when Paul uses educational language, he might only be

---

<sup>7</sup> Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, *Paul: A Critical Life* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 253. See too Ciampa and Rosner, “The Structure and Argument of 1 Corinthians,” 205-18.

<sup>8</sup> Di Lella and Skehan, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*, 10

<sup>9</sup> See Theis, *Paulus als Weisheitslehrer*.

adapting his language to suit the Corinthians' expectations for how a community like theirs ought to function.<sup>10</sup> It seems more likely that the many educational parallels adduced above provide further evidence not only that Paul drew on common educational language, adapting it for his epistolary response to the Corinthian situation, but also in his actual founding of the community. If Paul founded the Corinthian community in the same fashion as a grammarian would when setting up a school, and the Corinthians thought of him as a teacher, then the factionalistic Corinthians can be forgiven for assuming that Paul and Apollos would behave competitively. This, we observed, was how most other διδάσκαλοι, grammarians, and rhetors recruited and retained their students. Dutch, then, would be at least partially correct when he writes that the Corinthians “cannot transfer the cultural values of *paideia* learnt in the gymnasium with its intellectual and physical conflict, set within its religious tradition, to the new faith.”<sup>11</sup>

Dutch suggests that the Corinthians have imported these Greco-Roman educational mores into the community. But given that Paul favorably adopts common educational language and imagery to describe himself, Apollos, and God, perhaps Paul evangelized the Corinthian community by adopting a recognizably teacherly ethos. It may not have occurred to him that his audience understood more than he meant—and that he ought to delineate all the ways in which his Christian παιδεία was not only like but also unlike the educational traditions he was adapting. Perhaps becoming “all things to all people” entailed liabilities as well as advantages (9:22). Moreover, we must contend with 1 Cor 4:17, which strongly implies that Paul had a set of talking-points, analogous to a

---

<sup>10</sup> Schmeller, *Schulen im neuen Testament*, 145. Though, according to Dahl, “this assumption remains highly conjectural” (“Paul and the Church at Corinth,” 317).

<sup>11</sup> Dutch, *Paul and the Educated Elite*, 302.

curriculum, which he taught “in all the churches.” Finally, I think it likely that the Corinthian community was, to some degree, a scholastic community, because if it were otherwise, it is unlikely that Paul’s argument in 1 Cor 1-4 would have gained any traction with its Corinthian recipients. As chapters 4, 5, and 6 made clear, Paul defends his teaching by appealing to the common didactic strategies of dividing curricula into multiple stages, with each stage adapted to the capacities of the students. This can be no merely ornamental application of didactic logic. For it to have any argumentative force, it must correlate with the Corinthians’ historical experience of Paul and his work. Of course, we do not know exactly how 1 Corinthians was received, but it is plausible to assume that Paul would not be stacking the deck against himself by describing his 18 month stay in Corinth in a way that his audience would have found utterly unrecognizable.

Whatever our conclusions regarding the historical Corinthian community and its scholastic shape, the persistent presence of educational language in 1 Cor 1-4 encourages us to identify other educational motifs in the rest of the Pauline corpus. There are, in fact, educational motifs dotting the *corpus paulinum*, in both the undisputed and disputed epistles. And the accurate identification and interpretation of these educational motifs is as potentially illuminating for those letters as it is for 1 Corinthians.

Within Paul’s undisputed letters, there are two prominent loci of educational language. The most obvious is 1 Thess 1-2, which contains several of the educational motifs identified in the present study. For example, Paul praises the Thessalonians for their imitation of their teachers (1:6; cf. 2:14), Paul’s presentation of himself as a nurse (i.e., one who provides milk) (2:7), and teachers as parents (2:11). In addition, Galatians

contains several conspicuous educational tropes. The most obvious of these is Paul's use of pedagogue imagery in Gal 3:24-25, but Paul's discussion of Hagar and Sarah strongly parallels Philo's adaptation of the Penelope allegory in *Congr.* where he interprets Hagar and Sarah as two levels of education, encyclical education and philosophical education, respectively (Gal 4:22-31).<sup>12</sup> Since Paul couples his exposition of Hagar and Sarah in Gal 4:22-31 with the theme of growth from childhood to maturity in Gal 4:1-21, it is possible that Paul and Philo were drawing from a similar educational/developmental script. While educational language is evident in other portions of Paul's undisputed letters (e.g., his reference to the Jewish παιδευτής ἀφρόνων in Rom 2:20), 1 Thessalonians and Galatians seem to offer the most promising starting points.

The prominence of educational language in 1 Cor 1-4 and other portions of the undisputed letters must inform our reading of the disputed Pauline epistles. It is clear that the highly didactic language one encounters in, e.g., 1 & 2 Timothy cannot be immediately dismissed as some secondary accretion upon original Pauline tradition. Rather the notion that Paul was a teacher extends back to Paul's undisputed letters.<sup>13</sup> One must likewise account for the explicitly educational valence of the νήπιος and τέλειος

---

<sup>12</sup> Much remains to be done with this particular passage. See Jason M. Zurawski, "Mosaic Torah as Encyclical Paideia: Reading Paul's Allegory of Hagar and Sarah in Light of Philo of Alexandria's" (paper presented at the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, 2012).

<sup>13</sup> Cf., e.g., 1 Tim 1:3 (μὴ ἑτεροδιδασκαλεῖν); 1 Tim 1:20 (ἵνα παιδευθῶσιν μὴ βλασφημεῖν); 1 Tim 2:7 (διδάσκαλος ἔθνων); 1 Tim 2:11-12 (Γυνὴ ἐν ἡσυχίᾳ μανθανέτω ἐν πάσῃ ὑποταγῇ· διδάσκειν δὲ γυναῖκι οὐκ ἐπιτρέπω); 1 Tim 3:2 (τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ... διδακτικόν); 1 Tim 4:1 (διδασκαλίαις δαιμονίων); 1 Tim 4:7 (Γύμναζε δὲ σεαυτὸν); 1 Tim 4:13 (πρόσεχε τῇ ἀναγνώσει, τῇ παρακλήσει, τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ); 1 Tim 6:3 (τῇ κατ' εὐσέβειαν διδασκαλίᾳ); 2 Tim 1:11 (ἐγὼ κῆρυξ καὶ ἀπόστολος καὶ διδάσκαλος); 2 Tim 2:2 (ταῦτα παράθου πιστοῖς ἀνθρώποις, οἵτινες ἱκανοὶ ἔσονται καὶ ἑτέρους διδάξαι); 2 Tim 2:23 (τὰς δὲ μορὰς καὶ ἀπαιδεύτους ζητήσεις παραιτοῦ); 2 Tim 2:24 (δοῦλον δὲ κυρίου ... διδακτικόν); 2 Tim 3:7 (πάντοτε μανθάνοντα καὶ μηδέποτε εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν δυνάμενα); 2 Tim 3:10 (Σὺ δὲ παρηκολούθησάς μου τῇ διδασκαλίᾳ); 2 Tim 3:14 (Σὺ δὲ μένε ἐν οἷς ἔμαθες καὶ ἐπιστώθης); 2 Tim 4:2-3 (κῆρυξον τὸν λόγον ... ἔλεγξον, ἐπιτίμησον, παρακάλεσον, ἐν πάσῃ μακροθυμίᾳ καὶ διδαχῇ. Ἔσται γὰρ καιρὸς ὅτε τῆς ὑγιαίνουσας διδασκαλίας ... ἐπισωρεύσουσιν διδασκάλους κνηθόμενοι τὴν ἀκοήν).

terminology in Eph 4:13-14. Future scholarship will determine whether there are any significant differences between the educational traditions in the undisputed and disputed epistles, and what the import of those differences (or not) may be for the interpretation of the disputed epistles. This study is also relevant to a number of additional topics, such as the development of the Christian catechumenate and early Christianity's interaction with Greco-Roman education,<sup>14</sup> its primary contribution is to the field of Pauline studies.

Twenty-first-century readers owe a debt to the many early Christians who persisted in remembering Paul not only as an apostle but also as a teacher of the nations. Thanks to their familiarity with the ancient educational system, they observed a feature of Paul's letters which modern scholarship has long overlooked. Their writings form a collective sign post alerting us to an important element of Paul's discourse. Though questions surrounding the makeup and character of early Pauline communities will surely persist, studies like the present one are making it increasingly clear that Paul drew liberally from the educational traditions dominant in the ancient Mediterranean world, modifying them for literary, rhetorical, and evangelistic ends.

---

<sup>14</sup> It also relevant to the question of the development of Christian educational institutions in early Christianity. Perhaps the mimetic pedagogy of the Alexandrians, from Clement to Didymus, had a Pauline antecedent? On imitation in Clement's pedagogy, see Henri Crouzel, "L'imitation et la 'suite' de Dieu et du Christ dans les premiers siècles chrétiens, ainsi que leurs sources gréco-romaines et hébraïques," *JAC* 21 (1978): 7-41. On imitation in Didymus's school, see Richard A. Layton, *Didymus the Blind and his Circle in Late-Antique Alexandria* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004), e.g., 8-10, 94-96.



### Bibliography

- Abbott, N.J.S. "The Treatise De Liberis Educandis Attributed to Plutarch." DPhil thesis, Oxford University, 1980.
- Adams, Edward. "Review of *Paul and the Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians*, by Robert S. Dutch." *JSNT* 29 (2006): 238-41.
- Albini, Francesca. "Family and the Formation of Character in Plutarch." Pages 59-71 in *Plutarch and his Intellectual World*. Edited by Judith Mossman. London: Gerald Duckworth, 1997.
- Ambrose. *On the Christian Faith*. In vol. 10 of *the Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers*, Series 2. Edited by Philipp Schaff. 1886-1889. 14 vols. Repr., Peabody: Hendrickson, 1994.
- Amir, Yehoshua. *Die hellenistische Gestalt des Judentums bei Philon von Alexandrien*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1983.
- . "θεοκρατία as a Concept of Political Philosophy: Josephus' Presentation of Moses' *Politeia*." *Scripta Classical Israelica* 8-9 (1985-88): 83-105.
- Alexander, Loveday. "Paul and the Hellenistic Schools: The Evidence of Galen." Pages 60-83 in *Paul in his Hellenistic Context*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- . "IPSE DIXIT: Citation of Authority in Paul and in the Jewish and Hellenistic Schools." Pages 103-27 in *Paul Beyond the Judaism-Hellenism Divide*. Edited by Troels Engberg-Pedersen. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- von Arnim, Hans. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. 4 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1904-1924.
- Arrighetti, Graziano. "Ieronimo di Rhodi." *SCO* 3 (1954): 111-28.

Artz-Grabner, Peter, Amfilochios Papatomas, Ruth Elisabeth Kritzer, and Franz Winter.

*I Korinther*. PKNT 2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2006.

Asmis, Elizabeth. "Basic Education in Epicureanism." Pages 209-39 in *Education in*

*Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Edited by Yun Lee Too. Leiden: Brill, 2001.

Atherton, Catherine. "Hand over Fist: The Failure of Stoic Rhetoric." *CQ* 38 (1988):

392-427.

Attridge, Harold W. *A Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. Hermeneia.

Philadelphia: Fortress, 1989.

Babbitt, Frank Cole, et al., trans. 1927-2004. *Plutarch: Moralia*. 16 vols. LCL.

Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Bailey, D.R. Shackleton, trans. 1993. *Martial: Epigrams*. 3 vols. LCL. Cambridge:

Harvard University Press.

Barbour, Robin S. "Wisdom and the Cross in 1 Corinthians 1 and 2." Pages 57-71 in

*Theologia Crucis-Signum Crucis, Festschrift Erich Dinkler*. Edited by Carl

Andressen. Tübingen: Mohr, 1979.

Barclay, John M.G. "Manipulating Moses: Exodus 2:15 in Egyptian Judaism and the New

Testament." Pages 20-40 in *Text as Pretext: Essays in Honour of Robert*

*Davidson*. Edited by Robert P. Carroll. JSOTSup 138. Sheffield: Journal for the

Study of the Old Testament Press, 1992.

———. *Against Apion*. FJTC 10. Leiden: Brill, 2007.

———. "Matching Theory and Practice: Josephus' Constitutional Ideal and Paul's

Strategy in Corinth." Pages 81-106 in *Pauline Churches and Diaspora Jews*.

WUNT 275. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.

- Barr, James. *The Semantics of Biblical Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1961.
- Baur, F.C. "Die Christuspartei in der korinthischen Gemeinde, der Gegensatz der petrinischen und paulinischen Christentums in der ältesten Kirche, der Apostel Petrus in Rom." *Tübinger Zeitschrift für Theologie* 4 (1831): 61-206.
- . *Paul, the Apostle of Jesus Christ: His Life and Works, His Epistles and Teachings: A Contribution to a Critical History of Primitive Christianity*. 2 Vols. in 1. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2003.
- Barrett, C.K. *A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. HNTC. New York: Harper & Row, 1968.
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and A Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*. VetTSup 68. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . *Happy the One Who Meditates on Wisdom (Sir 14,20): Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira*. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
- . "Scripture and Scribe: Ben Sira 38:34c-39:11." Pages 115-22 in *Happy the One Who Meditates on Wisdom (Sir 14,20): Collected Essays on the Book of Ben Sira*. Leuven: Peeters, 2006.
- Berg, Shane A. *Religious Epistemologies in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Heritage and Transformation of the Wisdom Tradition*. PhD diss., Yale University, 2008.
- Berger, Klaus. "Zur Diskussion über die Herkunft von I Kor. ii.9." *NTS* 24 (1978): 270-83.

- Berry, Edmund. "The *De Liberis Educandis* of Pseudo-Plutarch." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 63 (1958): 387-99.
- Best, Ernest. "The Power and Wisdom of God." Pages 9-41 in *Paolo: A Una Chiesa Divisa (1 Cor 1-4)*. Edited by Lorenzo de Lorenzi. Rome: Abbazia di S. Paolo, 1980.
- Betz, Otto. "Die Geburt der Gemeinde durch den Lehrer." *NTS* 3 (1956/57): 314-26.
- Bird, Michael and Joseph Dodson, eds., *Paul and the Second Century*. LNTS 412. London: T&T Clark, 2011.
- Beaudean, John William. *Paul's Theology of Preaching*. Macon: Mercer University Press, 1988.
- Becker, Adam H. and Annette Yoshiko Reed, eds. *The Ways that Never Parted: Jews and Christians in Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Age*. TSAJ 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Blank, D.L. *Sextus Empiricus: Against the Grammarians (Adversus Mathematicos I)*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1998.
- Bloomer, W. Martin. *The School of Rome: Latin Studies and the Origins of Liberal Education*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2011.
- . *A Companion to Ancient Education*. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.
- . "Quintilian on Education." Pages 347-57 in *A Companion to Ancient Education*. Edited by W. Martin Bloomer. Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2015.
- Bockmuehl, Marcus N.A. *Revelation and Mystery in Ancient Judaism and Pauline Christianity*. WUNT 2/36. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1990.

- Bolin, Thomas. "1-2 Samuel and Jewish *Paideia* in the Persian and Hellenistic Periods." Pages 133-58 in *Deuteronomy-Kings As Emerging Authoritative Books: A Conversation*. Edited by Diana Vikander Edelman. ANEM. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2014.
- Bonner, Stanley F. *Education in Ancient Rome: From the Elder Cato to the Younger Pliny*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1977.
- Booth, Alan D. "Punishment, Discipline, and Riot in the Schools of Antiquity." *Echos du Monde Classique* 17 (1973): 107-14.
- . "Elementary and Secondary Education in the Roman Empire." *Florilegium* 1 (1979): 1-14.
- Bormann, Paul. *Die Heilswirksamkeit der Verkündigung nach dem Apostel Paulus: Ein Beitrag zur Theologie der Verkündigung*. Paderborn: Bonifacius Druckerei, 1965.
- Bovon, François. *L'Évangile selon Saint Luc*. 4 vols. CNT 2/3. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1991-2009.
- Bowie, E.L. "The Importance of the Sophists." *YCS* 27 (1982): 29-52.
- Brandenburger, Egon. *Fleisch und Geist: Paulus und die dualistische Weisheit*. WMANT 29. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1968.
- Bringmann, Klaus. "Rhodos als Bildungszentrum der hellenistische Welt." *Chiron* 32 (2002): 65-81.
- Brinton, Alan. "Quintilian, Plato, and the 'Vir Bonus.'" *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 16 (1983): 167-184.
- Brookins, Timothy A. "The Wise Corinthians: Their Stoic Education and Outlook." *JTS* 62 (2011): 51-76.

- . *Corinthian Wisdom, Stoic Philosophy, and the Ancient Economy*. SNTSMS 159. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Brown, Alexandra R. *The Cross and Human Transformation: Paul's Apocalyptic Word in 1 Corinthians*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Brown, Raymond E. "The Pre-Christian Concept of Mystery." *CBQ* 20 (1958): 417-43.
- . *The Semitic Background of the Term "Mystery" in the New Testament*. FBBS 21. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1968.
- Bullmore, Michael. *St. Paul's Theology of Rhetorical Style: An examination of 1 Corinthians 2:1-5 in Light of First-Century Rhetorical Criticism*. San Francisco: International Scholars Publications, 1995.
- Bultmann, Rudolf. *Der Stil der Paulinischen Predigt und die Kynisch-Stoische Diatribe*. FRLANT 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1910.
- Bussman, Claus. *Themen der Paulinischen Missionspredigt auf dem Hintergrund der spätjüdisch-hellenistischen Missionsliteratur*. Bern: Lang, 1975.
- Byrskog, Samuel. "Co-Senders, Co-Authors, and Paul's Use of the First Person Plural." *ZNW* 87 (1996): 230-50.
- Calame, Claude. *Choruses of Young Women in Ancient Greece: Their Morphology, Religious Role and Social Functions*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield, 1997.
- Carr, David M. *Writing on the Tablet of the Heart: Origins of Scripture and Literature*. New York: Oxford, 2005.
- Carr, Wesley. *Angels and Principalities: The Background, Meaning and Development of the Pauline Phrase *hai archai kai exousiai**. SNTSMS 42. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.

- Castelli, Elizabeth. *Imitating Paul: A Discourse of Power*. Philadelphia: Westminster John Knox, 1991.
- Chapman, David W. *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2010.
- Charlesworth, James H. ed. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2009.
- Chester, Stephen J. *Conversion at Corinth: Perspectives on Conversion in Paul's Theology and the Corinthian Church*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Ciampa, Roy E. and Brian S. Rosner. "The Structure and Argument of 1 Corinthians: A Biblical/Jewish Approach." *NTS* 52 (2006): 207-215.
- Clark, Elizabeth A. *History, Theory, Text: Historians and the Linguistic Turn*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2004.
- Clarke, Andrew. *Secular & Christian Leadership in Corinth: A Socio-Historical & Exegetical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-6*. AGJU 18. Brill: Leiden, 1993.
- Clarke, M.L. *Higher Education in the Ancient World*. New York: Routledge, 2012.
- Clifford, Richard J. *Creation Accounts in the Ancient Near East and in the Bible*. CBQMS 26. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1994.
- Clivaz, Claire and Sara Schultess. "On the Source and Rewriting of 1 Corinthians 2:9 in Christian, Jewish and Islamic Traditions (1 Clem 34.8; GosJud 47.10–13; a *ḥadīth qudsī*)." *NTS* 61 (2015): 183-200.
- Collins, John J. "Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and Generic Compatibility." Pages 165-86 in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*. Edited by Leo G. Perdue, B.B. Scott, and W.J. Wiseman. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.

- . “Wisdom, Apocalypticism, and the Dead Sea Scrolls.” Pages 19-32 in *“Jedes Ding hat seine Zeit...” Studien zur israelhischen und altorientalischen Weisheit Diethelm Michel zum 65. Geburtstag*. Edited by Anja Angela Diesel, Reinhard G. Lehmann, Eckart Otto, Andreas Wagner, and Diethelm Michel. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1996.
- . “Wisdom Reconsidered, in Light of the Scrolls.” *DSD* 4 (1997): 265-81.
- . *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age*. OTL. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1997.
- Collins, Raymond F. *First Corinthians*. SP 7. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1999.
- Colson, F.H. “Philo on Education.” *JTS* 18 (1916-17): 151-62.
- Colson, F.H., et al., trans. 1929-1962. *Philo*. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Conley, Thomas. “General Education in Philo of Alexandria.” Protocol of the 15<sup>th</sup> Colloquy of the Center for Hermeneutical Studies in Hellenistic and Modern Culture, 9 March 1975.
- Conzelmann, Hans. “Paulus und die Weisheit.” *NTS* 12 (1966): 231-44.
- . *I Corinthians: A Commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1975.
- . “Die Schule des Paulus.” Pages 85-96 in *Theologia Crucis-Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Carl Andresen and Günter Klein. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979.



- Coppens, Joseph. “‘Mystery’ in the Theology of Saint Paul and its Parallels at Qumran.” Pages 132-58 in *Paul and Qumran: Studies in New Testament Exegesis*. Edited by Jerome Murphy-O’Connor. Chapman: London, 1968.
- Crenshaw, James L. “The Primacy of Listening in Ben Sira’s Pedagogy.” Pages 172-87 in *Wisdom, You Are My Sister: Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O. Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*. Edited by Michael L. Barré. CBQMS 29. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1997.
- . *Education in Ancient Israel: Across the Deadenng Silence*. ABRL. New York: Doubleday, 1998.
- Cribiore, Raffaella. *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996.
- . *Gymnastics of the Mind: Greek Education in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2001.
- . “The Grammarian’s Choice: The Popularity of Euripides’s *Phoenissae* in Hellenistic and Roman Education.” Pages 241-60 in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Edited by Yun Lee Too. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- . *The School of Libanius in Late Antique Alexandria*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
- . “Education in the Papyri.” Pages 320-37 in *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*. Edited by Roger Bagnall. New York: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- Crouzel, Henri. “L’imitation et la ‘suite’ de Dieu et du Christ dans les premiers siècles chrétiens, ainsi que leurs sources gréco-romaines et hébraïques,” *JAC* 21 (1978): 7-41.

- Dahl, Nils. "Paul and the Church at Corinth according to 1 Corinthians 1:10-4:21." Pages 313-35 in *Christian History and Interpretation*. Edited by William Farmer, C.F.D. Moule, and Richard R. Niehbur. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1967.
- . *Studies in Paul*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1977.
- Daube, David. "Paul a Hellenistic Schoolmaster?" Pages 801-803 in vol. 2 of *Collected Works of David Daube*. Edited by Calum Carmichael. 4 Vols. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Davies, G. I. "Were There Schools in Ancient Israel?" Pages 199-211 in *Wisdom in Ancient Israel: Essays in Honour of J. A. Emerton*. Edited by J. Day, R. P. Gordon, and H. G. M. Williamson. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Davies, Philip R. *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1998.
- Davies, W.D. "'Knowledge' in the Dead Sea Scrolls." *HTR* 46 (1953): 113-39.
- Davis, James A. *Wisdom and Spirit: An Investigation of 1 Corinthians 1.18-3.20 against the Background of Jewish Sapiential Traditions in the Greco-Roman Period*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America, 1984.
- Debanné, Marc J. *Enthymemes in the Letters of Paul*. LNTS 303. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2006.
- de Boer, Martinus C. "Images of Paul in the Post Apostolic Period." *CBQ* 42 (1980): 359-80.
- De Boer, Willis Peter. *The Imitation of Paul: An Exegetical Study*. Kampen: Kok, 1962.

- de Rijk, L.M. “Ἐγκύκλιος παιδεία: A study of its original meaning.” *Vivarium* 3 (1965): 24–93.
- Derrett, J. Duncan M. “Paul as Master-Builder.” *EvQ* 69 (1997): 129-37.
- Dibelius, Martin. *From Tradition to Gospel*. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: Scribner’s Sons, 1956.
- Dibelius, Martin and Hans Conzelmann. *The Pastoral Epistles*. Hermeneia. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1972.
- Dickey, Eleanor. *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana. Volume 1: Colloquia Monacensia-Einsidlensia, Leidense-Stephani, and Stephani*. CCTC 49. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
- . *The Colloquia of the Hermeneumata Pseudodositheana. Volume 2: Colloquium Harleianum, Colloquium Montepessulanum, Colloquium Celtis, and Fragments*. CCTC 53. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2015.
- Dillon, John. *The Middle Platonists: A Study of Platonism, 80 B.C. to A.D. 220*. London: Duckworth, 1977.
- . *Alcinous: The Handbook of Platonism*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1993.
- Dodd, Brian J. *Paul’s Paradigmatic ‘I’: Personal Example as Literary Strategy*. JSNTSup 177. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999.
- Dodd, C.H. *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments: Three Lectures*. London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1936.
- Doty, Ralph. “Chrysippus’ Theory of Education.” *Journal of Thought* 20 (1985): 70-75.
- Downing, F. Gerald. *Cynics, Paul, and the Pauline Churches: Cynics and Christian Origins II*. New York: Routledge, 1998.

- Drazin, Nathan. *The History of Jewish Education from 515 B.C.E to 220 C.E.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1940.
- Dyroff, Adolf. *Die Ethik der alten Stoa.* Berlin: S. Calvary, 1897.
- Dunn, J.D.G. *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament: An Inquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity.* 3rd ed. London: SCM, 2006.
- Dürr, Lorenz. *Das Erziehungswesen im Alten Testament und im antiken Orient.* Leipzig: Hinrichs 1932.
- Dutch, Robert S. *Paul and the Educated Elite in 1 Corinthians: Education and Community Conflict in Graeco-Roman Context.* JSNTSup 271. London: T&T Clark, 2005.
- Ebner, Eliezer. *Education in Ancient Israel during the Tannaitic Period 10-220 CE.* New York: Bloch, 1956.
- Ebner, Martin. *Leidenslisten und Apostelbrief.* FB 66. Würzburg: Echter, 1991.
- Edsall, Benjamin. “Kerygma, Catechesis, and Other Things We Used to Find: Twentieth-Century Research on Early Christian Teaching since Alfred Seeberg (1903).” *CBR* 10 (2012): 410-41.
- . *Paul’s Witness to Formative Early Christian Instruction.* WUNT 2/365. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2014.
- Ehrensperger, Kathy. *Paul and the Dynamics of Power: Communication and Interaction in the Early Christ Movement.* LNTS 325. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Elgvin, Torleif. “An Analysis of 4QInstruction.” PhD diss., Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997.

- . “Priestly Sages? The Milieus of Origin of 4QMysteries and 4QInstruction.” Pages 67-87 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20-22 May 2001*. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory Sterling, and R.A. Clements. STDJ 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Ellingworth, Paul. *The Epistle to the Hebrews: A Commentary on the Greek Text*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1993.
- Evelyn-White, Hugh G., trans. 1919-1921. *Ausonius*. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Fee, Gordon D. *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NICNT. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Ferri, M. Schiefer. *Die Sprache des Leids in den paulinischen Peristasenkatalogen*. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1991.
- Finney, Mark T. *Honour and Conflict in the Ancient World: 1 Corinthians in its Greco-Roman Social Setting*. LNTS 460. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Fiore, Benjamin. “‘Covert Allusion’ in 1 Cor 1-4.” *CBQ* 47 (1985): 85-102.
- . *The Function of Personal Example in the Socratic and Pastoral Epistles*. AnBib 105. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1986.
- Fitzgerald, John T. *Cracks in an Earthen Vessel: An Examination of the Catalogues of Hardships in the Corinthian Correspondence*. SBLDS 99. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988.
- . Fitzgerald, John T. and L. Michael White. *The Tabula of Cebes*. SBLTT 24. Chico, CA: Scholars Press, 1983.

- Fitzmyer, Joseph A. *First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 32. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2008.
- Fox, Michael V. "Qohelet's Epistemology." *HUCA* 58 (1987): 137-55.
- . "Who Can Learn? A Dispute in Ancient Pedagogy." Pages 62-67 in *Wisdom, You Are My Sister: Studies in Honor of Roland E. Murphy, O.Carm., on the Occasion of His Eightieth Birthday*. Edited by Michael L. Barré. CBQMS 29. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1997.
- Francis, James. "As Babes in Christ—Some Proposals regarding 1 Cor. 3:1-3." *JSNT* 7 (1980): 41-60.
- Fraser, P.M. *Rhodian Funerary Monuments*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1977.
- Frey, Jörg. "Die paulinisehe Antithese von 'Fleisch' und 'Geist' und die palästinisch-jüdische Weisheitstradition." *ZNW* 90 (1999): 45-77.
- . "Paul's View of the Spirit in Light of Qumran." Pages 237-60 in *The Dead Sea Scrolls and Pauline Literature*. Edited by Jean-Sébastien Rey. STDJ 102. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Frid, Bo. "The Enigmatic ἀλλὰ in 1 Cor 2:9." *NTS* 31 (1985): 603-611.
- Friesen, Courtney J.P. *Reading Dionysus: Euripides' Bacchae and the Cultural Contestations of Greeks, Jews, Romans, and Christians*. STAC 95. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2015.
- Friesen, Steven. "Poverty and Paul: Beyond the So-Called New Consensus." *JSNT* 26 (2004): 323-61.
- Friesen, Steven and Walter Scheidel. "The Size of the Economy and the Distribution of Income in the Roman Empire." *JRS* 99 (2009): 61-91.

- Furnish, Victor. *The Moral Teaching of Paul: Selected Issues*. 3rd ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 2009.
- Gärtner, Bertil. "The Pauline and Johannine Idea of 'To Know God' against the Hellenistic Background: The Greek Philosophical Principle 'Like by Like' in Paul and John." *NTS* 14 (1967-1968): 209-31.
- Gammie, John G. "The Sage in Sirach." Pages 355-71 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Gaventa, Beverly Roberts. *Our Mother St. Paul*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2007.
- Geljon, Albert C. and David T. Runia. *Philo of Alexandria: On Cultivation: Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*. PACS 4. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Georgi, Dieter. "Forms of Religious Propaganda." Pages 124-31 in *Jesus in His Time*. Edited by H. J. Schultz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1971.
- Gerber, Christine. *Ein Bild des Judentums für Nichtjuden von Flavius Josephus: Untersuchungen zu seiner Schrift Contra Apionem*. Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- . *Paulus und Seine 'Kinder': Studien zur Beziehungsmetaphorik der Paulinischen Briefe*. BZNW 136. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005.
- Glad, Clarence. *Paul and Philodemus: Adaptability in Epicurean and Early Christian Psychagogy*. NovTSup 81. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Gladd, Benjamin. *Revealing the mysterion: The Use of Mystery in Daniel and Second Temple Judaism with its Bearing on First Corinthians*. BZNW 160. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.

- Goering, Greg Schmidt. *Wisdom's Root Revealed: Ben Sira and the Election of Israel*. JSJSup 139. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . "Election and Knowledge in the Book of Wisdom." Pages 163-82 in *Studies in the Book of Wisdom*. Edited by Géza Xeravits and József Zsengellér. JSJSup 142. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Goff, Matthew J. *The Worldly and Heavenly Wisdom of 4QInstruction*. STDJ 50. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- . "Reading Wisdom at Qumran: 4QInstruction and the Hodayot." *DSD* 2 (2004): 263-88.
- . *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. VTSup 116. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- . "Being Fleshly or Spiritual: Anthropological Reflection and Exegesis of Genesis 1-3 in 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians." Pages 41-59 in *Christian Body, Christian Self: Concepts of Early Christian Personhood*. Edited by Clare K. Rothschild and Trevor W. Thompson. WUNT 284. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2011.
- . *4QInstruction*. WLAW 2. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013.
- Goff, Matthew and Karina M. Hogan, eds., *From Musar to Paideia: Pedagogy in Early Judaism and Early Christianity*. Atlanta: SBL Press, forthcoming.
- Goodrich, John. *Paul as an Administrator of God in 1 Corinthians*. SNTMS 152. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.



- Gordis, Robert. "The Social Background of Wisdom Literature: Dedicated to Professor Louis Ginzberg in Honor of his seventieth Anniversary." *HUCA* 18 (1943-44): 77-118.
- Gorday, Peter. *Principles of Patristic Exegesis: Romans 9-11 in Origen, John Chrysostom and Augustine*. New York: Mellen, 1983.
- Goulder, Michael. *Paul and the Competing Mission in Corinth*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson, 2001.
- Grant, Fredrick C. *Hellenistic Cults: The Age of Syncretism*. New York: Liberal Arts Press, 1953.
- Grant, Robert M. "Theological Education at Alexandria." Pages 178-89 in *The Roots of Egyptian Christianity*. Edited by Birger A. Pearson and James E. Goehring. SAC. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986.
- Grindheim, Sigurd. "Wisdom for the Perfect: Paul's Challenge to the Corinthian Church." *JBL* 121 (2002): 689-709.
- . *The Crux of Election: Paul's Critique of the Jewish Confidence in the Election of Israel*. WUNT 2/202. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Grubbs, Judith Evans and Tim Parkin, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Childhood and Education in the Classical World*. New York: Oxford, 2013.
- Grundmann, Walter. "Die νήπιοι in der urchristlichen Paranese." *NTS* 5 (1958-59): 188-205.
- Gummere, Richard M., trans. 1917-1925. *Seneca: Epistles*. 3 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Hadot, Ilsetraut. *Arts Libéraux et Philosophie dans la Pensée Antique*. Paris: Études Augustiniennes, 1984.
- Hall, David R. “A Disguise for the Wise: μετασχηματισμός in 1 Corinthians 4:6,” *NTS* 40 (1994): 143-49
- Hanges, James C. “1 Corinthians 4:6 and the Possibility of Written Bylaws in the Corinthian Church.” *JBL* 117 (1998): 275–98.
- Hanson, A.T. *Studies in Paul’s Technique and Theology*. London: SPCK, 1974.
- . *The Paradox of the Cross in the Thought of St. Paul*. JSNTSup 17. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1987.
- Haran, Menahem. “On the Diffusion of Literacy and Schools in Ancient Israel.” Pages 81-95 in *Congress Volume, Jerusalem 1986*. Edited by J.A. Emerton. VTSup 40. Leiden: Brill, 1988).
- Hardie, Alex. “Philitas and the Plane Tree.” *ZPE* 119 (1997): 21-36.
- . “Muses and Mysteries.” Pages 11-37 in *Music and the Muses: The Culture of ‘Mousikē’ in the Classical Athenian City*. Edited by Penelope Murray and Peter Wilson. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hardwick, Lorna. *Reception Studies*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Harrison, James R. “Paul and the Gymnasiarchs: Two Approaches to Pastoral Formation in Antiquity.” Pages 141-78 in *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter. PAST 5. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- . “Paul and the Ancient Gymnasium.” Pages 33-48 in *Learning and Teaching Theology: Some Ways Ahead*. Edited by Les Ball and James R. Harrison. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2015.

- Hays, Richard B. *Echoes of Scripture in the Letters of Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989.
- Heaton, Eric. *The School Tradition of the Old Testament: The Bampton Lectures for 1994*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994.
- Heinrici, C.F.G. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. KEK 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896.
- Helleman, W.E. "Penelope as Lady Philosophy." *Phoenix* 49 (1995): 283-302.
- Hendrickson, G.L. and H.M. Hubbell, et al., trans. 1913-2010. Cicero. 30 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Hengel, Martin. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- . *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1977.
- . *The Pre-Christian Paul*. London: SCM, 1991.
- Hezser, Catherine. *Jewish Literacy in Roman Palestine*. TSAJ 81. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Hijmans, B.J. *Askesis: Notes on Epictetus's Educational System*. Assen: Van Gorcum, 1959.
- Hiller von Gaertringen, Friedrich and Carl H. Robert. "Relief von dem Grabmal eines Rhodischen Schulmeisters." *Hermes* 37 (1902): 121-43.
- Hirsch-Luipold, Rainer. ed. *Das Bildtafel des Kebes: Allegorie des Lebens*. Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft: Darmstadt, 2005.

Hock, Ronald F. "The Workshop as a Social Setting for Paul's Missionary Preaching."

*CBQ* 41 (1979): 438-50.

———. "Paul and Greco-Roman Education." Pages 189-227 in *Paul in the Greco-*

*Roman World: A Handbook*. Edited by J. Paul Sampley. Harrisburg, PA: Trinity

International Press, 2003.

Hock Ronald F. and Edward N. O'Neil. *The Progymnasmata: The chreia in Ancient*

*Rhetoric*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1986.

———. *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Classroom Exercises*. Atlanta: SBL Press,

2002.

———. *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Commentaries on Aphthonius's*

*Progymnasmata*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2012.

Hofius, Otfried. "Das Zitat 1 Kor 2:9 und das koptische Testament des Jacob." *ZNW* 66

(1975): 140-42.

Holmes, Michael. *The Apostolic Fathers: Greek Texts and English Translations*. 3rd.

Grand Rapids: Baker, 2007.

Hooker, Morna. "Hard Sayings: 1 Cor 3:2." *Theology* 69 (1966):19-22.

———. "'Beyond the Things which Are Written:' An Examination of 1 Cor 4:6." *NTS*

10 (1963-64): 127-32.

Horrell, David G. *The Social Ethos of the Corinthian Correspondence: Interests and*

*Ideology from 1 Corinthians to 1 Clement*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996.

Horsley, Richard A. "Gnosis in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 8:1-6." *NTS* 27 (1980): 32-51.

- . “Pneumatikos vs. Psychikos: Distinctions of Spiritual Status among the Corinthians.” Pages 1-20 in *Wisdom and Spiritual Transendnce at Corinth: Studies in First Corinthians*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2008.
- Hugede, Norbert. *Saint Paul et la culture grecque*. Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1966.
- Hurd, J.C. *The Origin of 1 Corinthians*. New York: Seabury, 1965.
- Jamieson-Drake, David W. *Scribes and Schools in Monarchic Judah: A Socio-Archeological Approach*. JSOTSup 109. Sheffield: Almond, 1991.
- Jaeger, Werner. *Paideia: The Ideals of Greek Culture*. 3 vols. New York: Oxford University Press, 1939.
- . *Early Christianity and Greek Paideia*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1965.
- Jewett, Robert. *Paul’s Anthropological Terms: A Study of their Use in Conflict Settings*. Leiden, Brill, 1971.
- Jipp, Joshua W. *Christ is King: Paul’s Royal Ideology*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2015.
- Johnson, E. Elizabeth. “Wisdom and Apocalyptic in Paul.” Pages 263-83 in *In Search of Wisdom: Essays in Memory of John G. Gammie*,. Edited by Leo G. Perdue, B.B. Scott, and W.J. Wiseman. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1993.
- Johnson, Kent. *Paul the Teacher: A Resource for Teachers in the Church*. Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1986.
- Johnson, Luke Timothy. *The Gospel of Luke*. SP 3. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Joyal, Mark, Iain McDougal, and John Yardley, eds. *Greek and Roman Education: A Sourcebook*. New York: Routledge, 2009.

- Judge, E.A. *The First Christians in the Roman World: Augustan and New Testament Essays*. WUNT 229. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Kamlah, Eberhard. *Die Form der katalogischen Paränese im Neuen Testament*. WUNT 7. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1964.
- Kammler, Hans-Christian. *Kreuz und Weisheit*. WUNT 159. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.
- Kasher, Aryeh. "Polemic and Apologetic Modes of Writing in Contra Apionem." Pages 143-86 in *Josephus's Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Missing Portion in Greek*. Edited by Louis H. Feldman and John R. Levison. AGJU 34. Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Kaster, Robert. "Notes on 'Primary' and 'Secondary' Schools in Late Antiquity." *TAPA* 113 (1983): 323-46.
- . *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
- Keith, Chris. *The pericopae adulterae, the Gospel of John, and the Literacy of Jesus*. NTTSD 38. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- . *Jesus' Literacy: Scribal Culture and the Teacher from Galilee*. LNTS 413. New York: T&T Clark, 2011.
- . *Jesus against the Scribal Elite: the Origins of the Conflict*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.
- Kemmler, Dieter. *Faith and Human Reason: A Study of Paul's Method of Preaching as Illustrated by 1 Thessalonians 1-2 and Acts 17:2-4*. NovTSup 40. Leiden: Brill, 1975.

- Kennedy, George A. *The Art of Persuasion in Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1963.
- . *The Progymnasmata: Greek Handbooks of Prose Composition and Rhetoric*. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2003.
- . *Quintilian: A Roman Educator and his Quest for the Perfect Orator*. Sophron, 2013.
- Lucian*. Translated by K. Kilburn et al. 13 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1913-1967.
- Kleijwegt, Marc. *Ancient Youth: The Ambiguity of Youth and the Absence of Adolescence in Greco-Roman Society*. Amsterdam: Gieben, 1991.
- Kleinknecht, Karl T. *Der leidende Gerechtfertigte: Die alttestamentlich-jüdische Tradition vom "leidenden Gerechten" und ihre Rezeption bei Paulus*. WUNT 2/13. Tübingen: Mohr, 1984.
- Kloppenborg, John. "An Analysis of the Pre-Pauline Formula 1 Cor 15:3b-5 in Light of Some Recent Literature." *CBQ* 40 (1978): 351-67.
- Klostermann, August. "Schulwesen im Alten Israel." Pages 193-232 in *Theologische Studien Theodor Zahn zum 10. Oktober 1908 dargebracht*. Edited by Gottlieb Nathanael Bonwetsch. Leipzig: Deichert, 1908.
- Koester, Craig R. *Hebrews: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 36. New York: Doubleday, 2001.
- Koperski, Veronica. "'Mystery of God' or 'Testimony of God' in 1 Cor 2:1: Textual and Exegetical Considerations." Pages 305-15 in *New Testament Textual Criticism*

- and Exegesis: Festschrift J. Delobel*. Edited by Adelbert Denaux. BETL 161. Leuven: Peeters, 2002.
- Kövesecs, Zoltán. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Knapp, Robert C. *Invisible Romans*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2011.
- Kraftchick, Steven J. "Seeking a More Fluid Model: A Response to Jouette M. Bassler." Pages 18-34 in *Pauline Theology, Volume II: 1&2 Corinthians*. Edited by David M. Hay. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- Kuck, David W. *Judgment and Community Conflict: Paul's Use of Apocalyptic Judgment Language in 1 Corinthians 3:5-4:5*. NovTSup 66. Leiden: Brill, 1992.
- Laes, Christian. "Schoolteachers in the Roman Empire: A Survey of the Epigraphical Evidence." *Acta Classica* 50 (2007): 109-27.
- . "Pedagogues in Greek Inscriptions in Hellenistic and Roman Antiquity." *ZPE* 171 (2009): 113-22.
- . *Children in the Roman Empire: Outsiders Within*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- Laing, Gordon. "Quintilian, the Schoolmaster." *Classical Journal* 15 (1920): 515-34.
- Lambrecht, Jan. "Paul as Example: A Study of 1 Corinthians 4,6-21." Pages 43-62 in *Collected Studies on Pauline Literature and the Book of Revelation*. AnBib 147. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute, 2001.
- Lanci, John R. *A New Temple for Corinth: Rhetorical and Archaeological Approaches to Pauline Imagery*. New York: Lang, 1997.



- Lang, Bernhard. "Schule und Unterricht im alten Israel." Pages 186-201 in *La sagesse de l'Ancien Testament*. Edited by Maurice Gilbert. BETL 51. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1979.
- Lange, Armin. *Weisheit und Prädestination: Weisheitliche Urordnung und Prädestination in den Textfunden von Qumran*. STDJ 18. Leiden: Brill, 1995.
- Lassen, Eva Marie. "The Use of the Father Image in Imperial Propoganda and 1 Corinthians 4:1-21." *TynBul* 42 (1991): 127-36.
- Lautenschlager, Manfred. "Abschied vom Disputierer: Zur Bedeutung von συζητητής in 1 Kor 1,20." *ZNW* 83 (1992): 276–85.
- Layton, Richard A. *Didymus the Blind and his Circle in Late-Antique Alexandria* (Chicago: University of Illinois Press, 2004
- Lemaire, André. *Les écoles et la formation de la Bible dans l'ancien Israël*. OBO 39. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1981.
- . "The Sage in School and Temple." Pages 165-81 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Levine, Lee I. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2005.
- Levison, John R. *The Spirit in First Century Judaism*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Lieb, Michael, Emma Mason, Jonathan Roberts, and Christopher Rowland, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of the Reception History of the Bible*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

- Liebersohn, Yosef Z. *The Dispute concerning Rhetoric in Hellenistic Thought*.  
Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.
- Lightfoot, J.B. *Notes on Epistles of St Paul from Unpublished Commentaries*. London:  
MacMillan, 1904.
- Lim, Timothy H. "Not in Persuasive Words of Wisdom, but in the Demonstration of the  
Spirit and of Power." *NovT* 29 (1987): 137-49.
- Lindemann, Andreas. *Paulus im ältesten Christentum: das Bild des Apostels und die  
Rezeption der paulinische Theologie in der frühchristlichen Literatur bis  
Marcion*. BHT 58. Tübingen: Mohr, 1979.
- . *Paulus, Apostel und Lehrer der Kirche: Studien zu Paulus und zum frühen  
Paulusverständnis*. Tübingen : Mohr Siebeck, 1999.
- . *Der Erste Korintherbrief*. HNT 9/1. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2000.
- Lipsius, R.A. *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha: Acta Petri, Acta Pauli, Acta Petri et Pauli,  
Acta Pauli et Theclae, Acta Thaddaei*. Hildesheim: Olms, 1972.
- Litfin, Duane. *St. Paul's Theology of Proclamation: 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Greco-Roman  
Rhetoric*. SNTSMS 79. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- Longenecker, Bruce. *Remember the Poor: Paul, Poverty, and the Greco-Roman World*.  
Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2010.
- Lüttger, Wilhelm. *Freiheitspredigt und Schwarmgeister in Korinth: Ein Beitrag zur  
Charakteristik der Christuspartei*. BFCT 12/3. Gutersloh: Bertelsmann, 1908.
- Malherbe, Abraham J. *Social Aspects of Early Christianity*. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.
- . *Paul and the Thessalonians: The Philosophic Tradition of Pastoral Care*.  
Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

- . *Paul and the Popular Philosophers*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989.
- . “Hellenistic Moralists and the New Testament.” *ANRW* 2.26.1: 267-333. Part 2, *Pincipat* 26.1. Edited by Wolfgang Haase and Hildegard Temporini. New York: de Gruyter, 1992.
- . *Light from the Gentiles: Hellenistic Philosophy and Early Christianity*. Edited by Carl R. Holladay, John T. Fitzgerald, Gregory E. Sterling, and James W. Thompson. *NovTSup* 150. 2 Vols. Leiden: Brill, 2014.
- Marguerat, Daniel. *Paul in Acts and Paulin His Letters*. WUNT 310. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2013.
- Markschies, Christoph. “Lehrer, Schüler, Schule: Zur Bedeutung einer Institution für das antike Christentum.” Pages 97-119 in *Religiöse Vereine in der römischen Antike*. Edited by Ulrike Egelhaaf-Gaiser and Alfred Schäfer. STAC 13. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2002.
- . *Christian Theology and its Institutions in the Early Roman Empire: Prolegomena to a History of Early Christian Theology*. Translated by Wayne Coppins. Waco: Baylor, 2015.
- Marrou, Henri. *A History of Education in Antiquity*. Translated by George Lamb. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1956.
- Marshall, I. Howard. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Pastoral Epistles*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1999.
- Marshall, Peter. *Enmity in Corinth: Social Conventions in Paul’s Relations with the Corinthians*. WUNT 2/23. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1987.

- Martin, Dale B. *Slavery as Salvation: The Metaphor of Slavery in Pauline Christianity*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1990.
- . *The Corinthian Body*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995.
- Martin, Troy W. *Metaphor and Composition in 1 Peter*. SBLDS 131. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Martindale, Charles. *Redeeming the Text: Latin Poetry and the Hermeneutics of Reception*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993.
- . “Thinking Through Reception.” Pages 1-13 in *Classics and the Uses of Reception*. Edited by Charles Martindale and Richard F. Thomas. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2006.
- Martínez, F. García. “Wisdom at Qumran: Worldly or Heavenly?” Pages 1-16 in *Wisdom and Apocalypticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Biblical Tradition*. Edited by F. García Martínez. BETL 168. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 2003.
- Matelli, Elisabetta. “Hieronymus in Athens and Rhodes.” Pages 289-314 in *Lycos of Troas and Hieronymus of Rhodes: Text, Translation, and Discussion*. Edited by William W. Fortenbraugh and Stephen A. White. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers, 2004.
- Maurice, Lisa. *The Teacher in Ancient Rome: The Magister and his World*. Lanham, MD: Lexington, 2013.
- McDonald, James I.H.. *Kerygma and Didache: The Articulation and Structure of the Earliest Christian Message*. SNTSMS 37. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980.

- Mearns, Christopher L. "Early Eschatological Development in Paul: The Evidence of 1 Corinthians." *JSNT* 22 (1984): 19-35.
- Meeks, Wayne A. *The First Urban Christians: The Social World of the Apostle Paul*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1983.
- Meggitt, Justin. *Paul, Poverty, and Survival*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998.
- Mendelson, Alan. *Secular Education in Philo of Alexandria*. HUCM 7. Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press, 1982.
- Merkel, Helmut. "Der Lehrer Paulus und seine Schüler: Forschungsgeschichtliche Schlaglichter." Pages 235-52 in *Religiöses Lernen in der Biblischen, Frühjüdischen, und Frühchristlichen Überlieferung*. Edited by Beate Ego and Helmut Merkel. WUNT 180. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.
- Merklein, Helmut. "Das paulinischen Paradox des Kreuzes." *TTZ* 106 (1997): 81-98.
- Merritt, H. Wayne. *In Word and Deed: Moral Integrity in Paul*. New York: Lang, 1993.
- Metzger, Bruce M. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament*. 2nd ed. Stuttgart: United Bible Societies, 1994.
- Meyer, Elizabeth. "Writing Paraphernalia, Tablets, and Muses in Campanian Wall Painting." *AJA* 113 (2009): 569-97.
- Meyer, H.A.W. *Critical and Exegetical Handbook to the Epistles to the Corinthians*. Translated by D. Douglas Bannerman and William P. Dickson. 2. Vols. KEKNT 6. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1877-79.
- Michaelis, Wilhelm. "μυέομαι." Pages 668-69 in vol. 4 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.

- Michel, Otto. *Der Brief an die Hebräer*. KEKNT 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1966.
- Middendorp, Theophil. *Die Stellung Jesu Ben Siras zwischen Judentum und Hellenismus*. Leiden: Brill, 1973.
- Mihaila, Corin. *The Paul-Apollos Relationship and Paul's Stance toward Greco-Roman Rhetoric: An Exegetical and Socio-Historical Study of 1 Corinthians 1-4*. LNTS 402. New York: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Mitchell, Margaret M. *Paul and the Rhetoric of Reconciliation: An Exegetical Investigation of the Language and Composition of 1 Corinthians*. HUT 28. Tübingen: Mohr, 1991.
- . *The Heavenly Trumpet: John Chrysostom and the Art of Pauline Interpretation*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2002.
- Moffitt, David M. "Affirming the 'Creed': The Extent of Paul's Citation of an Early Christian Formula in 1 Cor 15,3b-7." *ZNW* 99 (2008): 49-73.
- Moore, John D. *Wrestling with Rationality in Paul: Romans 1-8 in a New Perspective*. SNTSMS 82. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- Morgan, Teresa. *Literate Education in the Hellenistic and Roman Worlds*. New York: Cambridge, 1998.
- . "Assessment in Roman Education." *Assessment in Education* 8 (2001): 11-24.
- . "Rhetoric and Education." Pages 303-19 in *A Companion to Greek Rhetoric*. Edited by Ian Worthington. Oxford: Blackwell, 2007.
- Moss, Candida R. *The Other Christs: Imitating Jesus in Ancient Christian Ideologies of Martyrdom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.

- Müller, Peter *Anfänge der Paulusschule: Dargestellt am zweiten Thessalonicherbrief und am Kollaserbrief*. ATANT 74. Zurich: Theologische Verlag, 1988.
- Munck, Johannes. "The Church without Factions: Studies in 1 Corinthians 1-4." Pages 135-67 in *Paul and the Salvation of Mankind*. London: SCM, 1959.
- Muñoz, Kevin A. "How Not to Go Out of the World: First Corinthians 14:13-25 and the Social Functions of Early Christian Expansion." PhD diss., Emory University, 2008.
- . "1 Thess 1:9-10 and the Missionary Preaching of Paul." *NTS* 9 (1962-63): 95-110.
- Murphy, James. *Quintilian on the Teaching of Speaking and Writing*. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1987.
- Murphy-O'Connor, Jerome. *Paul on Preaching*. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1964.
- . "Interpolations in 1 Corinthians." *CBQ* 48 (1986): 81-84.
- . *St. Paul's Corinth: Texts and Archaeology*. 3rd ed. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2002.
- Najman, Hindy. "Text and Figure in Ancient Jewish *Paideia*." Pages 253-65 in *Authoritative Scriptures in Ancient Judaism*. Edited by Mladen Popović. JSJSup 141. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Natali, Carlo. "Schools and Sites of Learning." Pages 40-66 in *The Greek Pursuit of Knowledge*. Edited by J. Brunshwig and G. E. R. Lloyd. Cambridge: Belknap, 2003.

- Newsom, Carol A. "The Sage in the Literature of Qumran: The Functions of the Maskil." Pages 373-82 in *The Sage in Israel and the Ancient Near East*. Edited by John G. Gammie and Leo G. Perdue. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- . *Job. NIB*. Nashville: Abingdon, 1994.
- Niehoff, Maren. *Philo on Jewish Identity and Culture*. TSAJ 86. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.
- Nissinen, Martti. "Transmitting Divine Mysteries: The Prophetic Role of Wisdom Teachers in the Dead Sea Scrolls." Pages 513-33 in *Scripture and Tradition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Raija Sollamo*. Edited by Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Nock, A.D. *St. Paul*. New York: Harper & Brothers, 1963.
- Isocrates*. Translated by George Norlin, et al. 3 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928-1945.
- O'Brien, Peter T. *Introductory Thanksgivings in the Letters of Paul*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009.
- O'Day, Gail R. "Jeremiah 9:22-23 and 1 Corinthians 1:26-31: A Study in Intertextuality." *JBL* 109 (1990): 259-67.
- Diodorus Siculus*. Translated by C.H. Oldfather et al. 12 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1933-1967..
- Epictetus*. Translated by W.A. Oldfather. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925-1928.



- Pao David W. "Gospel within the Constraints of an Epistolary Form: Pauline Introductory Thanksgivings and Paul's Theology of Thanksgiving." Pages 101-127 in *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams. PAST 6. Leiden: Brill, 2010.
- Patrologia Graeca. Edited by J.-P. Migne. 162 vols. Paris, 1857-1886.
- Pearson, Birger A. *The pneumatikos-psychichos Terminology in 1 Corinthians: A Study in the Theology of the Corinthian Opponents of Paul and its Relation to Gnosticism*. SBLDS 12. Missoula, MT: SBL Press, 1973.
- Perdue, Leo G. "Revelation and the Problem of the Hidden God in Second Temple Wisdom Literature." Pages 201-22 in *Shall Not the Judge of the Earth Do What is Right? Studies on the Nature of God in Tribute to James L. Crenshaw*. Edited by David Penchansky and Paul L. Redditt. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns, 2000.
- . "Ben Sira and the Prophets." Pages 132-54 in *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit: Essays in Honor of Alexander A. Di Lella*. Edited by Jeremy Coley and Vincent Skemp. CBQMS 38. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 2005.
- . *The Sword and the Stylus: An Introduction to Wisdom in the Age of Empires*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- Pernot, Laurent. *À l'école des anciens: Professeurs, élèves et étudiants*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 2008.
- Plutarch: Lives*. Translated by Bernadotte Perrin. 11 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914-1926..

- Pervo, Richard I. *Dating Acts: Between the Evangelists and the Apostles*. Santa Rosa, CA: Polebridge, 2006.
- . *Acts: A Commentary*. Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- Pesch, Wilhelm. “Der Sonderlohn für die Verkündiger des Evangeliums (I Kor 3, 8.14f. und Parallelen).” Pages 199-206 in *Neutestamentliche Aufsätze; Festschrift für Prof. Josef Schmid zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Josef Blinzler, Otto Kuss, and Franz Mussner. Regensburg: Pustet, 1963.
- Puech, Émile. “Les écoles dans l’Israël préexilique: données épigraphiques.” Pages 189-203 in *Congress Volume: Jerusalem 1986*. Edited by J.A. Emerton. VTSup 40. Leiden: Brill, 1988.
- Pickett, Raymond. *The Cross in Corinth: The Social Significance of the Death of Jesus*. JSNTSup 143. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997.
- Pitts Andrew W. and Matthew Ryan Hauge, eds. *Ancient Education and Early Christianity*. New York: T&T Clark, forthcoming.
- Planck, Karl A. *Paul and the Irony of Affliction*. SBLSS. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1987.
- Pogoloff, Stephen. *Logos and Sophia: The Rhetorical Situation of 1 Corinthians*. SBLDS 134. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1992.
- Preisigke, Friedrich, and Hans-Albert Rupprecht, Friedrich Bilabel, and Emil Kießling, eds. *Sammelbuch griechischer Urkunden aus Aegypten*. 21 vols. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 1915-2002.
- Rajak, Tessa. “The *Against Apion* and the Continuities in Josephus’s Political Thought.” Pages 195-218 in *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*. Leiden: Brill, 2002.

- Reiterer, Friedrich V. "The Interpretation of the Wisdom Tradition of the Torah within Ben Sira." Pages 209-32 in *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*. Edited by Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- Reitzenstein, Richard. *Hellenistic Mystery-Religions: Their Basic Ideas and Significance*. Pittsburgh: Pickwick, 1978.
- Rensberger, David. *As the Apostle Teaches: The Development and Use of Paul's Letters in Second-Century Christianity*. PhD diss., Yale University, 1981.
- Reumann, John. "'Stewards of God': Pre Christian Religious Application of Oikonomos in Greek." *JBL* 77 (1958): 339-49.
- . "Οἰκονομία-Terms in Paul in Comparison with Lucan *Heilsgeschichte*." *NTS* 13 (1967): 147-67.
- . *Stewardship and the Economy of God*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1992.
- Rey, Jean-Sébastien and Jan Joosten, eds. *The Texts and Versions of the Book of Ben Sira: Transmission and Interpretation*. JSJSup 150. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Rigaux, Bédé. "Révélation des mystères et perfection à Qumran et Dans le Nouveau Testament." *NTS* 4 (1957-58): 237-62.
- Suetonius*. Translated by J.C. Rolfe. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1914..
- Quintilian: The Orator's Education*. Translated by D.A. Russell, D. A.. 5 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- . "Arts and Sciences in Ancient Education." *Greece and Rome* 36 (2010): 210-25.

- Rylardsaam, David. "Interpretations of Paul in the Early Church." Pages 148-87 in *Rereading Paul Together: Protestant and Catholic Perspectives on Justification*. Edited by David Aune. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2006.
- Queyrel, Anne. "Les Muses à l'école: images de quelques vases du peintre de Calliope." *Antike Kunst* 31 (1988): 90-102.
- Sanders, Jack T. *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom*. SBLMS 28. Chico, CA: Scholars, 1983.
- Sandnes, Karl Olav. *Paul, One of the Prophets? A Contribution to the Apostle's Self-understanding*. WUNT 2/43. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1991.
- . *The Challenge of Homer: School, Pagan Poets, and Early Christianity*. LNTS 400. London: T&T Clark, 2009.
- Saunders, Ross. "Attalus, Paul, and *Paideia*: The Contribution of I. Eph. 202 to Pauline Studies." Pages 175-83 in *Ancient History in a Modern University: Proceedings of a Conference held at Macquarie University, 8-13 July 1993 to mark twenty-five years of the teaching of Ancient History at Macquarie University and the retirement from the Chair of Professor Edwin Judge*. Edited by T.W. Hillard, R.A. Kearsley, C.E.V. Nixon, and A.M. Nobbs. 2 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1998.
- Schaller, Berndt. "Zum Textcharakter der Hiobzitate im paulinischen Schriftum," *ZNW* 71 (1980): 21-26.
- Origen. *Homilies on Ezekiel 1-14*. Translated by Thomas P. Scheck. ACW 62. New York: Newman, 2010.
- Schmeller, Thomas. *Schulen im Neuen Testament? Zur Stellung des Urchristentums in der Bildungswelt seiner Zeit*. HBT 30. Freiberg: Herder, 2001.

- Schmithals, Walther. *Gnosticism in Corinth: An Investigation of the Letters to the Corinthians*. 3rd ed. Nashville: Abingdon, 1971.
- Schnelle, Udo. "Das frühe Christentum und die Bildung." *NTS* 61 (2015): 113-43.
- Schrage, Wolfgang. *Die konkreten Einzelgebote in der paulinischen Paränese: Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentlichen Ethik*. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 1961.
- . "Leid, Kreuz, und Eschaton: Die Peristasenkataloge als Merkmale paulinischer *theologia crucis* und Eschatologie." *EvT* 34 (1974): 859-79.
- . *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. EKK 7. 4 vols. Zürich: Benziger; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener, 1991-2001.
- Schröter, Jens "The Historical Jesus and the Sayings Tradition: Comments on Current Research." *Neotestamentica* 30 (1996): 151-68.
- Schubert, Paul. *Form and Function of the Pauline Thanksgivings*. BZNW 20. Berlin: Töpelmann, 1939.
- Scott, C.A. Anderson. *Saint Paul: The Man and the Teacher*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1936; Repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- Seeberg, Alfred. *Der Katechismus der Urchristenheit*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1903.
- . *Die Didache des Judentums und der Urchristenheit*. Leipzig: Deichert, 1908.
- Sellin, Gerhard. "Das 'Geheimnis' der Weisheit und das Rätsel der 'Christuspartei' (zu 1 Kor 1-4)." *ZNW* 73 (1982): 69-96.
- . *Der Streit um die Auferstehung der Toten: Eine religionsgeschichtliche und exegetische Untersuchung von 1 Korinther 15*. FRLANT 138. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1986.

- Senft, Christophe. *La première épître de Saint-Paul aux Corinthiens*. CNT 2/7. Neuchâtel: Delachaux & Niestlé, 1979.
- Shanor, Jay. "Paul as Master Builder: Construction Terms in First Corinthians." *NTS* 34 (1988): 461-71.
- Shellenberger, Ryan. *Rethinking Paul's Rhetorical Education: Comparative Rhetoric and 2 Corinthians 10-13*. ECL 10. Atlanta: SBL Press, 2013.
- Shi, Wenhua. *Paul's Message of the Cross as Body Language*. WUNT 2/254. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- Schlier, Heinrich. "ὕπόδειγμα." Pages 32-33 in vol. 2 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Schnabel, Eckhard J. *Law and Wisdom from Ben Sira to Paul: A Tradition Historical Enquiry into the Relation of Law, Wisdom, and Ethics*. WUNT 2/16. Tübingen: Mohr, 1985.
- Schneider, Carl. "ῥάβδος." Pages 966-70 in vol. 6 of *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Edited by Gerhard Kittel. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2006.
- Schwartz, Eduard, Johannes Straub, and Rudolf Schieffer, eds. *Acta Conciliorum Oecumenicorum*. 4 vols. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1914-1984.
- Schweitzer, Albert. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*. Translated by William Montgomery. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998.
- Seow, C.L. *Job 1-21: Interpretation and Commentary*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2013.
- Shupak, Nili. "Learning Methods in Ancient Israel." *VT* 53 (2003): 416-26.

- Sider, Robert. "Literary Artifice and the Figure of Paul in Tertullian." Pages 99-120 in *Paul and the Legacies of Paul*. Edited by William Babcock. Dallas: Southern Methodist University Press, 1990.
- Skehan, Patrick W. and Alexander A. Di Lella. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*. AB 39. Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1987.
- Smail, William. *Quintilian on Education*. New York: Teachers College Press, 1966.
- Smit, Joop F.M. "What is Apollos? What is Paul? In Search of the Coherence of First Corinthians 1:10-4:21." *NovT* 44 (2002): 231-51.
- Smith, Claire S. *Pauline Communities as "Scholastic Communities:" A Study of the Vocabulary of "Teaching" in 1 Corinthians, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus*. WUNT 2/335. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Sparks, H.F.D. "1 Kor 2:9: A Quotation from the Coptic Testament of Jacob?" *ZNW* 67 (1976): 269-76.
- Spencer, William. "The Power in Paul's Teaching (1 Cor 4:9-20)." *JETS* 32 (1989): 51-61.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, Christiane. "The Priesthoods of the Eleusinian Cult of Demeter and Kore." *ThesCRA* 5:60-65.
- Standhartinger, Angela. "Colossians and the Pauline School." *NTS* 50 (2004): 572-93.
- Stanley, Christopher D. *Paul and the Language of Scripture: Citation Technique in the Pauline Epistles and Contemporary Literature*. SNTSMS 74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Sterling, Gregory E. "'Wisdom among the Perfect:' Creation Traditions in Alexandrian Judaism and Corinthian Christianity." *NovT* 37 (1995): 355-84.

- . “‘The School of Sacred Laws:’ The Social Setting of Philo’s Treatises.” *VigChr* 53 (1999): 148-64.
- Stowers, Stanley. “Social Status, Public Speaking and Private Teaching: The Circumstances of Paul’s Preaching Activity.” *NovT* 36 (1984): 59-82.
- . *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. LEC 5. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1986.
- Strawbridge, Jennifer R. *The Pauline Effect: The Use of the Pauline Epistles by Early Christian Writers*. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2015.
- Strugnell, John and Daniel J. Harrington. *Qumran Cave 4.XXIV: Sapiential Texts, Part 2. 4QInstruction (Musar le Mevin): 4Q415ff. With a Revision of 1Q26*. DJD 34. Oxford: Clarendon, 1999.
- Tanzer, Sarah. “The Sages at Qumran: Wisdom in the Hodayot.” PhD diss., Harvard University, 1987.
- Tcherikover, Victor. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Theis, Joachim. *Paulus als Weisheitslehrer: Der Gekreuzigte und die Weisheit Gottes in 1 Kor 1-4*. BU 22. Regensburg: Pustet, 1991.
- Theissen, Gerd. “Social Stratification in the Corinthian Community: A Contribution to the Sociology of Early Hellenistic Christianity.” Pages 69-102 in *The Social Setting of Pauline Christianity: Essays on Corinth*. Translated by John H. Schütz. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1982.
- . *Psychological Aspects of Pauline Theology*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1987.



- Thiessen, Matthew. "Paul's Argument against Gentile Circumcision in Romans 2:17-29." *NovT* 56 (2014): 373-91.
- Thiselton, Anthony. "Realized Eschatology at Corinth." *NTS* 24 (1978): 510-26.
- . *The First Epistle to the Corinthians*. NIGTC. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000.
- Tigchelaar, Eibert J.C. "The Addressees of 4QInstruction." Pages 62-75 in *Sapiential, Liturgical, and Poetical Texts from Qumran*. Edited by Daniel K. Falk, Florentino García Martínez, and Eileen M. Schuller. STDJ 35. Leiden: Brill, 2000.
- . *To Increase Learning for the Understanding Ones: Reading and Reconstructing the Fragmentary Early Jewish Sapiential Text 4QInstruction*. STDJ 44. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Thackeray, Henry St. John. *The Relation of St. Paul to Contemporary Jewish Thought*. London: MacMillan, 1900.
- Thompson, James W. *Preaching Like Paul: Homiletical Wisdom for Today*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 2001.
- . *Moral Formation According to Paul: The Context and Coherence of Pauline Ethics*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Thorsteinsson, Runar. *Paul's Interlocutor in Romans 2: Function and Identity in the Context of Ancient Epistolography*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell International, 2003.
- Tite, Philip L. "How to Begin, and Why? Diverse Functions of the Pauline prescript with a Greco-Roman Context." Pages 57-99 in *Paul and the Ancient Letter Form*. Edited by Stanley E. Porter and Sean A. Adams. PAST 6. Leiden: Brill, 2010.

- Tobin, Thomas H. *The Creation of Man: Philo and the History of Interpretation*. CBQMS 14. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association, 1983.
- Tomlin, Graham. "Christians and Epicureans in 1 Corinthians." *JSNT* 68 (1997): 51-72.
- Too, Yun Lee, ed., *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Tuckett, Christopher. "Paul and Jesus Tradition: The Evidence of 1 Cor 2:9." Pages 55-73 in *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict. Essays in Honour of Margaret Thrall*, eds., Trevor J. Burke and J.K. Elliott. NovTSup 109. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Tyler, Ronald L. "1 Corinthians 4:6 and Hellenistic Pedagogy." *CBQ* 60 (1998): 97-103.
- . "The History of Interpretation of τὸ μὴ ὑπὲρ ἃ γέγραπται in 1 Cor 4.6." *ResQ* 43 (2001): 243–252.
- Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Critical Essays*. Translated by Stephen Usher. 2 vols. LCL. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974-1985.
- Vanderkam, James C. "The Prophetic-Sapiential Origins of Apocalyptic Thought." Pages 163-76 in *A Word in Season: Essays in Honour of William McKane*. Edited by J.D. Martin and P.R. Davies. Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1986.
- van Unnik, W.C. *Tarsus or Jerusalem: The City of Paul's Youth*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 2009.
- Vegge, Tor. *Paulus und das antike Schulwesen: Schule und Bildung des Paulus*. BZNW 134. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2006.
- Verheyden, Josef. "Origen on the Origin of 1 Cor 2:9." Pages 491-511 in *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Edited by Reimund Bierenger. BETL 125. Leuven: Peeters, 1996.

- von Nordheim, Eckhard. "Das Zitat des Paulus in Kor 2:9 und seine Beziehung zum koptischen Testament Jakobs." *ZNW* 65 (1974): 112-20.
- Vos, Johan S. "Der ΜΕΤΑΣΧΕΜΑΤΙΣΜΟΣ in 1 Kor 4:6." *ZNW* 86 (1995): 154-72.
- . "Die Argumentation des Paulus in 1 Kor 1:10-3:4." Pages 87-114 in *The Corinthian Correspondence*. Edited by Reimund Bieringer. BETL 125. Leuven: Leuven University Press, 1996.
- Vössing, Konrad. *Schule und Bildung im Nordafrika der römischen Kaiserzeit*. Brussels: Latomus, 1997.
- Wagner, J. Ross. "'Not Beyond the Things which Are Written': A Call to Boast Only in the Lord." *NTS* 44 (1998): 279-87.
- Walker Jr., William O. "1 Corinthians 2:6-16: A Non-Pauline Interpolation?" *JSNT* 47 (1992): 75-94.
- Walzer, Arthur E. "Quintilian's 'Vir Bonus' and the Stoic Wise Man." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 33 (2003): 25-41.
- Webb, Ruth. "The *progymnasmata* as Practice." Pages 289-316 in *Education in Greek and Roman Antiquity*. Edited by Yun Lee Too. Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Weeks, Stuart. *Early Israelite Wisdom*. Oxford: Clarendon, 1994.
- Weiss, Johannes. *Der erste Korintherbrief*. KEKNT 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1977.
- Welborn, L.L. "A Conciliatory Principle in 1 Corinthians 4:6." *NovT* 29 (1987): 320-46.
- . L.L. Welborn, "On the Discord in Corinth: 1 Corinthians 1-4 and Ancient Politics." *JBL* 106 (1987): 85-111.

- . *Paul, the Fool of Christ: A Study of 1 Corinthians 1-4 in the Comic-Philosophic Tradition*. JSNTSup 293. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- White, Adam *Where is The Wise Man?: Graeco-Roman Education as a Background to the Divisions in 1 Corinthians 1-4*. PhD diss., Macquarie University, 2013.
- . *Where is the Wise Man? Graeco-Roman Education as a Background to the Divisions in 1 Corinthians 1-4*. LNTS 536. London: T&T Clark, 2015.
- White, Benjamin. *Remembering Paul: Ancient and Modern Contests over the Image of the Apostle*. New York: Oxford, 2014.
- White, L. Michael and John T. Fitzgerald. “*Quod est comparandum: The Problem of Parallels*.” Pages 13-39 in *Early Christianity and Classical Culture: Comparative Studies in Honor of Abraham J. Malherbe*. Edited by John T. Fitzgerald, Thomas H. Olbricht, and L. Michael White. NovTSup 110. Brill: Leiden, 2003.
- Whitmarsh, Tim. *Greek Literature in the Roman Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- Whybray, R.N. *The Intellectual Tradition in the Old Testament*. BZAW 135. Berlin: de Gruyter, 1974.
- Widder, Wendy. “*To Teach*” in *Ancient Israel: A Cognitive Linguistic Study of a Biblical Hebrew Lexical Set*. BZAW 456. Berlin: de Gruyter 2014.
- Widmann, Martin. “I Kor 2 6-16: Ein Einspruch gegen Paulus.” *ZNW* 70 (1979): 44-53.
- Wilamowitz von Moellendorff, Ulrich. “Die Lindische Tempelchronik.” *Archäologischer Anzeiger* 28 (1913): 42-46.
- Wilckens, Ulrich. *Weisheit und Torheit*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1959.

- . “Zu 1 Kor 2,1-16.” Pages 5-1-37 in *Theologia Crucis, Signum Crucis: Festschrift für Erich Dinkler zum 70. Geburtstag*. Edited by Carl Andresen and Günter Klein. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1979.
- Williams, David S. “The Date of Ecclesiasticus.” *VT* 44 (1994): 563-66.
- Williams, H.H. Drake. *The Wisdom of the Wise: The Presence and Function of Scripture within 1 Cor. 1:18-3:23*. AGJU 49. Brill: Leiden, 2001.
- Windisch, Hans . *Paulus und Christus: Ein biblisch-religionsgeschichtlicher Vergleich*. UNT 24. Leipzig: Heinrichs, 1934.
- Winter, Bruce. *Seek the Welfare of the City: Early Christians as Benefactors and Citizens*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994.
- . *After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001.
- . *Philo and Paul among the Sophists: Alexandrian and Corinthian Responses to a Julio-Claudian Movement*. 2nd ed. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2003.
- . “The ‘Underlays’ of Conflict and Compromise in 1 Corinthians.” Pages 139-55 in *Paul and the Corinthians: Studies on a Community in Conflict*. Edited by Trevor Burke and James Elliott. NovTSup 109. Leiden: Brill, 2003.
- Winterbottom, Michael. “Quintilian and the Vir Bonus.” *JRS* 54 (1964): 90–97.
- Witherington III, Ben. *Conflict and Community in Corinth: A Socio-Rhetorical Commentary on 1 and 2 Corinthians*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1995.
- Wold, Benjamin G. *Women, Men, and Angels: The Qumran Wisdom Document Musar leMevin and its Allusions to Genesis Creation Traditions*. WUNT 2/201. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2005.

- Wolfson, H.A. *Philo: Foundations of Religious Philosophy in Judaism, Christianity, and Islam*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1947.
- Wright III, Benjamin G. "The Categories of Rich and Poor in the Qumran Sapiential Literature." Pages 101-23 in *Sapiential Perspectives: Wisdom Literature in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium of the Orion Center, 20-22 May 2001*. Edited by John J. Collins, Gregory Sterling, and R.A. Clements. STDJ 51. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "Torah and Sapiential Pedagogy in the Book of Ben Sira." Pages 157-86 in *Wisdom and Torah: The Reception of 'Torah' in the Wisdom Literature of the Second Temple Period*. Edited by Bernd U. Schipper and D. Andrew Teeter. JSJSup 163. Leiden: Brill, 2013.
- Wytttenbach, Daniel. *Animadversiones in Plutarchi opera moralia*. Leipzig: Teubner, 1820.
- Yarbrough, O. Larry. "Parents and Children in the Letters of Paul." Pages 126-41 in *The Social World of the First Christians: Essays in Honor of Wayne A. Meeks*. Edited by L. Michael White and O. Larry Yarbrough. Minneapolis: Fortress, 1995.
- Young, Frances M. *Biblical Exegesis and the Formation of Christian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Young, Norman. "PAIDAGOGOS: The Social Setting of a Pauline Metaphor." *NovT* 29 (1987): 150-76.
- Zeller, Dieter. *Der erste Brief an die Korinther*. KEKNT 5. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2010.

Ziegler, Joseph. *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*. Septuaginta 12/2. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1965.

Zuck, Roy B. *Teaching as Paul Taught*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 1998.

Zurawski, Jason. "Mosaic Torah as Encyclical Paideia: Reading Paul's Allegory of Hagar and Sarah in Light of Philo of Alexandria's." Paper presented at the Society of Biblical Literature Annual Meeting, Chicago, IL, 2012.

———. "Second Temple Jewish *Paideia* within its Hellenistic Contexts." PhD diss., University of Michigan, 2016.